#### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

# **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?

		<ol> <li>Use knowledge of students' strengths and prior experiences to engage them in learning</li> </ol>					ect classroo world	om learni	ng to	<ol><li>Engage students in inquiry, problem solving, and reflection to promote their critical thinking</li></ol>			
		Prog	gram	State	wide	Program State			wide	Prog	jram .	ram Statew	
		47	100.0%	4939	98.3%	47	100.0%	4938	98.3%	47	100.0%	4931	98.1%
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	6	0.1%	0	0.0%	12	0.2%	0	0.0%	10	0.2%
2 = Poorly		0	0.0%	45	0.9%	0	0.0%	67	1.4%	0	0.0%	78	1.6%
3 = Adequately		3	6.4%	514	10.4%	4	8.5%	585	11.8%	2	4.3%	577	11.7%
4 = Well		13	27.7%	1548	31.3%	13	27.7%	1562	31.6%	20	42.6%	1611	32.7%
5 = Very well		31	66.0%	2826	57.2%	30	63.8%	2712	54.9%	25	53.2%	2655	53.8%
	Mean : SD	4.60	0.61	4.45	0.72	4.55	0.65	4.40	0.77	4.49	0.59	4.38	0.77

4. Meet the instructional needs of English learners

5. Identify and address special learning needs with appropriate teaching strategies

							5 00.005.00	•	
		Program		Statewide		Program		am Statev	
		47	100.0%	4924	98.0%	47	100.0%	4929	98.1%
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	8	0.2%	0	0.0%	26	0.5%
2 = Poorly		0	0.0%	81	1.6%	1	2.1%	149	3.0%
3 = Adequately		2	4.3%	754	15.3%	7	14.9%	905	18.4%
4 = Well		15	31.9%	1614	32.8%	16	34.0%	1688	34.2%
5 = Very well		30	63.8%	2467	50.1%	23	48.9%	2161	43.8%
	Mean : SD	4.60	0.58	4.31	0.80	4.30	0.81	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?

6. Engage students in cooperative
group work as well as independent
learning

Establish and maintain a safe and respectful learning environment for all students

8. Create a productive learning environment with high expectations for all students

	Pro	Program		Statewide		Program		wide	Program		State	wide	
	47	100.0%	4922	98.0%	47	100.0%	4917	97.9%	47	100.0%	4906	97.6%	
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	7	0.1%	0	0.0%	9	0.2%	0	0.0%	12	0.2%	
2 = Poorly	2	4.3%	49	1.0%	0	0.0%	26	0.5%	0	0.0%	30	0.6%	
3 = Adequately	1	2.1%	517	10.5%	3	6.4%	421	8.6%	3	6.4%	475	9.7%	
4 = Well	12	25.5%	1525	31.0%	9	19.1%	1266	25.7%	12	25.5%	1466	29.9%	
5 = Very well	32	68.1%	2824	57.4%	35	74.5%	3195	65.0%	32	68.1%	2923	59.6%	
Mean	: <b>SD</b> 4.57	0.74	4.44	0.73	4.68	0.59	4.55	0.69	4.62	0.61	4.48	0.71	

#### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

### **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?	Develop curriculum to teach content standards effectively					effective ir es to teach and skills			materials, resources, and technologies to make subject matter accessible to all students			
	Prog	gram	State	Statewide		Program		wide	Prog	ıram	State	wide
	44	93.6%	4710	93.7%	44	93.6%	4719	93.9%	44	93.6%	4708	93.7%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	15	0.3%	0	0.0%	5	0.1%	0	0.0%	13	0.3%
2 = Poorly	2	4.5%	107	2.3%	1	2.3%	61	1.3%	3	6.8%	77	1.6%
3 = Adequately	6	13.6%	700	14.9%	3	6.8%	567	12.0%	4	9.1%	747	15.9%
4 = Well	14	31.8%	1572	33.4%	16	36.4%	1590	33.7%	14	31.8%	1575	33.5%
5 = Very well	22	50.0%	2316	49.2%	24	54.5%	2496	52.9%	23	52.3%	2296	48.8%
Mean : SD	4.27	0.87	4.29	0.82	4.43	0.73	4.38	0.75	4.30	0.90	4.29	0.81

# 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?

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 technologies to meet the learning needs of all students

Date: 1/30/2019

11 Calast adams and daylalan

following as a teacher?		u, and m	uividuai de	velopine	110	meet the lea	iii students			
Tollowing as a coasile.	Program Statewide					Program		State	wide	
		44	93.6%	4705	93.6%		44	93.6%	4711	93.8%
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	9	0.2%		0	0.0%	5	0.1%
2 = Poorly		1	2.3%	39	0.8%		1	2.3%	52	1.1%
3 = Adequately		3	6.8%	543	11.5%		3	6.8%	559	11.9%
4 = Well		13	29.5%	1525	32.4%		19	43.2%	1580	33.5%
5 = Very well		27	61.4%	2589	55.0%		21	47.7%	2515	53.4%
	Mean : SD	4.50	0.73	4.41	0.74		4.36	0.72	4.39	0.74

### **Assessing Students for Learning**

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the	sources to	ces to establish learning goals and to plan,					olve all stud nent, goal s ing progres	setting, ar		16. Give productive feedback to students to guide their learning				
following as a teacher?		Prog	gram	Statewide		Pro	Program		Statewide		ram	State	wide	
		44	93.6%	4700	93.5%	44	93.6%	4700	93.5%	44	93.6%	4693	93.4%	
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	18	0.4%	0	0.0%	22	0.5%	0	0.0%	14	0.3%	
2 = Poorly		0	0.0%	104	2.2%	1	2.3%	130	2.8%	0	0.0%	73	1.6%	
3 = Adequately		7	15.9%	725	15.4%	5	11.4%	860	18.3%	3	6.8%	659	14.0%	
4 = Well		17	38.6%	1633	34.7%	14	31.8%	1607	34.2%	16	36.4%	1641	35.0%	
5 = Very well		20	45.5%	2220	47.2%	24	54.5%	2081	44.3%	25	56.8%	2306	49.1%	
	Mean : SD	4.30	0.73	4.26	0.83	4.39	0.78	4.19	0.86	4.50	0.63	4.31	0.79	

# **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

Deve	loping a	s a Profe	ssional	Educato	or								
How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?	17. Evaluate the effects of your actions on student learning and modify plans accordingly					k with fam and studen rning			19. Work with colleagues to improve instruction				
	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	ıram .	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide	
	41	87.2%	4596	91.5%	41	87.2%	4604	91.6%	41	87.2%	4601	91.6%	
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	17	0.4%	0	0.0%	53	1.2%	0	0.0%	29	0.6%	
2 = Poorly	1	2.4%	72	1.6%	2	4.9%	229	5.0%	1	2.4%	122	2.7%	
3 = Adequately	5	12.2%	692	15.1%	7	17.1%	1037	22.5%	5	12.2%	747	16.2%	
4 = Well	12	29.3%	1569	34.1%	14	34.1%	1547	33.6%	13	31.7%	1498	32.6%	
5 = Very well	23	56.1%	2246	48.9%	18	43.9%	1738	37.7%	22	53.7%	2205	47.9%	
Mean : SD	4.39	0.80	4.30	0.80	4.17	0.89	4.02	0.95	4.37	0.80	4.24	0.86	

# **Content for Multiple Subjects**

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

subjects:	20. English Literacy/Language Arts					21. Mathematics				22. Science		
	Prog	gram	State	wide	Program		Statewide		Program		State	wide
	41	87.2%	4616	91.9%	41	87.2%	4613	91.8%	41	87.2%	4604	91.6%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	7	0.2%	0	0.0%	23	0.5%	3	7.3%	52	1.1%
2 = Poorly	0	0.0%	71	1.5%	2	4.9%	117	2.5%	1	2.4%	209	4.5%
3 = Adequately	3	7.3%	558	12.1%	3	7.3%	717	15.5%	11	26.8%	1006	21.9%
4 = Well	14	34.1%	1500	32.5%	17	41.5%	1479	32.1%	18	43.9%	1552	33.7%
5 = Very well	24	58.5%	2480	53.7%	19	46.3%	2277	49.4%	8	19.5%	1785	38.8%
Mean : SD	4.51	0.64	4.38	0.77	4.29	0.81	4.27	0.85	3.66	1.06	4.04	0.94

		23. History/Social Studies				24. Creative/Fine arts				25. Physical Education/Health			th
		Program		Statewide		Program		am State		Program		State	ewide
		41	87.2%	4592	91.4%	41	87.2%	4575	91.0%	41	87.2%	4549	90.5%
1 = Not at all		1	2.4%	62	1.4%	7	17.1%	165	3.6%	4	9.8%	219	4.8%
2 = Poorly		3	7.3%	208	4.5%	3	7.3%	371	8.1%	4	9.8%	408	9.0%
3 = Adequately		10	24.4%	1031	22.5%	14	34.1%	1234	27.0%	17	41.5%	1318	29.0%
4 = Well		23	56.1%	1589	34.6%	17	41.5%	1435	31.4%	14	34.1%	1310	28.8%
5 = Very well		4	9.8%	1702	37.1%	0	0.0%	1370	29.9%	2	4.9%	1294	28.4%
	Mean : SD	3.63	0.86	4.02	0.95	3.00	1.10	3.76	1.08	3.15	1.01	3.67	1.12

### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

### **Field Experiences**

26. Which of the following best describes the kind of clinical experience you had during your preparation (check all	Prog	ıram	State	wide
that apply):	39	83.0%	4639	92.3%
Student teaching with a cooperating teacher	37	78.7%	3517	70.0%
Teaching fellow or intern in a program where I served as teacher of record while taking courses for my credential	2	4.3%	1030	20.5%
Teaching on an emergency credential [PIP/ STP] while taking courses for my credential	1	2.1%	327	6.5%

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

	Pro	gram	State	wide
	39	83.0%	4606	91.7%
1 = Less than once per month	1	2.6%	153	3.3%
2 = Once per month	0	0.0%	407	8.8%
3 = Twice per month	12	30.8%	940	20.4%
4 = Once per week	15	38.5%	1620	35.2%
5 = 2-3 times per week	8	20.5%	1146	24.9%
6 = Daily	3	7.7%	340	7.4%
Mean : SD	3.97	1.04	3.92	1.18

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

	Prog	gram	State	ewide
	39	83.0%	4597	91.5%
1 = Once or twice	0	0.0%	104	2.3%
2 = 3-5  times	2	5.1%	789	17.2%
3 = 6-10  times	26	66.7%	1794	39.0%
4 = 11-15 times	2	5.1%	926	20.1%
5 = 16-20  times	7	17.9%	527	11.5%
6 = More than 20 times	2	5.1%	457	9.9%
Mean : SD	3.51	1.02	3.51	1.25

 $29.\ \mbox{My}$  field experiences helped me integrate and apply the major ideas developed through program coursework

	Prog	ram	State	wide
	39	83.0%	4603	91.6%
1 = Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	37	0.8%
2 = Disagree	1	2.6%	38	0.8%
3 = Neutral	1	2.6%	226	4.9%
4 = Agree	12	30.8%	1661	36.1%
5 = Strongly Agree	25	64.1%	2641	57.4%
Mean : SD	4.56	0.68	4.48	0.70

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

	Prog	gram	State	wide
	39	83.0%	4503	89.6%
Frequently observed my teaching and met with me to				
offer feedback	32	68.1%	3812	75.9%
Was an excellent educator and a valuable role model	36	76.6%	3874	77.1%
Modeled effective practices	35	74.5%	3869	77.0%
Helped me plan and organize curriculum materials	35	74.5%	3638	72.4%
Offered useful strategies and advice about my teaching	33	70.2%	4075	81.1%
Helped me reflect on my practice	32	68.1%	3786	75.3%
Helped me to solve teaching problems	32	68.1%	3753	74.7%
Was knowledgeable about and able to provide support				
for field-based assignments	34	72.3%	3718	74.0%

#### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

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	gram	State	ewide
	39	83.0%	4585	91.2%
1 = Less than 100 hours	0	0.0%	78	2.2%
2 = 100 - 299 hours	2	5.1%	343	9.5%
3 = 300 - 599 hours	6	15.4%	1013	28.0%
4 = 600 - 799  hours	18	46.2%	1217	33.6%
5 = 800 hours or more	13	33.3%	967	26.7%
This question does not apply to me because				
I did not do any student teaching. **	0	-	967	-
Mean : SD	4.08	0.84	3.73	1.02

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

	Prog	ıram	State	wide
	39	83.0%	2645	52.6%
1 = Less than 100 hours	0	0.0%	24	2.1%
2 = 100 - 299 hours	0	0.0%	83	7.2%
3 = 300 - 599 hours	1	25.0%	170	14.8%
4 = 600 - 799 hours	3	75.0%	137	11.9%
5 = 800 hours or more	0	0.0%	735	64.0%
Does not apply/I was not in an internship **	35	-	1496	_
Mean : SD	3.75	0.50	4.28	1.09

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	gram	State	ewide
	39	83.0%	2636	52.5%
1 = Once or twice	0	0.0%	84	7.6%
2 = 3-5 times	1	25.0%	192	17.4%
3 = 6-10  times	1	25.0%	253	22.9%
4 = 11-15 times	0	0.0%	190	17.2%
5 = 16-20  times	1	25.0%	128	11.6%
6 = More than 20 times	1	25.0%	256	23.2%
Does not apply/I was not in an internship **	35	-	1533	-
Mean : SL	4.00	1.83	3.77	1.61

Date: 1/30/2019

### **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 t	each deco	oding		ways to b				how to he ns to impr ension		ts make	d) Learn how to support older students in learning to read			
	Prog	ıram	Statewide		Prog	Program		Statewide		Program		wide	Program		Statewide	
	39	83.0%	4463	88.8%	39	83.0%	4461	88.8%	39	83.0%	4449	88.5%	39	83.0%	4435	88.3%
1 = None	1	2.6%	99	2.2%	0	0.0%	23	0.5%	0	0.0%	35	0.8%	0	0.0%	179	4.0%
2 = Touched on it Briefly	1	2.6%	472	10.6%	2	5.1%	216	4.8%	2	5.1%	245	5.5%	6	15.4%	554	12.5%
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	8	20.5%	998	22.4%	5	12.8%	838	18.8%	2	5.1%	858	19.3%	9	23.1%	1071	24.1%
4 = Explored in Some Depth	14	35.9%	1647	36.9%	11	28.2%	1587	35.6%	14	35.9%	1602	36.0%	13	33.3%	1397	31.5%
5 = Extensive Opportunity	15	38.5%	1247	27.9%	21	53.8%	1797	40.3%	21	53.8%	1709	38.4%	11	28.2%	1234	27.8%
Mean : SD	4.05	0.97	3.78	1.04	4.31	0.89	4.10	0.91	4.38	0.81	4.06	0.93	3.74	1.04	3.67	1.13

### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

	writing t	ways to to students or reading	s at differ	_	f) Learn prior kno	how to acowledge	tivate stu	dents'	aloud fo	n to an indi r the purpo reading acl	ose of ass	essing	h) Plan a lesson	Program         Statew           39         83.0%         4453           0         0.0%         73		
	Program Statewide		Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	gram State		Statewide		Program		Statewide		
	39	83.0%	4448	88.5%	39	83.0%	4454	88.6%	39	83.0%	4456	88.7%	39	83.0%	4453	88.6%
1 = None	0	0.0%	30	0.7%	0	0.0%	12	0.3%	0	0.0%	57	1.3%	0	0.0%	73	1.6%
2 = Touched on it Briefly	2	5.1%	237	5.3%	0	0.0%	90	2.0%	0	0.0%	181	4.1%	0	0.0%	211	4.7%
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	5	12.8%	823	18.5%	3	7.7%	591	13.3%	2	5.1%	696	15.6%	3	7.7%	689	15.5%
4 = Explored in Some Depth	11	28.2%	1533	34.5%	15	38.5%	1341	30.1%	12	30.8%	1436	32.2%	7	17.9%	1339	30.1%
5 = Extensive Opportunity	21	53.8%	1825	41.0%	21	53.8%	2420	54.3%	25	64.1%	2086	46.8%	29	74.4%	2141	48.1%
Mean : SD	4 31	0.89	4 10	0.93	4 46	0.64	4 36	0.81	4 59	0.59	4 19	0.93	4 67	0.62	4 18	0.97

	,	to teach ste their idea			results t	udent read o address s rove your t	student n			ce what yo reading ii ces		
	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	ıram	State	wide	Prog	ıram	State	wide
	39	83.0%	4455	88.7%	39	83.0%	4452	88.6%	39	83.0%	4450	88.6%
1 = None	0	0.0%	57	1.3%	0	0.0%	29	0.7%	0	0.0%	32	0.7%
2 = Touched on it Briefly	1	2.6%	253	5.7%	1	2.6%	179	4.0%	1	2.6%	167	3.8%
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	2	5.1%	812	18.2%	4	10.3%	745	16.7%	2	5.1%	681	15.3%
4 = Explored in Some Depth	8	20.5%	1467	32.9%	12	30.8%	1503	33.8%	13	33.3%	1351	30.4%
5 = Extensive Opportunity	28	71.8%	1866	41.9%	22 56.4% 1996	44.8%	23	59.0%	2219	49.9%		
Mean : SD	4.62	0.71	4.08	0.97	4.41	0.79	4.18	0.90	4.49	0.72	4.25	0.90

		state stan language a				) Study, critique or adapt reading riculum materials				
	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	tewide		
	39	83.0%	4450	88.6%	39	83.0%	4444	88.4%		
1 = None	0	0.0%	28	0.6%	0	0.0%	90	2.0%		
2 = Touched on it Briefly	1	2.6%	154	3.5%	2	5.1%	292	6.6%		
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	5	12.8%	631	14.2%	3	7.7%	832	18.7%		
4 = Explored in Some Depth	11	28.2%	1401	31.5%	17	43.6%	1467	33.0%		
5 = Extensive Opportunity	22	56.4%	2236	50.2%	17	43.6%	1763	39.7%		
Mean : SD	4.38	0.81	4.27	0.87	4.26	0.82	4.02	1.01		

#### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

### **Content for Multiple Subjects: Mathematics**

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

a) Learn typical difficulties students have with place value

b) Learn typical difficulties students have with fractions

c) Use representations (e.g., geometric representation, graphs, number lines) to show explicitly why a procedure works

d) Prove that a solution is valid or that a method works for all similar cases

	nave wit	in piace va	iue		nave wit	n rractions	5		wny a pr	ocedure w	OFKS		cases				
	Prog	gram	Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		
	39	83.0%	4430	88.2%	39	83.0%	4393	87.4%	39	83.0%	4427	88.1%	39	83.0%	4428	88.1%	
1 = None	1	2.6%	293	6.6%	4	10.3%	303	6.9%	1	2.6%	195	4.4%	1	2.6%	211	4.8%	
2 = Touched on it Briefly	4	10.3%	529	11.9%	3	7.7%	570	13.0%	3	7.7%	404	9.1%	5	12.8%	442	10.0%	
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	9	23.1%	969	21.9%	7	17.9%	936	21.3%	8	20.5%	876	19.8%	5	12.8%	935	21.1%	
4 = Explored in Some Depth	14	35.9%	1302	29.4%	14	35.9%	1207	27.5%	9	23.1%	1318	29.8%	12	30.8%	1389	31.4%	
5 = Extensive Opportunity	11	28.2%	1337	30.2%	11	28.2%	1377	31.3%	18	46.2%	1634	36.9%	16	41.0%	1451	32.8%	
Mean : SD	3.77	1.06	3.65	1.21	3.64	1.27	3.63	1.24	4.03	1.11	3.86	1.14	3.95	1.15	3.77	1.15	

e) Study, critique, or adapt math curriculum materials

f) Learn how to facilitate math learning for students in small groups

g) Adapt math lessons for students with diverse needs and learning

	curricul	um materia	als		groups				styles			
	Pro	Program		Statewide		Program		wide	Program		State	wide
	39	83.0%	4435	88.3%	39	83.0%	4442	88.4%	39	83.0%	4439	88.3%
1 = None	3	7.7%	146	3.3%	1	2.6%	122	2.7%	1	2.6%	84	1.9%
2 = Touched on it Briefly	2	5.1%	369	8.3%	2	5.1%	334	7.5%	3	7.7%	337	7.6%
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	4	10.3%	922	20.8%	8	20.5%	840	18.9%	5	12.8%	807	18.2%
4 = Explored in Some Depth	11	28.2%	1343	30.3%	9	23.1%	1331	30.0%	12	30.8%	1342	30.2%
5 = Extensive Opportunity	19	48.7%	1655	37.3%	19	48.7%	1815	40.9%	18	46.2%	1869	42.1%
Mean :	<b>SD</b> 4.05	1.23	3.90	1.10	4.10	1.07	3.99	1.07	4.10	1.07	4.03	1.04

h) Practice what you learned about teaching math in your field experience

i) Study national or state standards for mathematics

j) Review local district mathematics

	experier	experience							curriculu	m		
	Pro	Program		Statewide		gram	Statewide		vide Progra		gram Statew	
	39	83.0%	4430	88.2%	39	83.0%	4440	88.4%	39	83.0%	4422	88.0%
1 = None	0	0.0%	88	2.0%	0	0.0%	68	1.5%	1	2.6%	313	7.1%
2 = Touched on it Briefly	0	0.0%	229	5.2%	2	5.1%	273	6.1%	4	10.3%	495	11.2%
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	5	12.8%	723	16.3%	5	12.8%	724	16.3%	8	20.5%	807	18.2%
4 = Explored in Some Depth	16	41.0%	1265	28.6%	11	28.2%	1374	30.9%	7	17.9%	1205	27.3%
5 = Extensive Opportunity	18	46.2%	2125	48.0%	21	53.8%	2001	45.1%	19	48.7%	1602	36.2%
Mean:	<b>SD</b> 4.33	0.70	4.15	1.00	4.31	0.89	4.12	0.99	4.00	1.17	3.74	1.25

#### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

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

General

		Prog	ram	State	ewide		
		39	83.0%	4396	87.5%		
1 = Not at all effective		0	0.0%	28	0.6%		
2 = Somewhat effective		5	12.8%	380	8.6%		
3 = Effective		13	33.3%	1551	35.3%		
4 = Very effective		21	53.8%	2437	55.4%		
	Mean : SD	3.41	0.72	3.46	0.68		

# **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?

	Pro	gram	State	wide
	38	80.9%	4415	87.9%
No, not Hispanic or Latino	*		3062	69.4%
Yes, Hispanic or Latino	*		1353	30.6%

### 38. What is your race? Mark all that apply

	Prog	ıram	State	wide
	38	80.9%	3798	75.6%
American Indian or Alaska Native	*		167	3.3%
Chinese	*		143	2.8%
Japanese	*		82	1.6%
Korean	*		77	1.5%
Vietnamese	*		49	1.0%
Asian Indian	*		41	0.8%
Laotian	*		6	0.1%
Cambodian	*		14	0.3%
Filipino	*		153	3.0%
Hmong	*		20	0.4%
Other Asian	*		47	0.9%
Black or African American	*		158	3.1%
Hawaiian	*		14	0.3%
Guamanian	*		5	0.1%
Samoan	*		6	0.1%
Tahitian	*		1	0.0%
Other Pacific Islander	*		28	0.6%
White	29	61.7%	3179	63.3%

# 39. What is your gender?

	Prog	<b>jram</b>	State	wide
	39	83.0%	4427	88.1%
Female	36	92.3%	3835	86.6%
Male	*		534	12.1%
Decline to state	*		58	1.3%

		# and of Respo		
Program:	48	47	97.9 %	
Statewide:	5172	5025	97.2 %	

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

#### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

### **Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning**

1. Use knowledge of students'

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

			is and prior them in lea		ices to	2. Conne the real	ect classroo world	om learni	ng to	problem solving, and reflection to promote their critical thinking						
		Program		Statewide		Program		m State		Prog	gram	State	wide			
		20	100.0%	4116	98.4%	20	100.0%	4116	98.4%	20	100.0%	4103	98.1%			
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	12	0.3%	0	0.0%	15	0.4%	0	0.0%	16	0.4%			
2 = Poorly		0 0.0%		73	1.8%	0	0.0%	120	2.9%	0	0.0%	100	2.4%			
3 = Adequately		0	0.0%	594	14.4%	0	0.0%	651	15.8%	0	0.0%	575	14.0%			
4 = Well		7	35.0%	1342	32.6%	4	20.0%	1325	32.2%	6	30.0%	1375	33.5%			
5 = Very well		13 65.0%		2095	2095	2095	2095	50.9%	16	80.0%	2005	48.7%	14	70.0%	2037	49.6%
	Mean : SD	4.65	0.49	4.32	0.80	4.80	0.41	4.26	0.85	4.70	0.47	4.30	0.83			

4. Meet the instructional needs of English learners

5. Identify and address special learning needs with appropriate teaching strategies

3. Engage students in inquiry,

Date: 1/29/2019

	Pro	Program		wide	Pro	gram	State	ewide
	20	100.0%	4099	98.0%	20	100.0%	4109	98.2%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	10	0.2%	0	0.0%	20	0.5%
2 = Poorly	0	0.0%	117	2.9%	0	0.0%	145	3.5%
3 = Adequately	4	20.0%	788	19.2%	1	5.0%	742	18.1%
4 = Well	9	45.0%	1376	33.6%	8	40.0%	1440	35.0%
5 = Very well	7	35.0%	1808	44.1%	11	55.0%	1762	42.9%
Mean : SD	4.15	0.75	4.18	0.86	4.50	0.61	4.16	0.88

### 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?

	<ol><li>Engage students in cooperative group work as well as independent learning</li></ol>					lish and m ul learning nts			<ol><li>Create a productive learning environment with high expectat for all students</li></ol>			
	Pro	Program		Statewide		Program		wide	Program		State	wide
	20	100.0%	4097	97.9%	20 100.0%		4100 98.0%		20 100.0%		4095	97.9%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	15	0.4%	0	0.0%	13	0.3%	0	0.0%	20	0.5%
2 = Poorly	0 0.0%		66	1.6%	0	0.0%	54	1.3%	0	0.0%	64	1.6%
3 = Adequately	1	5.0%	522	12.7%	1	5.0%	439	10.7%	0	0.0%	516	12.6%
4 = Well	5	25.0%	1303	31.8%	3	15.0%	1162	28.3%	6	30.0%	1305	31.9%
5 = Very well	14 70.0%		2191	53.5%	16	80.0%	2432	59.3%	14	70.0%	2190	53.5%
Mean : SD	4.65	0.59	4.36	0.79	4.75	0.55	4.45	0.76	4.70	0.47	4.36	0.80

#### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

Understanding ar	d Organizing	ı Subject Matter fo	r Student Learning
------------------	--------------	---------------------	--------------------

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?		lop curricul standards (			strategie	effective ir es to teach and skills			11. Select, adapt, and develop materials, resources, and technologies to make subject matter accessible to all students				
	Program Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide				
	20	100.0%	3942	94.2%	20	100.0%	3944	94.3%	20	100.0%	3926	93.8%	
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	26	0.7%	0	0.0%	22	0.6%	0	0.0%	15	0.4%	
2 = Poorly	0	0.0%	121	3.1%	0	0.0%	103	2.6%	0	0.0%	109	2.8%	
3 = Adequately	1	5.0%	677	17.2%	2	10.0%	564	14.3%	1	5.0%	645	16.4%	
4 = Well	10	50.0%	1343	34.1%	11	55.0%	1310	33.2%	9	45.0%	1346	34.3%	
5 = Very well	9	45.0%	1775	45.0%	7	35.0%	1945	49.3%	10	50.0%	1811	46.1%	
Mean : SD	4.40	0.60	4.20	0.87	4.25	0.64	4.28	0.84	4.45	0.60	4.23	0.85	

# 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?

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 technologies to meet the learning needs of all students

Date: 1/29/2019

following as a teacher:								
	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	20	100.0%	3938	94.1%	20	100.0%	3939	94.1%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	14	0.4%	0	0.0%	7	0.2%
2 = Poorly	0	0.0%	81	2.1%	0	0.0%	81	2.1%
3 = Adequately	0	0.0%	596	15.1%	0	0.0%	560	14.2%
4 = Well	8	40.0%	1358	34.5%	8	40.0%	1377	35.0%
5 = Very well	12	60.0%	1889	48.0%	12	60.0%	1914	48.6%
Mean : SD	4.60	0.50	4.28	0.82	4.60	0.50	4.30	0.80

### **Assessing Students for Learning**

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?		<ol> <li>Develop and use assessment data from a variety of sources to establish learning goals and to plan, differentiate, and modify instruction</li> </ol>				asses	15. Involve all students in self- assessment, goal setting, and monitoring progress				16. Give productive feedback to students to guide their learning			
		Program		Statewide		Prog	Program		ewide	Program		ram Statewide		
		20	100.0%	3937	94.1%	19	95.0%	3935	94.0%	20	100.0%	3934	94.0%	
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	17	0.4%	0	0.0%	33	0.8%	0	0.0%	21	0.5%	
2 = Poorly		0	0.0%	139	3.5%	0	0.0%	161	4.1%	0	0.0%	104	2.6%	
3 = Adequately		2	10.0%	696	17.7%	1	5.3%	763	19.4%	0	0.0%	627	15.9%	
4 = Well		8	40.0%	1368	34.7%	7	36.8%	1324	33.6%	6	30.0%	1303	33.1%	
5 = Very well		10	50.0%	1717	43.6%	11	57.9%	1654	42.0%	14	70.0%	1879	47.8%	
	Mean : SD	4.40	0.68	4.18	0.87	4.53	0.61	4.12	0.92	4.70	0.47	4.25	0.85	

#### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

Devel	oping as a	a Prof	fessional	Educator

How well did your teacher preparation 17. Evaluate the effects of your 18. Work with families to better program prepare you to do each of the actions on student learning and understand students and to support 19. Work with colleagues to following as a teacher? modify plans accordingly their learning improve instruction **Program** Statewide Program Statewide **Program** Statewide 3881 92.8% 92.6% 3877 20 100.0% 20 100.0% 3874 20 100.0% 92.7% 0.0% 77 1 = Not at all0.0% 17 0.4% 2.0% 5.0% 39 1.0% 2 = Poorly 0 0.0% 83 2.1% 0 0.0% 251 6.5% 0 0.0% 120 3.1% 3 = Adequately3 15.0% 15.5% 7 35.0% 1025 26.5% 17.2% 601 20.0% 666 4 = Well 9 45.0% 1405 36.2% 7 35.0% 1258 32.5% 4 20.0% 1252 32.3% 40.0% 45.7% 30.0% 32.6% 55.0% 46.4% 5 = Very well 8 1775 6 1263 11 1800

#### **Content for Single Subjects**

0.72

4.25

0.82

3.95

0.83

3.87

1.01

4.20

1.11

4.20

Date: 1/29/2019

0.90

4.25

Mean : SD

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the following as a teacher?	accordin	ch my cont g to Califo standards	rnia acad		21. Contribute to students' reading skills including comprehension in my subject area			22. Enable students to acquire subject matter skills that contribute to future success in life, college, and career				23. Anticipate and address the needs of students who are at risk of dropping out				
	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	Program Statewide Program		Program Statewide		wide	Program		Statewide			
	20	100.0%	3885	92.9%	20	100.0%	3874	92.6%	20	100.0%	3880	92.7%	20	100.0%	3870	92.5%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	37	1.0%	0	0.0%	31	0.8%	0	0.0%	28	0.7%	1	5.0%	127	3.3%
2 = Poorly	0	0.0%	117	3.0%	0	0.0%	131	3.4%	0	0.0%	94	2.4%	0	0.0%	318	8.2%
3 = Adequately	4	20.0%	579	14.9%	2	10.0%	708	18.3%	1	5.0%	667	17.2%	7	35.0%	950	24.5%
4 = Well	5	25.0%	1220	31.4%	6	30.0%	1303	33.6%	8	40.0%	1325	34.1%	4	20.0%	1174	30.3%
5 = Very well	11	55.0%	1932	49.7%	12	60.0%	1701	43.9%	11	55.0%	1766	45.5%	8	40.0%	1301	33.6%
Mean : SD	4.35	0.81	4.26	0.89	4.50	0.69	4.16	0.90	4.50	0.61	4.21	0.86	3.90	1.12	3.83	1.08

#### Field Experiences

24. Which of the following best describes the kind of clinical experience you had during your preparation (check all that apply):		<b>jram</b>	Statewide	
		95.0%	3940	94.2%
Student teaching with a cooperating teacher	18	90.0%	2928	70.0%
Teaching fellow or intern in a program where I served as teacher of record while taking courses for my credential	1	5.0%	1000	23.9%
Teaching on an emergency credential [PIP/ STP] while taking courses for my credential	3	15.0%	294	7.0%

#### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

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

		Prog	ram	State	ewide	
		19	95.0%	3926	93.8%	
1 = Less than once per month		1	5.3%	134	3.4%	
2 = Once per month		1	5.3%	420	10.7%	
3 = Twice per month		3	15.8%	822	20.9%	
4 = Once per week		9	47.4%	1290	32.9%	
5 = 2-3 times per week		2	10.5%	999	25.4%	
6 = Daily		3	15.8%	261	6.6%	
Mean	: SD	4.00	1.29	3.86	1.20	

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

	Pro	gram	State	ewide
	19	95.0%	3918	93.6%
1 = Once or twice	0	0.0%	64	1.6%
2 = 3-5 times	2	10.5%	622	15.9%
3 = 6-10 times	10	52.6%	1843	47.0%
4 = 11-15 times	1	5.3%	728	18.6%
5 = 16-20 times	4	21.1%	348	8.9%
6 = More than 20 times	2	10.5%	313	8.0%
Mean : SD	3.68	1.25	3.41	1.15

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

	Prog	ram	State	wide
	19	95.0%	3922	93.7%
1 = Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	41	1.0%
2 = Disagree	0	0.0%	52	1.3%
3 = Neutral	0	0.0%	287	7.3%
4 = Agree	10	52.6%	1521	38.8%
5 = Strongly Agree	9	47.4%	2021	51.5%
Mean : SD	4.47	0.51	4.38	0.77

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

	Prog	gram	State	wide
	19	95.0%	3790	90.6%
Frequently observed my teaching and met with me to				
offer feedback	13	65.0%	3169	75.7%
Was an excellent educator and a valuable role model	13	65.0%	3077	73.5%
Modeled effective practices	16	80.0%	3022	72.2%
Helped me plan and organize curriculum materials	14	70.0%	2872	68.6%
Offered useful strategies and advice about my teaching	15	75.0%	3359	80.3%
Helped me reflect on my practice	16	80.0%	3222	77.0%
Helped me to solve teaching problems	15	75.0%	3102	74.1%
Was knowledgeable about and able to provide support				
for field-based assignments	13	65.0%	3015	72.1%

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	ıram	State	wide
19	95.0%	3898	93.2%
0	0.0%	55	1.8%
0	0.0%	323	10.6%
6	33.3%	928	30.6%
7	38.9%	946	31.2%
5	27.8%	783	25.8%
1	-	863	-
3.94	0.80	3.69	1.03
	19 0 0 6 7 5	0 0.0% 0 0.0% 6 33.3% 7 38.9% 5 27.8%	19 95.0% 3898 0 0.0% 55 0 0.0% 323 6 33.3% 928 7 38.9% 946 5 27.8% 783 1 - 863

#### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

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

	Program		State	ewide
	19	95.0%	2453	58.6%
1 = Less than 100 hours	0	0.0%	15	1.3%
2 = 100 - 299 hours	0	0.0%	109	9.3%
3 = 300 - 599 hours	0	0.0%	160	13.7%
4 = 600 - 799 hours	0	0.0%	178	15.3%
5 = 800 hours or more	1	100.0%	705	60.4%
Does not apply/I was not in an				
internship **	18	-	1286	-
Mean : SD	5.00	?	4.24	1.08

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?

	Pro	gram	State	ewide
	18	90.0%	2449	58.5%
1 = Once or twice	1	100.0%	67	6.1%
2 = 3-5 times	0	0.0%	147	13.4%
3 = 6-10  times	0	0.0%	304	27.8%
4 = 11-15 times	0	0.0%	209	19.1%
5 = 16-20 times	0	0.0%	142	13.0%
6 = More than 20 times	0	0.0%	225	20.6%
Does not apply/I was not in an internship **	17	-	1355	-
Mean : SD	1.00	?	3.81	1.51

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

	Prog	ıram	State	wide
	19	95.0%	3816	91.2%
1 = Not at all effective	0	0.0%	39	1.0%
2 = Somewhat effective	0	0.0%	374	9.8%
3 = Effective	7	36.8%	1404	36.8%
4 = Very effective	12	63.2%	1999	52.4%
Mean : SD	3.63	0.50	3.41	0.71

# **Demographics**

# 33. Are you Hispanic or Latino?

	Prog	ıram	State	ewide
	19	95.0%	3841	91.8%
No, not Hispanic or Latino	*		2614	68.1%
Yes, Hispanic or Latino	*		1227	31.9%

### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

# 34. What is your race? Mark all that apply

	Prog	gram	State	ewide	
	19	95.0%	3284	78.5%	
American Indian or Alaska Native	*		173	4.1%	
Chinese	*		146	3.5%	
Japanese	*		72	1.7%	
Korean	*		72	1.7%	
Vietnamese	*		75	1.8%	
Asian Indian	*		37	0.9%	
Laotian	*		4	0.1%	
Cambodian	*		13	0.3%	
Filipino	*		116	2.8%	
Hmong	*		15	0.4%	
Other Asian	*		56	1.3%	
Black or African American	*		190	4.5%	
Hawaiian	*		18	0.4%	
Guamanian	*		8	0.2%	
Samoan	*		8	0.2%	
Tahitian	*		2	0.0%	
Other Pacific Islander	*		16	0.4%	
White	16	80.0%	2692	64.3%	

#### 35. What is your gender?

	Prog	gram	State	ewide		
	19	95.0%	3847	91.9%		
Female	13	68.4%	2122	55.2%		
Male	*		1649	42.9%		
Decline to state	*		76	2.0%		

	Number of Program Completers Asked to Participate in Survey	# and of Respo	
Program:	21	20	95.2 %
Statewide:	4275	4184	97.9 %

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

### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

### 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 s and prior them in lea	r experier		2. Connethe real	ect classroo world	om learni	ng to	3. Engag problem promote	ion to		
		Prog	Program Statewide				<b>jram</b>	State	wide	Prog	ıram	Statewide	
		17	100.0%	1991	99.6%	17	100.0%	1987	99.4%	17	100.0%	1978	98.9%
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	3	0.2%	0	0.0%	9	0.5%
2 = Poorly		0	0.0%	19	1.0%	0	0.0%	31	1.6%	0	0.0%	35	1.8%
3 = Adequately		0	0.0%	244	12.3%	0	0.0%	265	13.3%	1	5.9%	275	13.9%
4 = Well		4	23.5%	593	29.8%	5	29.4%	619	31.2%	4	23.5%	682	34.5%
5 = Very well		13	76.5%	1134	57.0%	12	70.6%	1069	53.8%	12	70.6%	977	49.4%
	Mean : SD	4.76	0.44	4.43	0.74	4.71	0.47	4.37	0.78	4.65	0.61	4.31	0.81

5. Identify and address special

9. Prevent behavior problems by

intervening early using strategies

Date: 11/3/2017

	4. Meet English	the instrud learners	ctional nee	eds of		j needs witl g strategies	h appropriate s			
	Prog	gram	State	wide	Pro	gram	State	wide		
	17	100.0%	1982	99.1%	17	100.0%	1984	99.2%		
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	4	0.2%	0	0.0%	2	0.1%		
2 = Poorly	0	0.0%	38	1.9%	0	0.0%	22	1.1%		
3 = Adequately	2	11.8%	316	15.9%	0	0.0%	191	9.6%		
4 = Well	4	23.5%	634	32.0%	2	11.8%	516	26.0%		
5 = Very well	11	64.7%	990	49.9%	15	88.2%	1253	63.2%		
Mean : SD	4.53	0.72	4.30	0.82	4.88	0.33	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?

6. Engage students in cooperative

	7 '.	group work as well as independent learning			respectf all stude	ul learning ents	environn	nent for	environr for all st	nent with I udents	high expe	ctations	matched to student's current learning and behavior level			
	Pro	gram	State	ewide	Program		State	Statewide		ıram .	State	Statewide		Program		ewide
	17	100.0%	1625	81.3%	17	100.0%	1973	98.7%	17	100.0%	1978	98.9%	17	100.0%	1969	98.5%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	4	0.2%	0	0.0%	3	0.2%	0	0.0%	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	4	0.2%
2 = Poorly	0	0.0%	18	1.1%	0	0.0%	12	0.6%	0	0.0%	16	0.8%	0	0.0%	33	1.7%
3 = Adequately	1	5.9%	209	12.9%	0	0.0%	187	9.5%	0	0.0%	217	11.0%	0	0.0%	263	13.4%
4 = Well	3	17.6%	512	31.5%	3	17.6%	513	26.0%	3	17.6%	566	28.6%	3	17.6%	646	32.8%
5 = Very well	13	76.5%	882	54.3%	14	82.4%	1258	63.8%	14	82.4%	1177	59.5%	14	82.4%	1023	52.0%
Mean : S	<b>SD</b> 4.71	0.59	4.38	0.77	4.82	0.39	4.53	0.70	4.82	0.39	4.47	0.73	4.82	0.39	4.35	0.79

7. Establish and maintain a safe and 8. Create a productive learning

#### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

### 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				strategie	effective in es to teach and skills			technolo	s, resource gies to ma ccessible t	akė subjed		based instructional and assistive technology to support student access to challenging content					
		Program		State	wide	Program		State	Statewide		Program		Program		wide	Prog	Program		ewide
		16	94.1%	1843	92.2%	14	82.4%	1844	92.2%	15	88.2%	1840	92.0%	15	88.2%	1838	91.9%		
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	9	0.5%	0	0.0%	4	0.2%	0	0.0%	3	0.2%	0	0.0%	4	0.2%		
2 = Poorly		0	0.0%	57	3.1%	0	0.0%	31	1.7%	0	0.0%	26	1.4%	0	0.0%	37	2.0%		
3 = Adequately		4	25.0%	324	17.6%	1	7.1%	268	14.5%	1	6.7%	253	13.8%	1	6.7%	249	13.5%		
4 = Well		3	18.8%	619	33.6%	3	21.4%	610	33.1%	3	20.0%	585	31.8%	3	20.0%	610	33.2%		
5 = Very well		9	56.3%	834	45.3%	10	71.4%	931	50.5%	11	73.3%	973	52.9%	11	73.3%	938	51.0%		
	Mean : SD	4.31	0.87	4.20	0.87	4.64	0.63	4.32	0.80	4.67	0.62	4.36	0.78	4.67	0.62	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

12. Select, adapt, and develop

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

Date: 11/3/2017

13. Expand expertise with evidence-

	Culturar t	ackgrou	nu, anu m	uiviuuai u	evelopinent	meet the lean	Obtail	obtainable							
		Prog	gram	State	wide	F	Program		State	wide	Pr	ogra	am	State	ewide
		16	94.1%	1835	91.8%		16	94.1%	1835	91.8%	1	.6	94.1%	1834	91.7%
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	2	0.1%		0	0.0%	2	0.1%		0	0.0%	5	0.3%
2 = Poorly		0	0.0%	29	1.6%		0	0.0%	16	0.9%		0	0.0%	43	2.3%
3 = Adequately		0	0.0%	204	11.1%		0	0.0%	232	12.6%		1	6.3%	254	13.8%
4 = Well		5	31.3%	623	34.0%		4	25.0%	605	33.0%		4	25.0%	578	31.5%
5 = Very well		11	68.8%	977	53.2%		12	75.0%	980	53.4%	1	1	68.8%	954	52.0%
	Mean : SD	4.69	0.48	4.39	0.75	4.	.75	0.45	4.39	0.75	4.6	3	0.62	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

		Program		State	wide	Prog	ram	Statewide	
		16	94.1%	1833	91.7%	16	94.1%	1832	91.6%
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	7	0.4%	0	0.0%	5	0.3%
2 = Poorly		0	0.0%	46	2.5%	0	0.0%	24	1.3%
3 = Adequately		1	6.3%	250	13.6%	2	12.5%	196	10.7%
4 = Well		3	18.8%	599	32.7%	3	18.8%	566	30.9%
5 = Very well		12	75.0%	931	50.8%	11	68.8%	1041	56.8%
	Mean : SD	4.69	0.60	4.31	0.83	4.56	0.73	4.43	0.76

<sup>\*\*</sup> Responses of "Don't Know" or variations on "N/A" are excluded from the percentage calculations.

#### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

### Assessing Students for Learning

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

19. Develop and use assessment data from a variety of sources to establish learning goals and to plan, differentiate, and modify instruction

20. Involve all students in selfassessment, goal setting, and monitoring progress

21. Give productive feedback to students to guide their learning

27. Provide a continuum of support

Date: 11/3/2017

	·	•	•	•			J. J				_		_
		Prog	Program		ewide	 Program		Statewide		Program		State	ewide
		15	88.2%	1768	88.4%	15	88.2%	1760	88.0%	15	88.2%	1765	88.3%
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	3	0.2%
2 = Poorly		0	0.0%	31	1.8%	0	0.0%	45	2.6%	0	0.0%	29	1.6%
3 = Adequately		1	6.7%	237	13.4%	3	20.0%	289	16.4%	1	6.7%	265	15.0%
4 = Well		4	26.7%	601	34.0%	2	13.3%	611	34.7%	4	26.7%	568	32.2%
5 = Very well		10	66.7%	897	50.7%	10	66.7%	813	46.2%	10	66.7%	900	51.0%
	Mean : SD	4.60	0.63	4.33	0.78	4.47	0.83	4.24	0.82	4.60	0.63	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

		Prog	<b>jram</b>	Statewide		Prog	gram	Statewide			
		15	88.2%	1763	88.2%	15	88.2%	1764	88.2%		
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	3	0.2%	0	0.0%	8	0.5%		
2 = Poorly		1	6.7%	33	1.9%	0	0.0%	41	2.3%		
3 = Adequately		0	0.0%	257	14.6%	3	20.0%	292	16.6%		
4 = Well		4	26.7%	582	33.0%	2	13.3%	567	32.1%		
5 = Very well		10	66.7%	888	50.4%	10	66.7%	856	48.5%		
	Mean : SD	4.53	0.83	4.32	0.80	4.47	0.83	4.26	0.85		

#### 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 end on student plans accor	learning			k with fam and studen rning				with colle			for consultation, collaboration, co- teaching to mentoring with multi c interdisciplinary team members			
	Prog	gram	State	wide	Program         Statewide           15         88.2%         1766         88.3		wide	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		
	15	88.2%	1765	88.3%	15	88.2%	1766	88.3%	15	88.2%	1765	88.3%	15	88.2%	1768	88.4%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	5	0.3%	0	0.0%	11	0.6%	0	0.0%	5	0.3%	0	0.0%	9	0.5%
2 = Poorly	0	0.0%	22	1.2%	0	0.0%	30	1.7%	0	0.0%	26	1.5%	0	0.0%	22	1.2%
3 = Adequately	1	6.7%	219	12.4%	3	20.0%	269	15.2%	1	6.7%	225	12.7%	2	13.3%	232	13.1%
4 = Well	4	26.7%	609	34.5%	2	13.3%	585	33.1%	4	26.7%	568	32.2%	3	20.0%	591	33.4%
5 = Very well	10	66.7%	910	51.6%	10	66.7%	871	49.3%	10	66.7%	941	53.3%	10	66.7%	914	51.7%
Mean : SD	4.60	0.63	4.36	0.77	4.47	0.83	4.29	0.83	4.60	0.63	4.37	0.78	4.53	0.74	4.35	0.79

### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

#### Content

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

28. Teach my content area(s) according to California academic content standards in my grade(s)

29. Contribute to students' reading skills including comprehension in my subject area

30. Enable students to acquire subject matter skills that contribute to future success in life, college, and career

31. Anticipate and address the needs of students who are at risk of dropping out

Date: 11/3/2017

	content	Stanuarus	III IIIy gra	iue(s)	illy Subj	ect area			and care	and career				aropping out			
	Pro	Program Statewide		Program Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide					
	15	88.2%	1759	88.0%	15	88.2%	1758	87.9%	15	88.2%	1762	88.1%	15	88.2%	1748	87.4%	
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	8	0.5%	0	0.0%	4	0.2%	0	0.0%	6	0.3%	0	0.0%	33	1.9%	
2 = Poorly	0	0.0%	33	1.9%	0	0.0%	30	1.7%	0	0.0%	28	1.6%	0	0.0%	71	4.1%	
3 = Adequately	3	20.0%	286	16.3%	0	0.0%	249	14.2%	0	0.0%	260	14.8%	3	20.0%	379	21.7%	
4 = Well	3	20.0%	594	33.8%	2	13.3%	574	32.7%	4	26.7%	642	36.4%	1	6.7%	575	32.9%	
5 = Very well	9	60.0%	838	47.6%	13	86.7%	901	51.3%	11	73.3%	826	46.9%	11	73.3%	690	39.5%	
Mean: S	<b>d</b> 4.40	0.83	4.26	0.83	4.87	0.35	4.33	0.80	4.73	0.46	4.28	0.80	4.53	0.83	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):	15	88.2%	1731	86.6%
Student teaching with a cooperating teacher	8	47.1%	671	33.6%
Teaching fellow or intern in a program where I served as teacher of record while taking courses for my credential	7	41.2%	1017	50.9%
Teaching on an emergency credential [PIP/ STP] while taking courses for my credential	1	5.9%	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	jram	State	wide
	15	88.2%	1730	86.5%
1 = Less than once per month	0	0.0%	55	3.2%
2 = Once per month	0	0.0%	151	8.7%
3 = Twice per month	3	20.0%	375	21.7%
4 = Once per week	9	60.0%	562	32.5%
5 = 2-3 times per week	2	13.3%	471	27.2%
6 = Daily	1	6.7%	116	6.7%
Mean : SD	4.07	0.80	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	gram	State	ewide
	15	88.2%	1731	86.6%
= Once or twice	1	6.7%	104	6.0%
= 3-5 times	5	33.3%	390	22.5%
= 6-10 times	6	40.0%	530	30.6%
= 11-15 times	2	13.3%	296	17.1%
= 16-20 times	1	6.7%	194	11.2%
= More than 20 times	0	0.0%	217	12.5%
Mean : SD	2.80	1.01	3.43	1.43

# **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

 $35. \ \mathrm{My}$  field experiences helped me integrate and apply the major ideas developed through program coursework.

	Prog	ıram	State	ewide
	15	88.2%	1730	86.5%
1 = Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	244	14.1%
2 = Disagree	0	0.0%	144	8.3%
3 = Neutral	0	0.0%	97	5.6%
4 = Agree	3	20.0%	511	29.5%
5 = Strongly Agree	12	80.0%	734	42.4%
Mean : SD	4.80	0.41	3.78	1.43

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

	Prog	jram	State	wide
	15	88.2%	1534	76.7%
1 = Less than 100 hours	0	0.0%	63	7.6%
2 = 100 - 299 hours	2	20.0%	133	16.1%
3 = 300 - 599 hours	2	20.0%	269	32.5%
4 = 600 - 799 hours	5	50.0%	170	20.6%
5 = 800 hours or more	1	10.0%	192	23.2%
This question does not apply to me because I did not do				
any student teaching. **	5	-	707	-
Mean : SD	3.50	0.97	3.36	1.21

39. **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	ıram	State	wide
	15	88.2%	1498	74.9%
1 = Once or twice	0	0.0%	65	5.8%
2 = 3-5  times	2	25.0%	161	14.3%
3 = 6-10  times	4	50.0%	284	25.2%
4 = 11-15 times	1	12.5%	183	16.3%
5 = 16-20  times	1	12.5%	146	13.0%
6 = More than 20 times	0	0.0%	287	25.5%
Does not apply/I was not in an internship**	7	-	372	-
Mean : SD	3.13	0.99	3.93	1.58

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

	Prog	gram	State	wide
	14	82.4%	1674	83.7%
Frequently observed my teaching and met with me to				
offer feedback	12	70.6%	1237	61.9%
Was an excellent educator and a valuable role model	13	76.5%	1288	64.4%
Modeled effective practices	10	58.8%	1182	59.1%
Helped me plan and organize curriculum materials	10	58.8%	1161	58.1%
Offered useful strategies and advice about my teaching	13	76.5%	1398	69.9%
Helped me reflect on my practice	11	64.7%	1307	65.4%
Helped me to solve teaching problems	12	70.6%	1287	64.4%
Was knowledgeable about and able to provide support				
for field-based assignments	13	76.5%	1327	66.4%

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

	Prog	ıram	State	wide
	15	88.2%	1497	74.9%
1 = Less than 100 hours	0	0.0%	17	1.5%
2 = 100 - 299 hours	0	0.0%	45	3.9%
3 = 300 - 599  hours	1	14.3%	101	8.8%
4 = 600 - 799 hours	2	28.6%	106	9.2%
5 = 800 hours or more	4	57.1%	882	76.6%
Does not apply/I was not in an internship **	8	-	346	_
Mean : SD	4.43	0.79	4.56	0.91

# **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

# **Content for Special Education: English Language Arts**

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

						arn ways t and motiv			,	arn how to edictions t nension			40d) Learn how to support students in learning to read			
	Prog	Program		wide	Prog	gram	State	ewide	Prog	gram	State	ewide	•		State	wide
	15	88.2%	1593	79.7%	15	88.2%	1601	80.1%	15	88.2%	1597	79.9%	15	88.2%	1581	79.1%
1 = None	0	0.0%	45	2.8%	0	0.0%	15	0.9%	0	0.0%	22	1.4%	0	0.0%	71	4.5%
2 = Touched on it Briefly	0	0.0%	135	8.5%	0	0.0%	90	5.6%	0	0.0%	122	7.6%	0	0.0%	190	12.0%
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	1	6.7%	380	23.9%	0	0.0%	298	18.6%	0	0.0%	349	21.9%	2	13.3%	369	23.3%
4 = Explored in Some Depth	7	46.7%	579	36.3%	4	26.7%	586	36.6%	3	20.0%	561	35.1%	6	40.0%	494	31.2%
5 = Extensive Opportunity	7	46.7%	454	28.5%	11	73.3%	612	38.2%	12	80.0%	543	34.0%	7	46.7%	457	28.9%
Mean : SD	4.40	0.63	3.79	1.04	4.73	0.46	4.06	0.94	4.80	0.41	3.93	0.99	4.33	0.72	3.68	1.14

	40e) Learn ways to teach reading and writing to students at different stages or reading abilities				40f) Learn how to activate students' prior knowledge				40g) Listen to an individual child read aloud for the purpose of assessing his/her reading achievement			
	Program St		State	Statewide		Program		wide	Program		Statewide	
	15	88.2%	1596	79.8%	15	88.2%	1600	80.0%	15	88.2%	1592	79.6%
1 = None	0	0.0%	21	1.3%	0	0.0%	8	0.5%	0	0.0%	47	3.0%
2 = Touched on it Briefly	0	0.0%	107	6.7%	0	0.0%	67	4.2%	0	0.0%	94	5.9%
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	0	0.0%	303	19.0%	0	0.0%	264	16.5%	0	0.0%	299	18.8%
4 = Explored in Some Depth	3	20.0%	560	35.1%	4	26.7%	490	30.6%	1	6.7%	496	31.2%
5 = Extensive Opportunity	12	80.0%	605	37.9%	11	73.3%	771	48.2%	14	93.3%	656	41.2%
Mean : SD	4.80	0.41	4.02	0.98	4.73	0.46	4.22	0.90	4.93	0.26	4.02	1.05

	,	40h) Plan and teach a guided reading lesson				40i) Learn to teach students to organize their ideas prior to writing				assessment results to address student needs and improve your teaching			
	Pro	Program		Statewide		Program		wide	Program		Statewide		
	15	88.2%	1593	79.7%	15	88.2%	1590	79.5%	15	88.2%	1586	79.3%	
1 = None	0	0.0%	43	2.7%	0	0.0%	45	2.8%	0	0.0%	37	2.3%	
2 = Touched on it Briefly	0	0.0%	109	6.8%	0	0.0%	129	8.1%	0	0.0%	76	4.8%	
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	0	0.0%	289	18.1%	0	0.0%	346	21.8%	0	0.0%	299	18.9%	
4 = Explored in Some Depth	1	6.7%	474	29.8%	3	20.0%	499	31.4%	2	13.3%	484	30.5%	
5 = Extensive Opportunity	14	93.3%	678	42.6%	12	80.0%	571	35.9%	13	86.7%	690	43.5%	
Mean : S	4.93	0.26	4.03	1.06	4.80	0.41	3.89	1.07	4.87	0.35	4.08	1.01	

40j) Use student reading

# **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

40k) Practice what you learned about teaching reading in your field experiences

40I) Study state standards for reading/language arts

40m) Study, critique or adapt reading curriculum materials

Date: 11/3/2017

		CAPCITICIOCO				redding/language arts				reading carriculari materials			
		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
		15	88.2%	1590	79.5%	15	88.2%	1596	79.8%	15	88.2%	1590	79.5%
1 = None		0	0.0%	37	2.3%	0	0.0%	34	2.1%	0	0.0%	36	2.3%
2 = Touched on it Briefly		0	0.0%	87	5.5%	0	0.0%	103	6.5%	0	0.0%	123	7.7%
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing		0	0.0%	267	16.8%	1	6.7%	310	19.4%	1	6.7%	325	20.4%
4 = Explored in Some Depth		1	6.7%	468	29.4%	1	6.7%	495	31.0%	2	13.3%	513	32.3%
5 = Extensive Opportunity		14	93.3%	731	46.0%	13	86.7%	654	41.0%	12	80.0%	593	37.3%
	Mean : SD	4.93	0.26	4.11	1.02	4.80	0.56	4.02	1.03	4.73	0.59	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?

	41a) Learn typical difficulties students have with place value			41b) Learn typical difficulties students have with fractions			41c) Use representations (e.g., geometric representation, graphs, number lines) to show explicitly why a procedure works				41d) Prove that a solution is valid o that a method works for all similar cases					
	Prog	jram	State	wide	Program Statewide		Program		rogram Statewide		Program		Statewide			
	15	88.2%	1573	78.7%	15	88.2%	1570	78.5%	15	88.2%	1574	78.7%	15	88.2%	1570	78.5%
1 = None	1	6.7%	194	12.3%	1	6.7%	212	13.5%	0	0.0%	167	10.6%	0	0.0%	182	11.6%
2 = Touched on it Briefly	1	6.7%	210	13.4%	1	6.7%	227	14.5%	0	0.0%	204	13.0%	2	13.3%	217	13.8%
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	3	20.0%	359	22.8%	3	20.0%	378	24.1%	3	20.0%	381	24.2%	4	26.7%	388	24.7%
4 = Explored in Some Depth	6	40.0%	438	27.8%	5	33.3%	400	25.5%	5	33.3%	408	25.9%	3	20.0%	399	25.4%
5 = Extensive Opportunity	4	26.7%	372	23.6%	5	33.3%	353	22.5%	7	46.7%	414	26.3%	6	40.0%	384	24.5%
Mean : SD	3.73	1.16	3.37	1.31	3.80	1.21	3.29	1.33	4.27	0.80	3.44	1.29	3.87	1.13	3.37	1.30

		41e) Study, critique, or adapt math curriculum materials				41f) Learn how to facilitate math learning for students in small groups				41g) Adapt math lessons for students with diverse needs and learning styles			
	Pro	Program		Statewide		Program		wide	Program		Statewide		
	15	88.2%	1574	78.7%	15	88.2%	1580	79.0%	15	88.2%	1582	79.1%	
1 = None	0	0.0%	135	8.6%	0	0.0%	104	6.6%	0	0.0%	95	6.0%	
2 = Touched on it Briefly	0	0.0%	144	9.1%	2	13.3%	138	8.7%	1	6.7%	127	8.0%	
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing	3	20.0%	388	24.7%	1	6.7%	349	22.1%	1	6.7%	327	20.7%	
4 = Explored in Some Depth	6	40.0%	445	28.3%	3	20.0%	441	27.9%	3	20.0%	421	26.6%	
5 = Extensive Opportunity	6	40.0%	462	29.4%	9	60.0%	548	34.7%	10	66.7%	612	38.7%	
Mean : S	<b>d</b> 4.20	0.77	3.61	1.23	4.27	1.10	3.75	1.20	4.47	0.92	3.84	1.20	

# **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

41h) Practice what you learned about teaching math in your field experience

41i) Study national or state standards for mathematics

41j) Review local district mathematics curriculum

		CAPCITICO				Startadias for matricinaties				matricinatics carricalani			
		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Prog	ıram	State	ewide
		15	88.2%	1575	78.8%	15	88.2%	1575	78.8%	15	88.2%	1572	78.6%
1 = None		0	0.0%	109	6.9%	0	0.0%	86	5.5%	0	0.0%	178	11.3%
2 = Touched on it Briefly		0	0.0%	126	8.0%	0	0.0%	174	11.0%	1	6.7%	217	13.8%
3 = Spent Time Discussing or Doing		0	0.0%	319	20.3%	1	6.7%	346	22.0%	3	20.0%	339	21.6%
4 = Explored in Some Depth		5	33.3%	410	26.0%	5	33.3%	470	29.8%	7	46.7%	423	26.9%
5 = Extensive Opportunity		10	66.7%	611	38.8%	9	60.0%	499	31.7%	4	26.7%	415	26.4%
	Mean : SD	4.67	0.49	3.82	1.23	4.53	0.64	3.71	1.18	3.93	0.88	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?

	Program		State	wide
	15	88.2%	1663	83.2%
1 = Not at all effective	0	0.0%	11	0.7%
2 = Somewhat effective	0	0.0%	135	8.1%
3 = Effective	3	20.0%	613	36.9%
4 = Very effective	12	80.0%	904	54.4%
Mean : SD	3.80	0.41	3.45	0.67

# Demographics

43. Are you Hispanic or Latino?

	Prog	<b>jram</b>	State	ewide
	15	88.2%	1671	83.6%
No, not Hispanic or Latino	*		1177	70.4%
Yes, Hispanic or Latino	*		494	29.6%

<sup>\*</sup> Demographic numbers below 10 are not shown. If only one category is below 10, then the next highest number is also hidden.

# **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

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

	Prog	ıram	State	wide
	13	76.5%	1476	73.8%
American Indian or Alaska Native	*		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	*		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	12	70.6%	1218	60.9%

45. What is your gender?

	Prog	jram	State	wide
	15	88.2%	1675	83.8%
Female	13	86.7%	1275	76.1%
Male	*		369	22.0%
Decline to state	*		31	1.9%

\* 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:	17	17	100.0 %
Statewide:	2080	2000	96.2 %

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

### **Chapman 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	17	5126	21	4165	14	862
Total Surveys Begin	12	1529	12	1159	8	283
Response Rate	70.6%	29.8%	57.1%	27.8%	57.1%	32.8%

How many years have you served as a master teacher?				
	Prog	gram	State	ewide
	34	100.0%	3585	99.7%
1 = 1	12	35.3%	1109	30.9%
2 = 2-3	4	11.8%	775	21.6%
3 = 4-5	5	14.7%	516	14.4%
4 = 6-10	5	14.7%	482	13.4%
5 = 11-20	8	23.5%	539	15.0%
6 = 21 or more	0	0.0%	164	4.6%
Mean : SD	2.79	1.63	2.74	1.59

#### Feedback on the Preliminary Preparation Program

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

	Prog	ıram	State	ewide
	32	94.1%	3033	84.3%
1 = 1	22	68.8%	1425	47.0%
2 = 2	3	9.4%	615	20.3%
3 = 3	3	9.4%	345	11.4%
4 = 4	3	9.4%	215	7.1%
5 = 5 or more	1	3.1%	433	14.3%
Mean : SD	1.69	1.18	2.21	1.45

Page 1 Date: 7/18/2017

# **Chapman 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 critic	nd reflect	ion to	c) Meet English l	the instruc earners	ctional nee	eds of	léarning	fy and add needs with strategies	h appropri	
	Pro	gram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	ıram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide
	32	94.1%	3020	84.0%	32	94.1%	3021	84.0%	32	94.1%	3013	83.8%	32	94.1%	3010	83.7%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	10	0.3%	0	0.0%	24	0.8%	1	3.1%	22	0.7%	0	0.0%	31	1.0%
2 = Poorly	3	9.4%	99	3.3%	3	9.4%	179	5.9%	3	9.4%	193	6.4%	3	9.4%	210	7.0%
3 = Adequately	3	9.4%	681	22.5%	5	15.6%	690	22.8%	6	18.8%	929	30.8%	6	18.8%	908	30.2%
4 = Well	13	40.6%	1150	38.1%	10	31.3%	1158	38.3%	9	28.1%	1064	35.3%	10	31.3%	1054	35.0%
5 = Very Well	13	40.6%	1080	35.8%	14	43.8%	970	32.1%	13	40.6%	805	26.7%	13	40.6%	807	26.8%
Mean : SD	4.13	0.94	4.06	0.86	4.09	1.00	3.95	0.93	3.94	1.13	3.81	0.93	4.03	1.00	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?

	a) Establish and earning environ						uctive lear		onment w
	Pro	gram	Statewide		Program St		State	wide	
	32	94.1%	3015	83.8%		32	94.1%	3015	83.8%
Not at all	0	0.0%	16	0.5%		0	0.0%	18	0.6%
Poorly	2	6.3%	106	3.5%		3	9.4%	145	4.8%
= Adequately	6	18.8%	536	17.8%		3	9.4%	597	19.8%
= Well	6	18.8%	1007	33.4%		9	28.1%	1051	34.9%
e Very Well	18	56.3%	1350	44.8%		17	53.1%	1204	39.9%
Mean	<b>: SD</b> 4.25	0.98	4.18	0.88		4.25	0.98	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		es to teach	h and tech	<ul> <li>b) Select, adapt, and develop materials, and technologies to make subject matte to all students</li> </ul>				
	Prog	gram	State	wide		Prog	gram	Statewide		
	32	94.1%	3004	83.5%		32	94.1%	2999	83.4%	
= Not at all	0	0.0%	20	0.7%		0	0.0%	27	0.9%	
= Poorly	3	9.4%	149	5.0%		3	9.4%	164	5.5%	
= Adequately	5	15.6%	628	20.9%		5	15.6%	663	22.1%	
= Well	9	28.1%	1174	39.1%		8	25.0%	1113	37.1%	
= Very Well	15	46.9%	1033	34.4%		16	50.0%	1032	34.4%	
Mean : SD	4.13	1.01	4.02	0.90		4.16	1.02	3.99	0.93	

### **Chapman University**

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

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

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

	Pr	ogra	am	State	wide	 Prog	ram	State	wide
	3	1 9	91.2%	3011	83.7%	31	91.2%	3001	83.4%
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	27	0.9%	0	0.0%	23	0.8%
2 = Poorly		4 :	12.9%	175	5.8%	3	9.7%	191	6.4%
3 = Adequately		5 :	16.1%	792	26.3%	6	19.4%	738	24.6%
4 = Well		9 2	29.0%	1158	38.5%	9	29.0%	1161	38.7%
5 = Very Well	1	3 4	41.9%	859	28.5%	13	41.9%	888	29.6%
Mea	nn : SD 4.0	0	1.06	3.88	0.92	4.03	1.02	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 all students in self-assessment, goal setting, and monitoring progress

b) Give productive feedback to students to guide their learning

	setting, t	setting, and monitoring progress					_ trieir learning				
		Program		Statewide			Prog	ıram .	Statewide		
		31	91.2%	2999	83.4%		31	91.2%	2988	83.1%	
L = Not at all		1	3.2%	53	1.8%		0	0.0%	28	0.9%	
e = Poorly		5	16.1%	280	9.3%		4	12.9%	174	5.8%	
3 = Adequately		2	6.5%	993	33.1%		4	12.9%	816	27.3%	
1 = Well		11	35.5%	1038	34.6%		11	35.5%	1127	37.7%	
5 = Very Well		12	38.7%	635	21.2%		12	38.7%	843	28.2%	
	Mean : SD	3.90	1.19	3.64	0.97		4.00	1.03	3.86	0.92	

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

a) Evaluate the effects of actions on student learning and modify plans accordingly

b) Work with colleagues to improve instruction

		Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	wide
		32	94.1%	3006	83.6%	32	94.1%	3001	83.4%
1 = Not at all		1	3.1%	35	1.2%	0	0.0%	34	1.1%
2 = Poorly		2	6.3%	172	5.7%	3	9.4%	137	4.6%
3 = Adequately		4	12.5%	776	25.8%	3	9.4%	545	18.2%
4 = Well		10	31.3%	1109	36.9%	10	31.3%	940	31.3%
5 = Very Well		15	46.9%	914	30.4%	16	50.0%	1345	44.8%
	Mean : SD	4.13	1.07	3.90	0.94	4.22	0.97	4.14	0.95

# **Chapman University**

7. Which of these, select all that apply, were involved when you were initially selected as a master teacher for this institution?	Prog	ıram	State	wide
	32	94.1%	3023	84.0%
I applied to be a master teacher	4	11.8%	366	10.2%
I was observed by the institution prior to selection as a master teacher	3	8.8%	288	8.0%
My site administrator selected me	21	61.8%	1766	49.1%
I offered when my administrator asked for volunteers	9	26.5%	1143	31.8%
Other (please specify)	4	11.8%	503	14.0%

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

	Prog	jram	Statewide			
	32	94.1%	3021	84.0%		
1 = Not at all clear	0	0.0%	57	1.9%		
2 = Somewhat clear	5	15.6%	476	15.8%		
3 = Clear	17	53.1%	1303	43.1%		
4 = Extremely Clear	10	31.3%	1185	39.2%		
Mean : SD	3.16	0.68	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	ıram	State	wide
	32	94.1%	3008	83.6%
1 = Not at all supported	1	3.1%	125	4.2%
2 = Somewhat supported	4	12.5%	443	14.7%
3 = Adequately supported	15	46.9%	1154	38.4%
4 = Very well supported	12	37.5%	1286	42.8%
Mean : SD	3.19	0.78	3.20	0.84

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

	Prog	jram	Statewide			
	32	94.1%	3012	83.7%		
= Once or twice	3	9.4%	296	9.8%		
e = 3-5 times	14	43.8%	1425	47.3%		
= 6-10 times	13	40.6%	995	33.0%		
= 11-15 times	0	0.0%	174	5.8%		
5 = 16-20 times	1	3.1%	92	3.1%		
<sub>5 =</sub> more than 20 times	1	3.1%	30	1.0%		
Mean : SD	2.53	1.02	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	gram	State	wide
	32	94.1%	3015	83.8%
1 = Not at all sufficient	0	0.0%	139	4.6%
2 = Somewhat sufficient	3	9.4%	675	22.4%
3 = Sufficient	29	90.6%	2201	73.0%
Mean : SD	2.91	0.30	2.68	0.56

# **Chapman University**

12. What credential was your student teacher completing?

	Prog	ram	State	wide
	32	94.1%	3021	84.0%
1 = Multiple Subject	12	37.5%	1558	51.6%
2 = Single Subject	12	37.5%	1179	39.0%
3 = Education Specialist	8	25.0%	284	9.4%

Overall, how effective do you believe the teacher preparation program was in assisting your student		Multiple	Subject			Single Su	ubject			Education	ı Specia	list
teacher to develop the skills and tools to be an effective teacher?	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	ıram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	wide
circulate teacher.	12	100.0%	1529	98.1%	12	100.0%	1159	98.3%	8	100.0%	283	99.6%
1 = Not at all effective	0	0.0%	25	1.6%	0	0.0%	27	2.3%	0	0.0%	6	2.1%
2 = Somewhat effective	1	8.3%	237	15.5%	2	16.7%	206	17.8%	2	25.0%	48	17.0%
3 = Effective	8	66.7%	705	46.1%	7	58.3%	494	42.6%	3	37.5%	125	44.2%
4 = Very effective	3	25.0%	568	37.1%	3	25.0%	432	37.3%	3	37.5%	104	36.7%
Mean : SD	3.17	0.58	3.18	0.75	3.08	0.67	3.15	0.79	3.13	0.83	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	a) Englis	sh Literacy	& Langua	age Arts		b) Math	ematics			c) Sci	ence	
		Prog	ıram .	State	wide	Prog	ıram	State	wide	Prog	ıram	State	wide
		12	100.0%	1527	98.0%	12	100.0%	1523	97.8%	12	100.0%	1510	96.9%
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	5	0.3%	0	0.0%	3	0.2%	0	0.0%	23	1.5%
2 = Poorly		0	0.0%	44	2.9%	0	0.0%	40	2.6%	0	0.0%	43	2.8%
3 = Adequately		2	16.7%	295	19.3%	1	8.3%	319	20.9%	2	16.7%	443	29.3%
4 = Well		5	41.7%	641	42.0%	5	41.7%	608	39.9%	5	41.7%	592	39.2%
5 = Very well		5	41.7%	542	35.5%	6	50.0%	553	36.3%	5	41.7%	409	27.1%
	Mean : SD	4.25	0.75	4.09	0.83	4.42	0.67	4.10	0.83	4.25	0.75	3.87	0.89

Page 5 Date: 7/18/2017

# **Chapman University**

		d)	History/S	ocial Stud	ies		e) Creativ	e/Fine art	s	 f) P	hysical Edu	cation/He	alth
		Pro	gram	State	wide	Pro	gram	State	wide	Pro	gram	State	wide
		12	100.0%	1520	97.6%	12	100.0%	1510	96.9%	12	100.0%	1500	96.3%
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	12	0.8%	(	0.0%	44	2.9%	1	8.3%	66	4.4%
2 = Poorly		1	8.3%	40	2.6%	1	8.3%	71	4.7%	0	0.0%	64	4.3%
3 = Adequately		1	8.3%	448	29.5%	3	25.0%	502	33.2%	3	25.0%	545	36.3%
4 = Well		6	50.0%	617	40.6%	2	16.7%	542	35.9%	6	50.0%	526	35.1%
5 = Very well		4	33.3%	403	26.5%	6	50.0%	351	23.2%	2	16.7%	299	19.9%
	Mean : SD	4.08	0.90	3.89	0.85	4.08	1.08	3.72	0.97	3.67	1.07	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?

			or her cor a academic		according to standards	b) Cor			s' reading skills including the content area		
		Prog	gram	State	ewide		Prog	gram	State	wide	
		12	100.0%	1159	98.3%		12	100.0%	1157	98.1%	
1 = Not at all		1	8.3%	8	0.7%		1	8.3%	20	1.7%	
2 = Poorly		0	0.0%	40	3.5%		0	0.0%	57	4.9%	
3 = Adequately		1	8.3%	178	15.4%		1	8.3%	312	27.0%	
4 = Well		3	25.0%	370	31.9%		5	41.7%	456	39.4%	
5 = Very well		7	58.3%	563	48.6%		5	41.7%	312	27.0%	
	Mean · SD	4.25	1.22	4.24	0.88		4.08	1.16	3.85	0.93	

c) Enable students to acquire subject matter skills that contribute to future success in life, college, and

d) Anticipate and address the needs of students who are at risk of dropping out

		Pro	gram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	wide
		12	100.0%	1157	98.1%	12	100.0%	1153	97.8%
1 = Not at all		0	0.0%	8	0.7%	1	8.3%	41	3.6%
2 = Poorly		2	16.7%	52	4.5%	1	8.3%	89	7.7%
3 = Adequately		0	0.0%	214	18.5%	1	8.3%	379	32.9%
4 = Well		3	25.0%	471	40.7%	6	50.0%	387	33.6%
5 = Very well		7	58.3%	412	35.6%	3	25.0%	257	22.3%
	lean : SD	4.25	1.14	4.06	0.88	3.75	1.22	3.63	1.02

### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

### **Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning**

1. Use knowledge of students'

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

	strengths engage th			ces to	2. Conne the real	ect classro world	om learni	ng to		٠,	and reflecti ical thinkin	
	Progi	ram	State	wide	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	ewide
	16	100.0%	3670	99.2%	16	100.0%	3662	99.0%	16	100.0%	3665	99.1%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	3	0.1%	0	0.0%	6	0.2%	0	0.0%	9	0.2%
2 = Poorly	0	0.0%	50	1.4%	0	0.0%	104	2.8%	0	0.0%	70	1.9%
3 = Adequately	0	0.0%	476	13.0%	4	25.0%	548	15.0%	0	0.0%	499	13.6%
4 = Well	9	56.3%	1255	34.2%	3	18.8%	1204	32.9%	8	50.0%	1227	33.5%
5 = Very well	7	43.8%	1886	51.4%	9	56.3%	1800	49.2%	8	50.0%	1860	50.8%

4. Meet the instructional needs of English learners

0.51

4.35

0.76

4.31

4.44

5. Identify and address special learning needs with appropriate teaching strategies

0.87

4.28

0.83

4.50

3. Engage students in inquiry,

0.52

4.33

Date: 11/3/2017

0.80

	Pro	gram	State	wide	Pro	gram	State	ewide
	16	100.0%	3659	98.9%	16	100.0%	3665	99.1%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	5	0.1%	0	0.0%	8	0.2%
2 = Poorly	0	0.0%	99	2.7%	0	0.0%	128	3.5%
3 = Adequately	3	18.8%	667	18.2%	2	12.5%	670	18.3%
4 = Well	7	43.8%	1213	33.2%	8	50.0%	1252	34.2%
5 = Very well	6	37.5%	1675	45.8%	6	37.5%	1607	43.8%
Mean : S	<b>4</b> .19	0.75	4.22	0.84	4.25	0.68	4.18	0.87

Mean : SD

### 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 student: /ork as wel J			7. Establish and maintain a safe and respectful learning environment for all students					nenṫ with h	tive learning high expectations	
	Pro	gram	State	wide	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewic	
	16	100.0%	2677	72.4%	16	100.0%	3645	98.5%	16	100.0%	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	0	0.0%	35	1.3%	0	0.0%	48	1.3%	0	0.0%	63	1.7%
3 = Adequately	0	0.0%	273	10.2%	0	0.0%	359	9.8%	0	0.0%	421	11.5%
4 = Well	6	37.5%	813	30.4%	3	18.8%	1000	27.4%	6	37.5%	1147	31.5%
5 = Very well	10	62.5%	1553	58.0%	13	81.3%	2233	61.3%	10	62.5%	2009	55.1%
Mean : SD	4.63	0.50	4.45	0.74	4.81	0.40	4.48	0.74	4.63	0.50	4.40	0.77

### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

# **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?		op curricul standards				effective in s to teach nd skills			11. Selection materials technology matter a	t		
	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide
	13	81.3%	3463	93.6%	13	81.3%	3469	93.8%	13	81.3%	3467	93.7%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	14	0.4%	0	0.0%	13	0.4%	0	0.0%	9	0.3%
2 = Poorly	0	0.0%	119	3.4%	0	0.0%	79	2.3%	0	0.0%	77	2.2%
3 = Adequately	1	7.7%	557	16.1%	2	15.4%	451	13.0%	0	0.0%	563	16.2%
4 = Well	8	61.5%	1166	33.7%	6	46.2%	1175	33.9%	6	46.2%	1220	35.2%
5 = Very well	4	30.8%	1607	46.4%	5	38.5%	1751	50.5%	7	53.8%	1598	46.1%
Mean : SD	4.23	0.60	4.22	0.87	4.23	0.73	4.32	0.81	4.54	0.52	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?

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 technologies to meet the learning needs of all students

Date: 11/3/2017

_	•		•		_		
Prog	ıram	State	wide	Pro	gram	State	wide
13	81.3%	3463	93.6%	13	81.3%	3468	93.8%
0	0.0%	7	0.2%	0	0.0%	5	0.1%
0	0.0%	65	1.9%	0	0.0%	56	1.6%
0	0.0%	519	15.0%	1	7.7%	498	14.4%
5	38.5%	1198	34.6%	5	38.5%	1218	35.1%
8	61.5%	1674	48.3%	7	53.8%	1691	48.8%
4.62	0.51	4.29	0.80	4.46	0.66	4.31	0.78
	13 0 0 0 5	0 0.0% 0 0.0% 5 38.5% 8 61.5%	13 81.3% 3463 0 0.0% 7 0 0.0% 65 0 0.0% 519 5 38.5% 1198 8 61.5% 1674	13     81.3%     3463     93.6%       0     0.0%     7     0.2%       0     0.0%     65     1.9%       0     0.0%     519     15.0%       5     38.5%     1198     34.6%       8     61.5%     1674     48.3%	13       81.3%       3463       93.6%       13         0       0.0%       7       0.2%       0         0       0.0%       65       1.9%       0         0       0.0%       519       15.0%       1         5       38.5%       1198       34.6%       5         8       61.5%       1674       48.3%       7	13       81.3%       3463       93.6%       13       81.3%         0       0.0%       7       0.2%       0       0.0%         0       0.0%       65       1.9%       0       0.0%         0       0.0%       519       15.0%       1       7.7%         5       38.5%       1198       34.6%       5       38.5%         8       61.5%       1674       48.3%       7       53.8%	13       81.3%       3463       93.6%       13       81.3%       3468         0       0.0%       7       0.2%       0       0.0%       5         0       0.0%       65       1.9%       0       0.0%       56         0       0.0%       519       15.0%       1       7.7%       498         5       38.5%       1198       34.6%       5       38.5%       1218         8       61.5%       1674       48.3%       7       53.8%       1691

### **Assessing Students for Learning**

How well did your teacher preparation program prepare you to do each of the		Develop and use assessment data from a variety of sources to establish learning goals and to plan, differentiate, and modify instruction			15. 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	gram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide
		13	81.3%	3463	93.6%	13	81.3%	3463	93.6%	13	81.3%	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		0	0.0%	102	2.9%	0	0.0%	141	4.1%	0	0.0%	78	2.3%
3 = Adequately		1	7.7%	575	16.6%	1	7.7%	657	19.0%	1	7.7%	524	15.1%
4 = Well		7	53.8%	1229	35.5%	7	53.8%	1248	36.0%	6	46.2%	1178	34.0%
5 = Very well		5	38.5%	1548	44.7%	5	38.5%	1401	40.5%	6	46.2%	1675	48.3%
	Mean : SD	4.31	0.63	4.21	0.84	4.31	0.63	4.12	0.89	4.38	0.65	4.28	0.82

#### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

How well did your teacher preparation 17. Evaluate the effects of your 18. Work with families to better program prepare you to do each of the actions on student learning and understand students and to support 19. Work with colleagues to following as a teacher? modify plans accordingly their learning improve instruction **Program** Statewide Program Statewide Statewide Program 3403 92.0% 92.1% 3408 13 81.3% 13 81.3% 3407 13 81.3% 92.1% 0.0% 7 0.0% 1 = Not at all0.2% 46 1.4% 0.0% 19 0.6% 0 0.0% 57 1.7% 0 0.0% 214 6.3% 0 0.0% 94 2.8% 2 = Poorly3 = Adequately3 23.1% 26.4% 2 15.4% 580 17.0% 0.0% 504 14.8% 898 4 = Well 6 46.2% 1264 37.1% 4 30.8% 1121 32.9% 4 30.8% 1125 33.0% 53.8% 46.2% 46.2% 33.1% 53.8% 1590 46.7% 5 = Very well 7 1571 6 1128 7 4.54 0.52 4.27 0.79 4.23 0.83 3.90 0.98 4.38 0.77 4.22 0.86 Mean : SD

#### **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 g to Califo standards	rnia acad			ribute to s luding con ect area			subject r	le student natter skil success ii er	ls that co	ntribute		ipate and students v		
	Prog	gram	State	wide	Prog	ıram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide	Prog	ram	State	wide
	13	81.3%	3406	92.1%	13	81.3%	3401	91.9%	13	81.3%	3403	92.0%	13	81.3%	3403	92.0%
1 = Not at all	0	0.0%	29	0.9%	0	0.0%	20	0.6%	0	0.0%	21	0.6%	0	0.0%	79	2.3%
2 = Poorly	0	0.0%	105	3.1%	0	0.0%	118	3.5%	0	0.0%	85	2.5%	0	0.0%	290	8.5%
3 = Adequately	3	23.1%	477	14.0%	3	23.1%	591	17.4%	2	15.4%	510	15.0%	5	38.5%	836	24.6%
4 = Well	4	30.8%	1083	31.8%	4	30.8%	1206	35.5%	5	38.5%	1241	36.5%	5	38.5%	1039	30.5%
5 = Very well	6	46.2%	1712	50.3%	6	46.2%	1466	43.1%	6	46.2%	1546	45.4%	3	23.1%	1159	34.1%
Mean : SD	4.23	0.83	4.28	0.88	4.23	0.83	4.17	0.88	4.31	0.75	4.24	0.84	3.85	0.80	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	ıram	State	wide
that apply):	13	81.3%	3408	92.1%
Student teaching with a cooperating teacher	13	81.3%	2578	69.7%
Teaching fellow or intern in a program where I served as teacher of record while taking courses for my credential	2	12.5%	860	23.2%
Teaching on an emergency credential [PIP/ STP] while taking courses for my credential	0	0.0%	255	6.9%

### **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

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

	Program		State	wide	
	13	81.3%	3412	92.2%	
1 = Less than once per month	0	0.0%	112	3.3%	
2 = Once per month	0	0.0%	299	8.8%	
3 = Twice per month	1	7.7%	672	19.7%	
4 = Once per week	6	46.2%	1134	33.2%	
5 = 2-3 times per week	5	38.5%	927	27.2%	
6 = Daily	1	7.7%	268	7.9%	
Mean : SD	4.46	0.78	3.96	1.19	

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

	Prog	gram .	Statewide		
	13	81.3%	3401	91.9%	
1 = Once or twice	0	0.0%	42	1.2%	
2 = 3-5 times	1	7.7%	563	16.6%	
3 = 6-10  times	7	53.8%	1504	44.2%	
4 = 11-15 times	3	23.1%	655	19.3%	
5 = 16-20 times	1	7.7%	353	10.4%	
6 = More than 20 times	1	7.7%	284	8.4%	
Mean : SD	3.54	1.05	3.46	1.17	

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

	Prog	ram	State	wide
	13	81.3%	3405	92.1%
1 = Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	525	15.4%
2 = Disagree	0	0.0%	425	12.5%
3 = Neutral	0	0.0%	212	6.2%
4 = Agree	8	61.5%	916	26.9%
5 = Strongly Agree	5	38.5%	1327	39.0%
Mean : SD	4.38	0.51	3.62	1.48

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

	Program		State	ewide
	13	81.3%	3287	88.9%
Frequently observed my teaching and met with me to				
offer feedback	12	75.0%	2720	73.5%
Was an excellent educator and a valuable role model	12	75.0%	2669	72.2%
Modeled effective practices	12	75.0%	2619	70.8%
Helped me plan and organize curriculum materials	13	81.3%	2451	66.3%
Offered useful strategies and advice about my teaching	13	81.3%	2922	79.0%
Helped me reflect on my practice	11	68.8%	2763	74.7%
Helped me to solve teaching problems	12	75.0%	2742	74.1%
Was knowledgeable about and able to provide support				
for field-based assignments	13	81.3%	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?

	Program		State	ewide	
	13	81.3%	3239	87.6%	
1 = Less than 100 hours	0	0.0%	66	2.4%	
2 = 100 - 299 hours	1	7.7%	320	11.8%	
3 = 300 - 599 hours	4	30.8%	910	33.5%	
4 = 600 - 799 hours	7	53.8%	703	25.9%	
5 = 800 hours or more	1	7.7%	715	26.3%	
This question does not apply to me because I did not do any student teaching.**	0	-	525	-	
Mean : SD	3.62	0.77	3.62	1.07	

# **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

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

	Prog	gram	State	wide
	13	81.3%	2486	67.2%
1 = Less than 100 hours	1	20.0%	15	1.4%
2 = 100 - 299 hours	1	20.0%	97	9.3%
3 = 300 - 599 hours	1	20.0%	204	19.5%
4 = 600 - 799 hours	2	40.0%	170	16.2%
5 = 800 hours or more	0	0.0%	562	53.6%
Does not apply/I was not in an				
internship **	8	-	1438	-
Mean : SD	2.80	1.30	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?

	Prog	gram	Statewide		
	13	81.3%	2490	67.3%	
1 = Once or twice	0	0.0%	62	6.4%	
2 = 3-5 times	0	0.0%	135	14.0%	
3 = 6-10  times	1	25.0%	221	22.9%	
4 = 11-15 times	0	0.0%	156	16.1%	
5 = 16-20  times	0	0.0%	170	17.6%	
6 = More than 20 times	3	75.0%	223	23.1%	
Does not apply/I was not in an internship **	9	-	1523	-	
Mean : SD	5.25	1.50	3.94	1.57	

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

	Program		State	tewide	
	13	81.3%	3354	90.7%	
1 = Not at all effective	0	0.0%	31	0.9%	
2 = Somewhat effective	0	0.0%	288	8.6%	
3 = Effective	6	46.2%	1204	35.9%	
4 = Very effective	7	53.8%	1831	54.6%	
Mean : SD	3.54	0.52	3.44	0.69	

# Demographics

33. Are you Hispanic or Latino?

	<b>Program</b> 13 81.3%		Statewide		
			3334	90.1%	
No, not Hispanic or Latino	*		2363	70.9%	
Yes, Hispanic or Latino	*		971	29.1%	

# **CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY**

### 34. What is your race? Mark all that apply

	Prog	Program		wide
	12	75.0%	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	*		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	*		2406	65.0%

#### 35. What is your gender?

	Prog	gram	Statewide		
	13	81.3%	3354	90.7%	
Female	*		1843	54.9%	
Male	*		1424	42.5%	
Decline to state	*		87	2.6%	

	Number of Program Completers Asked to Participate in Survey	# and of Resp	l % ondents
Program:	16	16	100.0 %
Statewide:	3814	3699	97 %

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

# General Education (MS/SS) Program Completer Survey - 2017

# **Statewide Results**

Total survey respondents: 10151 Response rate: 94.9 %

Your program	and	Support	Provider

1	_ ,	hired into an assignment that requires a	1.0	1112	00.60/		
1					99.6%		
### Students   422			Ditte	30	0.470	2.40	
2	1 =		4	1228	41.8%		
A sesignment   A second   A sec	2 =	Within one to two months of beginning my assignment	_			1.00	SD
## More than five months after beginning my assignment   468   4.6%	3 =	Within three to five months of beginning my					
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 Presonnel?    Within two months of enrolling in the program		assignment		308	3.0%		
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?  1	4 =	More than five months after beginning my assignment		468	4.6%		
10091   99.4%   10091   99.4%   10091   99.4%   10091   99.4%   10091   99.4%   10091   99.4%   10091   99.4%   10091   99.4%   10091   99.4%   10091   99.2	5 =	One year or more after beginning my assignment	2	2654	26.2%		
1	_ ,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10	0091	99.4%		
2	support from Clear Credent	ial Personnel?	DNR	60	0.6%		
3	1 =	Within one month of enrolling in the program	8	3786	87.1%	1.23	Mean
3	2 =	Within two months of enrolling in the program		826	8.2%		
### with him/her    1   1   2   3   3   0.3%     2   1   2   3   3   0.3%     3   2   3   0.3%     4   2   2   3   3   0.3%     5   1   2   2   3   3   0.3%     6   1   2   2   3   3   0.3%     7   1   2   2   3   3   3   3   3   3   3   3	3 =	More than three months after enrolling in the program		205	2.0%		
1 was never assigned a Support Provider   241   2.4%	4 =			33	0.3%		
1	5 =	I was never assigned a Support Provider					
1	-		10	096	99.5%		
1	3. What was the length of y	your induction/clear credential program?					
2 = 1 school year 3 = More than 1 school year but less than 2 school years 4 = 2 school years 5 = More than 2 school years 5 = More than 2 school years 7604 75.3% 5 = More than 2 school years 7604 75.3% 5 = More than 2 school years 201 2.0%  How helpful was your Support Provider/Mentor/System of Support in helping you impact students in learning regarding the following:  4a. Modeling instruction while I observed  10067 99.2%  Por 84 0.8% 1 = Very Helpful 2 = Helpful 3 = Somewhat helpful 4 = Not at all helpful 4 = Not at all helpful 5 = Very Helpful 2 = Helpful 3 = Somewhat helpful 4 = Very Helpful 2 = Helpful 3 = Somewhat helpful 3 = Somewhat helpful 4 = Not at all helpful 3 = Somewhat helpful 3 = Somewhat helpful 4 = Not at all helpful 4 = Not at all helpful 5 = Very Helpful 5 = Helpful	1 -	Less than 1 school year				3.57	Moan
3	_		1	_			
## 2 school years   7604   75.3%   ## 5	_	,		_		0.03	SD
How helpful was your Support Provider/Mentor/System of Support in helping you impact students in learning regarding the following:    10067   99.2%	3 -		7	_			
How helpful was your Support Provider/Mentor/System of Support in helping you impact students in learning regarding the following:  4a. Modeling instruction while I observed  1	4 =			_			
1 = Very Helpful 5582 55.4% 2 = Helpful 2615 26.0% 3 = Somewhat helpful 1171 11.6% 4 = Not at all helpful 699 6.9%  4b. Identifying Resources  1	you impact students in lear	ning regarding the following:					
2 = Helpful       2615 26.0%         3 = Somewhat helpful       1171 11.6%         4 = Not at all helpful       699 6.9%         4b. Identifying Resources       10066 99.2%         DNR 85 0.8%       0.8%         1 = Very Helpful       6352 63.1%         2 = Helpful       2721 27.0%         3 = Somewhat helpful       831 8.3%         4 = Not at all helpful       162 1.6%         4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction       10060 99.1%         DNR 91 0.9%       0.9%         1 = Very Helpful       6934 68.9%		Very Helnful				1 70	
3 = Somewhat helpful 1171 11.6% 4 = Not at all helpful 699 6.9%  4b. Identifying Resources 10066 99.2%  bur 85 0.8%  1 = Very Helpful 6352 63.1% 2 = Helpful 2721 27.0% 3 = Somewhat helpful 831 8.3% 4 = Not at all helpful 162 1.6%  4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction 1 = Very Helpful 6934 68.9%  1 = Very Helpful 6934 68.9%  1 = Very Helpful 6934 68.9%	<del>-</del>						
4 = Not at all helpful 699 6.9%  4b. Identifying Resources    10066 99.2%     DNR 85 0.8%     Very Helpful 6352 63.1%     2 = Helpful 2721 27.0%     3 = Somewhat helpful 831 8.3%     4 = Not at all helpful 162 1.6%     4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction     10060 99.1%     DNR 91 0.9%     1.41 Mean 1.41				-		0.93	SU
4b. Identifying Resources     10066   99.2%	-						
4b. Identifying Resources  1 = Very Helpful 2 = Helpful 3 = Somewhat helpful 4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction 1 = Very Helpful 5   0.8%   6352   63.1%   6372   27.0%   6372   27.0%   6372   5D   6372   5D   6372   5D   6372   5D   648.9%   658.9%   668.9%	4 =	Hot at all Helpful		333	0.570		
1 = Very Helpful 6352 63.1%  2 = Helpful 2721 27.0%  3 = Somewhat helpful 831 8.3%  4 = Not at all helpful 162 1.6%  4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction  1 = Very Helpful 6934 68.9%  1.41 Mean	4h Idontifying Pagauress		10	066	99.2%		
2 = Helpful       2721 27.0%       0.72 SD         3 = Somewhat helpful       831 8.3%         4 = Not at all helpful       162 1.6%         4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction       10060 99.1%         DNR 91 0.9%       0.9%         1 = Very Helpful       6934 68.9%	+b. Identifying Resources		DNR	85	0.8%		
2 = Helpful       2721 27.0%       0.72 SD         3 = Somewhat helpful       831 8.3%         4 = Not at all helpful       162 1.6%         4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction       10060 99.1%         DNR 91 0.9%       0.9%         1 = Very Helpful       6934 68.9%	1 =	Very Helpful	$\epsilon$	352	63.1%	1.48	Mean
4 = Not at all helpful  162 1.6%  4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction  10060 99.1%  DNR 91 0.9%  1 = Very Helpful  6934 68.9%  1.41 Mean	2 =	Helpful	2	721	27.0%		
4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction	3 =	Somewhat helpful		831	8.3%		
4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction	4 =	Not at all helpful		162	1.6%		
4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction				000	00.107		
1 = Very Helpful 6934 68.9% 1.41 <b>Mean</b>	4c. Providing feedback from	observations to improve my instruction					
	-	<u> </u>					
2323 23 1% 0.68 cm	1 =			_			
	2 =	Helpful	2	2323	23.1%	0.68	SD
3 = Somewhat helpful 646 6.4%	3 =	·		_			
4 = Not at all helpful 157 1.6%	4 =	Not at all helpful		157	1.6%		

## **Statewide Results**

Total survey respondents: 10151 Response rate: 94.9 %

		10043	98.9%	
4d. Teaching Practices		DNR 108	1.1%	
1 =	Very Helpful	6348	63.2%	1.47 Mean
2 =	Helpful	2777	27.7%	0.70 <b>SD</b>
3 =	Somewhat helpful	775	7.7%	
4 =	Not at all helpful	143	1.4%	
		10040	98.9%	
4e. Content Support		DNR 111	1.1%	
1 =	Very Helpful	5336	53.1%	1.69 <b>Mean</b>
2 =	Helpful	2901	28.9%	0.87 <b>SD</b>
3 =	Somewhat helpful	1357	13.5%	
4 =	Not at all helpful	446	4.4%	
46 Instructional Design and	Diamaina	10041	98.9%	
4f. Instructional Design and		DNR 110	1.1%	
1 =	Very Helpful	5547	55.2%	1.62 <b>Mean</b>
2 =	Helpful	3049	30.4%	0.80 <b>SD</b>
3 =	Somewhat helpful	1162	11.6%	
4 =	Not at all helpful	283	2.8%	
As Cuasting and Maintainin	a a Cafa and Daritiva Climata	10047	99.0%	
4g. Creating and Maintainin	g a Safe and Positive Climate	DNR 104	1.0%	
1 =	Very Helpful	6318	62.9%	1.49 <b>Mean</b>
2 =	Helpful	2736	27.2%	0.72 <b>SD</b>
3 =	Somewhat helpful	804	8.0%	
4 =	Not at all helpful	189	1.9%	
4h. Using strategies to supp	port English Learners	10037	98.9%	
411. Using strategies to supp		DNR 114	1.1%	
1 =	Very Helpful	5218	52.0%	1.67 <b>Mean</b>
2 =	Helpful	3221	32.1%	0.82 <b>SD</b>
3 =	Somewhat helpful	1274	12.7%	
4 =	Not at all helpful	324	3.2%	
Ai Using stratogies to supp	ort students with disabilities	10025	98.8%	
Ti. Using strategies to supp		DNR 126	1.2%	
1 =	Very Helpful	4881	48.7%	1.73 <b>Mean</b>
2 =	Helpful	3329	33.2%	0.83 <b>SD</b>
3 =	Somewhat helpful	1475	14.7%	
4 =	Not at all helpful	340	3.4%	
4i Minimizing hias and usin	g culturally responsive pedagogy	10045	99.0%	
iji i mimilizing bias and usii		DNR 106	1.0%	
1 =	Very Helpful	5481	54.6%	1.62 Mean
2 =	Helpful	3210	32.0%	0.79 <b>SD</b>
3 =	Somewhat helpful	1045	10.4%	
4 =	Not at all helpful	309	3.1%	

## **Statewide Results**

Total survey respondents: 10151 Response rate: 94.9 %

	10041	98.9%		
4k. Setting and reaching Professional Learning Goals	DNR 110	1.1%		
1 = Very Helpful	6683	66.6%	1.43	Mean
2 = Helpful	2583	25.7%	0.68	
3 = Somewhat helpful	622	6.2%		30
4 = Not at all helpful	153	1.5%		
4 - ····				
	9626	94.8%		
5. How well matched were you with your Support Provider?	DNR 525	5.2%		
1 = Well matched	8370	87.0%	1 16	Mean
2 = Somewhat well matched	999	10.4%	0.43	
3 = Not well matched	257	2.7%	0.43	SD
3 = Not well materied	237	2.7 70		
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	1039 DNR 217	82.7% 17.3%		
Grade level or subject area experience or background	644	62.0%		
Familiarity with site resources, expectations, policies, and procedures	234	22.5%		
Schedules /opportunities to meet	293	28.2%		
Personality, disposition, and working style	296	28.5%		
Teaching philosophy and style	198	19.1%		
6b. Did the program address the issue(s) with the match?	1234 DNR 22	98.2% 1.8%		
1 = Yes	262	21.2%	2.18	Mean
2 = To some extent, but not fully	483	39.1%	0.76	
3 = No	489	39.6%		32
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.	9597 DNR 554	94.5% 5.5%		
1 = Daily	873	9.1%	2.80	Mean
2 = Two or three times per week	2194	22.9%	0.92	SD
3 = Weekly	4840	50.4%		
4 = Twice per month	1324	13.8%		
5 = Less than twice per month	366	3.8%		
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)?  1 = More than ten times during the entire program	9577 DNR 574 2291	94.3% 5.7% 23.9%	2,29	Mean
2 = 6-10 times during the entire program	3156	33.0%	0.95	
3 = 3-5 times during the entire program	3318	34.6%		<i>30</i>
4 = Once or twice during the entire program	684	7.1%		
5 = I was not observed by my Support Provider	128	1.3%		
3 = 11 11 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21				

## **Statewide Results**

Total survey respondents: 10151 Response rate: 94.9 %

O What are not of interesting with a second Describer would be a been	9576	94.3%	
9. What amount of interaction with your Support Provider would have been best for you?	DNR 575	5.7%	
1 = Significantly more time	359	3.7%	2.86 <b>Me</b>
2 = A little more time	1265	13.2%	0.59 <b>SD</b>
3 = The same amount of time I had	7427	77.6%	30
4 = A little less time	419	4.4%	
5 = Much less time	106	1.1%	
J = 1.00.1.000 till.10	200	11170	
onnections between your induction/clear program and your Ir	adividual Ir	ductio	n Dlan (IID)
Reflecting on your engagement with formative assessment activities during credential program experience:			ii i iaii (iii )
10. To what degree was there cohesion between the professional	9536	93.9%	
development received in district or on site and induction/clear credential	DNR 615	6.1%	
1 = Strong	4776	51.3%	1.55 <b>Me</b>
2 = Moderate	3923	42.1%	0.62 <b>SD</b>
3 = Weak	620	6.7%	
Not applicable to me *	217	-	
	9531	03.00/	
11. How strong was the collaboration between your induction or clear		93.9%	
credential program and your site administration?	DNR 620	6.1%	1.02
1 = Very Strong	2991	36.0%	1.82 <b>Me</b>
2 = Strong	3784	45.6%	0.72 <b>SD</b>
3 = Not Strong	1524	18.4%	
I do not have sufficient information to answer this question *	1232		
How much impact did participating in the following activities have on your c 12a. Collection and analysis of evidence of my teaching practice	lassroom prac 9517 DNR 634	93.8% 6.2%	
Evtoncivo impact			1 20
$1 = \frac{\text{Extensive impact}}{\text{Limited impact}}$	6157 3064	32.3%	1.38 <b>Me</b>
2 = Limited impact 3 = No impact	268	2.8%	0.54 <b>SD</b>
I did not participate in this activity*	28	2.070	
T did not participate in this activity *	20	-	
	9518	93.8%	
12b. Analysis of my students' work	DNR 633	6.2%	
$_{1} = \overline{\text{Extensive impact}}$	6831	72.0%	1.30 <b>Me</b>
2 = Limited impact	2435	25.7%	0.51 <b>SD</b>
3 = No impact	216	2.3%	0.31 SD
I did not participate in this activity *	36	-	
	9511	93.7%	
12c. Observation of experienced teachers	DNR 640	6.3%	
	0.10		4.00
1 - Extensive impact	6483	72 6%	] 3() ##-
1 = Extensive impact 2 = Limited impact	6483 2244	72.6%	1.30 <b>Me</b> 0.50 <b>SD</b>

I did not participate in this activity \*

3 = No impact

205

579

2.3%

## **Statewide Results**

Total survey respondents: 10151 Response rate: 94.9 %

12d. Examination of my teaching p Continuum of Teaching Practice)	ractice against the CSTP (e.g., the	9495 DNR 656	93.5% <i>6.5%</i>		
1 = Extensi	ve impact	5354	57.5%	1.48	Mean
2 = Limited	impact	3434	36.9%	0.60	
3 = No impa	act	528	5.7%		
	I did not participate in this activity *	179	-		
12e. Development of my Individual	Induction Plan (IIP)/Individual Learning	9496	93.5%		
Plan (ILP)		DNR 655	6.5%		
1 = Extensi	ve impact	5607	59.8%	1.45	Mean
2 = Limited	impact	3278	35.0%	0.59	SD
3 = No impa	act	489	5.2%		
	I did not participate in this activity $st$	122	-		
12f. Professional Learning as identi	fied on my IIP or IIP	9492	93.5%		
———	med on my in or ici	DNR 659	6.5%		
1 = Extensi	ve impact	5643	60.4%	1.44	Mean
2 = Limited	impact	3324	35.6%	0.57	SD
3 = No impa	act	373	4.0%		
	I did not participate in this activity $st$	152	-		
12g. Collaboration with colleagues		9489	93.5%		
12g. Collaboration with colleagues		DNR 662	6.5%		
1 = Extensi	ve impact	7458	79.2%	1.23	Mean
2 = Limited	impact	1744	18.5%	0.47	SD
3 = No impa	act	217	2.3%		
	I did not participate in this activity *	70	-		

## 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?

12a Connect classro	om los	rning to the real world	9345	92.1%		
13a. Connect classroo	om iea	rning to the real world	DNR 806	7.9%		
	1 =	Very well	3682	39.4%	1.91	Mean
	2 =	Well	3537	37.8%	0.93	SD
	3 =	Adequately	1624	17.4%		
	4 =	Poorly	326	3.5%		
	5 =	Not at all	176	1.9%		
	_					
13b. Engage students	s in inc	uiry, problem solving, and reflection to promote	9337	92.0%		
13b. Engage students their critical thinking	s in inc	uiry, problem solving, and reflection to promote	9337 DNR <i>814</i>	92.0% <i>8.0%</i>		
5 5		uiry, problem solving, and reflection to promote  Very well			1.80	Mean
5 5	1 =		DNR 814	8.0%	1.80 0.88	
5 5	1 = 2 =	Very well	<b>DNR</b> 814 4150	8.0% 44.4%		
5 5	1 = 2 = 3 =	Very well Well	DNR 814 4150 3393	8.0% 44.4% 36.3%		
5 5	1 = 2 = 3 =	Very well Well Adequately	DNR 814 4150 3393 1432	8.0% 44.4% 36.3% 15.3%		

#### **Statewide Results**

Total survey respondents: 10151 Response rate: 94.9 %

42. M. (1)		9337	92.0%		
13c. Meet the instructional r	needs of English learners	DNR 814	8.0%		
1 =	Very well	3515	37.6%	1.93	Mean
2 =	Well	3494	37.4%	0.91	SD
3 =	Adequately	1911	20.5%		
4 =	Poorly	297	3.2%		
5 =	Not at all	120	1.3%		
13d. Identify and address sp	pecial learning needs with appropriate teaching	9334	92.0%		
strategies		DNR 817	8.0%		
1 =	Very well	3717	39.8%	1.89	Mean
2 =	Well	3477	37.3%	0.90	SD
3 =	Adequately	1719	18.4%		
4 =	Poorly	304	3.3%		
5 =	Not at all	117	1.3%		

#### **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?

14a Establish and maintain	a safe and respectful learning environment for	9332	91.9%		
all students	a sale and respective realising confidence to	DNR 819	8.1%		
1 =	Very well	4979	53.4%	1.66	Mean
2 =	Well	2944	31.5%	0.85	SD
3 =	Adequately	1154	12.4%		
4 =	Poorly	120	1.3%		
5 =	Not at all	135	1.4%		
14b. Create a productive lea	arning environment with high expectations for all	9331	91.9%		
students		DNR 820	8.1%		
1 =	Very well	4995	53.5%	1.65	Mean
2 =	Well	3001	32.2%	0.83	SD
3 =	Adequately	1092	11.7%		
4 =	Poorly	122	1.3%		
5 =	Not at all	121	1.3%		

#### **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 instruction	onal strategies to teach specific subject matter	9326	91.9%		
and skills		DNR 825	8.1%		
1 =	Very well	4388	47.1%	1.75	Mean
2 =	Well	3322	35.6%	0.87	SD
3 =	Adequately	1272	13.6%		
4 =	Poorly	224	2.4%		
5 =	Not at all	120	1.3%		

#### **Statewide Results**

Total survey respondents: 10151 Response rate: 94.9 %

15b. Select, adapt, and develop materials, resources, and technologies to		91.8%	
make subject matter accessible to all students	DNR 831	8.2%	_
1 = Very well	4452	47.8%	
2 = Well	3237	34.7%	
3 = Adequately	1299	13.9%	
4 = Poorly	213	2.3%	
5 = Not at all	119	1.3%	

0.87 <b>SD</b>	SD

#### 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?

	on students' prior knowledge, academic ncy, cultural background, and individual	9321	91.8%
development	,,	DNR 830	8.2%
1 =	Very well	4220	45.3%
2 =	Well	3478	37.3%
3 =	Adequately	1344	14.4%
4 =	Poorly	174	1.9%
5 =	Not at all	105	1.1%

1.76	Mean
0.85	SD

16b. Plan and adapt instruction that incorporates appropriate strategies,	9323	91.8%
resources and technologies to meet the learning needs of all students	DNR 828	8.2%
1 = Very well	4386	47.0%
2 = Well		36.5%
3 = Adequately	1267	13.6%
4 = Poorly	162	1.7%
5 = Not at all	101	1.1%

1.73	Mean
0.84	SD

136

1.5%

#### **Assessing Students for Learning**

5 = Not at all

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

17a. Involve all students in self-assessment, goal setting, and monitoring			91.8%	
progress	-	DNR 835	8.2%	
1 =	Very well	3689	39.6%	
2 =	Well	3489	37.5%	
3 =	Adequately	1721	18.5%	
4 =	Poorly	272	2.9%	
5 = Not at all		145	1.6%	
9318 91.8%				
17b. Give productive feedback to students to guide their learning		DNR 833	8.2%	
1 =	Very well	3832	41.1%	
2 =	Well	3546	38.1%	
3 =	Adequately	1576	16.9%	
4 =	Poorly	228	2.4%	

1.89	Mean
0.91	SD

1.85 **Mean** 0.89 **SD** 

#### **Statewide Results**

Total survey respondents: 10151 Response rate: 94.9 %

#### **Developing as a Professional Educator**

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

		0210	01.00/		
	of actions on student learning and modify plans	9318	91.8%		
accordingly		DNR 833	8.2%		
1	= Very well	4238	45.5%		Mean
2	= Well	3477	37.3%	0.83	SD
3	Adequately	1373	14.7%		
4	= Poorly	134	1.4%		
5	Not at all	96	1.0%		
		9321	91.8%		
18b. Work with colleagues	to improve instruction	DNR 830	8.2%		
1	Very well	4603	49.4%	1.74	Mean
2	_ Well	3041	32.6%	0.90	
3	Adequately	1320	14.2%		
4	Poorly	208	2.2%		
5	Not at all	149	1.6%		
19. Overall, how effective					
	e was your induction program at developing Is you needed to grow your teaching	9305	91.7%		
the skills, habits, or too	e was your induction program at developing Is you needed to grow your teaching	9305 DNR 846	91.7%		
the skills, habits, or too	Is you needed to grow your teaching			1.72	Mean
the skills, habits, or too practice?	Is you needed to grow your teaching	DNR 846	8.3%	1.72 0.79	Mean SD
the skills, habits, or too practice?	Is you needed to grow your teaching  Very effective  Effective	DNR 846 4324	8.3% 46.5%		
the skills, habits, or too practice?	Is you needed to grow your teaching  Very effective  Effective  Somewhat effective	DNR 846 4324 3483	8.3% 46.5% 37.4%		
the skills, habits, or too practice?  1 2 3	Is you needed to grow your teaching  Very effective  Effective  Somewhat effective	DNR 846 4324 3483 1269	8.3% 46.5% 37.4% 13.6%		
the skills, habits, or too practice?  1 2 3 4 20. Overall, how effective	Is you needed to grow your teaching  Very effective  Effective  Somewhat effective  Not at all effective  e was your induction program at developing	DNR 846 4324 3483 1269 229	8.3% 46.5% 37.4% 13.6% 2.5%		
the skills, habits, or too practice?  1 2 3 4 20. Overall, how effective	Is you needed to grow your teaching  Very effective  Effective  Somewhat effective  Not at all effective	DNR 846 4324 3483 1269 229	8.3% 46.5% 37.4% 13.6% 2.5%		
the skills, habits, or too practice?  1 2 3 4 20. Overall, how effective	Is you needed to grow your teaching  Very effective  Effective  Somewhat effective  Not at all effective  e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to continue in your career as a	DNR 846 4324 3483 1269 229	8.3% 46.5% 37.4% 13.6% 2.5%	0.79	SD
the skills, habits, or too practice?  1 2 3 4 20. Overall, how effective	Is you needed to grow your teaching  Very effective  Effective  Somewhat effective  Not at all effective  e was your induction program at developing Is you needed to continue in your career as a	DNR 846 4324 3483 1269 229	8.3% 46.5% 37.4% 13.6% 2.5%	1.71	SD
the skills, habits, or too practice?  1 2 3 4 20. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too teacher?	Is you needed to grow your teaching  Very effective  Effective  Somewhat effective  Not at all effective  e was your induction program at developing Is you needed to continue in your career as a  Very effective	DNR 846 4324 3483 1269 229 9308 DNR 843	8.3% 46.5% 37.4% 13.6% 2.5% 91.7% 8.3%	0.79	SD
the skills, habits, or too practice?  1 2 3 4 20. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too teacher?	Is you needed to grow your teaching  Very effective  Effective  Somewhat effective  Not at all effective  e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to continue in your career as a  Very effective  Effective	DNR 846 4324 3483 1269 229  9308 DNR 843 4406	8.3% 46.5% 37.4% 13.6% 2.5% 91.7% 8.3% 47.3%	1.71	SD

## Demographic Information

24. Augusta Historia an Laking 2	9237	91.0%
21. Are you Hispanic or Latino?	DNR 914	9.0%
No, not Hispanic or Latino	6776	73.4%
Yes, Hispanic or Latino	2461	26.6%

## **Statewide Results**

Total survey respondents: 10151 Response rate: 94.9 %

22. What is your race? Mark all that apply		8278	81.5%
		DNR1873	18.5%
	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

Samoan

Tahitian

White

Guamanian

Other Pacific Islander

9270	91.3%
DNR 881	8.7%
7517	74.1%
1652	16.3%
577	5.7%
19	0.2%
57	0.6%
	7517 1652 577

24.	What	is	your	gender?

	9256	91.2%
	DNR 895	8.8%
Female	6802	73.5%
Male	2274	24.6%
Decline to state	180	1.9%

35

20

12

29

6966

0.3%

0.2%

0.1%

0.1%

0.3%

68.6%

Response Rate by IHE (Statewide completion rate is 94.9 %)

# Survey Requests Made	# and % o Complete Respo	ers who	Name of Institution
13	13	100 %	ALHAMBRA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
29	29	100 %	ANAHEIM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
12	11	91.67 %	ANAHEIM UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
8	8	100 %	ANIMO LEADERSHIP CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL (GREEN DOT PUBLIC SCHOOLS)
20	19	95 %	ANTELOPE VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
21	21	100 %	ANTIOCH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
28	24	85.71 %	ANTIOCH UNIVERSITY
12	12	100 %	ARCADIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
89	82	92.13 %	ASPIRE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
35	32	91.43 %	AZUSA PACIFIC UNIVERSITY
55	55	100 %	BAKERSFIELD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
14	14	100 %	BALDWIN PARK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
41	38	92.68 %	BAY AREA SCHOOL OF ENTERPRISE (REACH INSTITUTE)
24	22	91.67 %	BELLFLOWER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
14	13	92.86 %	BIOLA UNIVERSITY
43	40	93.02 %	BRENTWOOD UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
41	38	92.68 %	BURBANK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
5	4	80 %	BUTTE COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
1	0	0 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, DOMINGUEZ HILLS
2	1	50 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO
118	110	93.22 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON
9	8	88.89 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
3	2	66.67 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES
63	57	90.48 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE
8	3	37.5 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
3	1	33.33 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
1	1	100 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN MARCOS
1	1	100 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
84	79	94.05 %	CAMPBELL UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
52	47	90.38 %	CAPISTRANO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
30	29	96.67 %	CENTRAL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
16	16	100 %	CERES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
22	21	95.45 %	CHAFFEY JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
3	3	100 %	CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY
80	76	95 %	CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
24	24	100 %	CLAREMONT GRADUATE UNIVERSITY
43	41	95.35 %	CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
9	8	88.89 %	COMPTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
15	13	86.67 %	CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY IRVINE
10	10	100 %	CONEJO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
169	160	94.67 %	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
26	26	100 %	CORONA-NORCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
22	21	95.45 %	CULVER CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
35	30	85.71 %	CUPERTINO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

Response Rate by IHE (Statewide completion rate is 94.9 %)

# Survey Requests Made	# and % o Complete Respo	ers who	Name of Institution
69	68	98.55 %	DAVIS JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
6	6	100 %	DOS PALOS ORO LOMA JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
89	85	95.51 %	EL DORADO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
3	3	100 %	EL RANCHO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
78	74	94.87 %	ELK GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
22	21	95.45 %	ENCINITAS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
24	23	95.83 %	ESCONDIDO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
24	21	87.5 %	ETIWANDA SCHOOL DISTRICT
5	5	100 %	EVERGREEN SCHOOL DISTRICT
24	24	100 %	FONTANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
63	62	98.41 %	FREMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
15	15	100 %	FREMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
98	93	94.9 %	FRESNO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
11	10	90.91 %	FRESNO PACIFIC UNIVERSITY
139	135	97.12 %	FRESNO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
33	33	100 %	FULLERTON SCHOOL DISTRICT
33	32	96.97 %	GARDEN GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
14	14	100 %	GROSSMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
12	12	100 %	HACIENDA LA PUENTE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
22	20	90.91 %	HANFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
31	29	93.55 %	HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
12	9	<i>75</i> %	HEBREW UNION COLLEGE
63	59	93.65 %	HIGH TECH HIGH
45	44	97.78 %	IMPERIAL COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
70	65	92.86 %	IRVINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
3	3	100 %	KEPPEL UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
143	142	99.3 %	KERN COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
70	69	98.57 %	KERN HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
30	30	100 %	KINGS COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
2	2	100 %	LA MESA-SPRING VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT
3	3	100 %	LA SIERRA UNIVERSITY
19	19	100 %	LANCASTER SCHOOL DISTRICT
38	34	89.47 %	LODI UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
47	44	93.62 %	LONG BEACH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
276	261	94.57 %	LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
416	394	94.71 %	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
23	20	86.96 %	LOS BANOS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
32	28	87.5 %	LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY
45	41	91.11 %	MADERA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
26	24	92.31 %	MANTECA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
58	55	94.83 %	MARIN COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
47	45	95.74 %	MERCED COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
20	20	100 %	MERCED UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
17	16	94.12 %	MILPITAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Response Rate by IHE (Statewide completion rate is 94.9 %)

# Survey Requests Made	# and % of Program Completers who Responded		Name of Institution
41	40	97.56 %	MODESTO CITY SCHOOLS
19	19	100 %	MONTEBELLO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
79	71	89.87 %	MONTEREY COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
33	32	96.97 %	MOUNT SAINT MARY'S UNIVERSITY
19	19	100 %	MT. DIABLO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
30	26	86.67 %	MT. DIABLO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT - FORTUNE SCHOOL
16	16	100 %	MURRIETA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
33	31	93.94 %	NAPA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
28	22	78.57 %	NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
31	28	90.32 %	NEW HAVEN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
27	26	96.3 %	NEWARK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
8	8	100 %	OAK GROVE SCHOOL DISTRICT
84	77	91.67 %	OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
34	33	97.06 %	OCEAN VIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT
15	14	93.33 %	ONTARIO-MONTCLAIR SCHOOL DISTRICT
105	101	96.19 %	ORANGE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
41	39	95.12 %	ORANGE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
2	2	100 %	PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE
7	7	100 %	PALMDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
11	11	100 %	PALMDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT
28	25	89.29 %	PALO ALTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
48	48	100 %	PALOS VERDES PENINSULA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
27	26	96.3 %	PANAMA-BUENA VISTA UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
30	29	96.67 %	PARAMOUNT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
27	25	92.59 %	PASADENA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
30	29	96.67 %	PLACENTIA-YORBA LINDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
90	87	96.67 %	PLACER COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
194	186	95.88 %	PLEASANTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
9	7	77.78 %	POINT LOMA NAZARENE UNIVERSITY
12	11	91.67 %	POMONA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
45	40	88.89 %	POWAY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
56	54	96.43 %	PUC SCHOOLS
4	4	100 %	REDWOOD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
41	40	97.56 %	RIALTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1181	1142	96.7 %	RIVERSIDE COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
71	68	95.77 %	RIVERSIDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
11	11	100 %	ROWLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
46	42	91.3 %	SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
244	233	95.49 %	SACRAMENTO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
18	18	100 %	SADDLEBACK VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
54	50	92.59 %	SAN BERNARDINO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
154	145	94.16 %	SAN DIEGO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
325	302	92.92 %	SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
116	111	95.69 %	SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Response Rate by IHE (Statewide completion rate is 94.9 %)

# Survey Requests Made	# and % of Program Completers who Responded		Name of Institution
15	14	93.33 %	SAN DIEGUITO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
145	133	91.72 %	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
30	29	96.67 %	SAN GABRIEL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1	1	100 %	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
75	68	90.67 %	SAN JOSE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
51	48	94.12 %	SAN JUAN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
56	55	98.21 %	SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
58	55	94.83 %	SAN MARCOS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
35	33	94.29 %	SAN MATEO - FOSTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
138	128	92.75 %	SAN MATEO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
63	61	96.83 %	SAN RAMON VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
35	35	100 %	SANGER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
46	45	97.83 %	SANTA ANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
126	120	95.24 %	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY EDUCATION OFFICE
31	30	96.77 %	SANTA CLARA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
10	9	90 %	SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY
296	281	94.93 %	SANTA CRUZ COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
6	5	83.33 %	SANTA MONICA-MALIBU UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
18	17	94.44 %	SAUGUS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
13	10	76.92 %	SCHOOL FOR INTEGRATED ACADEMICS AND TECHNOLOGY (SIA TECH)
36	35	97.22 %	SELMA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
32	32	100 %	SEQUOIA UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
234	222	94.87 %	SONOMA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
1	1	100 %	SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
24	24	100 %	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
107	105	98.13 %	STANISLAUS COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
20	20	100 %	STOCKTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
15	13	86.67 %	SUMMIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS
104	99	95.19 %	SUTTER COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
33	32	96.97 %	SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
80	74	92.5 %	TEACHERS COLLEGE OF SAN JOAQUIN
119	113	94.96 %	TEHAMA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
13	13	100 %	TEMPLE CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
34	29	85.29 %	TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
7	6	85.71 %	TRACY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
11	10	90.91 %	TULARE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
129	123	95.35 %	TULARE COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
29	29	100 %	TUSTIN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
240	230	95.83 %	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
9	8	88.89 %	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE
400	375	93.75 %	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO
3	3	100 %	UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE
23	23	100 %	VALLEJO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
228	219	96.05 %	VENTURA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Response Rate by IHE (Statewide completion rate is 94.9 %)

# Survey Requests Made	# and % o Complet Respo	ers who	Name of Institution
63	59	93.65 %	VISALIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
38	37	97.37 %	VISTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
68	68	100 %	WALNUT VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
20	19	95 %	WASHINGTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
51	48	94.12 %	WEST CONTRA COSTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
39	38	97.44 %	WEST COVINA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
7	6	85.71 %	WESTSIDE UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
3	3	100 %	WHITTIER COLLEGE
29	28	96.55 %	WILLIAM S. HART UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT