Statewide Results

Total survey respondents: 2246

Response rate: 93.1 %

Information about your program and working with your Support Provider

	hired into an assignment that requires a ing credential were you enrolled in a	2243	99.9%		
Commission-approved induc	tion or clear credential program?	DNR 3	0.1%		
1 =	At the time of hire or before beginning work with			2.93	Mean
	students	803	35.8%	1.79	SD
2 =	Within one to two months of beginning my assignment	396	17.7%		
3 =	Within three to five months of beginning my				
	assignment	72	3.2%		
4 =	More than five months after beginning my assignment	107	4.8%		
5 =	One year or more after beginning my assignment	865	38.6%		

2. How long after you were	enrolled in your induction/clear credential				
5 ,	king with a Support Provider (SP) or receive	2235	99.5%		
support from Clear Credential Personnel?		DNR 11	0.5%		
1 =	Within one month of enrolling in the program	1860	83.2%	1.31	Mean
2 =	Within two months of enrolling in the program	210	9.4%	0.83	SD
3 =	More than three months after enrolling in the program	85	3.8%		
4 =	I was assigned a Support Provider but never worked				
	with him/her	11	0.5%		
5 =	I was never assigned a Support Provider	69	3.1%		
3. What was the length of your clear induction program?			99.4%		
S. What was the length of y		dnr 13	0.6%	(

a longth of y	our clear induction program?				
		dnr 13	0.6%		
1 =	Less than 1 school year	147	6.6%	3.07	Mean
2 =	1 school year	778	34.8%	1.10	SD
3 =	More than 1 school year but less than 2 school years	161	7.2%		
4 =	2 school years	1074	48.1%		
5 =	More than 2 school years	73	3.3%		

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

		2222	98.9%		
. Modeling instruction while	a i observed	dnr 24	1.1%		
1 = V	'ery Helpful	1258	56.6%	1.66	Mean
2 = H	lelpful	584	26.3%	0.88	SD
3 = S	omewhat helpful	265	11.9%		
$4 = \overline{N}$	lot at all helpful	115	5.2%		

the Identifying Decourses		2219	98.8%	
4b. Identifying Resources		dnr 27	1.2%	
1 =	Very Helpful	1409	63.5%	1.49 Mean
2 =	Helpful	580	26.1%	0.73 SD
3 =	Somewhat helpful	190	8.6%	
4 =	Not at all helpful	40	1.8%	

4a.

Clear Education Specialist Program Completer Survey - 2017 Statewide Results

Total survey respondents: 2246

Response rate: 93.1 %

4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction	2214	98.6%			
	·····, ······	DNR 32	1.4%		
1 =	Very Helpful	1449	65.4%	1.46	Mean
2 =	Helpful	564	25.5%	0.71	SD
3 =	Somewhat helpful	159	7.2%		
4 =	Not at all helpful	42	1.9%		

1d Topobing Dupotions			2218	98.8%		
4d. Teaching Practices			dnr 28	1.2%		
	1 =	Very Helpful	1320	59.5%	1.52	Mean
	2 =	Helpful	673	30.3%	0.72	SD
	3 =	Somewhat helpful	188	8.5%		
	4 =	Not at all helpful	37	1.7%		

4. Contant Cumpart		2213	98.5%		
4e. Content Support		DNR 33	1.5%		
	= Very Helpful	1231	55.6%	1.62	Mean
	= Helpful	664	30.0%	0.80	SD
	= Somewhat helpful	254	11.5%		
	= Not at all helpful	64	2.9%		

4f. Instructional Design and Planning		2212	98.5%		
		DNR 34	1.5%		
1 =	Very Helpful	1205	54.5%	1.62	Mean
2 =	Helpful	694	31.4%	0.79	SD
3 =	Somewhat helpful	254	11.5%		
4 =	Not at all helpful	59	2.7%		

4g. Creating and Maintaining a Safe and Positive Climate		98.4%		
		1.6%		
1 = Very Helpful	1360	61.5%	1.51	Mean
2 = Helpful	628	28.4%	0.73	SD
3 = Somewhat helpful	174	7.9%		
4 = Not at all helpful	48	2.2%		

Ab I laine shuttering to success Fredick Learners		98.5%		
4h. Using strategies to support English Learners	DNR 33	1.5%		
1 = Very Helpful	1113	50.3%	1.69	Mean
2 = Helpful	748	33.8%	0.82	SD
3 = Somewhat helpful	274	12.4%		
4 = Not at all helpful	78	3.5%		

a shusha size to support shudonte with disphilities		2209	98.4%	
strategies to support students with disabilities		DNR 37	1.6%	
1 =	Very Helpful	1503	68.0%	^{1.43} <i>Mean</i>
2 =	Helpful	502	22.7%	0.71 SD
3 =	Somewhat helpful	166	7.5%	J
4 =	Not at all helpful	38	1.7%	

4i. Using

Clear Education Specialist Program Completer Survey - 2017 Statewide Results

Total survey respondents: 2246

Response rate: 93.1 %

	4j. Minimizing bias and using culturally responsive pedagogy		98.1%		
4]. Minimizing bias and usin	g culturally responsive pedagogy	DNR 42	1.9%		
1 =	Very Helpful	1247	56.6%	1.57	Mean
2 =	Helpful	712	32.3%	0.76	SD
3 =	Somewhat helpful	185	8.4%		
4 =	Not at all helpful	60	2.7%		
4k. Setting and reaching Pr	ofossional Loarning Goals	2209	98.4%		
4k. Setting and reaching Pr		DNR 37	1.6%		
1 =	Very Helpful	1395	63.2%	1.48	Mean
2 =	Helpful	616	27.9%	0.72	SD
3 =	Somewhat helpful	148	6.7%	L	
4 =	Not at all helpful	50	2.3%		

5 How well matched wore y	you with your Support Provider?	2050	91.3%		
5. How well matched were		DNR 196	8.7%		
1 =	Well matched	1742	85.0%	1.18	Mean
2 =	Somewhat well matched	240	11.7%	0.46	SD
3 =	Not well matched	68	3.3%		

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

6a. in which of the following	areas could the match have been improved?		295	95.8%
Mark all that apply		DNR	13	4.2%
	Grade level or subject area experience or background		154	52.2%
	Familiarity with site resources, expectations, policies,			
	and procedures		78	26.4%
	Schedules /opportunities to meet		87	29.5%
	Personality, disposition, and working style		64	21.7%
	Teaching philosophy and style		51	17.3%
			300	97.4%
6b. Did the program address	s the issue(s) with the match?	DNR	8	2.6%
1 =	Yes		90	30.0%
2 =	To some extent, but not fully		121	40.3%
3 =	No		89	29.7%

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

7. On average, how frequer	tly did you and your Support Provider have	2062	91.8%		
meaningful communication	about issues related to your teaching practice?	dnr 184	8.2%		
1 =	Daily	202	9.8%	2.87	Mean
2 =	Two or three times per week	462	22.4%	1.01	SD
3 =	Weekly	936	45.4%		
4 =	Twice per month	329	16.0%		
5 =	Less than twice per month	133	6.5%		

Statewide Results

Total survey respondents: 2246

Response rate: 93.1 %

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)?205891.6%DNR 1888.4%

	r technology):	DNR 188	8.4%		
	1 = More than ten times during the entire program	478	23.2%	2.38	Mean
	2 = 6-10 times during the entire program	613	29.8%	1.03	SD
	3 = 3-5 times during the entire program	722	35.1%	<u>.</u>	
	4 = Once or twice during the entire program	187	9.1%		
	5 = I was not observed by my Support Provider	58	2.8%		
9. What amount of best for you?	interaction with your Support Provider would have been	2058 DNR <i>188</i>	91.6% <i>8.4%</i>		
	1 = Significantly more time	103	5.0%	2.83	Mean
	2 = A little more time	252	12.2%	0.61	SD
	3 = The same amount of time I had	1618	78.6%	<u>.</u>	
	4 = A little less time	61	3.0%		
	5 = Much less time	24	1.2%		

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

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

5	re cohesion between the professional trict or on site and induction/clear credential ??	1992 DNR 254	88.7% 11.3%		
1 =	Strong	981	50.7%	1.56	Mean
2 =	Moderate	817	42.2%	0.62	SD
3 =	Weak	136	7.0%		,
	Not applicable to me *	58	-		
11. How strong was the coll credential program and you	aboration between your induction or clear r site administration?	1991 DNR 255	88.6% 11.4%		
1 =	Very Strong	615	35.6%	1.83	Mean
2 =	Strong	786	45.5%	0.72	SD
3 =	Not Strong	328	19.0%		
	I do not have sufficient information to answer this question \ast	262	-		

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

12a Collection and analysis	of outdomoo of	we take the state	1992	88.7%		
12a. Collection and analysis	of evidence of	my teaching practice	dnr 254	11.3%		
1 =	Extensive impac	t	1326	67.1%	1.36	Mean
2 =	Limited impact		595	30.1%	0.53	SD
3 =	No impact		54	2.7%		
		I did not participate in this activity $*$	17	-		
12b. Analysis of my student	s' work		1992	88.7%		
120. Analysis of my student	5 WOIK		DNR 254	11.3%		
1 =	Extensive impac	t	1427	72.6%	1.30	Mean
2 =	Limited impact		492	25.0%	0.51	SD
3 =	No impact		46	2.3%		
		I did not participate in this activity *	27	-		

Statewide Results

Total survey respondents: 2246

Response rate: 93.1 %

12c. Observation of experie	nced teachers		1989	88.6%		
			DNR 257	11.4%	4.04	
1 =	Extensive impac		1340	71.2%	1.31	
2 =	Limited impact		503	26.7%	0.51	SD
3 =	No impact		40	2.1%		
		I did not participate in this activity *	106	-		
12d. Examination of my tea	ching practice	against the CSTP (e.g., the	1980	88.2%		
Continuum of Teaching Prac	tice)		DNR 266	11.8%		
1 =	Extensive impac	t	1207	62.8%	1.41	Me
2 =	Limited impact		645	33.6%	0.56	
3 =	No impact		70	3.6%		
		I did not participate in this activity *	58	-		
			1985	88.4%		
12e. Development of my Ind Plan (ILP)	dividual Induct	ion Plan (IIP)/Individual Learning	DNR 261	11.6%		
. ,	Extensive impo		1280	65.1%	1 20	
-	Extensive impact		607	30.9%	1.39	
-	· · · ·				0.56	SD
3 =	No impact	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	78	4.0%		
		I did not participate in this activity *	20	-		
12f. Professional Learning a	c identified on	my IID or ILD	1985	88.4%		
121. FIOLESSIONAL Learning a			dnr 261	11.6%		
1 =	Extensive impac	t	1324	67.4%	1.36	Me
2 =	Limited impact		575	29.3%	0.54	SD
3 =	No impact		65	3.3%		
		I did not participate in this activity *	21	-		
			1990	88.6%		
12g. Collaboration with colle	eagues		1990 DNR 256			
	Extensive incom	~F		11.4%	1 34	
_	Extensive impac	L	1589	80.3%	1.21	
2 =	Limited impact		361	18.3%	0.44	SD
3 –	No impact		28	1.4%		
5 =		I did not participate in this activity *				

Impact of Induction on Teaching Practice

Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

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

13a. Connect classroom learning to the real world		1955	87.0%		
13a. Connect classroom lea	Iming to the real world	DNR 291	13.0%		
1 =	Very well	889	45.5%	1.79	Mean
2 =	Well	700	35.8%	0.89	SD
3 =	Adequately	284	14.5%		
4 =	Poorly	54	2.8%		
5 =	Not at all	28	1.4%		

1055 87.0%

Clear Education Specialist Program Completer Survey - 2017 Statewide Results

Total survey respondents: 2246

Response rate: 93.1 %

13b. Engage students in i	nquiry, problem solving, and reflection to promote	1953	87.0%		
their critical thinking	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	DNR 293	13.0%		
1	= Very well	873	44.7%	1.81	Mean
2	= Well	692	35.4%	0.90	SD
3	= Adequately	307	15.7%		
4	= Poorly	53	2.7%		
5	= Not at all	28	1.4%		
		1952	86.9%		
13c. Meet the instructiona	I needs of English learners	DNR 294	13.1%		
1	= Very well	806	41.3%	1.87	Mean
2	= Well	707	36.2%	0.90	SD
3	= Adequately	363	18.6%		
4	= Poorly	46	2.4%		
5	= Not at all	30	1.5%		
		1948	86.7%		
13d. Identify and address strategies	special learning needs with appropriate teaching	DNR 298	13.3%		
-	= Very well	1176	60.4%	1 58	Mean
-		484	24.8%	0.85	
_	= Well = Adequately	232	11.9%	0.05	SD
		-			
	= Poorly	36	1.8%		
5	= Not at all	20	1.0%		

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 mainta	in a safe and respectful learning environment for	1952	86.9%		
all students		DNR 294	13.1%		
1	= Very well	1112	57.0%	1.61	Mea
2	= Well	561	28.7%	0.85	SD
3	_ Adequately	230	11.8%		
4	= Poorly	17	0.9%		
5	= Not at all	32	1.6%		
11h. Create a productive	earning environment with high expectations for all	1948	86.7%		
students	earning environment with high expectations for an	dnr 298	13.3%		
1	= Very well	1101	56.5%	1.60	Меа
2	= Well	595	30.5%	0.82	SD
3	_ Adequately	210	10.8%		
4	= Poorly	15	0.8%		
5	= Not at all	27	1.4%		
1/c Prevent behavior pro	blems by intervening early using strategies	1945	86.6%		
•	ent learning and behavior level	DNR 301	13.4%		
1	= Very well	934	48.0%	1.77	Меа
2	= Well	646	33.2%	0.92	
3	_ Adequately	273	14.0%		
4	= Poorly	59	3.0%		
5	= Not at all	33	1.7%		

Statewide Results

Total survey respondents: 2246

Response rate: 93.1 %

Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning

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

15a. Use effective instructional strategies to teach specific subject matter	1945	86.6%	
and skills	dnr 301	13.4%	
1 = Very well	938	48.2%	1.73 Me a
2 = Well	681	35.0%	0.86 SD
3 = Adequately	259	13.3%	L
4 = Poorly	42	2.2%	
5 = Not at all	25	1.3%	
15b. Select, adapt, and develop materials, resources, and technologies to	1946	86.6%	
make subject matter accessible to all students	dnr 300	13.4%	
1 = Very well	985	50.6%	1.69 Me a
2 = Well	652	33.5%	0.85 SD
3 = Adequately	253	13.0%	
4 = Poorly	31	1.6%	
5 = Not at all	25	1.3%	
15c. Expand expertise with evidence-based instructional and assistive	1944	86.6%	
technology to support student access to challenging content?	dnr 302	13.4%	
1 = Very well	902	46.4%	1.77 Me a
2 = Well	684	35.2%	0.89 SD
3 = Adequately	282	14.5%	
4 = Poorly	48	2.5%	
5 = Not at all	28	1.4%	

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 ency, cultural background, and individual	1912 DNR <i>334</i>	85.1% <i>14.9%</i>		
1 =	Very well	919	48.1%	1.72	Mean
2 =	Well	690	36.1%	0.84	SD
3 =	Adequately	252	13.2%]
4 =	Poorly	26	1.4%		
5 =	Not at all	25	1.3%		
•	tion that incorporates appropriate strategies,	1910	85.0%		
resources and technologies	to meet the learning needs of all students	DNR 336	15.0%		
1 =	Very well	970	50.8%	1.68	Mean
2 =	Well	663	34.7%	0.83	SD
3 =	Adequately	226	11.8%	L]
4 =	Poorly	28	1.5%		
5 =	Not at all	23	1.2%		
16c. Develop IFSP/IEP goal	s and objectives that are measurable and	1903	84.7%		
obtainable	5	DNR 343	15.3%		
1 =	Very well	964	50.7%	1.78	Mean
2 =	Well	558	29.3%	0.98	
3 =	Adequately	275	14.5%]
4 =	Poorly	53	2.8%		
5 =	Not at all	53	2.8%		

Statewide Results

Total survey respondents: 2246

Response rate: 93.1 %

16d. Plan for instruction by	v incorporating all relevant IFSP/IEP information	1904	84.8%		
behavior and academic inf		DNR 342	15.2%		
1 :	_ Very well	915	48.1%	1.78	Mean
2 :	= Well	626	32.9%	0.94	SD
3 :	Adequately	275	14.4%		
4 :	= Poorly	40	2.1%		
5 :	= Not at all	48	2.5%		
16e. Ensure students with	exceptionalities receive appropriate instruction	1904	84.8%		
and support within the lease	st restrictive environment	DNR 342	15.2%		
1 :	= Very well	985	51.7%	1.71	Mean
2 :	= Well	596	31.3%	0.89	SD
3 :	Adequately	250	13.1%	L	
4 :	= Poorly	41	2.2%		
5 :	= Not at all	32	1.7%		

Assessing Students for Learning

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

17a. Involve all students in self- progress	-assessment, goal setting, and monitoring	1910 DNR 336	85.0% <i>15.0%</i>		
	y well	778	40.7%	1.87	Mon
2 = Well	·	710	37.2%	0.91	
	quately	339	17.7%	0.51	50
4 = Poor	. ,	50	2.6%		
5 = Not		33	1.7%		
17b. Give productive feedback to	o students to guide their learning	1912 DNR 334	85.1% <i>14.9%</i>		
1 = Very	y well	854	44.7%	1.78	Меа
2 = Well	I	713	37.3%	0.86	
$3 = \overline{Adec}$	quately	283	14.8%		-
4 = Poor	rly	38	2.0%		
$5 = \overline{Not}$	at all	24	1.3%		
		1055	05.001		
	ensure educational benefit when aligning services within the least restrictive	1909 dnr <i>337</i>	85.0% <i>15.0%</i>		
assessment data with goals and				1.72	
assessment data with goals and	y well	DNR 337	15.0%	1.72 0.84	
assessment data with goals and 1 = Very 2 = Well	y well	DNR 337 928	15.0% 48.6%		
assessment data with goals and 1 = Very 2 = Well	y well quately	DNR 337 928 671	15.0% 48.6% 35.1%		
assessment data with goals and $1 = \frac{Very}{2}$ $2 = \frac{Well}{3}$ $4 = \frac{Poor}{2}$	y well quately	DNR 337 928 671 253 1000	15.0% 48.6% 35.1% 13.3%		
assessment data with goals and $1 = \frac{Very}{2}$ $2 = \frac{Well}{3}$ $4 = \frac{Poor}{5}$ $5 = \frac{Not}{2}$	y well understand set of the set	DNR 337 928 671 253 37	15.0% 48.6% 35.1% 13.3% 1.9%		
assessment data with goals and $1 = \frac{Very}{2}$ $2 = \frac{Well}{3}$ $4 = \frac{Poor}{5}$ $5 = \frac{Not}{2}$	services within the least restrictive y well l quately rly at all accommodate state and local assessments	DNR 337 928 671 253 37 2253	15.0% 48.6% 35.1% 13.3% 1.9% 1.0%		
assessment data with goals and $1 = \frac{Very}{2}$ $2 = \frac{Well}{3}$ $3 = \frac{Adee}{4}$ $4 = \frac{Poor}{5}$ $5 = \frac{Not}{17}$ 17d. Appropriately modify and a	services within the least restrictive y well l quately rly at all accommodate state and local assessments l accessibility needs	DNR 337 928 671 253 37 20 1910	15.0% 48.6% 35.1% 13.3% 1.9% 1.0% 85.0%		SD
assessment data with goals and $1 = \frac{Very}{2}$ $2 = \frac{Well}{3}$ $3 = \frac{Adea}{1}$ $4 = \frac{Poor}{Not}$ 17d. Appropriately modify and a based on students' learning and	services within the least restrictive y well i quately rly at all accommodate state and local assessments accessibility needs y well	DNR 337 928 671 253 37 20 1910 DNR 336	15.0% 48.6% 35.1% 13.3% 1.9% 1.0% 85.0% 15.0%	0.84	SD
assessment data with goals and $1 = \frac{Very}{2}$ $2 = \frac{Well}{3}$ $3 = \frac{Adee}{4}$ $4 = \frac{Poor}{5}$ $17d. Appropriately modify and a based on students' learning and 1 = \frac{Very}{2} 2 = \frac{Well}{Well}$	services within the least restrictive y well i quately rly at all accommodate state and local assessments accessibility needs y well	DNR 337 928 671 253 37 20 20 1910 DNR 336	15.0% 48.6% 35.1% 13.3% 1.9% 1.0% 85.0% 15.0% 44.6%	0.84	SD
assessment data with goals and $1 = \frac{Very}{2}$ $2 = \frac{Well}{3}$ $3 = \frac{Adee}{4}$ $4 = \frac{Poor}{5}$ $17d. Appropriately modify and a based on students' learning and 1 = \frac{Very}{2} 2 = \frac{Well}{Well}$	services within the least restrictive y well quately rly at all accommodate state and local assessments accessibility needs y well l quately	DNR 337 928 671 253 37 20 20 1910 DNR 336 851 851	15.0% 48.6% 35.1% 13.3% 1.9% 1.0% 85.0% 15.0% 44.6% 35.7%	0.84	SD Mea

Statewide Results

Total survey respondents: 2246

Response rate: 93.1 %

Developing as a Professional Educator

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

18a. Evaluate the effects of actions on student learning and modify plans		1914	85.2%	
accordingly		dnr 332	14.8%	
1 =	Very well	932	48.7%	1.72 Mean
2 =	Well	657	34.3%	^{0.83} <i>SD</i>
3 =	Adequately	280	14.6%	
4 =	Poorly	26	1.4%	
5 =	Not at all	19	1.0%	

18b. Work with colleagues to improve instruction		1917	85.4%		
		dnr 329	14.6%		
1 =	Very well	997	52.0%	1.68	Mean
2 =	Well	620	32.3%	0.84	SD
3 =	Adequately	246	12.8%		
4 =	Poorly	33	1.7%		
5 =	Not at all	21	1.1%		

1916 85.3% 18c. Provide a continuum of support for consultation, collaboration, co-DNP 220 14 70/ teaching to mentoring with multi or interdisciplinary team members

with	multion interdisciplinary team members	550	14.770		
1 =	Very well	886	46.2%	1.78	Mean
2 =	Well	675	35.2%	0.90	SD
3 =	Adequately	273	14.2%		
4 =	Poorly	48	2.5%		
5 =	Not at all	34	1.8%		

19. Overall, how effective was your induction program at developing the skills, habits, or tools you needed to grow your teaching 1909 85.0%					
practice?		DNR 337	15.0%		
1 =	Very effective	966	50.6%	1.63	Mean
2 =	Effective	723	37.9%	0.73	SD
3 =	Somewhat effective	188	9.8%		
4 =	Not at all effective	32	1.7%		

20. Overall, how effective was your induction program at developing							
	you needed to continue in your career as a	1911	85.1%				
teacher?		DNR 335	14.9%				
1 =	Very effective	985	51.5%	1.62	Mean		
2 =	Effective	696	36.4%	0.74	SD		
3 =	Somewhat effective	196	10.3%				
4 =	Not at all effective	34	1.8%				

Demographic Information 1897 84.5% 21. Are you Hispanic or Latino? 15.5% **DNR** 349 No, not Hispanic or Latino 1433 75.5% Yes, Hispanic or Latino 464 24.5%

Statewide Results

Total survey respondents: 2246

Response rate: 93.1 %

22. What is your race? Mark all that apply		1740	77.5%
		dnr 506	22.5%
	American Indian or Alaska Native	74	3.3%
	Chinese	46	2.0%
	Japanese	34	1.5%
	Korean	19	0.8%
	Vietnamese	18	0.8%
	Asian Indian	10	0.4%
	Laotian	4	0.2%
	Cambodian	7	0.3%
	Filipino	61	2.7%
	Hmong	4	0.2%
	Other Asian	23	1.0%
	Black or African American	138	6.1%
	Hawaiian	11	0.5%
	Guamanian	3	0.1%
	Samoan	0	0.0%
	Tahitian	1	0.0%
	Other Pacific Islander	3	0.1%
	White	1432	63.8%

23. In what type of school did you teach during your induction program?		1898	84.5%
Mark all that apply		dnr 348	15.5%
	Public	1692	75.3%
Charter	168	7.5%	
	Private	23	1.0%
	Non-public special education	74	3.3%
	Other	24	1.1%

24. What is your gender?		1900	84.6%
		dnr 346	15.4%
	Female	1447	76.2%
	Male	409	21.5%
	Decline to state	44	2.3%

Response Rate by IHE (Statewide completion rate is 93.1 %)

# Survey Requests Made	Comple	of Program eters who bonded	Name of Institution
4	4	100 %	ALHAMBRA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
12	11	91.67 %	ALLIANT INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
5	4	80 %	ANTELOPE VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
6	4	66.67 %	ANTIOCH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
10	9	90 %	ASPIRE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
74	70	94.59 %	AZUSA PACIFIC UNIVERSITY
10	10	100 %	BAKERSFIELD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
1	1	100 %	BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY
14	13	92.86 %	BRENTWOOD UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
1	1	100 %	CALIFORNIA LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY
1	1	100 %	CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO
1	1	100 %	CALIFORNIA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF, FREMONT
6	5	83.33 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
22	21	95.45 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, DOMINGUEZ HILLS
23	21	91.3 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO
90	84	93.33 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON
10	10	100 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
57	53	92.98 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES
8	7	87.5 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, MONTEREY BAY
58	56	96.55 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE
1	1	100 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
10	10	100 %	CAMPBELL UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
15	12	80 %	CAPISTRANO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
4	4	100 %	CLAREMONT GRADUATE UNIVERSITY
9	9	100 %	CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
3	3	100 %	CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY IRVINE
5	5	100 %	CONEJO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
31	31	100 %	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
10	10	100 %	CORONA-NORCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
5	4	80 %	CUPERTINO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
32	28	87.5 %	DAVIS JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
23	22	95.65 %	EL DORADO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
6	6	100 %	EL RANCHO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
22	22	100 %	ELK GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
6	5	83.33 %	ETIWANDA SCHOOL DISTRICT
13	12	92.31 %	FONTANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
15	13	86.67 %	FREMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
6	5	83.33 %	FREMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
32	28	87.5 %	FRESNO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
3	2	66.67 %	FRESNO PACIFIC UNIVERSITY
2	2	100 %	HACIENDA LA PUENTE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
9	8	88.89 %	HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
16	14	87.5 %	HIGH TECH HIGH
1	1	100 %	HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

All Institutions with 10 or more responders, and any program with 5 to 9 responders with a 100% response rate, will receive a detail report (shown in bold). The rest have insufficient responses to receive a detail report (shown in italics).

Response Rate by IHE (Statewide completion rate is 93.1 %)

# Survey Requests		of Program ters who	
Made	Responded		Name of Institution
16	15	93.75 %	IRVINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
26	26	100 %	KERN COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
4	4	100 %	KERN HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
5	5	100 %	KINGS COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
5	5	100 %	LANCASTER SCHOOL DISTRICT
11	11	100 %	LONG BEACH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
108	98	90.74 %	LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
147	133	90.48 %	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1	1	100 %	LOS BANOS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
2	2	100 %	MADERA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
3	3	100 %	MARIN COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
10	10	100 %	MERCED UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
7	7	100 %	MODESTO CITY SCHOOLS
5	3	60 %	MONTEREY COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
3	3	100 %	MURRIETA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
6	6	100 %	NAPA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
29	28	96.55 %	NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
21	19	90.48 %	NEW HAVEN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
38	37	97.37 %	NEWARK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
18	15	83.33 %	OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
7	6	85.71 %	ORANGE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
24	23	95.83 %	ORANGE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
5	4	80 %	PALMDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT
8	8	100 %	PANAMA-BUENA VISTA UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
13	12	92.31 %	PLACER COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
15	15	100 %	PLEASANTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
30	28	93.33 %	POINT LOMA NAZARENE UNIVERSITY
11	9	81.82 %	POWAY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
17	17	100 %	RIALTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
218	208	95.41 %	RIVERSIDE COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
16	16	100 %	RIVERSIDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
15	14	93.33 %	SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
54	51	94.44 %	SACRAMENTO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
19	19	100 %	SAN BERNARDINO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
97	90	92.78 %	SAN DIEGO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
36	33	91.67 %	SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
35	33	94.29 %	SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1	1	100 %	SAN DIEGUITO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
27	25	92.59 %	SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY
1	0	0 %	SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
5	5	100 %	SAN JOSE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
12	12	100 %	SAN JUAN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
16	15	93.75 %	SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
18	17	94.44 %	SAN MARCOS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

All Institutions with 10 or more responders, and any program with 5 to 9 responders with a 100% response rate, will receive a detail report (shown in bold). The rest have insufficient responses to receive a detail report (shown in italics).

and % of Program

Response Rate by IHE (Statewide completion rate is 93.1 %)

# Survey Requests	Comple	of Program eters who	
Made		onded	Name of Institution
6	5	83.33 %	SAN MATEO - FOSTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
23	22	95.65 %	SAN MATEO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
5	5	100 %	SAN RAMON VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
13	11	84.62 %	SANTA ANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
10	10	100 %	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY EDUCATION OFFICE
13	13	100 %	SANTA CLARA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
3	2	66.67 %	SANTA CLARA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
47	46	97.87 %	SANTA CRUZ COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
1	1	100 %	SANTA MONICA-MALIBU UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
5	5	100 %	SAUGUS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
1	1	100 %	SCHOOL FOR INTEGRATED ACADEMICS AND TECHNOLOGY (SIA TECH)
4	4	100 %	SELMA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
7	7	100 %	SEQUOIA UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
38	35	92.11 %	SONOMA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
11	10	90.91 %	SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
28	25	89.29 %	STANISLAUS COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
3	3	100 %	STOCKTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1	1	100 %	SUMMIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS
21	20	95.24 %	SUTTER COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
42	36	85.71 %	TEACHERS COLLEGE OF SAN JOAQUIN
25	24	96 %	TEHAMA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1	1	100 %	TOURO UNIVERSITY
3	3	100 %	TRACY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
2	2	100 %	TULARE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
31	29	93.55 %	TULARE COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
1	1	100 %	TUSTIN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
46	45	97.83 %	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
54	50	92.59 %	VENTURA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
5	5	100 %	VISTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
21	19	90.48 %	WALNUT VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
9	9	100 %	WEST CONTRA COSTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
11	9	81.82 %	WEST COVINA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
11	10	90.91 %	WILLIAM S. HART UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
51	41		WISEBURN SCHOOL DISTRICT
51	74	30100 %0	