
4F

Information

Educator Preparation Committee

Update on the Commission's Program Surveys and Their Use in Accreditation

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides an update on implementation of the Commission's Program Completer Surveys, Master Teacher Survey, and Employer Survey. The item also discusses how the information from surveys will be used in the accreditation process.

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenters: Cheryl Hickey, Administrator, and Mike Taylor, Consultant, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability

- a) Develop and maintain rigorous, meaningful, and relevant standards that drive program quality and effectiveness for the preparation of the education workforce and are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population.

February 2019

Update on the Commission’s Program Surveys and Their Use in Accreditation

Introduction

This agenda item presents an update on the implementation of the Commission’s Program Completer Surveys, Master Teacher Survey, and Employer Survey. The item also discusses how the survey results are and will be used in the accreditation process.

Background

As part of the work to strengthen and streamline the Commission’s accreditation system, the Commission has developed and implemented a number of program completer surveys, as well as a survey of master teachers and of employers. Work on the Commission’s set of surveys began with the initial convening of the Surveys and Outcomes Data Taskforce Group in 2015. The group’s task was to draft brief but focused surveys that can be completed quickly and conveniently by program completers and other stakeholders to maximize accuracy of results as well as response rates in order to make data meaningful to programs, accreditation staff and volunteers, and the general public. The Commission maintains a [Credential Program Completer Surveys web page](#) where the surveys and statewide results are posted.

Surveys Currently Being Administered

The nine surveys developed and currently being administered by the Commission are listed below:

- Preliminary Multiple Subject Completer Survey
- Preliminary Single Subject Completer Survey
- Preliminary Education Specialist Completer Survey
- Preliminary Administrative Services Completer Survey
- Clear/Induction Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Education Specialist Completer Survey¹
- Clear Administrative Services Completer Survey
- General Educator Completer Survey^{1, 2}
- Master Teacher Survey
- Employer Survey

¹Surveys are new or combined for the 2018-19 academic year.

²Survey for completers of all types of educator preparation programs for which there is no specific completer survey—PPS, CTEL, Teacher Librarian, School Nurse, and Reading programs.

[Appendix A](#) describes each survey, including target respondents and the types of data collected.

Implementation of Program Completer Surveys

The Preliminary and Clear Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, and the Preliminary Administrative Services Program Completer Surveys were originally administered in 2015 to gather information from 2014-15 program completers. Survey links were sent in an email to candidates after they had paid for their credential. Program completers who were recommended for a credential and who paid for their credential between January 1 and August 15, 2015 were the original respondents for these surveys. During the 2015-16 year, the surveys continued to be available to completers after they received their credential.

Starting in the fall of 2016, a change was made to the survey data collection process. Program completers are now routed directly to the completer survey when they are completing the online application process *prior* to paying for their credential. The survey continues to be optional and a completer may still elect to not respond to the survey once it is opened and then be directed back to pay for their credential. However, this change in collection method has greatly increased the response rate. Beginning with the 2016-17 academic year, all completer surveys opened on September 1 and closed on August 31 each year.

An additional survey for Clear Administrative Services completers was implemented in 2017-18 as the initial completers of the Administrative Services Clear Induction programs were finishing their programs. A revised and “combined” clear teaching credential survey was launched in 2018 to replace what were previously two separate surveys for completers of Multiple/Single Subject and Education Specialist induction programs. This change to a single survey for all induction program completers, with the ability to disaggregate the data by the completer’s credential, is consistent with the Commission’s adoption of one set of teacher induction standards for all induction programs. Also in 2018, a new General Educator Survey was launched for completers of Pupil Personnel Services, School Nurse, Teacher Librarian, and Speech-Language Pathology. Survey results for the new and revised surveys implemented in 2018-19 will not be available until fall 2019.

Preliminary Teacher Preparation Surveys and Collaboration with the California State University Survey Process

During the process of developing and revising the surveys, Commission staff met with representatives of the CSU’s Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ). The CTQ has been administering surveys to program completers and employers for many years. The CTQ administers a completer survey from all CSU campuses as well as one year out surveys of both completers and employers. There are additional non-CSU institutions that contract with the CTQ for the one year out completer and employer surveys.

Commission and CSU staff agreed to collaborate to reduce potential survey overload for individuals who complete CSU teacher preparation programs so that they will not be asked to complete two different surveys, one from CTQ and one from the Commission at the time of program completion. Beginning in 2016, the CTQ embedded the questions from the Commission’s program completer surveys (Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist programs) into its own surveys for program completers. This allows

individuals to complete a single survey instead of two different surveys. Commission staff has provided the survey questions and response options to CTQ and CTQ provides data collected for these questions back to the Commission.

Implementation of the Master Teacher and Employer Surveys

The Master Teacher Survey was initially implemented in spring 2016. Commission-approved programs were asked to distribute the link to the Master Teacher Survey to all master or cooperating teachers working with candidates in the final student teaching portion of the program. The online survey is open all year long to accommodate the various schedules used by programs. Programs provide data annually on the total number of Master Teachers through an electronic survey so that a return rate for the Master Teacher survey can be calculated.

The Employer Survey was launched in October 2016. A link to the survey is emailed to over 12,000 public school email addresses and over 3,000 private school email addresses each year. The survey was opened again for its third year of data collection in fall 2018. The site administrator is asked to complete one survey for each program from which newly hired teachers at their school graduated. To minimize the impact of a single candidate, employers are asked to complete the survey only when they have hired two or more new teachers from the same institution during the previous few years. The Commission’s Employer Survey is opened in the fall to avoid confusion in the field with the California State University (CSU) employer survey which is administered statewide each spring. The two surveys take different approaches to collecting the perceptions of employers, as explained below.

Survey	Survey Opens	Survey Closes	Reports Sent to Institutions
Master Teacher Survey	September 1	August 31	Fall
Employer Survey	October 1	December 31	Fall

Changes to Surveys for the 2018-19 Collection Year

For the 2018-19 survey year, edits were made to some of the surveys and questions for clarity based on feedback from the field. Changes were made to specific questions on each of the Preliminary Multiple Subject, Preliminary Single Subject, and Preliminary Education Specialist surveys. An additional answer option was added to the question about gender on all surveys as required by [SB 179](#) (Chap. 853, Stats 2017). For 2019-20, an additional question about sexual orientation will be added to each survey as required by [Assembly Bill 677](#) (Chap. 744 Stats 2017).

Program Completer Survey Response Rates, 2018

Table 1 below shows the robust statewide response rates for each of the seven program completer surveys administered in 2017-18.

Table 1: Program Completer Survey Statewide Response Rates, 2018

Survey	# of Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents	Program Response Rates
Preliminary Multiple Subject	5,630	5,059	89.9%	54.2% - 100%
Preliminary Single Subject	4,499	4,184	93.0%	53.3% - 100%
Preliminary Education Specialist	2,169	2,019	93.1%	54.5% - 100%
Preliminary Administrative Services	2,662	2,585	97.1%	90.9% - 100%
Clear General Education (MS, SS)	10,289	9,854	95.8%	84.2% - 100%
Clear Education Specialist	2,409	2,265	94.0%	73.3% - 100%
Clear Administrative Services	2,198	2,083	94.8%	84.2% - 100%

Master Teacher Survey Response Rates

The Master Teacher Survey and Employer Survey are administered separately from the completer surveys. To be able to calculate response rates for the Master Teacher Survey, programs have been required to submit the total number of master teachers who are working with candidates in their final student teaching placement. Beginning with the 2018-19 surveys, this information will be collected through the [Annual Data System](#) that was developed for use in the Commission’s accreditation system. Table 2 shows the statewide response rates for the Master Teacher Survey.

Table 2: Master Teacher Survey Statewide Response Rates, 2018

# of Master Teachers as reported by programs	# of Respondents	Response Rate
Multiple Subject	1236	25.4%
Single Subject	1166	32.6%
Education Specialist	233	18.0%

Although the low response rate does not allow for findings to be generalized, responses have been informative. Commission staff will continue to strategize as to how response rates for master teachers can be improved.

The employer survey had 1,122 respondents in 2017-18. It is not possible to calculate a traditional response rate for the Employer Survey since we do not know which employers have recently hired completers from individual programs. The survey link and directions are sent to all public and private schools in California.

Statewide and Program Specific Reports

The statewide reports are all posted on the [Credential Program Completer Surveys web page](#) and linked below. These reports include the statewide mean for each of the questions for each of the surveys.

- Preliminary Multiple Subject
- Preliminary Single Subject
- Preliminary Education Specialist
- [Preliminary Administrative Services](#)
- [General Education Induction](#)
- [Clear Education Specialist Induction](#)
- [Employer](#)
- [Master Teacher](#)

In addition to statewide reports, detailed program specific reports showing the results of each of the surveys are provided to programs and accreditation staff. Historically the Commission has required a minimum of ten responses for publishing reports or data at the program level. This is to ensure that candidate responses will not be individually identifiable, a factor which protects candidate privacy. Programs receive program-specific reports as long as at least ten respondents have answered at least one question.

The fine level of detail in the reports (means and standard deviations for their candidates' responses to each question, demographic information, numbers and percentages of candidates who choose each option for each question) ensures transparency of the process and allows programs to identify strengths and areas in need of improvement according to completers and those who work with their completers. Programs with sufficient respondents also have the option of receiving raw data files, minus the demographic information, to conduct their own analysis of survey results.

Programs with Low Numbers of Completers

Because programs find the survey results to be useful for program improvement staff heard from a number of institutions which did not receive a program specific-report because they did not have the minimum number of respondents necessary to produce a report while ensuring privacy promised to the completers for their honest feedback. These institutions were understandably disappointed at not receiving a detailed program-level report. To increase the number of program specific reports available to institutions beginning with the 2017 Survey Reports, staff augmented the rule of ten (10) to also provide reports to any program that had a minimum of five (5) completers where all completers submitted survey responses. To even further increase the numbers of program-specific reports available staff are also looking into the possibility of providing multi-year reports to institutions, so that even if a particular program may not have ten survey respondents in a single year they may be able to meet the minimum number across multiple academic years.

Use of Surveys in the Commission's Accreditation Process

One of the major drivers of implementing a robust survey program was to provide information to be used during the accreditation process. While the survey efforts have been underway for a number of years, 2018-19 is only the second year of having sufficiently strong response rates to allow for the survey results to be used in accreditation in a reliable manner. While the work of incorporating survey results in the accreditation system is well underway, there are ongoing discussions that need to continue to ensure that the results for all institutions are examined thoroughly and that appropriate follow up is taking place when needed.

Use of Program Completer Surveys by Institutions to Inform Unit and Program Improvement

The Commission's Common Standards have long required that institutions develop and implement a comprehensive unit and program continuous improvement process informed by multiple sources of data. The Commission's accreditation system has been focused over the years on ensuring that institutions have these systems in place and that institutions are, in fact, using the data they have to determine where improvements should be made to program coursework and clinical practice to strengthen the preparation that candidates receive.

When the Commission adopted its revised [Common Standards](#) in 2015, it included explicit language that required institutions to include program completer data as part of an institution's assessment system for its programs and the unit. Common Standard 4 reads, in part:

Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.

Institutions are now required to consider performance assessment data, key assessments developed locally, and other indicators of program and unit effectiveness as well as information from program completers.

This is operationalized in the accreditation system in several ways. First, many institutions have long standing efforts to conduct exit interviews upon program completion or survey their completers and to use these data to inform programmatic changes. These efforts provide important insight into an institution's use of data to drive decision-making as is required in Common Standard 4.

Program completer survey data collected by the Commission also provides important information for institutions. The Commission's Program Completer survey data is provided to all programs with sufficient responses in November of each year. The Commission's program completer survey results for those programs for which surveys are available, along with any locally administered program completer surveys, is expected to be part of an institution's comprehensive assessment system. Institutions must demonstrate that they use survey results, as well as other data, to make programmatic and institutional improvements.

At the site visit, teams must determine whether the institution meets Common Standard 4. Institutions that meet this standard have clear processes for collecting data, including survey data, key stakeholders review that data, and that changes and improvements result from the process. A strong source of information to demonstrate alignment with Common Standard 4 includes examples of what the data indicated and examples of changes that were instituted as a result of that data. Survey data is an important component to meeting Common Standard 4.

Use of Program Completer Surveys by Reviewers during Year 5 and 6 of Accreditation Cycle During Common Standard Review (Year 5). In recent updates to the accreditation system, the Commission revised the Common Standard submission process to require more intentional and

targeted information that will allow reviewers to determine how the standards are being addressed. Currently, for Common Standard 4, the Commission has identified key evidence that must be submitted including:

1. A graphic description of the unit assessment system.
2. A list of data sources used in the assessment system.
3. A multi-year unit assessment cycle schedule specifying when they occur and who is responsible for collecting, analyzing and determining modifications.
4. Annual data submission, analysis, and feedback.
5. Survey data, including CTC sponsored survey data and any local survey data/and or exit interview data.

For this part of the review, the reviewers are looking to ensure that the institution has a process in place and that they are engaged in systematic review of all of the outcomes data available to them, including survey data.

During Site Visits (Year 6) – Relevant survey data is reviewed by all members of the site visit team. A copy of the state’s program completer survey for that institution is provided to the team and they use it to a) inform the focus of their questions in interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, program personnel and others; b) review programmatic changes that the institution and program have made as a result of some of the findings of the survey data as well as other data; and c) use the information gathered to determine whether the institution is meeting standards – both the Common Standards and all relevant program standards.

Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) that review the Common Standards in Year 5 also serve on the site visit team in Year 6. The institutions undergoing a site visit are required to include the data from the surveys on their accreditation website. All Common Standards site visit reviewers are expected to be prepared to ask questions that will determine if the institution is meeting Common Standard 4. During interviews and review of evidence the Common Standards reviewers on the site visit team are ensuring that, in fact, the institution is implementing a comprehensive assessment system as well as following up on any issues that arose during the Common Standards review in Year 5. Common Standards reviewers include questions about how the survey data is used by the institution to ensure that these data are being used as part of the assessment system. Commission consultants assigned to the institutions are expected to be familiar with the data results and to ensure that the reviewers are following up on whatever the data may indicate.

Additionally, Program Review team members use the survey data themselves to follow up on any program specific issues that the data may indicate. For example, if survey data indicated that a number of completers were unsatisfied with a particular aspect of their program, the site visit reviewer assigned to that program is instructed to use that information to formulate questions – to candidates, to completers, to faculty and program personnel – to find out more about the issue, to determine if anything has been or is being considered to change to improve

the outcome, and to ensure that the standards are being addressed sufficiently. Depending on the responses and the information they were able to glean from the surveys, interviews, and other available evidence, the program reviewer will make a determination about the relevant standard.

As of spring 2018, the Board of Institutional Reviewers training now includes a focus on the use of program survey data as one source of evidence that must be examined by reviewers to inform the determination of whether a program is meeting standards. This will continue to be included in BIR training in the future.

Once the Commission's program completer survey data response rates were improved significantly (2017-18), site visit team members were required to consider survey results in helping them target areas to investigate during accreditation visits and inform decisions on the standards. In 2018-19, there has been an effort to make more transparent how the teams have used the survey data to support their decisions by including more information in site visits reports as to what the survey data indicated. An example from a recent team report for Greenfield Union School District's accreditation report is as follows:

Program Completer Survey data for 2017-18 garnered responses from 17 completers (100%). Fifteen of the candidates were paired from the point of hire to two months into their teaching assignment. All 17 finished within two years. All 17 completers found their support provider to be helpful/very helpful in impacting student learning. Additionally, all 17 thought they were well matched with their support provider. Overall, after close review of the survey data, the team felt satisfied with determining that the program had successfully served these completers of the teacher induction program.

Ensuring that teams describe in the accreditation report the data for the institution they have reviewed and how that data informed their decision making is an ongoing process. As the information on the Annual Data System becomes more useful, for example, when performance assessment data is able to be incorporated, it will be critical for review teams to ensure that all available data is used to inform decision making.

Use of Program Completer Surveys for the Institutions in Years 1-5 and 7 of the Accreditation Cycle

While the use of survey results for institutions hosting a site visit (those in Years 5 and 6) is an important aspect of accreditation, the potential impact of the information that can be gleaned from these survey data will not be maximized unless they are used on a continuous basis for program improvement by all institutions regardless of the timing of their site visit. These surveys have enormous opportunity for impact at the institution, program, and on a state level.

The Commission's accreditation system is based on a 7-year cycle with 1/7 of institutions hosting a site visit in any given year. It is important that a system be established to ensure that the program completer data results for all of the remaining institutions not hosting a site visit in

a particular year are reviewed and that appropriate action can be taken to address any potential issues that may be identified. The plan, as it is currently envisioned, is outlined below.

Developing Efficiencies and Tools that Assist Staff in Identifying Potential Issues

The focus of Commission efforts as they relate to the program completer surveys in recent years has been on the development of the instruments themselves as well as to ensure that structures are in place for successful implementation. Now that there have been several years of successful implementation and the response rates are healthy, the work has shifted to determining how systematically summarize and analyze survey data for use by institutions, by the Committee on Accreditation (COA), by the Commission, and where appropriate, by the public.

Annually, staff will review all survey results including both statewide program completer results and those for individual institutions in order to identify any potential issues that will need to be followed up in some manner. The review of data for over 250 institutions, sponsoring approximately 1,000 programs, represents a significant workload. In order to accomplish this work with existing staff, developing efficiencies for identifying areas or institutions needing further examination will be of critical importance. Staff is considering ways in which some of the work of “flagging” potential issues may be automated or assisted by technology. For example, staff has begun to explore the possibility of using internal dashboards to highlight survey results for each institution including those results that may indicate areas for the institution and the COA to take note. More information will be made available as staff is able to develop and explore the use of internal dashboards and whether they will be useful for identifying potential issues.

In addition, while employer surveys and mentor/master teacher surveys are an important part of this work, the response rates for these surveys continue to be challenging, as discussed earlier in this item. Staff will continue to explore strategies for increasing the response rate in order to use the results more effectively.

Identifying Potential Issues for Further Examination

Survey data has the potential to surface numerous issues that support continuous program improvement. Positive results across the board on a given question could indicate that institutions are implementing the standards as envisioned. More “negative” results across the board for a given question may indicate that institutions, in general, are struggling with implementation of some of the standards and may require any number of interventions – either additional technical assistance from the Commission, clarification of the applicable requirements and standards, a better understanding from the field of the obstacles to implementation, and even, perhaps, some further policy direction from the Commission.

Negative results outside the norm from a specific institution, either on a given question or on many questions, may raise issues that need to be further explored and examined through the accreditation system.

Some of the questions that will guide staff review of survey data include:

- 1) *Does the data appear to be consistently positive for certain institutions?* For institutions with results that are consistently positive, no further action is needed. The survey results will continue to be provided to the accreditation site visit team at the appropriate times during the accreditation cycle and will be used by the visiting team to inform, along with all the other available information, their decisions on standards.
- 2) *Where questions are closely tied to standards language, can issues be identified that indicate that a program may not be meeting the standard or precondition?* For example, the induction survey asks candidates to identify when the individual had been assigned a mentor. Induction Precondition #2 requires that the program identify and assign a mentor within 30 days of the participant's enrollment in the program.

Staff can review the responses across all induction programs to determine if institutions are meeting this precondition. If the responses indicate that the majority of candidates are not being assigned a mentor until more than three months after enrolling in a program, assigned a support provider but never worked with them, or never assigned a support provider, there would be a good rationale for some kind of follow up with that program.

The type of follow up that may be needed could vary significantly depending on whether the issue relates to a precondition or a more substantive issue of program quality. For example, on the induction survey, completers are also asked to respond to this prompt: "I would describe my mentor's skills in meeting my needs as..." with choices "unable to meet my needs," "minimally skilled," "skilled," and "highly skilled." If numerous candidates answer this question with "unable to meet needs" and "minimally skilled" this may indicate that the program has an area of concern regarding selection, training, and evaluation of mentors.

- 3) *What does the distribution of more "negative" results look like and how does that change the follow up needed?* Staff will review the data to determine how negative responses are distributed across similar programs.
 - a. Does a single institution have numerous "negative" survey findings indicating perhaps greater oversight and follow up is necessary?
 - b. Do numerous programs have the same "negative" results for the same question indicating perhaps a broader concern with the implementation of a particular aspect of the program?
 - c. Are there any programs where there exists an outlier on some of the data that may indicate a focused and perhaps immediate intervention is necessary?
 - d. Is there any other relevant information that staff should review prior to indicating a possible course of action? This might include, when available, examination pass rates including performance assessment data and data in the annual accreditation data system. The triangulation of data has always been and continues to be an important feature of accreditation.

- 4) *What does the data show over time?* Staff will review survey data longitudinally, to the extent possible, to determine if there are trends over time. In particular, this is helpful when standards are new to provide insight as to what challenges institutions may be experiencing as they transition to new standards. In addition, reviewing the data over time will help to identify institutions that have a persistent issue identified year after year. This may require additional follow up to determine if appropriate changes are being implemented to improve outcomes.

Once potential issues are identified, Commission staff will work to determine an appropriate course of action. In many cases, consultants with expertise in the program area in question could work closely with the institution to ensure that it addresses the potential concerns, understand any unique context that may explain the results, and monitor future survey results for any changes. If the data indicates more serious potential concerns, the issues appear to persist over time, or where institutional personnel fail to recognize and take action to address the concerns, the COA could be notified at any of its regularly scheduled meetings and more formal action could be taken such as scheduling a focused or full site visit.

Developing an Annual Report for the COA

The expanded survey team would be responsible for developing an annual report that would go to the COA each year. This report would contain a summary of the survey data results, information about any trends identified where institutions may be having difficulty, information about the survey results for specific institutions for which the data indicates that there are topics or issues that need to be explored further, summary information about work staff had done with institutions to address some of the potential concerns, and recommendations for formal follow up for the COA to consider. Over time, this report should also look at the survey data longitudinally, to the extent possible, to determine if any changes/improvements can be identified and what can be learned from these differences over time.

Determining what processes should be followed once a potential issue is identified will be important. For example, what kind of notification will be provided to institutions? What opportunities will be available for institutions to provide a response or an action plan? How much time will be provided for institutions to address the potential concerns raised? These are all issues that the COA will need to discuss further and determine over the next few months.

Inclusion in the COA Annual Report to the Commission

The COA reports to the Commission each December on the prior year's accreditation activities. It is appropriate that the results of the review of the program completer surveys are summarized in this report and any action or follow up be included for the Commission's information.

Transparency, Accountability, and Complexity of Using Surveys

As the Commission works to fully implement surveys in its accreditation system a number of issues will need to be addressed. These include, but are not limited to, how to interpret and use survey findings with small programs that have few responses, transparency of data and under

what circumstances the data should be made available on public websites and dashboards, the possible misinterpretation of data, issues related to survey question structure or language usage in questions, and the potential for an overreliance on a single source of data. The Commission staff, in collaboration with the COA, will continue to monitor and address these and other data related questions.

Next Steps

Based on the Commission's discussion, staff will continue to work with the COA to further incorporate the use of survey data in the accreditation processes.

Appendix A

Survey and Respondents	Data to be Collected All surveys collect demographic information (gender and ethnicity)
<p>Preliminary Multiple Subject Completer Survey Those who completed a preliminary multiple subject credential program and who have been recommended for a credential.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of preparation they received to teach according to the TPEs • Quality of field experiences including student teaching • Quality of preparation they received to teach content for multiple subjects including specific skills in reading and mathematics • Overall quality of their preparation program
<p>Preliminary Single Subject Completer Survey Those who completed a preliminary single subject credential program and who have been recommended for a credential.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of preparation they received to teach according to the TPEs • Quality of field experiences including student teaching • Quality of preparation they received to teach content for single subjects • Quality of their preparation program.
<p>Preliminary Education Specialist Completer Survey Those who completed a preliminary education specialist credential program and who have been recommended for a credential.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of preparation they received to teach according to the TPEs • Quality of preparation they received to teach students with special needs • Quality of field experiences including student teaching • Quality of preparation they received to teach content including specific skills in reading and mathematics • Overall quality of their preparation program
<p><u>Preliminary Administrative Services Completer Survey</u> Those who completed a preliminary administrative services credential program and who have been recommended for a credential. <u>2017-18 Statewide Report</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of preparation they received to be an effective school site administrator according to the CAPEs • Quality of field experiences and other program experiences • Quality of their preparation program • Information about completers' pathways into and reasons for pursuing school leadership preparation
<p><u>Clear Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist Induction</u> Those who completed a multiple subject, single subject or education specialist induction program and who have been recommended for a clear credential. <u>2017-18 GenEd Statewide Report</u> <u>2017-18 SpEd Statewide Report</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of preparation they received to teach according to the CSTPs • Overall quality of their clear/induction program including interactions with support providers

<p align="center">Survey and Respondents</p>	<p align="center">Data to be Collected All surveys collect demographic information (gender and ethnicity)</p>
<p>Clear Administrative Services Induction Survey Those who completed an administrative services clear credential or induction program and who have been recommended for a clear credential.</p> <p>2017-18 Statewide Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of preparation they received to be an effective school site administrator according to the CAPEs • Quality of field experiences and other program experiences • Overall quality of their clear/induction program including interactions with support providers • Information about completers’ pathways into and reasons for pursuing school leadership preparation
<p>General Educator Those who completed Pupil Personnel Services, School Nurse, Teacher Librarian, Speech-language Pathology, and Reading added authorization programs. New Survey for 2018-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of preparation received • Information about fieldwork or clinical practice
<p>Master Teacher Those who serve in the field as master or cooperating teachers supervising student teachers for preliminary multiple subject and single subject credential programs.</p> <p>2017-18 Statewide Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of the preparedness of student teachers they work with to teach according to the CSTPs • Quality of the preparedness of student teachers they work with to teach appropriate content for their credential/assignment • Quality of the training, orientation and support the program provides to master teachers • Quality of the quality of field experiences provided • Overall quality of preparation of candidates
<p>Employer Survey School site administrators who recently hired one or more graduates from a specific program to work as new teachers at their school.</p> <p>2017-18 Statewide Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of preparation of recent graduates (last 2-3 years) from the specific program or institution to teach according to the CSTPs