

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

1900 Capitol Avenue Sacramento, CA 95811 Professional Services Division (916) 324-8002 Fax (916) 324-8927

November 2017

Dear Deans, Superintendents, Directors, and Chairs,

We are pleased to provide the reports of program completers' responses to the 2017 Program Completer Survey administered by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The attached reports provide summary responses from completers of Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist teaching and Administrative Services preparation programs as well as Clear Credential General Education Completers Survey and Clear Credential Education Specialist Completer Survey who were recommended for a credential between September 1, 2016 and August 31, 2017. Additional reports for the Commission's Employer Survey, which was administered October through December 2016, and the Master Teacher Survey, which was administered during the spring and summer of 2017, may also be included for your programs.

All Statewide reports and Summary of Response rates by Teacher Preparation Programs are available at the program completer website: <u>http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/completer-surveys.html</u>. These surveys were part of the Commission's current work to streamline and strengthen the Commission's Accreditation System. As part of this work, there were several Task Groups to address specific areas. One of the task groups was the "Outcomes/Surveys Task Group," which focused on improving the quality of the surveys. Based on the feedback from the task group, the survey questions were organized under the six domains of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), the survey lengths were shortened, and consistency was established among the three teaching credential surveys. In addition to modifying the four pilot surveys, two additional surveys were administered - Clear Credential General Education Completers Survey and Clear Credential Education Specialist Completer Survey.

Program-level reports for your institution/agency are attached for each preliminary and clear credential program having ten or more program completers. Reports for programs with fewer than ten completers may be included if all of the completers responded to the survey. The program-level reports provide the counts, percentages, and, where appropriate, the mean and standard deviation for questions. In the interest of protecting the identity of each individual who participated in the survey, it has been determined that no report would be provided to the program if fewer than 10 individuals responded to the survey, unless 100% of program completers responded. Instead, a statewide report will be provided for that program. In addition, demographic information is provided if at least 10 individuals selected that option.

The data reported through the survey process represent the self-reported individual perceptions of candidates who have completed your preliminary and or clear preparation program. Individual completers elected to take the survey voluntary provided answers under conditions that promised anonymity. It is equally important to consider the number of respondents from your program and the extent to which the respondents reflect the gender, ethnic, and program composition of this cohort at your institution. The last page of each program report contains a summary of the total number of email invitations sent to your program completers and the number and percent of program completers who answered any non-demographic survey question. Numbers for the same parameters at the statewide level are also provided for your information.

If you have questions or suggestions about the Program Completer Surveys or the Survey Reports, please submit them to <u>Accreditation@ctc.ca.gov</u>.

Thank you for your continuing work in preparing effective educators for California public schools.

Sincerely yours,

Jeii Clark

Teri Clark, Director Professional Services Division

Ensuring Educator Excellence

Visionary Leadership

How well did your administrator preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as an administrator?	teaching consister	op and arti and learni nt with the overall vis	ng for the local edu	e school Ication	the visio	op a share n among a ol commur	II membe			by example ntation of			dership with others in ommunity			
	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	wide	Program		Statewide	
	292	100.0%	2217	100.0%	292	100.0%	2212	99.8%	291	99.7%	2208	99.6%	290	99.3%	2208	99.6%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2 = Poorly	2	0.7%	10	0.5%	2	0.7%	4	0.2%	0	0.0%	4	0.2%	1	0.3%	8	0.4%
3 = Adequately	34	11.6%	139	6.3%	30	10.3%	124	5.6%	36	12.4%	153	6.9%	30	10.3%	136	6.2%
4 = Well	97	33.2%	594	26.8%	93	31.8%	569	25.7%	97	33.3%	566	25.6%	99	34.1%	540	24.5%
5 = Very well	159	54.5%	1474	66.5%	167	57.2%	1515	68.5%	157	54.0%	1483	67.2%	160	55.2%	1524	69.0%
Mean : SD	4.41	0.72	4.59	0.63	4.46	0.70	4.63	0.60	4.41	0.73	4.60	0.63	4.44	0.69	4.62	0.62

Instructional Leadership

	standard effective	ote implem ls, and peo instruction assessmer on	dagogical nal practio	skills, ces and	feedback classrooi student	ate, analyz on the eff m instructi learning ar onal growth	fectivenes on to pro nd teache	ss of mote	the schoo including implicatio	nstrate un ol and con the instru ons of cult nomic, and	nmunity c Ictional Ural/lingu	ontext, iistic,	commun	Communicate with th ommunity about schoo utcomes data and imp oals		le
	Prog	Iram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide
	292	100.0%	2209	99.6%	291	99.7%	2208	99.6%	291	99.7%	2200	99.2%	290	99.3%	2193	98.9%
= Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	2	0.1%	1	0.3%	4	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
= Disagree	1	0.3%	16	0.7%	3	1.0%	22	1.0%	3	1.0%	6	0.3%	3	1.0%	12	0.5%
= Neutral	43	14.7%	230	10.4%	40	13.7%	206	9.3%	35	12.0%	131	6.0%	30	10.3%	162	7.4%
_ Agree	103	35.3%	701	31.7%	88	30.2%	653	29.6%	89	30.6%	603	27.4%	97	33.4%	649	29.6%
= Strongly Agree	145	49.7%	1260	57.0%	159	54.6%	1323	59.9%	164	56.4%	1460	66.4%	160	55.2%	1370	62.5%
Mean : SD	4.34	0.74	4.45	0.71	4.38	0.78	4.48	0.72	4.42	0.74	4.60	0.61	4.43	0.72	4.54	0.66

School Improvement Leadership

9. Work with others to identify

student and school needs and

develop a data-based school growth

How well did your administrator preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as an administrator? 10. Implement change strategies based on current, relevant theories and best practices in school improvement 11. Identify and use available human, fiscal, and material resources to implement the school growth plan 12. Institute a collaborative, ongoing process of monitoring and revising the growth plan based on student outcomes

administrator?	plan	plan				improvement				growth plan				student outcomes				
	Pro	gram	Statewide		Prog	Program		Statewide		Program		wide	Program		Statewide			
	267	91.4%	2072	93.5%	267	91.4%	2068	93.3%	267	91.4%	2066	93.2%	267	91.4%	2064	93.1%		
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%		
2 = Poorly	1	0.4%	7	0.3%	1	0.4%	10	0.5%	3	1.1%	21	1.0%	1	0.4%	7	0.3%		
3 = Adequately	34	12.7%	186	9.0%	30	11.2%	162	7.8%	39	14.6%	254	12.3%	35	13.1%	179	8.7%		
4 = Well	86	32.2%	622	30.0%	98	36.7%	624	30.2%	96	36.0%	734	35.5%	87	32.6%	641	31.1%		
5 = Very well	146	54.7%	1257	60.7%	138	51.7%	1272	61.5%	129	48.3%	1057	51.2%	144	53.9%	1236	59.9%		
Mean : SD	4.41	0.72	4.51	0.67	4.40	0.70	4.53	0.66	4.31	0.76	4.37	0.73	4.40	0.73	4.50	0.67		

Professional Learning and Growth Leadership

	How well did your administrator preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as an administrator?	are you to s an 13. Model life-long learning and related professional growth				individua	teachers i al professio profession	onal pract	ice	15. Identify and facilitate a variety of professional and personal growth opportunities for faculty, staff, parents and other members of the school community in support of the educational program						
		Prog	Iram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	ewide			
		267	91.4%	2069	93.3%	267	91.4%	2067	93.2%	266	91.1%	2067	93.2%			
1 =	Not at all	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%			
2 =	Poorly	2	0.7%	9	0.4%	4	1.5%	13	0.6%	2	0.8%	16	0.8%			
3 =	Adequately	28	10.5%	117	5.7%	29	10.9%	154	7.5%	33	12.4%	194	9.4%			
4 =	Well	86	32.2%	505	24.4%	106	39.7%	641	31.0%	95	35.7%	641	31.0%			
5 =	Very well	151	56.6%	1438	69.5%	128	47.9%	1258	60.9%	136	51.1%	1216	58.8%			
	Mean : SD	4.45	0.71	4.63	0.61	4.34	0.73	4.52	0.67	4.37	0.73	4.48	0.70			

Organizational and Systems Leadership

How well did your administrator preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as an administrator? 16. Understand and manage the complex interaction of all of the school's systems to promote teaching and learning

17. Develop, implement, and monitor the school's budget

18. Implement California school laws, guidelines, and other relevant federal, state, and local requirements and regulations

	Prog	Iram	State	Statewide		Program		Statewide		Iram	Statewide	
	265	90.8%	2063	93.1%	264	90.4%	2063	93.1%	265	90.8%	2064	93.1%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	0.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2 = Poorly	2	0.8%	10	0.5%	8	3.0%	87	4.2%	3	1.1%	22	1.1%
3 = Adequately	35	13.2%	181	8.8%	50	18.9%	472	22.9%	33	12.5%	249	12.1%
4 = Well	89	33.6%	694	33.6%	94	35.6%	648	31.4%	87	32.8%	653	31.6%
5 = Very well	139	52.5%	1178	57.1%	112	42.4%	844	40.9%	142	53.6%	1140	55.2%
Mean : SD	4.38	0.74	4.47	0.67	4.17	0.84	4.08	0.92	4.39	0.75	4.41	0.74

Community Leadership

How well did your administrator preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as an administrator?

19. Represent and promote the
school's accomplishments and
needs to the LEA and the public

20. Engage the community in helping achieve the school's vision and goals

	Pro	gram	State	wide	Program		State	ewide
	257	88.0%	2010	90.7%	256	87.7%	2008	90.6%
_ = Not at all	1	0.4%	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2 = Poorly	1	0.4%	15	0.7%	5	2.0%	15	0.7%
3 = Adequately	49	19.1%	276	13.7%	38	14.8%	224	11.2%
t = Well	96	37.4%	712	35.4%	91	35.5%	646	32.2%
5 = Very well	110	42.8%	1005	50.0%	122	47.7%	1123	55.9%
Mean : S	5D 4.22	0.79	4.34	0.75	4.29	0.79	4.43	0.72

Field-based Experience and Other Program Experiences

21. Were your field-based experiences (check all that apply)	Prog	ram	State	wide
	256	87.7%	1998	90.1%
Helpful to understanding the day to day roles and responsibilities of a school administrator?	213	72.9%	1696	76.5%
Helpful to understanding the long term roles and responsibilities of a school administrator?	200	68.5%	1610	72.6%
Helpful in providing an opportunity to practice the job role of a school administrator?	193	66.1%	1498	67.6%
Related to the administrator job role that you plan to seek?	178	61.0%	1421	64.1%
Sufficient?	119	40.8%	907	40.9%
My program did not provide field experiences.	2	0.7%	35	1.6%

experienced and effective erstood current educational theory red me develop problem solving processes that led to my success	Prog	Iram	Statewide	
	255	87.3%	1984	89.5%
Was an excellent mentor	152	52.1%	1390	62.7%
Was experienced and effective	196	67.1%	1609	72.6%
Understood current educational theory	165	56.5%	1430	64.5%
Helped me develop problem solving processes that led to my success	149	51.0%	1301	58.7%
Helped me develop collegial practices that led to my success	143	49.0%	1230	55.5%
Was well versed in helping me work through problems in educational leadership	155	53.1%	1298	58.5%
Promoted reflective practice	175	59.9%	1452	65.5%
I did not have a program supervisor	4	1.4%	39	1.8%

23. My program supervisor provided consistent feedback

	Prog	gram	State	wide
	254	87.0%	1995	90.0%
= Strongly Disagree	8	3.2%	87	4.5%
= Disagree	2	0.8%	30	1.5%
= Neutral	16	6.4%	118	6.0%
= Agree	101	40.4%	666	34.1%
= Strongly Agree	123	49.2%	1052	53.9%
I did not have a program supervisor **	4	-	42	-
Mean : SD	4.32	0.88	4.31	0.98

24. My field-based supervisor provided consistent feedback

	Prog	gram	State	wide
	254	87.0%	1992	89.9%
1 = Strongly Disagree	10	4.0%	92	4.8%
2 = Disagree	6	2.4%	24	1.2%
3 = Neutral	11	4.3%	132	6.9%
4 = Agree	92	36.4%	631	32.8%
5 = Strongly Agree	134	53.0%	1042	54.2%
I did not have a field-based supervisor **	1	-	71	-
Mean : SD	4.32	0.96	4.31	1.00

For each statement below select the option which best describes your experience.

	mentori develop	mentoring and professional development with knowledgeable				26. The field-based experiences I completed during my program helped prepare me for my role as a school leader.				eld-based me to prac /ledge of le through n ork	tice and a adership	apply
	Pro	gram	State	wide	Prog	ram	Statewide		Program		State	ewide
	251	86.0%	1966	88.7%	252	86.3%	1967	88.7%	250	85.6%	1961	88.5%
1 = Strongly Disagree	6	2.4%	63	3.3%	5	2.0%	51	2.6%	5	2.0%	51	2.7%
2 = Disagree	2	0.8%	37	1.9%	1	0.4%	8	0.4%	0	0.0%	8	0.4%
3 = Neutral	24	9.7%	188	9.8%	9	3.6%	66	3.4%	11	4.4%	83	4.3%
4 = Agree	107	43.1%	714	37.3%	88	35.1%	678	35.1%	89	35.7%	694	36.1%
5 = Strongly Agree	109	44.0%	912	47.6%	148	59.0%	1126	58.4%	144	57.8%	1086	56.5%
I did not have a program supervisor **	3	-	52	-								
I did not have field-based experiences in my program **					1	-	38	-	1	-	39	-
Mean : S	5D 4.25	0.85	4.24	0.94	4.49	0.77	4.46	0.81	4.47	0.76	4.43	0.82

For each question below select the option which best describes your experience in your preparation program.

	28. Approximately how much time did you spend doing supervised fieldwork?				29. About how often did you communicate with your program supervisor about issues related to your practice?		gram	30. About how often did you rece support in the field from your program supervisor?											
	Program		Program		Program		Program		State	Statewide		Prog	Iram	State	ewide	Prog	Iram	State	wide
	248	84.9%	1941	87.6%		249	85.3%	1955	88.2%	246	84.2%	1951	88.0%						
1 = I did not do any supervised field work	6	2.4%	105	5.4%	1 = Never or I did not have a program supervisor	4	1.6%	65	3.3%	9	3.7%	112	5.7%						
2 = Less than 100 hours	34	13.7%	411	21.2%	2 = Less than once per month	16	6.4%	189	9.7%	32	13.0%	259	13.3%						
3 = 100 - 299 hours	66	26.6%	718	37.0%	3 = Once per month	63	25.3%	379	19.4%	60	24.4%	433	22.2%						
4 = 300 - 599 hours	56	22.6%	365	18.8%	4 = Twice per month	78	31.3%	494	25.3%	65	26.4%	416	21.3%						
5 = 600 - 799 hours	32	12.9%	132	6.8%	5 = Once per week	48	19.3%	524	26.8%	40	16.3%	429	22.0%						
6 = 800 hours or more	54	21.8%	210	10.8%	6 = 2-3 times per week	30	12.0%	247	12.6%	30	12.2%	225	11.5%						
Mean : SD	3.95	1.43	3.33	1.32	7 = Daily	10	4.0%	57	2.9%	10	4.1%	77	3.9%						
					Mean : SD	4.12	1.30	4.12	1.38	3.91	1.45	3.91	1.52						

Your Overall Program Summary

31. Overall, how well do you think your program prepares graduates to become school leaders?

	Prog	jram	State	wide
	247	84.6%	1960	88.4%
1 = Poorly	1	0.4%	12	0.6%
2 = Adequately	58	24.2%	349	18.0%
3 = Very well	181	75.4%	1573	81.3%
No opinion, or decline to state **	7	-	26	-
Mean : SD	2.75	0.44	2.81	0.41

32. How effective was your preparation program at helping you develop the skills and tools you needed to become a school leader?

	Prog	gram	State	ewide
	249	85.3%	1964	88.6%
1 = Ineffective	0	0.0%	2	0.1%
2 = Somewhat effective	13	5.3%	80	4.1%
3 = Effective	82	33.3%	560	28.7%
4 = Very effective	151	61.4%	1311	67.1%
No opinion, or decline to state **	3	-	11	-
Mean : SD	3.56	0.59	3.63	0.57

33. Please indicate the reason, or reasons, you enrolled in and completed the Preliminary Administrative Services program.	Program		ram State	
	248	84.9%	1965	88.6%
Want to get a position as a school administrator	181	62.0%	1503	67.8%
Have a position as a school, district, or county office administrator (completed the program as an Administrative Intern)	63	21.6%	365	16.5%
Want to get a position as a district office or county office administrator	83	28.4%	720	32.5%
Wanted to earn a Master's degree	65	22.3%	656	29.6%
Wanted to earn units for the salary schedule	29	9.9%	394	17.8%
Other	10	3.4%	134	6.0%

34. Which of these best describes your primary job role while you were preparing to be a school leader?

	Program		ram State	
	248	84.9%	1960	88.4%
1 = General Education Teacher	80	32.3%	905	46.2%
2 = Special Education Teacher	47	19.0%	249	12.7%
3 = Counselor or other Pupil Personnel Services role	20	8.1%	102	5.2%
4 = School Nurse, Teacher Librarian, or Speech Language Pathologist	4	1.6%	21	1.1%
5 = Mentor/Master/Teacher Leader	24	9.7%	267	13.6%
6 = School Administrator (Intern program)	53	21.4%	243	12.4%
7 = Other	20	8.1%	173	8.8%
Mean : SD	3.34	2.24	2.96	2.25

Demographics

35. Are you Hispanic or Latino? (Select only one)

55. Are you hispanic of Latino? (Select only one)				
	Prog	gram	State	wide
	242	82.9%	1933	87.2%
No, not Hispanic or Latino	172	71.1%	1379	71.3%
Yes, Hispanic or Latino	70	28.9%	554	28.7%
36. What is your race?	212	72.6%	1733	78.2%
American Indian or Alaska Native	*		60	2.7%
Chinese	*		51	2.3%
Japanese	*		25	1.1%
Korean	*		29	1.3%
Vietnamese	*		15	0.7%
Asian Indian	*		18	0.8%
Laotian	*		0	0.0%
Cambodian	*		2	0.1%
Filipino	*		56	2.5%
Hmong	*		6	0.3%
Other Asian	*		17	0.8%
Black or African American	27	9.2%	163	7.4%
Hawaiian	*		10	0.5%
Guamanian	*		1	0.0%
Samoan	*		2	0.1%
Tahitian	*		0	0.0%
Other Pacific Islander	*		9	0.4%
White	164	56.2%	1372	61.9%

Demographic numbers below 10 are not shown. If only one
category is below 10, then the next highest number is also hidden.

	Number of Program Completers Asked to Participate in Survey	# and of Respo	
Program:	299	292	97.7 %
Statewide:	2307	2217	96.1 %

'Respondents' are those program completers who answered a minimum of 1 non-demographic question.

37. What is your gender?	244	83.6%	1945	87.7%
Male	*		535	27.5%
Female	172	70.5%	1384	71.2%
Decline to state	*		26	1.3%

Information about your program and working with your Support Provider

1. How long after you were hired into an assignment that requires a California preliminary teaching credential were you **enrolled** in a Commission-approved induction or clear credential program?

	Prog	rogram Stat		tatewide	
	28	100.0%	2243	99.9%	
 At the time of hire or before beginning work with students 	6	21.4%	803	35.8%	
= Within one to two months of beginning my assignment	2	7.1%	396	17.7%	
Within three to five months of beginning my					
assignment	0	0.0%	72	3.2%	
$_{\tt =}$ More than five months after beginning my assignment	2	7.1%	107	4.8%	
= One year or more after beginning my assignment	18	64.3%	865	38.6%	
Mean : SD	3.86	1.72	2.93	1.79	

2. How long after you were enrolled in your induction/clear credential program did you begin **working with a Support Provider (SP)** or receive support from Clear Credential Personnel?

	Program		State	ewide
	28	100.0%	2235	99.5%
1 = Within one month of enrolling in the program	26	92.9%	1860	83.2%
2 = Within two months of enrolling in the program	1	3.6%	210	9.4%
3 = More than three months after enrolling in the program	1	3.6%	85	3.8%
4 = I was assigned a Support Provider but never worked				
with him/her	0	0.0%	11	0.5%
5 = I was never assigned a Support Provider	0	0.0%	69	3.1%
Mean : SD	1.11	0.42	1.31	0.83

3. What was the length of your clear induction program?

Pro	rogram Stat		Statewide	
28	100.0%	2233	99.4%	
4	14.3%	147	6.6%	
20	71.4%	778	34.8%	
4	14.3%	161	7.2%	
0	0.0%	1074	48.1%	
0	0.0%	73	3.3%	
2.00	0.54	3.07	1.10	
	28 4 20 4 0 0	20 71.4% 4 14.3% 0 0.0% 0 0.0%	28 100.0% 2233 4 14.3% 147 20 71.4% 778 4 14.3% 161 0 0.0% 1074 0 0.0% 73	

How helpful was your Support Provider/Mentor/System of Support in helping you impact students in learning regarding the following:

		4a. Mod observe	eling instru d	uction wh	ile I					4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction				4d. Teaching Practices				
		Prog	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
		28	100.0%	2222	98.9%	28	100.0%	2219	98.8%	28	100.0%	2214	98.6%	28	100.0%	2218	98.8%	
1 = Very Helpful		21	75.0%	1258	56.6%	19	67.9%	1409	63.5%	18	64.3%	1449	65.4%	18	64.3%	1320	59.5%	
2 = Helpful		7	25.0%	584	26.3%	9	32.1%	580	26.1%	8	28.6%	564	25.5%	8	28.6%	673	30.3%	
3 = Somewhat helpful		0	0.0%	265	11.9%	0	0.0%	190	8.6%	2	7.1%	159	7.2%	2	7.1%	188	8.5%	
4 = Not at all helpful		0	0.0%	115	5.2%	0	0.0%	40	1.8%	0	0.0%	42	1.9%	0	0.0%	37	1.7%	
	Mean : SD	1.25	0.44	1.66	0.88	1.32	0.48	1.49	0.73	1.43	0.63	1.46	0.71	1.43	0.63	1.52	0.72	

Clear Education Specialist Program Completer Survey - 2017

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

		4e. Con	tent Suppo	ort						4g. Creating and Maintaining a Safe and Positive Climate				4h. Using strategies to support English Learners			
		Pro	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		ewide	Program		Statewide	
		28	100.0%	2213	98.5%	28	100.0%	2212	98.5%	28	100.0%	2210	98.4%	28	100.0%	2213	98.5%
1 = Very Helpful		17	60.7%	1231	55.6%	19	67.9%	1205	54.5%	17	60.7%	1360	61.5%	13	46.4%	1113	50.3%
2 = Helpful		10	35.7%	664	30.0%	8	28.6%	694	31.4%	8	28.6%	628	28.4%	13	46.4%	748	33.8%
3 = Somewhat helpful		1	3.6%	254	11.5%	1	3.6%	254	11.5%	3	10.7%	174	7.9%	2	7.1%	274	12.4%
4 = Not at all helpful		0	0.0%	64	2.9%	0	0.0%	59	2.7%	0	0.0%	48	2.2%	0	0.0%	78	3.5%
	Mean : SD	1.43	0.57	1.62	0.80	1.36	0.56	1.62	0.79	1.50	0.69	1.51	0.73	1.61	0.63	1.69	0.82

			g strategie s with disa		ort		nizing bias and using y responsive pedagogy			4k. Setting and reaching Professional Learning G			
		Program		Program Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
		28	100.0%	2209	98.4%	28	100.0%	2204	98.1%	28	100.0%	2209	98.4%
1 = Very Helpful		21	75.0%	1503	68.0%	18	64.3%	1247	56.6%	20	71.4%	1395	63.2%
2 = Helpful		6	21.4%	502	22.7%	9	32.1%	712	32.3%	7	25.0%	616	27.9%
3 = Somewhat helpful		1	3.6%	166	7.5%	1	3.6%	185	8.4%	1	3.6%	148	6.7%
4 = Not at all helpful		0	0.0%	38	1.7%	0	0.0%	60	2.7%	0	0.0%	50	2.3%
	Mean : SD	1.29	0.53	1.43	0.71	1.39	0.57	1.57	0.76	1.32	0.55	1.48	0.72

5. How well matched were you with your Support Provider?

	Pro	gram	State	ewide
	23	82.1%	2050	91.3%
1 = Well matched	23	100.0%	1742	85.0%
2 = Somewhat well matched	0	0.0%	240	11.7%
3 = Not well matched	0	0.0%	68	3.3%
Mean : SD	1.00	0.00	1.18	0.46

If you responded that you were "Not well matched" or "Somewhat well matched" with your Support Provider please respond to Questions 6a and 6b:

6a. in which of the following areas could the match have been improved? Mark all that apply

Program	State	wide
0	295	95.8%
0	154	52.2%
0	78	26.4%
0	87	29.5%
0	64	21.7%
0	51	17.3%
	0 0 0 0 0	0 295 0 154 0 78 0 87 0 64

6b. Did the program address the issue(s) with the match?

	Program	State	ewide
	0	300	97.4%
1 = Yes	0	90	30.0%
2 = To some extent, but not fully	0	121	40.3%
3 = No	0	89	29.7%

Clear Education Specialist Program Completer Survey - 2017

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

The following question asks about the interaction between you and your Support Provider. This includes all face-to-face or virtual interactions via technology.

7. On average, how frequently did you and your Support Provider have meaningful communication about issues related to your teaching practice?

	5 20.8% 7 29.2% 12 50.0% 0 0.0%		State	wide
	24	85.7%	2062	91.8%
1 = Daily	5	20.8%	202	9.8%
2 = Two or three times per week	7	29.2%	462	22.4%
3 = Weekly	12	50.0%	936	45.4%
4 = Twice per month	0	0.0%	329	16.0%
5 = Less than twice per month	0	0.0%	133	6.5%
Mean : SD	2.29	0.81	2.87	1.01

9. What amount of interaction with your Support Provider would have been best for you?

	Prog	gram	State	ewide
	24	85.7%	2058	91.6%
1 = Significantly more time	0	0.0%	103	5.0%
2 = A little more time	1	4.2%	252	12.2%
3 = The same amount of time I had	23	95.8%	1618	78.6%
4 = A little less time	0	0.0%	61	3.0%
5 = Much less time	0	0.0%	24	1.2%
Mean : SD	2.96	0.20	2.83	0.61

8. Across the full induction/clear program, how frequently did your Support Provider observe and coach you in your classroom during the program (in person or via visual technology)?

	Prog	Iram	State	ewide
	24	85.7%	2058	91.6%
1 = More than ten times during the entire program	5	20.8%	478	23.2%
2 = 6-10 times during the entire program	9	37.5%	613	29.8%
3 = 3-5 times during the entire program	9	37.5%	722	35.1%
4 = Once or twice during the entire program	1	4.2%	187	9.1%
5 = I was not observed by my Support Provider	0	0.0%	58	2.8%
Mean : SD	2.25	0.85	2.38	1.03

Connections between your induction/clear program and your Individual Induction Plan (IIP).

The next set of questions asks you to reflect on your engagement with formative assessment activities during your induction and credential program experience.

district or on site and induction/clear credential program	goais and	activities	?	
	Prog	gram	State	wide
	24	85.7%	1992	88.7%
Strong	11	47.8%	981	50.7%
- Moderate	12	52.2%	817	42.2%
- Weak	0	0.0%	136	7.0%
Not applicable to me **	1	-	58	-
Mean : SD	1.52	0.51	1.56	0.62

10. To what degree was there cohesion between the professional development received in district or on site and induction/clear credential program goals and activities?

11. How strong was the collaboration between your induction or clear credential program and your site administration?

	Prog	Iram	State	ewide
	24	85.7%	1991	88.6%
1 = Very Strong	8	33.3%	615	35.6%
2 = Strong	13	54.2%	786	45.5%
3 = Not Strong	3	12.5%	328	19.0%
I do not have sufficient information to answer this question * *	0	-	262	-
Mean : SD	1.79	0.66	1.83	0.72

Clear Education Specialist Program Completer Survey - 2017

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

How much impact did participating in the following activities have on your classroom practice?

		, ,,				12b. Analysis of my students' work				12c. Observation of experienced teachers				12d. Examination of my teaching practice against the CSTP (e.g., the Continuum of Teaching Practice)			
	Prog	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	24	85.7%	1992	88.7%	24	85.7%	1992	88.7%	24	85.7%	1989	88.6%	24	85.7%	1980	88.2%	
1 = Extensive impact	18	75.0%	1326	67.1%	20	83.3%	1427	72.6%	19	79.2%	1340	71.2%	16	66.7%	1207	62.8%	
2 = Limited impact	6	25.0%	595	30.1%	4	16.7%	492	25.0%	5	20.8%	503	26.7%	8	33.3%	645	33.6%	
3 = No impact	0	0.0%	54	2.7%	0	0.0%	46	2.3%	0	0.0%	40	2.1%	0	0.0%	70	3.6%	
I did not participate in this activity **	0	-	17	-	0	-	27	-	0	-	106	-	0	-	58	-	
Mean : SD	1.25	0.44	1.36	0.53	1.17	0.38	1.30	0.51	1.21	0.41	1.31	0.51	1.33	0.48	1.41	0.56	

		Induction	velopment n Plan (IIP ı Plan (ILP))/Individu			fessional Le d on my III		S	12g. Col	laboration	with colle	agues
		Prog	Iram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	wide
		24	85.7%	1985	88.4%	24	85.7%	1985	88.4%	24	85.7%	1990	88.6%
1 = Extensive impact		17	70.8%	1280	65.1%	18	75.0%	1324	67.4%	21	87.5%	1589	80.3%
2 = Limited impact		7	29.2%	607	30.9%	6	25.0%	575	29.3%	3	12.5%	361	18.3%
3 = No impact		0	0.0%	78	4.0%	0	0.0%	65	3.3%	0	0.0%	28	1.4%
I did not participate in this activity **		0	-	20	-	0	-	21	-	0	-	12	-
	Mean : SD	1.29	0.46	1.39	0.56	1.25	0.44	1.36	0.54	1.13	0.34	1.21	0.44

Impact of Induction on Teaching Practice

Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

		13a. Cor the real		sroom leai	ming to	problem	solving, a	ents in inq and reflect ical thinkir	ion to	13c. Mee English l	et the instr earners	ructional r	needs of	learning	ntify and a needs with strategies	n appropr	
		Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	ewide	Prog	Iram	State	ewide	Prog	Iram	State	wide
		23	82.1%	1955	87.0%	23	82.1%	1953	87.0%	23	82.1%	1952	86.9%	23	82.1%	1948	86.7%
1 = Very well		15	65.2%	889	45.5%	12	52.2%	873	44.7%	12	52.2%	806	41.3%	15	65.2%	1176	60.4%
2 = Well		5	21.7%	700	35.8%	9	39.1%	692	35.4%	9	39.1%	707	36.2%	8	34.8%	484	24.8%
3 = Adequately		3	13.0%	284	14.5%	2	8.7%	307	15.7%	2	8.7%	363	18.6%	0	0.0%	232	11.9%
4 = Poorly		0	0.0%	54	2.8%	0	0.0%	53	2.7%	0	0.0%	46	2.4%	0	0.0%	36	1.8%
5 = Not at all		0	0.0%	28	1.4%	0	0.0%	28	1.4%	0	0.0%	30	1.5%	0	0.0%	20	1.0%
	Mean : SD	1.48	0.73	1.79	0.89	1.57	0.66	1.81	0.90	1.57	0.66	1.87	0.90	1.35	0.49	1.58	0.85

Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

			ablish and ectful learı udents				ate a prod nent with l udents			interveni matched	vent behav ing early u to studen and behav	ising strat t's curren	egies
		Prog	ram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide
		23	82.1%	1952	86.9%	23	82.1%	1948	86.7%	23	82.1%	1945	86.6%
1 = Very well		16	69.6%	1112	57.0%	16	69.6%	1101	56.5%	13	56.5%	934	48.0%
2 = Well		4	17.4%	561	28.7%	4	17.4%	595	30.5%	5	21.7%	646	33.2%
3 = Adequately		3	13.0%	230	11.8%	3	13.0%	210	10.8%	5	21.7%	273	14.0%
4 = Poorly		0	0.0%	17	0.9%	0	0.0%	15	0.8%	0	0.0%	59	3.0%
5 = Not at all		0	0.0%	32	1.6%	0	0.0%	27	1.4%	0	0.0%	33	1.7%
	Mean : SD	1.43	0.73	1.61	0.85	1.43	0.73	1.60	0.82	1.65	0.83	1.77	0.92

Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

			e effective es to teach nd skills			material technolo	ect, adapt, s, resource gies to ma ccessible t	es, and ike subjed	ct	evidence assistive	and exper based ins technolog access to o	structional ly to supp	ort
		Prog	Iram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	ewide	Prog	Iram	State	wide
		23	82.1%	1945	86.6%	23	82.1%	1946	86.6%	23	82.1%	1944	86.6%
1 = Very well		13	56.5%	938	48.2%	11	47.8%	985	50.6%	10	43.5%	902	46.4%
2 = Well		7	30.4%	681	35.0%	9	39.1%	652	33.5%	10	43.5%	684	35.2%
3 = Adequately		2	8.7%	259	13.3%	3	13.0%	253	13.0%	3	13.0%	282	14.5%
4 = Poorly		1	4.3%	42	2.2%	0	0.0%	31	1.6%	0	0.0%	48	2.5%
5 = Not at all		0	0.0%	25	1.3%	0	0.0%	25	1.3%	0	0.0%	28	1.4%
	Mean : SD	1.61	0.84	1.73	0.86	1.65	0.71	1.69	0.85	1.70	0.70	1.77	0.89

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

		students academi proficien	n instructio s' prior kno c readines icy, cultura vidual deve	wledge, s, langua al backgro	ge ound,	incorpor resource	n and ada ates appro es and tech ning needs	opriate str nnologies	ategies, to meet		es that are	9/IEP goals e measura		incorpor	n for instru ating all re ion behavi ion	levant ÍFS	
		Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	ewide	Prog	Iram	State	wide
		23	82.1%	1912	85.1%	23	82.1%	1910	85.0%	23	82.1%	1903	84.7%	23	82.1%	1904	84.8%
1 = Very well		14	60.9%	919	48.1%	14	60.9%	970	50.8%	10	43.5%	964	50.7%	13	56.5%	915	48.1%
2 = Well		9	39.1%	690	36.1%	8	34.8%	663	34.7%	10	43.5%	558	29.3%	9	39.1%	626	32.9%
3 = Adequately		0	0.0%	252	13.2%	1	4.3%	226	11.8%	3	13.0%	275	14.5%	1	4.3%	275	14.4%
4 = Poorly		0	0.0%	26	1.4%	0	0.0%	28	1.5%	0	0.0%	53	2.8%	0	0.0%	40	2.1%
5 = Not at all		0	0.0%	25	1.3%	0	0.0%	23	1.2%	0	0.0%	53	2.8%	0	0.0%	48	2.5%
	Mean : SD	1.39	0.50	1.72	0.84	1.43	0.59	1.68	0.83	1.70	0.70	1.78	0.98	1.48	0.59	1.78	0.94

16e. Ensure students with exceptionalities receive appropriate instruction and support within the least restrictive environment

Prog	gram	State	wide
22	78.6%	1904	84.8%
11	50.0%	985	51.7%
10	45.5%	596	31.3%
1	4.5%	250	13.1%
0	0.0%	41	2.2%
0	0.0%	32	1.7%
1.55	0.60	1.71	0.89
	22 11 10 1 0 0	11 50.0% 10 45.5% 1 4.5% 0 0.0% 0 0.0%	22 78.6% 1904 11 50.0% 985 10 45.5% 596 1 4.5% 250 0 0.0% 41 0 0.0% 32

17b. Give productive feedback to students to guide their learning

17c. Collect and utilize data to ensure educational benefit when aligning assessment data with goals and services within the least restrictive environment and accessibility needs

17d. Appropriately modify and accommodate state and local assessments based on students' learning

		Prog	jram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	ewide
		23	82.1%	1912	85.1%	23	82.1%	1909	85.0%	23	82.1%	1910	85.0%
1 = Very well		11	47.8%	854	44.7%	14	60.9%	928	48.6%	15	65.2%	851	44.6%
2 = Well		9	39.1%	713	37.3%	9	39.1%	671	35.1%	7	30.4%	682	35.7%
3 = Adequately		3	13.0%	283	14.8%	0	0.0%	253	13.3%	1	4.3%	283	14.8%
4 = Poorly		0	0.0%	38	2.0%	0	0.0%	37	1.9%	0	0.0%	50	2.6%
5 ₌ Not at all		0	0.0%	24	1.3%	0	0.0%	20	1.0%	0	0.0%	44	2.3%
	Mean : SD	1.65	0.71	1.78	0.86	1.39	0.50	1.72	0.84	1.39	0.58	1.82	0.94

Assessing Students for Learning

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

		assessm	olve all stu ent, goal s ng progres	etting, ar	
		Prog	gram	State	wide
		23	82.1%	1910	85.0%
1 = Very well		13	56.5%	778	40.7%
2 = Well		7	30.4%	710	37.2%
3 = Adequately		3	13.0%	339	17.7%
4 = Poorly		0	0.0%	50	2.6%
5 = Not at all		0	0.0%	33	1.7%
	Mean : SD	1.57	0.73	1.87	0.91

Developing as a Professional Educator

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

				of actions according		ork with o	colleagues	to improv	ve instruction	consultation, mentoring w members	colla	aboration,	co-teach	ning to
		Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide	F	rog	ram	State	wide
		23	82.1%	1914	85.2%	23	82.1%	1917	85.4%		23	82.1%	1916	85.3%
1 = Very well		12	52.2%	932	48.7%	16	69.6%	997	52.0%		13	56.5%	886	46.2%
2 = Well		9	39.1%	657	34.3%	5	21.7%	620	32.3%		7	30.4%	675	35.2%
3 = Adequately		2	8.7%	280	14.6%	2	8.7%	246	12.8%		3	13.0%	273	14.2%
4 = Poorly		0	0.0%	26	1.4%	0	0.0%	33	1.7%		0	0.0%	48	2.5%
5 = Not at all		0	0.0%	19	1.0%	0	0.0%	21	1.1%		0	0.0%	34	1.8%
	Mean : SD	1.57	0.66	1.72	0.83	1.39	0.66	1.68	0.84	1.	57	0.73	1.78	0.90

19. Overall, how effective was your induction program at developing the skills, habits, or tools you needed to grow your teaching practice?

	Prog	gram	State	ewide
	23	82.1%	1909	85.0%
1 = Very effective	14	60.9%	966	50.6%
2 = Effective	8	34.8%	723	37.9%
3 = Somewhat effective	1	4.3%	188	9.8%
4 = Not at all effective	0	0.0%	32	1.7%
Mean : SD	1.43	0.59	1.63	0.73

20. Overall, how effective was your induction program at developing the skills, habits, or tools you needed to continue in your career as a teacher?

18c. Provide a continuum of support for

	Prog	gram	State	ewide
	23	82.1%	1911	85.1%
1 = Very effective	14	60.9%	985	51.5%
2 = Effective	8	34.8%	696	36.4%
3 = Somewhat effective	1	4.3%	196	10.3%
4 = Not at all effective	0	0.0%	34	1.8%
Mean : SD	1.43	0.59	1.62	0.74

Demographic Information

21. Are you Hispanic or Latino?

	Prog	gram	State	wide
	23	82.1%	1897	84.5%
No, not Hispanic or Latino	*		1433	75.5%
Yes, Hispanic or Latino	*		464	24.5%

Demographic numbers below 10 are not shown. If only one category is below 10, then the next highest number is also hidden.

22. What is your race? Mark all that apply

	Prog	yram	State	ewide	
	21	75.0%	1740	77.5%	
American Indian or Alaska Native	*		74	3.3%	
Chinese	*		46	2.0%	
Japanese	*		34	1.5%	
Korean	*		19	0.8%	
Vietnamese	*		18	0.8%	
Asian Indian	*		10	0.4%	
Laotian	*		4	0.2%	
Cambodian	*		7	0.3%	
Filipino	*		61	2.7%	
Hmong	*		4	0.2%	
Other Asian	*		23	1.0%	
Black or African American	*		138	6.1%	
Hawaiian	*		11	0.5%	
Guamanian	*		3	0.1%	
Samoan	*		0	0.0%	
Tahitian	*		1	0.0%	
Other Pacific Islander	*		3	0.1%	
White	19	67.9%	1432	63.8%	

23. In what type of school did you teach during your induction program? Mark all that apply

	Prog	ram	State	wide
	22	78.6%	1898	84.5%
Public	21	75.0%	1692	75.3%
Charter	*		168	7.5%
Private	*		23	1.0%
Non-public special education	*		74	3.3%
Other	*		24	1.1%

	Number of Program Completers Asked to Participate in Survey	# and of Respo	
Program:	29	28	96.6 %
Statewide:	2412	2246	93.1 %

'Respondents' are those program completers who answered a minimum of 1 non-demographic question.

24. What is your gender?	Prog	gram	Statewide				
24. What is your gender?	22	78.6%	1900	84.6%			
Female	14	63.6%	1447	76.2%			
Male	*		409	21.5%			
Decline to state	*		44	2.3%			

Demographic numbers below 10 are not shown. If only one category is below 10, then the next highest number is also hidden.

Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?

	strengt	1. Use knowledge of students' strengths and prior experiences to engage them in learning				ect classro world	om learni	ng to	3. Engag problem promote	ion to		
	Pro	Program Statewide			Program Statewide			ewide	Prog	Iram	Statewide	
	341	100.0%	1991	99.6%	340	99.7%	1987	99.4%	339	99.4%	1978	98.9%
1 = Not at all	1	0.3%	1	0.1%	2	0.6%	3	0.2%	2	0.6%	9	0.5%
2 = Poorly	7	2.1%	19	1.0%	12	3.5%	31	1.6%	10	2.9%	35	1.8%
3 = Adequately	57	16.7%	244	12.3%	57	16.8%	265	13.3%	63	18.6%	275	13.9%
4 = Well	121	35.5%	593	29.8%	117	34.4%	619	31.2%	117	34.5%	682	34.5%
5 = Very well	155	45.5%	1134	57.0%	152	44.7%	1069	53.8%	147	43.4%	977	49.4%
Mean : S	5D 4.24	0.82	4.43	0.74	4.19	0.88	4.37	0.78	4.17	0.87	4.31	0.81

. . .

	4. Meet English	the instruc earners	tional nee	eds of	 Identify and address special learning needs with appropriate teaching strategies 				
	Prog	gram	State	Statewide		gram	State	ewide	
	340	99.7%	1982	99.1%	339	99.4%	1984	99.2%	
1 = Not at all	1	0.3%	4	0.2%	2	0.6%	2	0.1%	
2 = Poorly	7	2.1%	38	1.9%	6	1.8%	22	1.1%	
3 = Adequately	54	15.9%	316	15.9%	32	9.4%	191	9.6%	
t = Well	120	35.3%	634	32.0%	95	28.0%	516	26.0%	
5 = Very well	158	46.5%	990	49.9%	204	60.2%	1253	63.2%	
Mean : SD	4.26	0.82	4.30	0.82	4.45	0.78	4.51	0.72	

Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?

	group w					lish and m ul learning ents				e a produc nent with l udents		5	intervening early using strategies matched to student's current learning and behavior level				
	Program		Statewide		Program		State	Statewide		Program		Statewide		Iram	State	wide	
	337	98.8%	1625	81.3%	336	98.5%	1973	98.7%	336	98.5%	1978	98.9%	333	97.7%	1969	98.5%	
1 = Not at all	4	1.2%	4	0.2%	1	0.3%	3	0.2%	2	0.6%	2	0.1%	3	0.9%	4	0.2%	
2 = Poorly	7	2.1%	18	1.1%	6	1.8%	12	0.6%	5	1.5%	16	0.8%	13	3.9%	33	1.7%	
3 = Adequately	56	16.6%	209	12.9%	38	11.3%	187	9.5%	41	12.2%	217	11.0%	46	13.8%	263	13.4%	
4 = Well	123	36.5%	512	31.5%	97	28.9%	513	26.0%	112	33.3%	566	28.6%	122	36.6%	646	32.8%	
5 = Very well	147	43.6%	882	54.3%	194	57.7%	1258	63.8%	176	52.4%	1177	59.5%	149	44.7%	1023	52.0%	
Mean : SD	4.19	0.87	4.38	0.77	4.42	0.78	4.53	0.70	4.35	0.80	4.47	0.73	4.20	0.89	4.35	0.79	

9. Prevent behavior problems by

Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?

		10. Develop curriculum to teach content standards effectively				effective ir es to teach and skills			materials technolo	ct, adapt, s, resource gies to ma ccessible t	es, and ike subjeo	t.	 Expand expertise with evider based instructional and assistive technology to support student access to challenging content 				
	Pro	Program Statewide		wide	Program		State	Statewide		Program		wide	Prog	gram State		wide	
	299	87.7%	1843	92.2%	298	87.4%	1844	92.2%	299	87.7%	1840	92.0%	299	87.7%	1838	91.9%	
1 = Not at all	3	1.0%	9	0.5%	4	1.3%	4	0.2%	3	1.0%	3	0.2%	2	0.7%	4	0.2%	
2 = Poorly	12	4.0%	57	3.1%	5	1.7%	31	1.7%	7	2.3%	26	1.4%	7	2.3%	37	2.0%	
3 = Adequately	65	21.7%	324	17.6%	45	15.1%	268	14.5%	43	14.4%	253	13.8%	41	13.7%	249	13.5%	
4 = Well	105	35.1%	619	33.6%	118	39.6%	610	33.1%	113	37.8%	585	31.8%	107	35.8%	610	33.2%	
5 = Very well	114	38.1%	834	45.3%	126	42.3%	931	50.5%	133	44.5%	973	52.9%	142	47.5%	938	51.0%	
Меа	an : SD 4.05	0.92	4.20	0.87	4.20	0.85	4.32	0.80	4.22	0.85	4.36	0.78	4.27	0.83	4.33	0.80	

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?

14. Plan instruction based on students' prior knowledge, academic readiness, language proficiency, cultural background, and individual development

15. Plan and adapt instruction that incorporates appropriate strategies, resources and technologies to meet the learning needs of all students

16. Develop IFSP/IEP goals and objectives that are measurable and obtainable

		cultural background, and marviadal development					meet the learning needs of an students						obtainable						
		Prog	gram	State	wide		Prog	ram	State	wide	P	ogra	m	State	wide				
		296	86.8%	1835	91.8%		296	86.8%	1835	91.8%	29	7 8	7.1%	1834	91.7%				
1 = Not at all		2	0.7%	2	0.1%		2	0.7%	2	0.1%		2	0.7%	5	0.3%				
2 = Poorly		5	1.7%	29	1.6%		5	1.7%	16	0.9%		9	3.0%	43	2.3%				
3 = Adequately		33	11.1%	204	11.1%		35	11.8%	232	12.6%	4	1 1	3.8%	254	13.8%				
4 = Well		114	38.5%	623	34.0%		120	40.5%	605	33.0%	ç	2 3	1.0%	578	31.5%				
5 = Very well		142	48.0%	977	53.2%		134	45.3%	980	53.4%	15	3 5	1.5%	954	52.0%				
	Mean : SD	4.31	0.79	4.39	0.75		4.28	0.79	4.39	0.75	4.3	0	0.87	4.33	0.82				

17. Plan for instruction by incorporating all relevant
IFSP/IEP information behavior and academic
information

18. Ensure students with exceptionalities receive appropriate instruction and support within the least restrictive environment

	restrictive environ	restrictive environment							
	Pro	gram	State	ewide	Pro	gram	State	ewide	
	296	86.8%	1833	91.7%	296	86.8%	1832	91.6%	
1 = Not at all	3	1.0%	7	0.4%	3	1.0%	5	0.3%	
2 = Poorly	11	3.7%	46	2.5%	7	2.4%	24	1.3%	
3 = Adequately	39	13.2%	250	13.6%	33	11.1%	196	10.7%	
4 = Well	91	30.7%	599	32.7%	96	32.4%	566	30.9%	
5 = Very well	152	51.4%	931	50.8%	157	53.0%	1041	56.8%	
Mean : S	D 4.28	0.90	4.31	0.83	4.34	0.84	4.43	0.76	

Page 2

Assessing Students for Learning

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?

	variety	Develop and use assessment data from a ty of sources to establish learning goals and an, differentiate, and modify instruction				and as	sessm	lve all stuc ent, goal s ng progres	etting, ar		21. Give productive feedback to students to guide their learning					
		Program		ogram Statewide			Program		Statewide		Pro	gram	State	ewide		
		279	81.8%	1768	88.4%		277	81.2%	1760	88.0%	277	81.2%	1765	88.3%		
1 = Not at all		2	0.7%	2	0.1%		2	0.7%	2	0.1%	1	0.4%	3	0.2%		
2 = Poorly		4	1.4%	31	1.8%		9	3.2%	45	2.6%	6	2.2%	29	1.6%		
3 = Adequately		38	13.6%	237	13.4%		46	16.6%	289	16.4%	49	17.7%	265	15.0%		
4 = Well		101	36.2%	601	34.0%		101	36.5%	611	34.7%	103	37.2%	568	32.2%		
5 = Very well		134	48.0%	897	50.7%		119	43.0%	813	46.2%	118	42.6%	900	51.0%		
	Mean : SD	4.29	0.81	4.33	0.78		4.18	0.87	4.24	0.82	4.19	0.83	4.32	0.80		

22. Collect and utilize data to ensure educational benefit when aligning assessment data with goals and services within the least restrictive environment

23. Appropriately modify and accommodate state and local assessments based on students' learning and accessibility needs

	Pro	Program		wide	Prog	ram	State	wide
	277	81.2%	1763	88.2%	278	81.5%	1764	88.2%
1 = Not at all	2	0.7%	3	0.2%	2	0.7%	8	0.5%
2 = Poorly	7	2.5%	33	1.9%	10	3.6%	41	2.3%
3 = Adequately	42	15.2%	257	14.6%	44	15.8%	292	16.69
4 = Well	99	35.7%	582	33.0%	98	35.3%	567	32.19
5 = Very well	127	45.8%	888	50.4%	124	44.6%	856	48.5%
Mean : S	d 4.23	0.85	4.32	0.80	4.19	0.88	4.26	0.8

Developing as a Professional Educator

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?

	actions	uate the e on student plans accor	learning			k with fam and studen rning				< with colle			for consi teaching	ide a conti ultation, co to mento iplinary te	ollaboration ring with r	on, co- multi or
	Prog	gram	State	ewide	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	wide
	279	81.8%	1765	88.3%	279	81.8%	1766	88.3%	277	81.2%	1765	88.3%	278	81.5%	1768	88.4%
1 = Not at all	5	1.8%	5	0.3%	5	1.8%	11	0.6%	4	1.4%	5	0.3%	4	1.4%	9	0.5%
2 = Poorly	4	1.4%	22	1.2%	5	1.8%	30	1.7%	6	2.2%	26	1.5%	6	2.2%	22	1.2%
3 = Adequately	37	13.3%	219	12.4%	53	19.0%	269	15.2%	39	14.1%	225	12.7%	37	13.3%	232	13.1%
4 = Well	109	39.1%	609	34.5%	101	36.2%	585	33.1%	94	33.9%	568	32.2%	97	34.9%	591	33.4%
5 = Very well	124	44.4%	910	51.6%	115	41.2%	871	49.3%	134	48.4%	941	53.3%	134	48.2%	914	51.7%
Mean : SD	4.23	0.86	4.36	0.77	4.13	0.91	4.29	0.83	4.26	0.88	4.37	0.78	4.26	0.87	4.35	0.79

Content

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?

		according to California academic s				ribute to s luding con ect area			subject r	le student natter skil success i er	ls that co	ntribute	31. Anticipate and address the needs of students who are at dropping out				
		Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	ewide	Prog	ram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide
		278	81.5%	1759	88.0%	278	81.5%	1758	87.9%	278	81.5%	1762	88.1%	279	81.8%	1748	87.4%
1 = Not at all		4	1.4%	8	0.5%	4	1.4%	4	0.2%	3	1.1%	6	0.3%	5	1.8%	33	1.9%
2 = Poorly		7	2.5%	33	1.9%	4	1.4%	30	1.7%	7	2.5%	28	1.6%	9	3.2%	71	4.1%
3 = Adequately		46	16.5%	286	16.3%	41	14.7%	249	14.2%	48	17.3%	260	14.8%	61	21.9%	379	21.7%
4 = Well		104	37.4%	594	33.8%	102	36.7%	574	32.7%	103	37.1%	642	36.4%	101	36.2%	575	32.9%
5 = Very well		117	42.1%	838	47.6%	127	45.7%	901	51.3%	117	42.1%	826	46.9%	103	36.9%	690	39.5%
	Mean : SD	4.16	0.89	4.26	0.83	4.24	0.86	4.33	0.80	4.17	0.88	4.28	0.80	4.03	0.94	4.04	0.97

Field Experiences

32. Which of the following best describes the kind of clinical experience you had during your preparation? (check all that apply):	264	77.4%	1731	86.6%
Student teaching with a cooperating teacher	60	17.6%	671	33.6%
Teaching fellow or intern in a program where I served as teacher of record while taking courses for my credential	196	57.5%	1017	50.9%
Teaching on an emergency credential [PIP/ STP] while taking courses for my credential	47	13.8%	226	11.3%

33. How often did preparation program faculty or staff communicate with you in person or by other means about your teaching practice?

	Prog	Iram	Statewide		
	262	76.8%	1730	86.5%	
1 = Less than once per month	11	4.2%	55	3.2%	
2 = Once per month	23	8.8%	151	8.7%	
3 = Twice per month	87	33.2%	375	21.7%	
4 = Once per week	67	25.6%	562	32.5%	
5 = 2-3 times per week	52	19.8%	471	27.2%	
6 = Daily	22	8.4%	116	6.7%	
Mean : SD	3.73	1.24	3.92	1.18	

34. How often did preparation program faculty or supervisors observe your classroom instruction and provide feedback during your clinical practice?

	Prog	Iram	Statewide			
	264	77.4%	1731	86.6%		
1 = Once or twice	8	3.0%	104	6.0%		
2 = 3-5 times	55	20.8%	390	22.5%		
3 = 6-10 times	99	37.5%	530	30.6%		
4 = 11-15 times	33	12.5%	296	17.1%		
5 = 16-20 times	35	13.3%	194	11.2%		
$_{5} =$ More than 20 times	34	12.9%	217	12.5%		
Mean : SD	3.51	1.38	3.43	1.43		

35. My field experiences helped me integrate and apply the major ideas developed through program coursework.

	Prog	ram	Statewide		
	264	77.4%	1730	86.5%	
1 = Strongly Disagree	5	1.9%	244	14.1%	
2 = Disagree	1	0.4%	144	8.3%	
3 = Neutral	14	5.3%	97	5.6%	
4 = Agree	118	44.7%	511	29.5%	
5 = Strongly Agree	126	47.7%	734	42.4%	
Mean : SD	4.36	0.77	3.78	1.43	

36. My cooperating teacher(s) (select all that apply):

	Prog	gram	Statewide		
	251	73.6%	1674	83.7%	
Frequently observed my teaching and met with me to offer feedback					
	197	57.8%	1237	61.9%	
Was an excellent educator and a valuable role model	192	56.3%	1288	64.4%	
Modeled effective practices	173	50.7%	1182	59.1%	
Helped me plan and organize curriculum materials	188	55.1%	1161	58.1%	
Offered useful strategies and advice about my teaching	217	63.6%	1398	69.9%	
Helped me reflect on my practice	204	59.8%	1307	65.4%	
Helped me to solve teaching problems	197	57.8%	1287	64.4%	
Was knowledgeable about and able to provide support					
for field-based assignments	202	59.2%	1327	66.4%	

37. Approximately how much time did you spend in student teaching (in the classroom of a cooperating teacher) as part of your supervised fieldwork?

38. Approximately how much time did you spend in an internship placement a	as teacher of
record as part of your fieldwork?	

	Prog	gram	Statewide		
	260	76.2%	1534	76.7%	
1 = Less than 100 hours	8	9.4%	63	7.6%	
2 = 100 - 299 hours	12	14.1%	133	16.1%	
3 = 300 - 599 hours	34	40.0%	269	32.5%	
4 = 600 - 799 hours	6	7.1%	170	20.6%	
5 = 800 hours or more	25	29.4%	192	23.2%	
This question does not apply to me because I did not do					
any student teaching. **	175	-	707	-	
Mean : SD	3.33	1.29	3.36	1.21	

39. If you served in an internshi	p placement , how often did your assigned mentor observe
your classroom instruction and prov	ide feedback and assistance during your clinical practice?

	Prog	Iram	Statewide		
	263	77.1%	1498	74.9%	
1 = Once or twice	6	2.8%	65	5.8%	
2 = 3-5 times	24	11.2%	161	14.3%	
3 = 6-10 times	55	25.7%	284	25.2%	
4 = 11-15 times	36	16.8%	183	16.3%	
5 = 16-20 times	28	13.1%	146	13.0%	
6 = More than 20 times	65	30.4%	287	25.5%	
Does not apply/I was not in an internship**	49	-	372		
Mean : SD	4.17	1.51	3.93	1.58	

	Prog	Iram	State	wide
	262	76.8%	1497	74.9%
1 = Less than 100 hours	2	0.9%	17	1.5%
2 = 100 - 299 hours	4	1.8%	45	3.9%
3 = 300 - 599 hours	12	5.5%	101	8.8%
4 = 600 - 799 hours	15	6.9%	106	9.2%
5 = 800 hours or more	184	84.8%	882	76.6%
Does not apply/I was not in an internship **	45	-	346	-
Mean : SD	4.73	0.73	4.56	0.91

Content for Special Education: English Language Arts

In your teacher preparation program, how much opportunity did you have to do each of the following?

	40a) Lea skills	arn ways to	o teach de	ecoding		arn ways to and motiv			,	irn how to edictions t iension				irn how to in learnin		
	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	wide
	254	74.5%	1593	79.7%	255	74.8%	1601	80.1%	255	74.8%	1597	79.9%	252	73.9%	1581	79.1%
1 = None	4	1.6%	45	2.8%	0	0.0%	15	0.9%	1	0.4%	22	1.4%	8	3.2%	71	4.5%
2 = Touched on it Briefly	28	11.0%	135	8.5%	20	7.8%	90	5.6%	22	8.6%	122	7.6%	27	10.7%	190	12.0%
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	72	28.3%	380	23.9%	54	21.2%	298	18.6%	63	24.7%	349	21.9%	68	27.0%	369	23.3%
4 = Explored in Some Depth	83	32.7%	579	36.3%	91	35.7%	586	36.6%	84	32.9%	561	35.1%	72	28.6%	494	31.2%
5 = Extensive Opportunity	67	26.4%	454	28.5%	90	35.3%	612	38.2%	85	33.3%	543	34.0%	77	30.6%	457	28.9%
Mean : SD	3.71	1.03	3.79	1.04	3.98	0.94	4.06	0.94	3.90	0.98	3.93	0.99	3.73	1.10	3.68	1.14

		and writ	irn ways to ing to stud r reading a	ents at di		40f) Lea prior kno	rn how to owledge	activate s	students'	40g) List read alor assessin achiever			
		Prog	Iram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	ewide	Prog	Iram	State	wide
		254	74.5%	1596	79.8%	255	74.8%	1600	80.0%	254	74.5%	1592	79.6%
1 = None		1	0.4%	21	1.3%	0	0.0%	8	0.5%	1	0.4%	47	3.0%
2 = Touched on it Briefly		17	6.7%	107	6.7%	13	5.1%	67	4.2%	16	6.3%	94	5.9%
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing		56	22.0%	303	19.0%	45	17.6%	264	16.5%	60	23.6%	299	18.8%
4 = Explored in Some Depth		83	32.7%	560	35.1%	89	34.9%	490	30.6%	78	30.7%	496	31.2%
5 = Extensive Opportunity		97	38.2%	605	37.9%	108	42.4%	771	48.2%	99	39.0%	656	41.2%
	Mean : SD	4.02	0.95	4.02	0.98	4.15	0.89	4.22	0.90	4.02	0.96	4.02	1.05

						40i) Learn to teach students to organize their ideas prior to writing				assessment results to address student needs and improve your teaching			
	Pro	Program S		ogram Statewide		Program		Program Statewide		Prog	gram	State	ewide
	254	74.5%	1593	79.7%	254	74.5%	1590	79.5%	254	74.5%	1586	79.3%	
1 = None	2	0.8%	43	2.7%	1	0.4%	45	2.8%	2	0.8%	37	2.3%	
2 = Touched on it Briefly	19	7.5%	109	6.8%	24	9.4%	129	8.1%	14	5.5%	76	4.8%	
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	52	20.5%	289	18.1%	63	24.8%	346	21.8%	45	17.7%	299	18.9%	
4 = Explored in Some Depth	78	30.7%	474	29.8%	79	31.1%	499	31.4%	87	34.3%	484	30.5%	
5 = Extensive Opportunity	103	40.6%	678	42.6%	87	34.3%	571	35.9%	106	41.7%	690	43.5%	
Mean : Si	4.03	0.99	4.03	1.06	3.89	1.00	3.89	1.07	4.11	0.94	4.08	1.01	

40j) Use student reading

		ictice what aching rea ices			,	dy state st language a		or	40m) Study, critique or adapt reading curriculum materials			
	Prog	Program Statewide				Program Statewide		ewide	e Program		gram State	
	253	74.2%	1590	79.5%	254	74.5%	1596	79.8%	254	74.5%	1590	79.5%
1 = None	7	2.8%	37	2.3%	0	0.0%	34	2.1%	4	1.6%	36	2.3%
2 = Touched on it Briefly	14	5.5%	87	5.5%	17	6.7%	103	6.5%	24	9.4%	123	7.7%
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	42	16.6%	267	16.8%	41	16.1%	310	19.4%	52	20.5%	325	20.4%
4 = Explored in Some Depth	68	26.9%	468	29.4%	90	35.4%	495	31.0%	80	31.5%	513	32.3%
5 = Extensive Opportunity	122	48.2%	731	46.0%	106	41.7%	654	41.0%	94	37.0%	593	37.3%
Mean : SD	4.12	1.05	4.11	1.02	4.12	0.91	4.02	1.03	3.93	1.05	3.95	1.04

Content for Special Education: Mathematics

In your teacher preparation program, how much opportunity did you have to do each of the following?

		arn typical s have witl				arn typical s have with			geometri number	represent c represer lines) to sh ocedure w	ntation, g now expli	raphs,		ve that a s ethod wor		
	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide
	253	74.2%	1573	78.7%	253	74.2%	1570	78.5%	253	74.2%	1574	78.7%	252	73.9%	1570	78.5%
1 = None	36	14.2%	194	12.3%	40	15.8%	212	13.5%	34	13.4%	167	10.6%	30	11.9%	182	11.6%
2 = Touched on it Briefly	43	17.0%	210	13.4%	45	17.8%	227	14.5%	45	17.8%	204	13.0%	43	17.1%	217	13.8%
$_{3}$ = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	51	20.2%	359	22.8%	50	19.8%	378	24.1%	50	19.8%	381	24.2%	56	22.2%	388	24.7%
4 = Explored in Some Depth	66	26.1%	438	27.8%	57	22.5%	400	25.5%	64	25.3%	408	25.9%	65	25.8%	399	25.4%
5 = Extensive Opportunity	57	22.5%	372	23.6%	61	24.1%	353	22.5%	60	23.7%	414	26.3%	58	23.0%	384	24.5%
Mean : SD	3.26	1.36	3.37	1.31	3.21	1.40	3.29	1.33	3.28	1.36	3.44	1.29	3.31	1.32	3.37	1.30

		41e) Study, critique, or adapt math curriculum materials				rn how to for studen			41g) Adapt math lessons for students with diverse needs and learning styles					
	Pro	Program S		Statewide		Program		Program Star		ewide	e Program		State	wide
	249	73.0%	1574	78.7%	253	74.2%	1580	79.0%	253	74.2%	1582	79.1%		
1 = None	31	12.4%	135	8.6%	24	9.5%	104	6.6%	21	8.3%	95	6.0%		
2 = Touched on it Briefly	24	9.6%	144	9.1%	27	10.7%	138	8.7%	22	8.7%	127	8.0%		
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	63	25.3%	388	24.7%	45	17.8%	349	22.1%	50	19.8%	327	20.7%		
4 = Explored in Some Depth	72	28.9%	445	28.3%	78	30.8%	441	27.9%	71	28.1%	421	26.6%		
5 = Extensive Opportunity	59	23.7%	462	29.4%	79	31.2%	548	34.7%	89	35.2%	612	38.7%		
Mean : SD	3.42	1.29	3.61	1.23	3.64	1.28	3.75	1.20	3.73	1.26	3.84	1.20		

.....

.

.. . . .

	about te	41h) Practice what you learned about teaching math in your field experience				dy nationa Is for math			41j) Review local district mathematics curriculum					
	Pro	Program Statewide				Program Statew			de Program		Statewide Progr		gram Statev	
	251	73.6%	1575	78.8%	250	73.3%	1575	78.8%	249	73.0%	1572	78.6%		
1 = None	23	9.2%	109	6.9%	13	5.2%	86	5.5%	29	11.6%	178	11.3%		
2 = Touched on it Briefly	20	8.0%	126	8.0%	26	10.4%	174	11.0%	36	14.5%	217	13.8%		
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	49	19.5%	319	20.3%	60	24.0%	346	22.0%	51	20.5%	339	21.6%		
4 = Explored in Some Depth	67	26.7%	410	26.0%	83	33.2%	470	29.8%	69	27.7%	423	26.9%		
5 = Extensive Opportunity	92	36.7%	611	38.8%	68	27.2%	499	31.7%	64	25.7%	415	26.4%		
Mean : SD	3.74	1.28	3.82	1.23	3.67	1.14	3.71	1.18	3.41	1.32	3.43	1.32		

General

42. Overall, how effective was your teacher preparation program at developing the skills or tools you needed to become an education specialist?

	Prog	gram	State	wide
	251	73.6%	1663	83.2%
1 = Not at all effective	3	1.2%	11	0.7%
2 = Somewhat effective	23	9.2%	135	8.1%
3 = Effective	99	39.4%	613	36.9%
4 = Very effective	126	50.2%	904	54.4%
Mean : SD	3.39	0.70	3.45	0.67

Demographics

43. Are you Hispanic or Latino?

	Prog	gram	State	wide	
	251	73.6%	1671	83.6%	
No, not Hispanic or Latino	198	78.9%	1177	70.4%	
Yes, Hispanic or Latino	53	21.1%	494	29.6%	

Demographic numbers below 10 are not shown. If only one category is below 10, then the next highest number is also hidden.

44. What is your race? (Select all that apply)

	Prog	gram	State	wide
	236	69.2%	1476	73.8%
American Indian or Alaska Native	10	2.9%	60	3.0%
Chinese	*		41	2.1%
Japanese	*		21	1.1%
Korean	*		26	1.3%
Vietnamese	*		20	1.0%
Asian Indian	*		15	0.8%
Laotian	*		3	0.2%
Cambodian	*		3	0.2%
Filipino	*		60	3.0%
Hmong	*		5	0.3%
Other Asian	*		13	0.7%
Black or African American	18	5.3%	115	5.8%
Hawaiian	*		7	0.4%
Guamanian	*		4	0.2%
Samoan	*		6	0.3%
Tahitian	*		2	0.1%
Other Pacific Islander	*		7	0.4%
White	197	57.8%	1218	60.9%

Demographic numbers below 10 are not shown. If only one category is below 10, then the next highest number is also hidden.

45. What is your gender?

	Prog	gram	State	wide
	252	73.9%	1675	83.8%
Female	175	69.4%	1275	76.1%
Male	*		369	22.0%
Decline to state	*		31	1.9%

	Number of Program Completers Asked to Participate in Survey	# and of Respo		
Program:	353	341	96.6 %	'Respondents' are those program completers who answered a minimum of 1
Statewide:	2080	2000	96.2 %	non-demographic question.

National University

The Commission is seeking feedback from individuals who have served as a master teacher for a student teacher. The intention is that the individual who completes this survey worked with the candidate in his or her final student teaching placement.

The purpose of this survey is not to gather information on the knowledge and skills of the individual candidates, but to gather information about the strengths and weaknesses of the preparation program. This information, along with information from program completers, current candidates, employers and others, will be used as part of the institution's accreditation process.

Please complete this survey for the institution for which you serve as a master teacher (also known as the cooperating teacher). If you have served as a master teacher for more than one institution, you will be able to complete a separate survey for the other institution(s).

	Multiple	Subject	Single S	Subject	Ed	Sp
	Program	State	Program	State	Program	State
Total Master Teachers	160	5126	314	4165	49	862
Total Surveys Begin	43	1529	46	1159	12	283
Response Rate	26.9%	29.8%	14.6%	27.8%	24.5%	32.8%

How many years have you served as a master teacher?

	Prog	gram	State	wide
	109	99.1%	3585	99.7%
1 = 1	42	38.5%	1109	30.9%
2 = 2-3	28	25.7%	775	21.6%
3 = 4-5	11	10.1%	516	14.4%
4 = 6-10	15	13.8%	482	13.4%
5 = 11-20	8	7.3%	539	15.0%
6 = 21 or more	5	4.6%	164	4.6%
Mean : SD	2.39	1.52	2.74	1.59

Feedback on the Preliminary Preparation Program

		Prog	Iram	State	ewide
		100	90.9%	3033	84.3%
1 = 1		73	73.0%	1425	47.0%
2 = 2		19	19.0%	615	20.3%
3 = 3		7	7.0%	345	11.4%
4 = 4		0	0.0%	215	7.1%
5 = 5 or more		1	1.0%	433	14.3%
	Mean : SD	1.37	0.71	2.21	1.45

How many new teachers from the institution you identified have you worked with over the past 5 years?

National University

1. Engaging and Supporting all Students in Learning: How well-prepared was your student teacher to do each of the following?

	a) Conn the real	ect classro world	om learni	ng to	problem	ge student solving, a their critio	nd reflect	ion to	c) Meet English l	the instruc earners	tional nee	eds of	learning	ify and add needs wit strategies	h appropri	
	Pro	gram	State	wide	Prog	jram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	wide
	101	91.8%	3020	84.0%	101	91.8%	3021	84.0%	101	91.8%	3013	83.8%	101	91.8%	3010	83.7%
1 = Not at all	2	2.0%	10	0.3%	5	5.0%	24	0.8%	4	4.0%	22	0.7%	5	5.0%	31	1.0%
2 = Poorly	4	4.0%	99	3.3%	9	8.9%	179	5.9%	12	11.9%	193	6.4%	9	8.9%	210	7.0%
3 = Adequately	26	25.7%	681	22.5%	29	28.7%	690	22.8%	31	30.7%	929	30.8%	31	30.7%	908	30.2%
4 = Well	37	36.6%	1150	38.1%	32	31.7%	1158	38.3%	32	31.7%	1064	35.3%	31	30.7%	1054	35.0%
5 = Very Well	32	31.7%	1080	35.8%	26	25.7%	970	32.1%	22	21.8%	805	26.7%	25	24.8%	807	26.8%
Mean : SD	3.92	0.96	4.06	0.86	3.64	1.11	3.95	0.93	3.55	1.08	3.81	0.93	3.61	1.10	3.80	0.95

2. Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning: How well-prepared was your student teacher to do each of the following?

,	stablish and ing environ					b) Create a productive learning environment w high expectations for all students					
	Pro	gram	State	ewide	P	Program		Statewide			
	101	91.8%	3015	83.8%	1	91 91	1.8% 30	015	83.8%		
1 = Not at all	2	2.0%	16	0.5%		4 4	4.0%	18	0.6%		
2 = Poorly	8	7.9%	106	3.5%		7 6	5.9% 1	L45	4.8%		
3 = Adequately	20	19.8%	536	17.8%		28 27	7.7% 5	597	19.8%		
4 = Well	33	32.7%	1007	33.4%		27 26	5.7% 10)51	34.9%		
5 = Very Well	38	37.6%	1350	44.8%		35 34	4.7% 12	204	39.9%		
Mean : Si	3 .96	1.04	4.18	0.88	3.	31	1.11 4	.09	0.91		

3. Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning: How well-prepared was your student teacher to do each of the following?

			nstructiona natter and		ies to teach	nologies			als, resourc atter access	
		Prog	gram	State	ewide	 Program		Statewide		
		101	91.8%	3004	83.5%	101	91.8%	2999	83.4%	
1 = Not at all		4	4.0%	20	0.7%	4	4.0%	27	0.9%	
2 = Poorly		9	8.9%	149	5.0%	9	8.9%	164	5.5%	
3 = Adequately		25	24.8%	628	20.9%	26	25.7%	663	22.1%	
4 = Well		41	40.6%	1174	39.1%	36	35.6%	1113	37.1%	
5 = Very Well		22	21.8%	1033	34.4%	26	25.7%	1032	34.4%	
	Mean : SD	3.67	1.04	4.02	0.90	3.70	1.07	3.99	0.93	

Page 2

National University

4. Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students: How well-prepared was your student teacher to do each of the following?

knov profi	an instructio vledge, acad ciency, cultu llopment	emic readi	ness, lang	juage	b) Plan and adapt instruction that incorpora appropriate strategies, resources and techn meet the learning needs of all students				
	Prog	gram	State	ewide	Pro	gram	State	wide	
	101	91.8%	3011	83.7%	100	90.9%	3001	83.4%	
1 = Not at all	4	4.0%	27	0.9%	4	4.0%	23	0.8%	
2 = Poorly	10	9.9%	175	5.8%	11	11.0%	191	6.4%	
3 = Adequately	27	26.7%	792	26.3%	25	25.0%	738	24.6%	
4 = Well	40	39.6%	1158	38.5%	40	40.0%	1161	38.7%	
5 = Very Well	20	19.8%	859	28.5%	20	20.0%	888	29.6%	
Mean : S	D 3.61	1.04	3.88	0.92	3.61	1.05	3.90	0.92	

5. Assessing Students for Learning: Compared to other beginning teachers with whom you have worked, how well-prepared was your student teacher to do each of the following?

	 a) Involve a setting, and 				ment, goal	 b) Give productive feedback to students to get their learning 					
		Program			wide	 Program		State	wide		
		101	91.8%	2999	83.4%	101	91.8%	2988	83.1%		
1 = Not at all		6	5.9%	53	1.8%	4	4.0%	28	0.9%		
2 = Poorly		8	7.9%	280	9.3%	7	6.9%	174	5.8%		
3 = Adequately		38	37.6%	993	33.1%	30	29.7%	816	27.3%		
4 = Well		30	29.7%	1038	34.6%	34	33.7%	1127	37.7%		
5 = Very Well		19	18.8%	635	21.2%	26	25.7%	843	28.2%		
Ма	ean : SD	3.48	1.07	3.64	0.97	3.70	1.05	3.86	0.92		

6. Developing as a Professional Educator: How well-prepared was your student teacher to do each of the following?

		effects of a a according		student learni	ng b) Work with coll	eagues to	improve i	nstruction
	Pro	gram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	wide
	101	91.8%	3006	83.6%	100	90.9%	3001	83.4%
1 = Not at all	7	6.9%	35	1.2%	4	4.0%	34	1.1%
2 = Poorly	8	7.9%	172	5.7%	11	11.0%	137	4.6%
3 = Adequately	29	28.7%	776	25.8%	22	22.0%	545	18.2%
t = Well	32	31.7%	1109	36.9%	25	25.0%	940	31.3%
5 = Very Well	25	24.8%	914	30.4%	38	38.0%	1345	44.8%
Mean : SD	3.59	1.15	3.90	0.94	3.82	1.18	4.14	0.95

National University

7. Which of these, select all that apply, were involved when you were initially selected as a master teacher for this institution?	Prog	ram	State	wide
	101	91.8%	3023	84.0%
I applied to be a master teacher	6	5.5%	366	10.2%
I was observed by the institution prior to selection as a master teacher	3	2.7%	288	8.0%
My site administrator selected me	65	59.1%	1766	49.1%
I offered when my administrator asked for volunteers	30	27.3%	1143	31.8%
Other (please specify)	14	12.7%	503	14.0%

8. How clear were your responsibilities as a master teacher?

	Prog	jram	Statewide		
	101	91.8%	3021	84.0%	
1 = Not at all clear	6	5.9%	57	1.9%	
2 = Somewhat clear	22	21.8%	476	15.8%	
3 = Clear	40	39.6%	1303	43.1%	
4 = Extremely Clear	33	32.7%	1185	39.2%	
Mean : SD	2.99	0.89	3.20	0.77	

9. Which of these best describes the degree to which you felt supported by the program in your role as a master teacher?

	Prog	Iram	am State					
	99	90.0%	3008	83.6%				
1 = Not at all supported	12	12.1%	125	4.2%				
2 = Somewhat supported	21	21.2%	443	14.7%				
3 = Adequately supported	36	36.4%	1154	38.4%				
4 = Very well supported	30	30.3%	1286	42.8%				
Mean : SD	2.85	0.99	3.20	0.84				

10. How often did the preparation program faculty or supervisor observe your student teacher and provide feedback?

	Prog	Iram	State	wide
	100	90.9%	3012	83.7%
1 = Once or twice	30	30.0%	296	9.8%
2 = 3-5 times	53	53.0%	1425	47.3%
3 = 6-10 times	15	15.0%	995	33.0%
4 = 11-15 times	1	1.0%	174	5.8%
5 = 16-20 times	1	1.0%	92	3.1%
6 = more than 20 times	0	0.0%	30	1.0%
Mean : SD	1.90	0.76	2.48	0.93

11. Was the amount of time in your classroom sufficient for your student teacher to acquire and practice the knowledge and tools necessary to be an effective teacher?

	Prog	Iram	State	wide
	101	91.8%	3015	83.8%
1 = Not at all sufficient	8	7.9%	139	4.6%
2 = Somewhat sufficient	20	19.8%	675	22.4%
3 = Sufficient	73	72.3%	2201	73.0%
Mean : SD	2.64	0.63	2.68	0.56

National University

12. What credential was your student teacher completing?

	Prog	ram	State	wide
	101	91.8%	3021	84.0%
1 = Multiple Subject	43	42.6%	1558	51.6%
2 = Single Subject	46	45.5%	1179	39.0%
3 = Education Specialist	12	11.9%	284	9.4%

Overall, how effective do you believe the teacher preparation program was in assisting your student	Multiple Subject					Single Subject						Education Specialist					
teacher to develop the skills and tools to be an effective teacher?	Prog	gram	State	wide	-	Program		Statewide			Prog	Iram	State	wide			
	43	100.0%	1529	98.1%		46	100.0%	1159	98.3%		12	100.0%	283	99.6%			
1 = Not at all effective	2	4.7%	25	1.6%		5	10.9%	27	2.3%		0	0.0%	6	2.1%			
2 = Somewhat effective	10	23.3%	237	15.5%	_	11	23.9%	206	17.8%		2	16.7%	48	17.0%			
3 = Effective	21	48.8%	705	46.1%	_	16	34.8%	494	42.6%		6	50.0%	125	44.2%			
4 = Very effective	10	23.3%	568	37.1%		14	30.4%	432	37.3%		4	33.3%	104	36.7%			
Mean : SD	2.91	0.81	3.18	0.75	_	2.85	0.99	3.15	0.79		3.17	0.72	3.16	0.77			

Multiple Subject

1. How well was your student teacher prepared to teach each of the following when he or she finished student teaching in your classroom?

		a) English Literacy & Language Arts					b) Mathematics					c) Science		
		Pro	gram	State	wide	Pro	Program		ewide	F	Program		State	wide
		43	100.0%	1527	98.0%	43	100.0%	1523	97.8%		43	100.0%	1510	96.9%
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	5	0.3%	0	0.0%	3	0.2%		1	2.3%	23	1.5%
2 = Poorly		1	2.3%	44	2.9%	1	2.3%	40	2.6%		2	4.7%	43	2.8%
3 = Adequately		14	32.6%	295	19.3%	18	41.9%	319	20.9%		16	37.2%	443	29.3%
4 = Well		18	41.9%	641	42.0%	12	27.9%	608	39.9%		11	25.6%	592	39.2%
5 = Very well		10	23.3%	542	35.5%	12	27.9%	553	36.3%		13	30.2%	409	27.1%
	Mean : SD	3.86	0.80	4.09	0.83	3.81	0.88	4.10	0.83	3.	77	1.02	3.87	0.89

National University

	d)	History/So	ocial Stud	ies	e	e) Creativ	e/Fine art	s	f) Physical Education			ation/Health		
	Pro	Program S		wide	Prog	Program		ewide	Pro	gram	State	ewide		
	43	100.0%	1520	97.6%	41	95.3%	1510	96.9%	41	95.3%	1500	96.3%		
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	12	0.8%	1	2.4%	44	2.9%	1	2.4%	66	4.4%		
2 = Poorly	2	4.7%	40	2.6%	3	7.3%	71	4.7%	4	9.8%	64	4.3%		
3 = Adequately	16	37.2%	448	29.5%	12	29.3%	502	33.2%	15	36.6%	545	36.3%		
4 = Well	14	32.6%	617	40.6%	14	34.1%	542	35.9%	13	31.7%	526	35.1%		
5 = Very well	11	25.6%	403	26.5%	11	26.8%	351	23.2%	8	19.5%	299	19.9%		
Mean : SD	3.79	0.89	3.89	0.85	3.76	1.02	3.72	0.97	3.56	1.00	3.62	0.99		

Single Subject

1. How well was your student teacher prepared to do each of the following when he or she finished student teaching in your classroom?

	a) Teach his California			i according standards		b) Contribute to students' reading skills in comprehension in the content area						
	Prog		Program Statewide Program		Program		State	wide				
	46	100.0%	1159	98.3%		46	100.0%	1157	98.1%			
1 = Not at all	2	4.3%	8	0.7%		3	6.5%	20	1.7%			
2 = Poorly	7	15.2%	40	3.5%		6	13.0%	57	4.9%			
3 = Adequately	9	19.6%	178	15.4%		12	26.1%	312	27.0%			
4 = Well	10	21.7%	370	31.9%		15	32.6%	456	39.4%			
5 = Very well	18	39.1%	563	48.6%		10	21.7%	312	27.0%			
Mean : Si	D 3.76	1.25	4.24	0.88		3.50	1.17	3.85	0.93			

			uccess in	ect matter skills life, college, and	d) Antic		d address t at risk of		of students v out
	Prog	gram	State	ewide		Pro	gram	State	wide
	46	100.0%	1157	98.1%		46	100.0%	1153	97.8%
1 = Not at all	1	2.2%	8	0.7%		6	13.0%	41	3.6%
e = Poorly	8	17.4%	52	4.5%		5	10.9%	89	7.7%
a = Adequately	6	13.0%	214	18.5%		13	28.3%	379	32.9%
, = Well	17	37.0%	471	40.7%		14	30.4%	387	33.6%
5 = Very well	14	30.4%	412	35.6%		8	17.4%	257	22.3%
Mean : SD	3.76	1.14	4.06	0.88		3.28	1.26	3.63	1.02

Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?

	strengtł	1. Use knowledge of students' strengths and prior experiences to engage them in learning				ect classroo world	om learni	ng to	3. Engag problem promote	tion to		
	Pro	gram	Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		State	ewide
	194	100.0%	4183	99.3%	194	100.0%	4180	99.2%	193	99.5%	4174	99.1%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	8	0.2%	1	0.5%	7	0.2%	0	0.0%	6	0.1%
2 = Poorly	0	0 0.0%	28	0.7%	1	0.5%	56	1.3%	2	1.0%	42	1.0%
3 = Adequately	19	9.8%	398	9.5%	25	12.9%	460	11.0%	24	12.4%	494	11.8%
4 = Well	60	30.9%	1280	30.6%	57	29.4%	1277	30.6%	61	31.6%	1313	31.5%
5 = Very well	115	59.3%	2469	59.0%	110	56.7%	2380	56.9%	106	54.9%	2319	55.6%
Mean : SD	4.49	0.67	4.48	0.71	4.41	0.77	4.43	0.75	4.40	0.74	4.41	0.75

			the instruc learners	tional nee	eds of	5. Identify and address special learning needs with appropriate teaching strategies					
		Pro	gram	State	wide	Prog	jram	State	wide		
		194	100.0%	4171	99.0%	193	99.5%	4178	99.2%		
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	6	0.1%	0	0.0%	16	0.4%		
2 = Poorly		2	1.0%	62	1.5%	4	2.1%	123	2.9%		
3 = Adequately		19	9.8%	557	13.4%	21	10.9%	696	16.7%		
4 = Well		58	29.9%	1304	31.3%	62	32.1%	1424	34.1%		
5 = Very well		115	59.3%	2242	53.8%	106	54.9%	1919	45.9%		
	Mean : SD	4.47	0.71	4.37	0.78	4.40	0.76	4.22	0.85		

Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?

		ge students ork as well				lish and m ul learning ents				e a produc nent with l udents		
	Pro	gram	State	ewide	Program 192 99.0%		Statewide		Prog	Iram	State	ewide
	193	99.5%	4162	4162 98.8%		99.0%	4162	98.8%	191	98.5%	4149	98.5%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	6	0.1%	0	0.0%	5	0.1%	1	0.5%	6	0.1%
2 = Poorly	1	1 0.5%	38	0.9%	0	0.0%	29	0.7%	1	0.5%	40	1.0%
3 = Adequately	23	11.9%	402	9.7%	13	6.8%	313	7.5%	15	7.9%	373	9.0%
4 = Well	62	32.1%	1287	30.9%	49	25.5%	1050	25.2%	52	27.2%	1150	27.7%
5 = Very well	107	55.4%	2429	58.4%	130	67.7%	2765	66.4%	122	63.9%	2580	62.2%
 Mean : Si	4 .42	0.72	4.46	0.72	4.61	0.61	4.57	0.67	4.53	0.71	4.51	0.71

Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?		9. Develop curriculum to teach				10. Use effective instructional strategies to teach specific subject matter and skills				11. Select, adapt, and develop materials, resources, and technologies to make subject matter accessible to all students			
	Pro	gram	State	ewide	Prog	Iram	State	ewide	Prog	ram	State	ewide	
	168	86.6%	3926	93.2%	167	86.1%	3927	93.2%	167	86.1%	3921	93.1%	
1 = Not at all	1	0.6%	11	0.3%	0	0.0%	6	0.2%	0	0.0%	6	0.2%	
2 = Poorly	2	1.2%	81	2.1%	1	0.6%	42	1.1%	1	0.6%	58	1.5%	
3 = Adequately	18	10.7%	540	13.8%	16	9.6%	427	10.9%	17	10.2%	497	12.7%	
4 = Well	55	32.7%	1351	34.4%	60	35.9%	1346	34.3%	53	31.7%	1368	34.9%	
5 = Very well	92	54.8%	1943	49.5%	90	53.9%	2106	53.6%	96	57.5%	1992	50.8%	
Меа	n : SD 4.40	0.77	4.31	0.80	4.43	0.69	4.40	0.74	4.46	0.70	4.35	0.77	

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students

10. Disc instruction besides a students built of a

v well did your teacher preparation gram prepare you to do each of the owing as a teacher?	academic rea	12. Plan instruction based on students' prior knowledge, academic readiness, language proficiency, cultural background, and individual development						13. Plan and adapt instruction that incorporates appropriate strategies, resources and technologie meet the learning needs of all students				
		Prog	ram	State	wide		Prog	Iram	State	wide		
		168	86.6%	3916	93.0%		168	86.6%	3914	92.9%		
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	3	0.1%		0	0.0%	5	0.1%		
2 = Poorly		1	0.6%	42	1.1%		1	0.6%	45	1.1%		
3 = Adequately		12	7.1%	385	9.8%		13	7.7%	407	10.4%		
t = Well		51	30.4%	1225	31.3%		56	33.3%	1303	33.3%		
5 = Very well		104	61.9%	2261	57.7%		98	58.3%	2154	55.0%		
	Mean : SD	4.54	0.66	4.46	0.72		4.49	0.67	4.42	0.73		

Assessing Students for Learning

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the	sources to	rces to establish learning goals and to plan,					 Involve all students in self- assessment, goal setting, and monitoring progress 				16. Give productive feedback to students to guide their learning			
following as a teacher?		Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	ewide	
		166	85.6%	3902	92.6%	167	86.1%	3897	92.5%	166	85.6%	3902	92.6%	
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	12	0.3%	0	0.0%	13	0.3%	0	0.0%	11	0.3%	
2 = Poorly		3	1.8%	73	1.9%	4	2.4%	116	3.0%	1	0.6%	62	1.6%	
3 = Adequately		19	11.4%	582	14.9%	18	10.8%	684	17.6%	13	7.8%	535	13.7%	
4 = Well		49	29.5%	1359	34.8%	66	39.5%	1361	34.9%	60	36.1%	1303	33.4%	
5 = Very well		95	57.2%	1876	48.1%	79	47.3%	1723	44.2%	92	55.4%	1991	51.0%	
	Mean : SD	4.42	0.76	4.28	0.81	4.32	0.76	4.20	0.85	4.46	0.67	4.33	0.79	

Developing as a Professional Educator

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?	ac	17. Evaluate the effects of your actions on student learning and modify plans accordingly			18. Work with families to better understand students and to support their learning				19. Work with colleagues to improve instruction				
	Program Statewide		Program State		wide	e Program		Statewide					
		159	82.0%	3777	89.7%	159	82.0%	3785	89.8%	159	82.0%	3782	89.8%
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	6	0.2%	1	0.6%	33	0.9%	0	0.0%	18	0.5%
2 = Poorly		1	0.6%	60	1.6%	4	2.5%	142	3.8%	2	1.3%	88	2.3%
3 = Adequately		14	8.8%	464	12.3%	21	13.2%	828	21.9%	17	10.7%	540	14.3%
4 = Well		60	37.7%	1347	35.7%	57	35.8%	1274	33.7%	52	32.7%	1199	31.7%
5 = Very well		84	52.8%	1900	50.3%	76	47.8%	1508	39.8%	88	55.3%	1937	51.2%
	Mean : SD	4.43	0.68	4.34	0.77	4.28	0.83	4.08	0.92	4.42	0.73	4.31	0.83

Content for Multiple Subjects

How well did your preparation program prepare you to teach each of the following subjects:

subjects:	20. Engl	ish Literacy	y/Langua	nguage Arts 21. Mathematics			22. Science					
	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	wide
	159	82.0%	3783	89.8%	159	82.0%	3788	89.9%	158	81.4%	3772	89.5%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	8	0.2%	0	0.0%	19	0.5%	2	1.3%	35	0.9%
2 = Poorly	3	1.9%	47	1.2%	5	3.1%	102	2.7%	6	3.8%	157	4.2%
3 = Adequately	15	9.4%	409	10.8%	21	13.2%	567	15.0%	34	21.5%	768	20.4%
4 = Well	55	34.6%	1217	32.2%	62	39.0%	1227	32.4%	52	32.9%	1318	34.9%
5 = Very well	86	54.1%	2102	55.6%	71	44.7%	1873	49.4%	64	40.5%	1494	39.6%
Mean : SD	4.41	0.74	4.42	0.75	4.25	0.80	4.28	0.85	4.08	0.94	4.08	0.92

		23. History/Social Studies				24. Creative/Fine arts				25. Physical Education/Health			:h
		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
		159	82.0%	3781	89.7%	159	82.0%	3766	89.4%	158	81.4%	3756	89.2%
1 = Not at all		3	1.9%	45	1.2%	4	2.5%	118	3.1%	1	0.6%	133	3.5%
2 = Poorly		3	1.9%	161	4.3%	11	6.9%	257	6.8%	12	7.6%	332	8.8%
3 = Adequately		28	17.6%	840	22.2%	36	22.6%	999	26.5%	28	17.7%	1078	28.7%
4 = Well		59	37.1%	1331	35.2%	51	32.1%	1214	32.2%	64	40.5%	1158	30.8%
5 = Very well		66	41.5%	1404	37.1%	57	35.8%	1178	31.3%	53	33.5%	1055	28.1%
	Mean : SD	4.14	0.91	4.03	0.93	3.92	1.04	3.82	1.05	3.99	0.94	3.71	1.08

Field Experiences

h of the following best describes the kind of clinical experience you had during your preparation (check all	155 79.9% 3756 89.2% 109 56.2% 2919 69.3%			
that apply):	155	79.9%	3756	89.2%
Student teaching with a cooperating teacher	109	56.2%	2919	69.3%
Teaching fellow or intern in a program where I served as teacher of record while taking courses for my credential	40	20.6%	863	20.5%
Teaching on an emergency credential [PIP/ STP] while taking courses for my credential	17	8.8%	263	6.2%

27. How often did preparation program faculty or staff communicate with you in person or by other means about your teaching practice?

28. How often did preparation program faculty or supervisors observe your classroom	
instruction and provide feedback during your clinical practice?	

other means about your teaching practice.				
	Prog	gram	ram Statev	
	154	79.4%	3756	89.2%
1 = Less than once per month	8	5.2%	107	2.8%
2 = Once per month	15	9.7%	303	8.1%
$_{3} =$ Twice per month	41	26.6%	736	19.6%
t = Once per week	44	28.6%	1270	33.8%
5 = 2-3 times per week	32	20.8%	1020	27.2%
5 = Daily	14	9.1%	320	8.5%
Mean : SD	3.77	1.29	4.00	1.18

	Prog	gram	Statewide						
	153	78.9%	3744	88.9%					
1 = Once or twice	7	4.6%	87	2.3%					
2 = 3-5 times	54	35.3%	679	18.1%					
3 = 6-10 times	50	32.7%	1416	37.8%					
4 = 11-15 times	14	9.2%	720	19.2%					
5 = 16-20 times	14	9.2%	474	12.7%					
6 = More than 20 times	14	9.2%	368	9.8%					
Mean : SD	3.10	1.35	3.51	1.26					

29. My field experiences helped me integrate and apply the major ideas developed through program coursework

	Prog	jram	Statewid			
	154	79.4%	3752	89.1%		
1 = Strongly Disagree	1	0.6%	705	18.8%		
2 = Disagree	1	0.6%	470	12.5%		
3 = Neutral	6	3.9%	167	4.5%		
4 = Agree	55	35.7%	916	24.4%		
5 = Strongly Agree	91	59.1%	1494	39.8%		
Mean : SD	4.52	0.67	3.54	1.56		

30. My cooperating teacher(s) (select all that apply):

	Prog	gram	State	wide
	153	78.9%	3672	87.2%
Frequently observed my teaching and met with me to				
offer feedback	141	72.7%	3067	72.8%
Was an excellent educator and a valuable role model	142	73.2%	3157	74.9%
Modeled effective practices	132	68.0%	3134	74.4%
Helped me plan and organize curriculum materials	130	67.0%	2912	69.1%
Offered useful strategies and advice about my teaching	145	74.7%	3270	77.6%
Helped me reflect on my practice	137	70.6%	3035	72.0%
Helped me to solve teaching problems	136	70.1%	3011	71.5%
Was knowledgeable about and able to provide support				
for field-based assignments		70.6%	3037	72.1%

31. Approximately how much time did you spend in student teaching (in the classroom of a cooperating teacher) as part of your supervised fieldwork?

	Prog	Iram	State	ewide	
	149	76.8%	3390	80.5%	
1 = Less than 100 hours	6	5.1%	63	2.1%	
2 = 100 - 299 hours	10	8.5%	297	9.8%	
3 = 300 - 599 hours	35	29.9%	905	29.8%	
4 = 600 - 799 hours	42	35.9%	897	29.6%	
5 = 800 hours or more	24	20.5%	871	28.7%	
This question does not apply to me because I did not do any student teaching. **	32	-	357	-	
Mean : SD	3.58	1.07	3.73	1.04	

32. Approximately how much time did you spend in an internship placement as teacher of record as part of your fieldwork?

	Program Statewide				
Prog	jram	State	wide		
153	78.9%	2738	65.0%		
0	0.0%	23	2.2%		
3	5.8%	81	7.8%		
7	13.5%	173	16.6%		
9	17.3%	181	17.4%		
33	63.5%	585	56.1%		
101	-	1695	-		
4.38	0.93	4.17	1.10		
	153 0 3 7 9 33 101	153 78.9% 0 0.0% 3 5.8% 7 13.5% 9 17.3% 33 63.5% 101 -	153 78.9% 2738 0 0.0% 23 3 5.8% 81 7 13.5% 173 9 17.3% 181 33 63.5% 585 101 - 1695		

33. If you served in an internship placement, how often did your assigned mentor observe your classroom instruction and provide feedback and assistance during your clinical practice?

	Prog	jram	State	ewide	
	152	78.4%	2726	64.7%	
1 = Once or twice	1	2.2%	67	6.9%	
2 = 3-5 times	9	19.6%	162	16.7%	
3 = 6-10 times	12	26.1%	230	23.7%	
4 = 11-15 times	9	19.6%	135	13.9%	
5 = 16-20 times	7	15.2%	141	14.5%	
6 = More than 20 times	8	17.4%	237	24.4%	
Does not apply/I was not in an internship **	106	-	1754	-	
Mean : SD	3.78	1.44	3.86	1.62	

Content for Multiple Subjects: English Language Arts

34. In your teacher preparation program, how much opportunity did you have to do each of the following?	a) Learn skills	ways to to	each deco	oding	 b) Learn ways to build student interest and motivation to read 					how to he ons to impr nension		ts make	d) Learn how to support older students in learning to read				
	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		State	Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	147	75.8%	3639	86.4%	146	75.3%	3637	86.3%	146	75.3%	3631	86.2%	144	74.2%	3607	85.6%	
1 = None	1	0.7%	69	1.9%	1	0.7%	15	0.4%	1	0.7%	22	0.6%	5	3.5%	110	3.0%	
2 = Touched on it Briefly	15	10.2%	350	9.6%	8	5.5%	153	4.2%	9	6.2%	180	5.0%	17	11.8%	459	12.7%	
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	40	27.2%	852	23.4%	27	18.5%	649	17.8%	27	18.5%	684	18.8%	33	22.9%	903	25.0%	
4 = Explored in Some Depth	50	34.0%	1345	37.0%	59	40.4%	1277	35.1%	59	40.4%	1338	36.8%	53	36.8%	1205	33.4%	
5 = Extensive Opportunity	41	27.9%	1023	28.1%	51	34.9%	1543	42.4%	50	34.2%	1407	38.7%	36	25.0%	930	25.8%	
Mean : SD	3.78	0.99	3.80	1.01	4.03	0.91	4.15	0.89	4.01	0.92	4.08	0.91	3.68	1.08	3.66	1.09	

	writing t		teach reading and s at different f) Learn how to activate st abilities prior knowledge					dents'	aloud for	to an indi the purpo eading ach	essing	h) Plan and teach a guided reading lesson				
	Prog	Program St		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		ram	Statewide	
	146	75.3%	3631	86.2%	146	75.3%	3628	86.1%	146	75.3%	3627	86.1%	145	74.7%	3624	86.0%
1 = None	2	1.4%	23	0.6%	0	0.0%	6	0.2%	2	1.4%	34	0.9%	1	0.7%	41	1.1%
$_2 =$ Touched on it Briefly	10	6.8%	191	5.3%	4	2.7%	73	2.0%	8	5.5%	151	4.2%	10	6.9%	173	4.8%
$_{3}$ = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	30	20.5%	620	17.1%	21	14.4%	399	11.0%	21	14.4%	523	14.4%	23	15.9%	550	15.2%
4 = Explored in Some Depth	54	37.0%	1303	35.9%	43	29.5%	1162	32.0%	52	35.6%	1178	32.5%	40	27.6%	1092	30.1%
5 = Extensive Opportunity	50	34.2%	1494	41.1%	78	53.4%	1988	54.8%	63	43.2%	1741	48.0%	71	49.0%	1768	48.8%
Mean : SD	3.96	0.97	4.12	0.91	4.34	0.82	4.39	0.77	4.14	0.95	4.22	0.91	4.17	0.98	4.21	0.94

	i) Learn to teach students to organize their ideas prior to writing				results t	udent read o address s rove your t	student n		 k) Practice what you learned about teaching reading in your field experiences 				
	Program		gram Statewide		Program		Statewide		Prog	Iram	State	ewide	
	146	75.3%	3627	86.1%	146	75.3%	3627	86.1%	145	74.7%	3624	86.0%	
1 = None	1	0.7%	28	0.8%	2	1.4%	21	0.6%	3	2.1%	27	0.7%	
2 = Touched on it Briefly	11	7.5%	211	5.8%	8	5.5%	157	4.3%	3	2.1%	101	2.8%	
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	20	13.7%	634	17.5%	22	15.1%	581	16.0%	18	12.4%	470	13.0%	
4 = Explored in Some Depth	51	34.9%	1229	33.9%	45	30.8%	1242	34.2%	44	30.3%	1187	32.8%	
5 = Extensive Opportunity	63	43.2%	1525	42.0%	69	47.3%	1626	44.8%	77	53.1%	1839	50.7%	
Mean : SD	4.12	0.96	4.11	0.94	4.17	0.97	4.18	0.89	4.30	0.92	4.30	0.85	

		state stan language			m) Study, critique or adapt readi curriculum materials					
	Prog	gram	Statewide		Prog	gram	State	wide		
	146	75.3%	3628	86.1%	145	74.7%	3625	86.0%		
1 = None	3	2.1%	18	0.5%	4	2.8%	62	1.7%		
2 = Touched on it Briefly	4	2.7%	117	3.2%	13	9.0%	241	6.6%		
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	22	15.1%	518	14.3%	23	15.9%	659	18.2%		
4 = Explored in Some Depth	48	32.9%	1072	29.5%	49	33.8%	1238	34.2%		
5 = Extensive Opportunity	69	47.3%	1903	52.5%	56	38.6%	1425	39.3%		
Mean : SD	4.21	0.94	4.30	0.87	3.97	1.08	4.03	1.00		
Content for Multiple Subjects: Mathematics

35. In your teacher preparation program, how much opportunity did you have to do each of the following?		typical dif h place va		tudents		typical dif h fractions		tudents	geometr number	epresentati ic represer lines) to sh rocedure w	ntation, gr	raphs,		that a solu ethod wor		
	Program		Statewide		Prog	Iram	Statewide		Prog	ram	State	wide	Program		Statewide	
	144	74.2%	3600	85.4%	144	74.2%	3591	85.2%	144	74.2%	3593	85.3%	143	73.7%	3591	85.2%
1 = None	10	6.9%	215	6.0%	10	6.9%	251	7.0%	6	4.2%	137	3.8%	7	4.9%	150	4.2%
2 = Touched on it Briefly	15	10.4%	435	12.1%	17	11.8%	441	12.3%	14	9.7%	343	9.5%	16	11.2%	364	10.1%
$_{3}$ = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	35	24.3%	776	21.6%	32	22.2%	750	20.9%	35	24.3%	691	19.2%	41	28.7%	780	21.7%
4 = Explored in Some Depth	45	31.3%	1143	31.8%	42	29.2%	1085	30.2%	44	30.6%	1138	31.7%	40	28.0%	1197	33.3%
5 = Extensive Opportunity	39	27.1%	1031	28.6%	43	29.9%	1064	29.6%	45	31.3%	1284	35.7%	39	27.3%	1100	30.6%
Mean : SD	3.61	1.19	3.65	1.18	3.63	1.22	3.63	1.22	3.75	1.13	3.86	1.12	3.62	1.14	3.76	1.12

		y, critique, um materia		math	 f) Learn how to facilitate math learning for students in small groups 				g) Adapt math lessons for st with diverse needs and learn styles			
	Pro	gram	Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	144	74.2%	3598	85.4%	144	74.2%	3601	85.5%	144	74.2%	3608	85.6%
1 = None	5	3.5%	105	2.9%	5	3.5%	73	2.0%	3	2.1%	60	1.7%
2 = Touched on it Briefly	10	6.9%	286	7.9%	12	8.3%	276	7.7%	10	6.9%	253	7.0%
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	31	21.5%	700	19.5%	25	17.4%	661	18.4%	25	17.4%	648	18.0%
4 = Explored in Some Depth	44	30.6%	1167	32.4%	43	29.9%	1121	31.1%	40	27.8%	1139	31.6%
5 = Extensive Opportunity	54	37.5%	1340	37.2%	59	41.0%	1470	40.8%	66	45.8%	1508	41.8%
Mean : Sl	3.92	1.09	3.93	1.07	3.97	1.11	4.01	1.04	4.08	1.05	4.05	1.01

		ice what yo math in y nce		d about	i) Study for math	national o ematics	andards	j) Review local district math curriculum			ematics		
	Pro	Program		Program Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	144	74.2%	3601	85.5%	144	74.2%	3600	85.4%	144	74.2%	3595	85.3%	
1 = None	0	0.0%	46	1.3%	1	0.7%	47	1.3%	8	5.6%	239	6.6%	
2 = Touched on it Briefly	7	4.9%	176	4.9%	5	3.5%	216	6.0%	14	9.7%	401	11.2%	
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	24	16.7%	555	15.4%	25	17.4%	557	15.5%	21	14.6%	658	18.3%	
4 = Explored in Some Depth	35	24.3%	1054	29.3%	48	33.3%	1099	30.5%	41	28.5%	1006	28.0%	
5 = Extensive Opportunity	78	54.2%	1770	49.2%	65	45.1%	1681	46.7%	60	41.7%	1291	35.9%	
Mean : SD	4.28	0.91	4.20	0.96	4.19	0.89	4.15	0.98	3.91	1.21	3.75	1.24	

General

36. Overall, how effective was your teacher preparation program at developing the skills or tools you needed to become a teacher?

Prog	ram	State	wide
4.40			
143	73.7%	3550	84.3%
1	0.7%	23	0.6%
6	4.2%	233	6.6%
48	33.6%	1227	34.6%
88	61.5%	2067	58.2%
3.56	0.61	3.50	0.65
	48 88	6 4.2% 48 33.6% 88 61.5%	6 4.2% 233 48 33.6% 1227 88 61.5% 2067

Demographics

Demographic numbers below 10 are not shown. If only one category is below 10, then the next highest number is also hidden.

37. Are you Hispanic or Latino?

	Prog	ram	State	wide
	144	74.2%	3573	84.8%
No, not Hispanic or Latino	107	74.3%	2545	71.2%
Yes, Hispanic or Latino	37	25.7%	1028	28.8%

38. What is your race? Mark all that apply

	Prog	ram	State	wide	
	131	67.5%	3145	74.6%	
American Indian or Alaska Native	*		115	2.7%	
Chinese	*		121	2.9%	
Japanese	*		58	1.4%	
Korean	*		72	1.7%	
Vietnamese	*		44	1.0%	
Asian Indian	*		32	0.8%	
Laotian	*		8	0.2%	
Cambodian	*		11	0.3%	
Filipino	*		95	2.3%	
Hmong	*		15	0.4%	
Other Asian	*		45	1.1%	
Black or African American	*		150	3.6%	
Hawaiian	*		13	0.3%	
Guamanian	*		8	0.2%	
Samoan	*		5	0.1%	
Tahitian	*		3	0.1%	
Other Pacific Islander	*		15	0.4%	
White	116	59.8%	2650	62.9%	

39. What is your gender?

	Pro	gram	State	ewide	
	142	73.2%	3578	84.9%	
Female	114	80.3%	3076	86.0%	
Male	*		450	12.6%	
Decline to state	*		52	1.5%	

	Number of Program Completers Asked to Participate in Survey	# and of Respo	
Program:	203	194	95.6 %
Statewide:	4355	4213	96.7 %

'Respondents' are those program completers who answered a minimum of 1 non-demographic question.

Your program and Support Provider

1. How long after you were hired into an assignment that requires a California preliminary teaching credential were you **enrolled** in a Commission-approved induction or clear credential program?

	Pro	gram	State	wide
	22	100.0%	10113	99.6%
L = At the time of hire or before beginning work with				
students	5	22.7%	4228	41.8%
2 = Within one to two months of beginning my				
assignment	4	18.2%	2455	24.3%
3 = Within three to five months of beginning my				
assignment	1	4.5%	308	3.0%
f = More than five months after beginning my assignment	3	13.6%	468	4.6%
5 = One year or more after beginning my assignment	9	40.9%	2654	26.2%
Mean : SD	3.32	1.70	2.49	1.6

2. How long after you were enrolled in your induction/clear credential program did you begin **working with a Support Provider (SP)** or receive support from Clear Credential Personnel?

	Pro	gram	State	wide
	22	100.0%	10091	99.4%
1 = Within one month of enrolling in the program	10	45.5%	8786	87.1%
2 = Within two months of enrolling in the program	0	0.0%	826	8.2%
3 = More than three months after enrolling in the program	2	9.1%	205	2.0%
4 = I was assigned a Support Provider but never worked				
with him/her	1	4.5%	33	0.3%
5 = I was never assigned a Support Provider	9	40.9%	241	2.4%
Mean : SD	2.95	1.91	1.23	0.72

3. What was the length of **your** induction/clear credential program?

	Program 22 100.0% : 7 31.8% : 5 22.7% : 3 13.6% : 4 18.2% : 3 13.6% :		State	ewide
	22	100.0%	10096	99.5%
1 = Less than 1 school year	7	31.8%	319	3.2%
2 = 1 school year	5	22.7%	1632	16.2%
3 = More than 1 school year but less than 2 school years	3	13.6%	340	3.4%
4 = 2 school years	4	18.2%	7604	75.3%
5 = More than 2 school years	3	13.6%	201	2.0%
Mean : SD	2.59	1.47	3.57	0.89

How helpful was your Support Provider/Mentor/System of Support in helping you impact students in learning regarding the following:

	4a. Moc observe	deling instr ed	4b. Ider	tifying Res	sources			iding feedl tions to im on			4d. Teaching Practices					
	Pro	Program S		Statewide		Program		Statewide		gram	Statewide		Program		State	wide
	22	100.0%	10067	99.2%	21	95.5%	10066	99.2%	22	100.0%	10060	99.1%	22	100.0%	10043	98.9%
1 = Very Helpful	9	40.9%	5582	55.4%	10	47.6%	6352	63.1%	9	40.9%	6934	68.9%	9	40.9%	6348	63.2%
2 = Helpful	8	36.4%	2615	26.0%	7	33.3%	2721	27.0%	7	31.8%	2323	23.1%	8	36.4%	2777	27.7%
3 = Somewhat helpful	2	9.1%	1171	11.6%	2	9.5%	831	8.3%	3	13.6%	646	6.4%	2	9.1%	775	7.7%
4 = Not at all helpful	3	13.6%	699	6.9%	2	9.5%	162	1.6%	3	13.6%	157	1.6%	3	13.6%	143	1.4%
Mean : SD	1.95	1.05	1.70	0.93	1.81	0.98	1.48	0.72	2.00	1.07	1.41	0.68	1.95	1.05	1.47	0.70

General Education (MS/SS) Program Completer Survey – 2017

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

		4e. Con	tent Suppo	ort						4g. Creating and Maintaining a Safe and Positive Climate				4h. Using strategies to support English Learners			
		Pro	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		ewide
		22	100.0%	10040	98.9%	20	90.9%	10041	98.9%	21	95.5%	10047	99.0%	21	95.5%	10037	98.9%
1 = Very Helpful		11	50.0%	5336	53.1%	6	30.0%	5547	55.2%	9	42.9%	6318	62.9%	10	47.6%	5218	52.0%
2 = Helpful		7	31.8%	2901	28.9%	10	50.0%	3049	30.4%	8	38.1%	2736	27.2%	7	33.3%	3221	32.1%
3 = Somewhat helpful		1	4.5%	1357	13.5%	1	5.0%	1162	11.6%	2	9.5%	804	8.0%	2	9.5%	1274	12.7%
4 = Not at all helpful		3	13.6%	446	4.4%	3	15.0%	283	2.8%	2	9.5%	189	1.9%	2	9.5%	324	3.2%
	Mean : SD	1.82	1.05	1.69	0.87	2.05	1.00	1.62	0.80	1.86	0.96	1.49	0.72	1.81	0.98	1.67	0.82

		4i. Using strategies to support students with disabilities				4j. Minimizing bias and using culturally responsive pedagogy				4k. Setting and reaching Professional Learning Goals			
		Program		State	wide	Program		Statewide		Program		m Statew	
		21	95.5%	10025	98.8%	20	90.9%	10045	99.0%	21	95.5%	10041	98.9%
1 = Very Helpful		7	33.3%	4881	48.7%	10	50.0%	5481	54.6%	11	52.4%	6683	66.6%
2 = Helpful		9	42.9%	3329	33.2%	7	35.0%	3210	32.0%	6	28.6%	2583	25.7%
3 = Somewhat helpful		3	14.3%	1475	14.7%	1	5.0%	1045	10.4%	3	14.3%	622	6.2%
4 = Not at all helpful		2	9.5%	340	3.4%	2	10.0%	309	3.1%	1	4.8%	153	1.5%
	Mean : SD	2.00	0.95	1.73	0.83	1.75	0.97	1.62	0.79	1.71	0.90	1.43	0.68

5. How well matched were you with your Support Provider?

	Prog	Iram	State	wide
	15	68.2%	9626	94.8%
1 = Well matched	11	73.3%	8370	87.0%
2 = Somewhat well matched	1	6.7%	999	10.4%
3 = Not well matched	3	20.0%	257	2.7%
Mean : SD	1.47	0.83	1.16	0.43

If you responded that you were "Not well matched" or "Somewhat well matched" with your Support Provider please respond to questions 6a and 6b:

6a. in which of the following areas could the match have been

improved? Mark all that apply	Pro	gram	Statewide			
	2	50.0%	1039	82.7%		
Grade level or subject area experience or background	0	0.0%	644	62.0%		
Familiarity with site resources, expectations, policies, and procedures	0	0.0%	234	22.5%		
Schedules /opportunities to meet	2	100.0%	293	28.2%		
Personality, disposition, and working style	2	100.0%	296	28.5%		
Teaching philosophy and style	1	50.0%	198	19.1%		

6b. Did the program address the issue(s) with the match?

	Pro	gram	State	ewide					
	2	50.0%	1234	98.2%					
1 = Yes	0	0.0%	262	21.2%					
2 = To some extent, but not fully	1	50.0%	483	39.1%					
3 = No	1	50.0%	489	39.6%					
Mean : SD	2.50	0.71	2.18	0.76					

7. On average, how frequently did you and your Support Provider have meaningful communication about issues related to your teaching practice? This includes all face-to-face or virtual interactions via technology.

8. Across the full induction/clear program, how frequently did your Support Provider observe and coach you in your classroom during the program (in person or via visual technology)?

or virtual interactions via technology.				
	Pro	gram	State	ewide
	13	59.1%	9597	94.5%
1 = Daily	1	7.7%	873	9.1%
2 = Two or three times per week	3	23.1%	2194	22.9%
3 = Weekly	3	23.1%	4840	50.4%
4 = Twice per month	1	7.7%	1324	13.8%
5 = Less than twice per month	5	38.5%	366	3.8%
Mean :	SD 3.46	1.45	2.80	0.92

	Prog	jram	State	ewide
	13	59.1%	9577	94.3%
1 = More than ten times during the entire program	1	7.7%	2291	23.9%
2 = 6-10 times during the entire program	4	30.8%	3156	33.0%
3 = 3-5 times during the entire program	4	30.8%	3318	34.6%
4 = Once or twice during the entire program	1	7.7%	684	7.1%
5 = I was not observed by my Support Provider	3	23.1%	128	1.3%
Mean : SD	3.08	1.32	2.29	0.95

9	What amount	of interaction w	ith your Support	Provider would have	ave been best for vou	12

	Prog	gram	State	ewide
	13	59.1%	9576	94.3%
1 = Significantly more time	2	15.4%	359	3.7%
2 = A little more time	2	15.4%	1265	13.2%
3 = The same amount of time I had	9	69.2%	7427	77.6%
4 = A little less time	0	0.0%	419	4.4%
5 = Much less time	0	0.0%	106	1.1%
Mean : SD	2.54	0.78	2.86	0.59

Connections between your induction/clear program and your Individual Induction Plan (IIP)

1 2 3

Reflecting on your engagement with formative assessment activities during your induction and credential program experience:

district or on site and induction/clear credential program	goals and	activities		
	Prog	Iram	State	wide
	13	59.1%	9536	93.9%
_ = Strong	4	44.4%	4776	51.3%
e = Moderate	5	55.6%	3923	42.1%
a = Weak	0	0.0%	620	6.7%
Not applicable to me **	4	-	217	-
Mean : SD	1.56	0.53	1.55	0.62

10. To what degree was there cohesion between the professional development received in district or on site and induction/clear credential program goals and activities?

	Prog	gram	State	ewide
	13	59.1%	9531	93.9%
Very Strong	2	28.6%	2991	36.0%
Strong	4	57.1%	3784	45.6%
Not Strong	1	14.3%	1524	18.4%
I do not have sufficient information to answer this				
question **	6	-	1232	-
Mean : SD	1.86	0.69	1.82	0.72

General Education (MS/SS) Program Completer Survey – 2017

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

How much impact did participating in the following activities have on your classroom practice?

	12a. Collection and analysis of evidence of my teaching practice				12b. Ana	alysis of m	ny student	12c. Observation of experienced teachers				12d. Examination of my teaching practice against the CSTP (e.g., the Continuum of Teaching Practice)				
	Prog	Program Statewide		Program Statewide		wide	Program		State	wide	Program		State	wide		
	13	59.1%	9517	93.8%	13	59.1%	9518	93.8%	13	59.1%	9511	93.7%	12	54.5%	9495	93.5%
1 = Extensive impact	8	66.7%	6157	64.9%	7	63.6%	6831	72.0%	9	69.2%	6483	72.6%	5	62.5%	5354	57.5%
2 = Limited impact	3	25.0%	3064	32.3%	3	27.3%	2435	25.7%	4	30.8%	2244	25.1%	3	37.5%	3434	36.9%
3 = No impact	1	8.3%	268	2.8%	1	9.1%	216	2.3%	0	0.0%	205	2.3%	0	0.0%	528	5.7%
I did not participate in this activity **	1	-	28	-	2	-	36	-	0	-	579	-	4	-	179	-
Mean : SD	1.42	0.67	1.38	0.54	1.45	0.69	1.30	0.51	1.31	0.48	1.30	0.50	1.38	0.52	1.48	0.60

		12e. Development of my Individual Induction Plan (IIP)/Individual Learning Plan (ILP)				essional Le 1 on my II		S	12g. Col	with colle	agues		
		Program Statewide		Program Sta		State	ewide	Program		State	ewide		
		13	59.1%	9496	93.5%	13	59.1%	9492	93.5%	13	59.1%	9489	93.5%
1 = Extensive impact		7	70.0%	5607	59.8%	9	90.0%	5643	60.4%	11	91.7%	7458	79.2%
2 = Limited impact		3	30.0%	3278	35.0%	1	10.0%	3324	35.6%	1	8.3%	1744	18.5%
3 = No impact		0	0.0%	489	5.2%	0	0.0%	373	4.0%	0	0.0%	217	2.3%
I did not participate in this activity **		3	-	122	-	3	-	152	-	1	-	70	-
	Mean : SD	1.30	0.48	1.45	0.59	1.10	0.32	1.44	0.57	1.08	0.29	1.23	0.47

Impact of Induction on Teaching Practice

Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

	13a. Cor the real	nnect class world	room lea	rning to	13b. Engage students in inquiry, problem solving, and reflection to promote their critical thinking			ion to	13c. Mee English l	et the insti earners	ructional r	needs of	learning		n appropr	ldress special appropriate	
	Prog	Iram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	ewide	Prog	ram	State	ewide	Prog	Iram	State	ewide	
	14	63.6%	9345	92.1%	14	63.6%	9337	92.0%	14	63.6%	9337	92.0%	14	63.6%	9334	92.0%	
1 = Very well	7	50.0%	3682	39.4%	8	57.1%	4150	44.4%	7	50.0%	3515	37.6%	8	57.1%	3717	39.8%	
2 = Well	4	28.6%	3537	37.8%	4	28.6%	3393	36.3%	5	35.7%	3494	37.4%	3	21.4%	3477	37.3%	
3 = Adequately	2	14.3%	1624	17.4%	1	7.1%	1432	15.3%	1	7.1%	1911	20.5%	2	14.3%	1719	18.4%	
4 = Poorly	1	7.1%	326	3.5%	0	0.0%	239	2.6%	1	7.1%	297	3.2%	0	0.0%	304	3.3%	
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	176	1.9%	1	7.1%	123	1.3%	0	0.0%	120	1.3%	1	7.1%	117	1.3%	
Mean : SD	1.79	0.97	1.91	0.93	1.71	1.14	1.80	0.88	1.71	0.91	1.93	0.91	1.79	1.19	1.89	0.90	

Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

1		and mainta environme		and respectful students	14b. Create a productive learning environme expectations for all students				
	Pro	Program		wide	-	Prog	jram	State	wide
	14	63.6%	9332	91.9%		14	63.6%	9331	91.9%
1 = Very well	9	64.3%	4979	53.4%		7	50.0%	4995	53.5%
2 = Well	3	21.4%	2944	31.5%		5	35.7%	3001	32.2%
a = Adequately	2	14.3%	1154	12.4%		1	7.1%	1092	11.7%
t = Poorly	0	0.0%	120	1.3%		1	7.1%	122	1.3%
; = Not at all	0	0.0%	135	1.4%		0	0.0%	121	1.3%
Mean : S	5D 1.50	0.76	1.66	0.85		1.71	0.91	1.65	0.83

Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

15a	. Use effective instructional strategies to specific subject matter and skills				teach	5b. Select, adapt, and develop materials, red d technologies to make subject matter acce all students				
	Prog	Program		ewide		Prog	yram	State	wide	
	14	63.6%	9326	91.9%		14	63.6%	9320	91.8%	
1 = Very well	8	57.1%	4388	47.1%		7	50.0%	4452	47.8%	
2 = Well	3	21.4%	3322	35.6%		5	35.7%	3237	34.7%	
3 = Adequately	1	7.1%	1272	13.6%		1	7.1%	1299	13.9%	
t = Poorly	2	14.3%	224	2.4%		0	0.0%	213	2.3%	
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	120	1.3%		1	7.1%	119	1.3%	
 Mean : SD	1.79	1.12	1.75	0.87		1.79	1.12	1.75	0.87	

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

	knowledge, a	16a. Plan instruction based on students' prior knowledge, academic readiness, language proficiency, cultural background, and individual development					16b. Plan and adapt instruction that incorporat appropriate strategies, resources and technologie meet the learning needs of all students					
		Program		Statewide				Prog	gram	Statewide		
		14	63.6%	9321	91.8%			14	63.6%	9323	91.8%	
1 = Very well		8	57.1%	4220	45.3%			10	71.4%	4386	47.0%	
2 = Well		4	28.6%	3478	37.3%			2	14.3%	3407	36.5%	
3 = Adequately		1	7.1%	1344	14.4%			1	7.1%	1267	13.6%	
4 = Poorly		1	7.1%	174	1.9%			1	7.1%	162	1.7%	
5 = Not at all		0	0.0%	105	1.1%			0	0.0%	101	1.1%	
	Mean : SD 1	.64	0.93	1.76	0.85			1.50	0.94	1.73	0.84	

Assessing Students for Learning

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

17		ll students g, and mor		ssessment, goal rogress	17b. Give pro	ive productive feedback to students to learning				
	Pro	Program		ewide		Program		Statewide		
	14	63.6%	9316	91.8%		14	63.6%	9318	91.8%	
_ = Very well	5	35.7%	3689	39.6%		7	50.0%	3832	41.1%	
= Well	7	50.0%	3489	37.5%		3	21.4%	3546	38.1%	
= Adequately	1	7.1%	1721	18.5%		3	21.4%	1576	16.9%	
= Poorly	0	0.0%	272	2.9%		0	0.0%	228	2.4%	
= Not at all	1	7.1%	145	1.6%		1	7.1%	136	1.5%	
Mean : SL	1.93	1.07	1.89	0.91	1	.93	1.21	1.85	0.89	

Developing as a Professional Educator

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

18a. Eva		effects of modify pla		n student learnin ingly	3b. Work with	o colleague	s to improve instruct		
	Program		State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide	
	14	63.6%	9318	91.8%	14	63.6%	9321	91.8%	
1 = Very well	8	57.1%	4238	45.5%	7	50.0%	4603	49.4%	
2 = Well	4	28.6%	3477	37.3%	4	28.6%	3041	32.6%	
3 = Adequately	1	7.1%	1373	14.7%	2	14.3%	1320	14.2%	
4 = Poorly	1	7.1%	134	1.4%	1	7.1%	208	2.2%	
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	96	1.0%	0	0.0%	149	1.6%	
Mean : SD	1.64	0.93	1.75	0.83	1.79	0.97	1.74	0.90	

	program	9. Overall, how effective was your induction gram at developing the skills, habits, or tools ou needed to grow your teaching practice?					20. Overall, how effective was your in program at developing the skills, habit you needed to continue in your care teacher?				
		Prog	Iram	State	wide			Pro	gram	State	wide
		14	63.6%	9305	91.7%			14	63.6%	9308	91.7%
1 = Very effective		9	64.3%	4324	46.5%			8	57.1%	4406	47.3%
2 = Effective		3	21.4%	3483	37.4%			5	35.7%	3451	37.1%
3 = Somewhat effective		2	14.3%	1269	13.6%			1	7.1%	1215	13.1%
a = Not at all effective		0	0.0%	229	2.5%			0	0.0%	236	2.5%
	Mean : SD	1.50	0.76	1.72	0.79			1.50	0.65	1.71	0.79

Demographic Information

21. Are you Hispanic or Latino?

	Pro	gram	State	wide
	14	63.6%	9237	91.0%
No, not Hispanic or Latino	*		6776	73.4%
Yes, Hispanic or Latino	*		2461	26.6%

23. In what type of school did you teach during your induction program? Mark all that apply

Program

13

*

*

*

*

14 63.6%

59.1%

Statewide

7517 74.1%

91.3%

16.3%

5.7%

0.2%

0.6%

9270

1652

577

19

57

22. What is your race? Mark all that apply

	Prog	gram	State	wide
	13	59.1%	8278	81.5%
American Indian or Alaska Native	*		398	3.9%
Chinese	*		349	3.4%
Japanese	*		157	1.5%
Korean	*		169	1.7%
Vietnamese	*		118	1.2%
Asian Indian	*		98	1.0%
Laotian	*		16	0.2%
Cambodian	*		17	0.2%
Filipino	*		242	2.4%
Hmong	*		27	0.3%
Other Asian	*		106	1.0%
Black or African American	*		349	3.4%
Hawaiian	*		35	0.3%
Guamanian	*		20	0.2%
Samoan	*		12	0.1%
Tahitian	*		8	0.1%
Other Pacific Islander	*		29	0.3%
White	13	59.1%	6966	68.6%

^{*} Demographic numbers below 10 are not shown. If only one category is below 10, then the next highest number is also hidden.

	Number of Program Completers Asked to Participate in Survey	# and of Respo		
Program:	28	22	78.6 %	'Respondents' are those program completers who answered a minimum of 1
Statewide:	10694	10151	94.9 %	non-demographic question.

24. What is your gender?

Non-public special education

Public

Charter

Private

Other

	Pro	gram	State	wide
	14	63.6%	9256	91.2%
Female	11	78.6%	6802	73.5%
Male	*		2274	24.6%
Decline to state	*		180	1.9%

Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?

	strength	nowledge ons and prior them in lea	r experier		2. Conne the real	ect classroo world	om learni	ng to	Engage students in inquiry, problem solving, and reflection t promote their critical thinking									
	Program		Program Statewid		Program Statewide		ewide Program		Statewide		m Statewid		Statewide		Program		Statewic	
	270	100.0%	3670	99.2%	270	100.0%	3662	99.0%	270	100.0%	3665	99.1%						
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	3	0.1%	0	0.0%	6	0.2%	1	0.4%	9	0.2%						
2 = Poorly	4	1.5%	50	1.4%	11	4.1%	104	2.8%	4	1.5%	70	1.9%						
3 = Adequately	39	14.4%	476	13.0%	45	16.7%	548	15.0%	47	17.4%	499	13.6%						
4 = Well	91	33.7%	1255	34.2%	94	34.8%	1204	32.9%	96	35.6%	1227	33.5%						
5 = Very well	136	50.4%	1886	51.4%	120	44.4%	1800	49.2%	122	45.2%	1860	50.8%						
Mean : SD	4.33	0.78	4.35	0.76	4.20	0.86	4.28	0.83	4.24	0.82	4.33	0.80						

		4. Meet English l	the instruc earners	tional nee	eds of		h appropr	ress special appropriate		
		Prog	gram	State	wide	Pro	gram	State	ewide	
		269	99.6%	3659	98.9%	270	100.0%	3665	99.1%	
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	5	0.1%	0	0.0%	8	0.2%	
2 = Poorly		4	1.5%	99	2.7%	3	1.1%	128	3.5%	
3 = Adequately		42	15.6%	667	18.2%	42	15.6%	670	18.3%	
4 = Well		89	33.1%	1213	33.2%	85	31.5%	1252	34.2%	
5 = Very well		134	49.8%	1675	45.8%	140	51.9%	1607	43.8%	
	Mean : SD	4.31	0.79	4.22	0.84	4.34	0.78	4.18	0.87	

Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?

	9		je students ork as well				lish and m ul learning nts			 Create a productive learning environment with high expectations for all students 			
		Prog	Iram	State	wide	Program		Statewid		Program		Statewide	
		269	99.6%	2677	72.4%	268	99.3%	3645	98.5%	268	99.3%	3646	98.6%
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	3	0.1%	0	0.0%	5	0.1%	0	0.0%	6	0.2%
2 = Poorly		3	1.1%	35	1.3%	2	0.7%	48	1.3%	2	0.7%	63	1.7%
3 = Adequately		39	14.5%	273	10.2%	26	9.7%	359	9.8%	37	13.8%	421	11.5%
4 = Well		94	34.9%	813	30.4%	90	33.6%	1000	27.4%	94	35.1%	1147	31.5%
5 = Very well		133	49.4%	1553	58.0%	150	56.0%	2233	61.3%	135	50.4%	2009	55.1%
	Mean : SD	4.33	0.76	4.45	0.74	4.45	0.70	4.48	0.74	4.35	0.74	4.40	0.77

Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?	9. Develop curriculum to teach content standards effectively					effective ir es to teach and skills			11. Select, adapt, and develop materials, resources, and technologies to make subject matter accessible to all students				
	Pro	Program		Statewide		Program		ewide	Program		State	wide	
	240	88.9%	3463	93.6%	240	88.9%	3469	93.8%	239	88.5%	3467	93.7%	
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	14	0.4%	2	0.8%	13	0.4%	0	0.0%	9	0.3%	
2 = Poorly	5	2.1%	119	3.4%	4	1.7%	79	2.3%	5	2.1%	77	2.2%	
3 = Adequately	40	16.7%	557	16.1%	37	15.4%	451	13.0%	35	14.6%	563	16.2%	
4 = Well	94	39.2%	1166	33.7%	79	32.9%	1175	33.9%	85	35.6%	1220	35.2%	
5 = Very well	101	42.1%	1607	46.4%	118	49.2%	1751	50.5%	114	47.7%	1598	46.1%	
Mean : S	5D 4.21	0.79	4.22	0.87	4.28	0.84	4.32	0.81	4.29	0.79	4.25	0.82	

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?	acader	nic readi	n based or ness, langu d, and indi	uage prof	iciency, c	ultural a	e, 13. Plan and adapt instruction appropriate strategies, resources meet the learning needs of				
		Prog	gram	State	ewide		Prog	gram	State	wide	
		238	88.1%	3463	93.6%		238	88.1%	3468	93.8%	
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	7	0.2%		0	0.0%	5	0.1%	
2 = Poorly		2	0.8%	65	1.9%		2	0.8%	56	1.6%	
3 = Adequately		37	15.5%	519	15.0%		33	13.9%	498	14.4%	
4 = Well		92	38.7%	1198	34.6%		96	40.3%	1218	35.1%	
5 = Very well		107	45.0%	1674	48.3%		107	45.0%	1691	48.8%	
	Mean : SD	4.28	0.75	4.29	0.80		4.29	0.73	4.31	0.78	

Assessing Students for Learning

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the		ces to est	use assess tablish lear tiate, and	rning goal	ls and to	asses	volve all s sment, go monitoring	al setting	, and	16. Give productive feedback to students to guide their learning				
following as a teacher?		Prog	gram	State	ewide	Prog	Iram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	ewide	
		238	88.1%	3463	93.6%	236	87.4%	3463	93.6%	237	87.8%	3466	93.7%	
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	9	0.3%	0	0.0%	16	0.5%	0	0.0%	11	0.3%	
2 = Poorly		4	1.7%	102	2.9%	7	3.0%	141	4.1%	4	1.7%	78	2.3%	
3 = Adequately		35	14.7%	575	16.6%	35	14.8%	657	19.0%	33	13.9%	524	15.1%	
4 = Well		86	36.1%	1229	35.5%	91	38.6%	1248	36.0%	83	35.0%	1178	34.0%	
5 = Very well		113	47.5%	1548	44.7%	103	43.6%	1401	40.5%	117	49.4%	1675	48.3%	
	Mean : SD	4.29	0.78	4.21	0.84	4.23	0.81	4.12	0.89	4.32	0.77	4.28	0.82	

Developing as a Professional Educator

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?	actions of	uate the en on student plans accor	learning			< with fam and studen rning				with colle		
	Prog	gram	State	wide	Program		State	wide	Prog	ram	ram Statew	
	235	87.0%	3403	92.0%	232	85.9%	3407	92.1%	235	87.0%	3408	92.1%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	7	0.2%	2	0.9%	46	1.4%	1	0.4%	19	0.6%
2 = Poorly	2	0.9%	57	1.7%	6	2.6%	214	6.3%	3	1.3%	94	2.8%
3 = Adequately	28	11.9%	504	14.8%	60	25.9%	898	26.4%	45	19.1%	580	17.0%
4 = Well	103	43.8%	1264	37.1%	82	35.3%	1121	32.9%	87	37.0%	1125	33.0%
5 = Very well	102	43.4%	1571	46.2%	82	35.3%	1128	33.1%	99	42.1%	1590	46.7%
Mean : SD	4.30	0.71	4.27	0.79	4.02	0.89	3.90	0.98	4.19	0.82	4.22	0.86

Content for Single Subjects

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?	accordin	ch my cont ig to Califo standards	rnia acad			ribute to s luding com ect area			subject r	ole student matter skill success ir er	ls that co	ntribute		cipate and students out		
	Prog	gram	State	ewide	Prog	Iram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	wide	Prog	Iram	State	wide
	233	86.3%	3406	92.1%	232	85.9%	3401	91.9%	232	85.9%	3403	92.0%	234	86.7%	3403	92.0%
1 = Not at all	6	2.6%	29	0.9%	3	1.3%	20	0.6%	3	1.3%	21	0.6%	3	1.3%	79	2.3%
2 = Poorly	6	2.6%	105	3.1%	3	1.3%	118	3.5%	4	1.7%	85	2.5%	12	5.1%	290	8.5%
3 = Adequately	33	14.2%	477	14.0%	38	16.4%	591	17.4%	33	14.2%	510	15.0%	54	23.1%	836	24.6%
4 = Well	94	40.3%	1083	31.8%	107	46.1%	1206	35.5%	96	41.4%	1241	36.5%	80	34.2%	1039	30.5%
5 = Very well	94	40.3%	1712	50.3%	81	34.9%	1466	43.1%	96	41.4%	1546	45.4%	85	36.3%	1159	34.1%
Mean : SD	4.13	0.93	4.28	0.88	4.12	0.82	4.17	0.88	4.20	0.84	4.24	0.84	3.99	0.96	3.85	1.06

Field Experiences

24. Which of the following best describes the kind of clinical experience you had during your preparation (check all	Prog	jram	State	wide
that apply):	229	84.8%	3408	92.1%
Student teaching with a cooperating teacher	124	45.9%	2578	69.7%
Teaching fellow or intern in a program where I served as teacher of record while taking courses for my credential	102	37.8%	860	23.2%
Teaching on an emergency credential [PIP/ STP] while taking courses for my credential	31	11.5%	255	6.9%

25. How often did preparation program faculty or staff communicate with you in person or by other means about your teaching practice?

26. How often did preparation program faculty or supervisors observe your classroom instruction and provide feedback during your clinical practice?

	-			
	Prog	gram	State	ewide
	229	84.8%	3412	92.2%
1 = Less than once per month	6	2.6%	112	3.3%
2 = Once per month	20	8.7%	299	8.8%
3 = Twice per month	74	32.3%	672	19.7%
4 = Once per week	66	28.8%	1134	33.2%
5 = 2-3 times per week	48	21.0%	927	27.2%
6 = Daily	15	6.6%	268	7.9%
Mean : SD	3.76	1.15	3.96	1.19

	Prog	ıram	State	ewide	
	228	84.4%	3401	91.9%	
1 = Once or twice	5	2.2%	42	1.2%	
2 = 3-5 times	59	25.9%	563	16.6%	
3 = 6-10 times	74	32.5%	1504	44.2%	
4 = 11-15 times	36	15.8%	655	19.3%	
5 = 16-20 times	29	12.7%	353	10.4%	
6 = More than 20 times	25	11.0%	284	8.4%	
Mean : SD	3.44	1.35	3.46	1.17	

27. My field experiences helped me integrate and apply the major ideas developed through program coursework

	Prog	Iram	State	wide
	229	84.8%	3405	92.1%
= Strongly Disagree	3	1.3%	525	15.4%
= Disagree	2	0.9%	425	12.5%
= Neutral	11	4.8%	212	6.2%
_ Agree	83	36.2%	916	26.9%
= Strongly Agree	130	56.8%	1327	39.0%
Mean : SD	4.46	0.75	3.62	1.48

28. My cooperating teacher(s) (select all that apply):

	Program State		ewide	
	221	81.9%	3287	88.9%
Frequently observed my teaching and met with me to offer feedback	186	68.9%	2720	73.5%
Was an excellent educator and a valuable role model	186	68.9%	2669	72.2%
Modeled effective practices	176	65.2%	2619	70.8%
Helped me plan and organize curriculum materials	160	59.3%	2451	66.3%
Offered useful strategies and advice about my teaching	190	70.4%	2922	79.0%
Helped me reflect on my practice	187	69.3%	2763	74.7%
Helped me to solve teaching problems	180	66.7%	2742	74.1%
Was knowledgeable about and able to provide support for field-based assignments	174	64.4%	2611	70.6%

29. Approximately how much time did you spend in student teaching (in the classroom of a cooperating teacher) as part of your supervised fieldwork?

	Prog	ram	State	wide
	226	83.7%	3239	87.6%
= Less than 100 hours	3	2.1%	66	2.4%
2 = 100 - 299 hours	13	9.0%	320	11.8%
_{3 =} 300 - 599 hours	48	33.3%	910	33.5%
t = 600 - 799 hours	47	32.6%	703	25.9%
5 = 800 hours or more	33	22.9%	715	26.3%
This question does not apply to me because I did not do any student teaching.**	82	-	525	-
Mean : SD	3.65	1.00	3.62	1.07

30. Approximately how much time did you spend in **an internship placement** as teacher of record as part of your fieldwork?

	Pro	gram	State	ewide
	226	83.7%	2486	67.2%
1 = Less than 100 hours	0	0.0%	15	1.4%
2 = 100 - 299 hours	4	3.6%	97	9.3%
3 = 300 - 599 hours	11	9.8%	204	19.5%
4 = 600 - 799 hours	14	12.5%	170	16.2%
5 = 800 hours or more	83	74.1%	562	53.6%
Does not apply/I was not in an				
internship **	114	-	1438	-
Mean : SD	4.57	0.81	4.11	1.10

31. **If you served in an internship placement**, how often did your assigned mentor observe your classroom instruction and provide feedback and assistance during your clinical practice?

Program Stat		tewide	
226	83.7%	2490	67.3%
4	3.8%	62	6.4%
12	11.4%	135	14.0%
27	25.7%	221	22.9%
18	17.1%	156	16.1%
20	19.0%	170	17.6%
24	22.9%	223	23.1%
121	-	1523	-
4.05	1.48	3.94	1.57
	226 4 12 27 18 20 24 121	226 83.7% 4 3.8% 12 11.4% 27 25.7% 18 17.1% 20 19.0% 24 22.9% 121 _	226 83.7% 2490 4 3.8% 62 12 11.4% 135 27 25.7% 221 18 17.1% 156 20 19.0% 170 24 22.9% 223 121 - 1523

32. Overall, how effective was your teacher preparation program at developing the skills or tools you needed to become a teacher?

	Prog	Iram	State	wide
	227	84.1%	3354	90.7%
1 = Not at all effective	2	0.9%	31	0.9%
2 = Somewhat effective	14	6.2%	288	8.6%
3 = Effective	91	40.1%	1204	35.9%
4 = Very effective	120	52.9%	1831	54.6%
Mean : SD	3.45	0.65	3.44	0.69

Demographics

33. Are you Hispanic or Latino?

	Prog	ram	State	wide
	222	82.2%	3334	90.1%
No, not Hispanic or Latino	173	77.9%	2363	70.9%
Yes, Hispanic or Latino	49	22.1%	971	29.1%

34. What is your race? Mark all that apply

	Program Statew		wide	
	205 75.9% 2911		78.7%	
American Indian or Alaska Native	*		143	3.9%
Chinese	*		156	4.2%
Japanese	*		64	1.7%
Korean	*		69	1.9%
Vietnamese	*		58	1.6%
Asian Indian	*		42	1.1%
Laotian	*		3	0.1%
Cambodian	*		9	0.2%
Filipino	*		104	2.8%
Hmong	*		4	0.1%
Other Asian	*		44	1.2%
Black or African American	11	4.1%	146	3.9%
Hawaiian	*		14	0.4%
Guamanian	*		4	0.1%
Samoan	*		7	0.2%
Tahitian	*		2	0.1%
Other Pacific Islander	*		13	0.4%
White	181	67.0%	2406	65.0%

35. What is your gender?

	Pro	gram	State	ewide
	224	83.0%	3354	90.7%
Female	*		1843	54.9%
Male	120	53.6%	1424	42.5%
Decline to state	*		87	2.6%

	Number of Program Completers Asked to Participate in Survey	# and of Respo		
Program:	280	270	96.4 %	'Respondents' are those program completers who answered a minimum of 1
Statewide:	3814	3699	97 %	non-demographic question.