

Update and Discussion of Survey Data in Accreditation February 2018

Overview of this Report

This agenda item presents information on the current implementation of the Commission's survey efforts. In addition, this agenda item provides an opportunity for the COA to discuss these efforts and to continue to develop the expectations for the information and its use in the accreditation process and decisions.

Background

As part of the accreditation strengthening and streamlining effort the Commission identified survey data as an important aspect of building and implementing an outcomes based accreditation system. At the February 2018 Commission meeting, the Commission discussed the current Commission survey efforts. The Commission agenda item is included beginning on page 2 of this item. The COA is charged with determining how best to use the data for accreditation purposes and to establish processes and procedures that will ensure this data is a critical component of an outcomes based accreditation system.

For COA Discussion

Based on the information provided in Commission agenda item, COA is asked to discuss the following:

- 1) Ways in which accreditation teams should use the survey data to inform areas needing further examination or to identify possible program strengths.
- 2) Ways in which accreditation teams should use the survey data to streamline the accreditation review process.
- 3) Ways in which the staff and COA may use the data to identify programs or institutions in which additional review may be needed to ensure quality and adherence with standards.

In addition, staff will identify any issues that the current survey results raise for further discussion with the COA.

Next Steps

Based on the COA discussion, staff will move forward with the use of survey data in accreditation.

4G

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: Mike Taylor, Consultant, and Teri Clark, Director, Professional Services Division

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, and provides results from the 2016-17 surveys. The item also discusses how the survey results 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 Task 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 eight 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 and Single Subject Completer Survey
- Clear Education Specialist Induction Completer Survey
- Master Teacher Survey
- Employer Survey

[Appendix A](#) describes each survey, including target respondents and the types of data collected. An additional survey for Clear Administrative Services completers is being put into place this year as the initial completers of the Administrative Services Induction programs will be finishing their programs this coming spring.

Implementation of Program Completer Surveys

The preliminary and clear Multiple/Single Subject 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. In 2016 the preliminary and clear surveys were again administered to candidates who were recommended for a credential and who paid for their credential between January 1 and August 15, 2016. Starting in the fall of 2016, a change was made to the survey data collection method. Program completers are now routed directly to the completer survey when they are completing the online application process prior to paying for their credential. A completer may elect to not respond to the survey once it is opened and then be directed back to pay for their credential. 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.

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 their final student teaching portion of the program. The online survey is open all year long to accommodate the various schedules used by programs. Staff requests that annually programs provide data 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 was emailed to over 12,000 public school email addresses and over 3,000 private school email addresses. The survey was opened again for its second year of data collection in fall 2017. 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 new teachers from the same institution. 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	October
Employer Survey	October 1	December 31	October

Cooperation 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 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.

Program Completer Survey Response Rates, 2017

Table 1 below shows the robust statewide response rates for each of the six program completer surveys administered.

Table 1: Program Completer Survey Statewide Response Rates, 2017

Survey	# of Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents	Program Response Rates
Preliminary Multiple Subject	4,355	4,213	96.7%	80.0% - 100%
Preliminary Single Subject	3,814	3,699	97.0%	76.2% - 100%
Preliminary Education Specialist	2,080	2,000	96.2%	70.0% - 100%
Preliminary Administrative Services	2,307	2,217	96.1%	80.0% - 100%
Clear General Education (MS, SS)	10,694	10,151	94.9%	75.0% - 100%
Clear Education Specialist	2,410	2,246	93.1%	80.4% - 100%

Master Teacher Survey Response Rates

The Master Teacher Survey and Employer Survey are administered separately from the completer surveys. Table 2 shows the statewide response rates for the Master Teacher Survey.

Table 2: Master Teacher Survey Statewide Response Rates, 2017

Survey	# of Master Teachers	# of Respondents	Response Rate
Master Teacher Survey	10,438	3,597	34.5%

The employer survey had 835 respondents in 2017. 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.

Survey Findings

The tables below show demographic information about the survey respondents and highlights some of the information obtained from the surveys.

Table 3: Demographic Information of Program Completers by Percent of Respondents, 2017

Survey	Preliminary				Clear	
	MS	SS	Ed Sp	Administrative Services	General Ed (MS/SS)	Ed Sp
What is your Gender?						
Female	86.0	54.9	76.2	71.2	73.5	76.2
Male	12.6	42.5	22.0	27.5	24.6	21.5
Decline to state	1.5	2.6	1.9	1.3	1.9	2.3
Are you Hispanic or Latino?						
No, not Hispanic or Latino	71.2	70.9	70.4	71.3	73.4	75.5
Yes, Hispanic or Latino	28.8	29.1	29.6	28.7	26.6	24.5
What is your ethnicity? Mark all that apply						
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.7	3.9	3.0	2.7	3.9	3.3
Chinese	2.9	4.2	2.1	2.3	3.4	2.0
Japanese	1.4	1.7	1.1	1.1	1.5	1.5
Korean	1.7	1.9	1.3	1.3	1.7	0.8
Vietnamese	1.0	1.6	1.0	0.7	1.2	0.8
Asian Indian	0.8	1.1	0.8	0.8	1.0	0.4
Laotian	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.2
Cambodian	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3
Filipino	2.3	2.8	3.0	2.5	2.4	2.7
Hmong	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2
Other Asian	1.1	1.2	0.7	0.8	1.0	1.0
Black or African American	3.6	3.9	5.8	7.4	3.4	6.1
Hawaiian	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.5
Guamanian	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.1
Samoan	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.0
Tahitian	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
Other Pacific Islander	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.1
White	62.9	65.0	60.9	61.9	68.6	63.8

Table 4 shows responses to questions which occur across surveys about candidate impressions of overall program quality and field experience. For all surveys, more than half of the respondents indicated that the preparation programs were “Very Effective” in developing the skills or tools needed to become a teacher or a leader. When asked about the field experience, nearly three-fourths (71.9 percent) of the teaching and more than four-fifths (88.4 percent) of administrative program completers responded that they “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” that the field experience helped to integrate and apply major ideas developed through the program coursework.

Table 4: Selected Findings from Program Completer Surveys by Percent of Respondents, 2017

Survey	Preliminary				Clear	
	MS	SS	Ed Sp	Admin	General Ed (MS/SS)	Ed Sp
Overall, how effective was your teacher preparation program at developing the skills or tools you needed to become a teacher? (for administrative services candidates – help you develop the skills and tools you needed to become a school leader)						
Not at all effective	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.1	2.5	1.7
Somewhat effective	6.6	8.6	8.1	4.1	13.6	9.8
Effective	34.6	35.9	36.9	28.7	37.4	37.9
Very effective	58.2	54.6	54.4	67.1	46.5	50.6
Field Experience						
My field experience helped me integrate and apply the major ideas developed through program coursework (for administrative services candidates – my field experience helped me to prepare me for my role as a school leader)						
Strongly disagree	18.8	15.4	14.1	2.7	Not applicable	
Disagree	12.5	12.5	8.3	0.4		
Neutral	4.5	6.2	5.6	4.3		
Agree	24.4	26.9	29.5	36.1		
Strongly agree	39.8	39.0	42.4	56.5		

Overall, the statewide responses for most of the questions for most of the surveys were positive with high means (above 4.0 on a scale of 1-5). However, as shown in Table 5, the statewide mean was slightly lower for the question, “How much opportunity did you have to do each of the following for Content for Multiple Subjects: Mathematics.” Similar responses were observed for the Education Specialist survey also. This type of analysis and observation helps identify patterns of response for similar questions across surveys. This will give an overall picture of all program completers for an institution and provide feedback on specific area where program improvements are needed.

Table 5: Selected Findings from Program Completer Surveys, Content for Mathematics, 2017

In your teacher preparation program, how much opportunity did you have to do each of the following?		
Survey Responses (<i>1=None, 2=Touched on it briefly, 3=Spent time discussing or doing, 4=Explored in some Depth, 5=Extensive opportunity</i>)	MS Preliminary	ES Preliminary
	Mean	Mean
a. Learn typical difficulties students have with place value	3.65	3.37
b. Learn typical difficulties students have with fractions	3.63	3.29
c. Use representations to show explicitly why a procedure works	3.86	3.44
d. Provide that a solution is valid or that a method works for all similar cases	3.76	3.37
e. Study, critique, or adapt math curriculum materials	3.93	3.61
f. Learn how to facilitate math learning for students in small groups	4.01	3.75
g. Adapt math lessons for students with diverse needs and learning styles	4.05	3.84

In your teacher preparation program, how much opportunity did you have to do each of the following?		
Survey Responses (1=None, 2=Touched on it briefly, 3=Spent time discussing or doing, 4=Explored in some Depth, 5=Extensive opportunity)	MS	ES
	Preliminary	Preliminary
	Mean	Mean
h. Practice what you learned about teaching math in your field experience	4.20	3.82
i. Study national or state standards for mathematics	4.15	3.71
j. Review local district mathematics curriculum	3.75	3.43

Statewide survey responses about opportunity to learn to teach mathematics content show relatively high mean responses according to the 1 to 5 scale, indicating that on average statewide completers had some opportunity to discuss or try each of the practices asked about. Overall means for completers of preliminary multiple subject credentials were slightly higher than means for completers of preliminary education specialist credentials, indicating that the MS completers as a group felt like they had slightly more opportunity in this specific area than the ES completers.

Statewide and Program Specific Reports

The statewide reports are posted on the [Credential Program Completer Surveys web page](#) and linked below.

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

In addition to statewide reports, detailed program specific reports showing the results of each of the surveys are provided to programs and accreditation staff. Programs receive responses to the demographic questions as long as at least ten respondents have selected the response option. This fine level of detail in the reports 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 to conduct their own analysis of survey results. 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 with Low Numbers of Completers

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. The rule for which programs receive program specific reports is a) there are a minimum of 10 responses for the program or b) there are between five and 10 completers and 100 percent of the completers submitted responses to the survey.

Use of Survey Data in the Accreditation Process

A key purpose of the surveys is to inform program improvements at the institution. Now that the Completer Surveys are gathering information from at least 90 percent of the program completers statewide, the surveys provide a wealth of information for accreditation site visit teams to review and consider alongside documentary evidence and interviews. Pursuant to the Commission objective to streamline the process where it is feasible to do so, a high response rate that is also very positive about a program could result in the need for fewer program completers, master teachers, or employers to be interviewed during an accreditation site visit. This means that the number of individuals that are interviewed in this new system for some institutions/programs might be substantially lower than for others and those of the past visits.

In addition, staff has determined that data from the survey should be provided in the accreditation site visit report with other data where appropriate. Site visit teams will be including more information in site visit reports from the Completer, Master Teacher, and Employer surveys.

Staff plans to review the Completer Surveys to identify outlier programs. An outlier program would be one where the program's responses are significantly better or worse than the state as a whole. For example, the Preliminary teacher preparation program completer surveys all ask how often the candidate was observed by the program supervisor. The statewide data for this question varies across programs as shown in the table below. Although there is a small percentage of completers statewide who report being observed only once or twice, identifying the programs that have the largest group of respondents that report being observed infrequently would give staff information to talk with the program leaders, and potentially, lead to information about programs that may require additional review by either staff, the Committee on Accreditation (COA), or a small team of reviewers. Conversely, staff would have information on programs where all completers report that they were observed and received substantial feedback from their program supervisors. This can assist in identifying best practices that other programs can consider. Much like a stop light, where green means go, yellow means caution and red requires the car to stop, the rows in Tables 6 and 7 are shaded to identify the responses that are most worrisome (red), the responses that indicate caution (yellow) and the responses that meet the Commission's expectations (green).

An essential task that staff is working on with the COA is to develop the process whereby staff reviews the program reports and identifies the programs where the survey results are the most problematic. For the 2017 survey, between 2.3 percent and 5.8 percent of preliminary teacher preparation program completers report that their program supervisor observed them only once or twice during the Preliminary preparation program. Although these percentages seem fairly low, if the individuals who responded with 'Once or Twice' or '3-5 times' are all in a few of the programs—it is important to communicate with those programs.

Table 6: Selected Findings from Program Completer Surveys by Percent of Respondents, 2017

How Often Were You Observed Teaching by your Program Supervisor?			
Responses	Multiple Subject	Single Subject	Education Specialist
Once or Twice	2.3 %	3.3 %	5.8 %
3-5 times	18.1 %	8.8 %	14.3 %
6-10 times	37.8 %	19.7 %	25.2 %
11-15 times	19.2 %	33.2 %	16.3 %
16-20 times	12.7 %	27.2 %	13.0 %
More than 20 times	9.8 %	7.9 %	25.5 %

The surveys for Induction programs ask completers when they enrolled in the Induction program compared to when the school year began, how long after enrollment they were assigned a support provider, and how often they met with their support provider.

Table 7: Selected Findings from Program Completer Surveys by Percent of Respondents, 2017

How long after you were hired into an assignment that requires a preliminary credential were you enrolled in an Induction program	General Education	Special Education
At the time of hire or before beginning work with students	41.8 %	35.8 %
within 1-2 months of beginning my assignment	24.3 %	17.7 %
Within 3-5 months of beginning my assignment	3.0 %	3.2 %
More than 5 months after beginning my assignment	4.6 %	4.8 %
One year or more after beginning my assignment	26.2 %	38.6 %
How long after you were enrolled in a program did you begin working with a Support Provider?	General Education	Special Education
Within one month of enrolling	87.1 %	83.2 %
Within two months of enrolling	8.2 %	9.4 %
More than three months after enrolling	2.0 %	3.8 %
I was assigned a Support Provider but never worked with the SP	0.3 %	0.5 %
I was never assigned a Support Provider	2.4 %	3.1 %
On average, how frequently did you and your Support Provider have meaningful communication about teaching?	General Education	Special Education
Daily	9.1 %	9.8 %
Two or three times per week	22.9 %	22.4 %
Weekly	50.4 %	45.4 %
Twice per month	13.8 %	16.0 %
Less than twice per month	3.8 %	6.5 %

Similar to the use of information from the Preliminary program surveys, if staff analyzes which programs have the most completers reporting that they enrolled in the program a year or more after beginning their assignments, were never assigned a support provider, or met very infrequently with support providers, staff will be able to identify programs with which to problem solve. Further, by identifying programs that report more early assignment and more frequent

interactions, staff will be able to identify programs that are using best practices and develop a plan to share the best practices across all Induction programs.

Next Steps

Staff is developing a short survey for the completers of programs other than teaching, induction and administration. These programs include the Pupil Personnel Services, School Nurse, Teacher Librarian, Speech-language Pathology, Reading added authorization, and the Special Education added authorizations programs. The plan is to ask all completers the same questions – focusing on aspects of the programs that are common.

Topics to be surveyed include, but are not limited to:

- The clarity of the credential requirements
- The knowledge and skills of the faculty
- The connection between the coursework and field experiences
- How well prepared the completer feels at the time of program completion

This new survey will be piloted in 2018. Staff will identify all program completers from the selected educator preparation programs who were recommended for credentials between September 1, 2017 and August 31, 2018 and invite them to complete the survey, using the same collection methodology as with other program completers. In fall 2018, staff will be distributing program reports when the program responses meet the threshold identified above.

Now that the Completer Surveys have robust response rates, staff is exploring the process of moving survey data into the Data Warehouse and publishing aggregate data in the form of data dashboards. The initial thinking is that dashboards would allow individuals to look at the aggregated survey data across the state, for the different the segments that prepare educators (CSU, UC, Private/Independent institution, and LEAs).

The COA will be discussing the survey results at its February 2018 meeting. The Site Visits this spring will be the first time that the accreditation teams will be using these statewide survey data for accreditation purposes. In addition, staff will identify if there are any outliers in the data and discuss that information with any institution in that situation. And finally, at the end of accreditation site visits this spring, questions will be included in the End of Visit Evaluation of the accreditation system about the best use of data from the surveys to inform the accreditation team's questions and decisions. These results will be discussed further with the COA.

Appendix A

Survey and Respondents	Data to be Collected
<p>Preliminary Multiple Subject Completer 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 • Demographic information (ethnicity and gender)
<p>Preliminary Single Subject Completer 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. • Demographic information (ethnicity and gender)
<p>Preliminary Education Specialist Completer 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 • Demographic information (ethnicity and gender)
<p>Preliminary Administrative Services Completer Those who completed a preliminary administrative services credential program and who have been recommended for a credential.</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 • Demographic information (ethnicity and gender)
<p>General Education (Multiple Subject/Single Subject) Induction and Clear Credential Those who completed a multiple subject or single subject clear credential or induction program and who have been recommended for a clear credential.</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 • Demographic information (ethnicity and gender)

Survey and Respondents	Data to be Collected
<p>Clear Education Specialist Induction Those who completed an education specialist clear credential or induction program and who have been recommended for a clear credential.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of preparation they received to teach according to the CSTPs • Quality of preparation they received to teach students with special needs • Overall quality of their clear/induction program including interactions with support providers • Demographic information (ethnicity and gender)
<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>	<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 to • Overall quality of preparation of student teachers by the program
<p>Employer School site administrators who recently hired one or more graduates from a specific program to work as new teachers at their school.</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

Appendix B

Completer Survey Response Rates by Institution – Preliminary Credentials

* Indicates no report was produced for the program/institution because of low number of respondents. Blank cell indicates the program is not offered at the institution

Institution	Multiple Subject			Single Subject			Education Specialist			Administrative Services		
	# Completers	# of Responses	% Respond	# Completers	# of Responses	% Respond	# Completers	# of Responses	% Respond	# Completers	# of Responses	% Respond
ACADEMY OF ART UNIVERSITY				4	*	*						
ALLIANT INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY	17	17	100.0%	33	32	97.0%	29	28	96.6%			
ANIMO LEADERSHIP CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL (GREEN DOT PUBLIC SCHOOLS)										4	*	*
ANTIOCH UNIVERSITY	24	23	95.8%				7	5	71.4%			
AZUSA PACIFIC UNIVERSITY	69	69	100.0%	71	65	91.5%	112	106	94.6%	47	47	100.0%
BARD COLLEGE				10	10	100.0%						
BAY AREA SCHOOL OF ENTERPRISE (REACH INSTITUTE)	23	19	82.6%	10	8	80.0%				30	30	100.0%
BIOLA UNIVERSITY	43	41	95.3%	17	17	100.0%	4	*	*			
BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY	98	95	96.9%	108	103	95.4%	103	99	96.1%	44	43	97.7%
CAL POLY, POMONA	55	55	100.0%	89	88	98.9%	31	30	96.8%	65	63	96.9%
CAL POLY, SAN LUIS OBISPO	68	68	100.0%	77	77	100.0%	15	15	100.0%	11	11	100.0%
CALIFORNIA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY	34	33	97.1%	38	34	89.5%	21	21	100.0%	5	5	100.0%
CALIFORNIA LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY	25	24	96.0%	37	36	97.3%	27	23	85.2%	59	57	96.6%
CALSTATE TEACH	477	471	98.7%	1	*	*						
CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY	8	8	100.0%	16	16	100.0%	17	17	100.0%			
CLAREMONT GRADUATE UNIVERSITY	8	7	87.5%	22	21	95.5%	12	12	100.0%			
CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY IRVINE	32	32	100.0%	25	25	100.0%	11	11	100.0%	211	203	96.2%
CSU, BAKERSFIELD	109	105	96.3%	74	73	98.6%	34	34	100.0%	29	27	93.1%
CSU, CHANNEL ISLANDS	38	38	100.0%	31	30	96.8%	13	13	100.0%	19	19	100.0%
CSU, CHICO	42	39	92.9%	58	58	100.0%	18	16	88.9%	6	5	83.3%
CSU, DOMINGUEZ HILLS	28	28	100.0%	50	48	96.0%	56	56	100.0%	120	118	98.3%
CSU, EAST BAY	64	62	96.9%	40	39	97.5%	12	12	100.0%	104	101	97.1%
CSU, FRESNO	116	114	98.3%	82	81	98.8%	15	15	100.0%	68	64	94.1%
CSU, FULLERTON	146	142	97.3%	171	168	98.2%	100	100	100.0%	39	37	94.9%
CSU, LONG BEACH	59	59	100.0%	228	226	99.1%	21	21	100.0%	43	41	95.3%

Institution	Multiple Subject			Single Subject			Education Specialist			Administrative Services		
	# Completers	# of Responses	% Respond	# Completers	# of Responses	% Respond	# Completers	# of Responses	% Respond	# Completers	# of Responses	% Respond
CSU, LOS ANGELES	72	71	98.6%	64	63	98.4%	47	46	97.9%	25	23	92.0%
CSU, MONTEREY BAY	36	35	97.2%	17	17	100.0%	18	18	100.0%			
CSU, NORTHRIDGE	78	75	96.2%	89	89	100.0%	43	42	97.7%	67	64	95.5%
CSU, SACRAMENTO	61	57	93.4%	51	51	100.0%	17	16	94.1%	18	17	94.4%
CSU, SAN BERNARDINO	73	72	98.6%	108	106	98.1%	20	20	100.0%	42	37	88.1%
CSU, SAN MARCOS	26	26	100.0%	1	*	*	30	28	93.3%	19	18	94.7%
CSU, STANISLAUS	69	66	95.7%	29	28	96.6%	9	7	77.8%	76	75	98.7%
DOMINICAN UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA	34	31	91.2%	29	29	100.0%	14	14	100.0%			
FRESNO PACIFIC UNIVERSITY	75	73	97.3%	49	48	98.0%	35	35	100.0%	25	22	88.0%
HEBREW UNION COLLEGE	5	5	100.0%									
HIGH TECH HIGH	8	8	100.0%	14	13	92.9%	12	10	83.3%			
HOLY NAMES UNIVERSITY	5	5	100.0%	6	6	100.0%	3	*	*			
HOPE INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY	7	7	100.0%	3	*	*				3	*	*
HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY	2	*	*	4	*	*	2	*	*	14	12	85.7%
HUMPHREYS UNIVERSITY	4	*	*									
LA SIERRA UNIVERSITY	3	*	*									
LOS ANGELES COE							23	23	100.0%			
LOS ANGELES USD	5	5	100.0%				140	132	94.3%			
LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY	165	157	95.2%	112	107	95.5%	80	78	97.5%	3	*	*
MADERA COE							3	*	*	67	66	98.5%
MILLS COLLEGE	10	10	100.0%	21	16	76.2%	3	*	*	3	*	*
MOUNT SAINT MARY'S UNIVERSITY	10	8	80.0%	8	8	100.0%	11	11	100.0%			
MT. DIABLO USD	6	6	100.0%	13	13	100.0%	13	12	92.3%			
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY	203	194	95.6%	280	270	96.4%	353	341	96.6%	299	292	97.7%
NOTRE DAME DE NAMUR UNIVERSITY	37	36	97.3%	25	24	96.0%	23	22	95.7%	3	*	*
ORANGE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION										59	54	91.5%
PACIFIC OAKS COLLEGE	5	*	*				3	*	*			
PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE	10	10	100.0%	3	*	*						

Institution	Multiple Subject			Single Subject			Education Specialist			Administrative Services		
	# Completers	# of Responses	% Respond	# Completers	# of Responses	% Respond	# Completers	# of Responses	% Respond	# Completers	# of Responses	% Respond
PATTEN UNIVERSITY	2	*	*	9	8	88.9%						
PLACER COE										27	26	96.3%
PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY	69	63	91.3%	29	27	93.1%				13	13	100.0%
POINT LOMA NAZARENE UNIVERSITY	82	79	96.3%	48	46	95.8%	89	82	92.1%	35	35	100.0%
SACRAMENTO COE	7	7	100.0%	3	*	*				74	73	98.6%
SAN DIEGO CHRISTIAN COLLEGE	13	13	100.0%	5	5	100.0%						
SAN DIEGO COE										38	37	97.4%
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY	97	96	99.0%	110	109	99.1%	24	24	100.0%	55	54	98.2%
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY	50	48	96.0%	72	72	100.0%	65	65	100.0%	16	16	100.0%
SAN JOAQUIN COE	8	7	87.5%	1	*	*	20	14	70.0%			
SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY	107	102	95.3%	40	38	95.0%	14	14	100.0%	46	42	91.3%
SAN MATEO COE										13	11	84.6%
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY EDUCATION OFFICE										9	9	100.0%
SANTA CLARA COE							11	11	100.0%	60	58	96.7%
SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY	46	44	95.7%	32	32	100.0%				16	14	87.5%
SIMPSON UNIVERSITY	40	39	97.5%	15	14	93.3%						
SHASTA COE										20	20	100.0%
SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY	55	55	100.0%	26	26	100.0%	13	13	100.0%	28	28	100.0%
ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF CALIFORNIA	46	45	97.8%	25	24	96.0%	16	16	100.0%	17	17	100.0%
STANFORD UNIVERSITY	26	26	100.0%	64	60	93.8%						
STANISLAUS COE							4	*	*			
TEACHERS COLLEGE OF SAN JOAQUIN	53	52	98.1%	68	65	95.6%	83	77	92.8%	49	44	89.8%
THE MASTER'S UNIVERSITY	8	8	100.0%	5	5	100.0%						
TOURO UNIVERSITY	8	8	100.0%	5	*	*	10	10	100.0%	20	17	85.0%
TULARE COE	28	28	100.0%	48	48	100.0%	27	27	100.0%	10	8	80.0%
UC, BERKELEY	17	16	94.1%	37	37	100.0%				20	19	95.0%
UC, DAVIS	75	73	97.3%	79	78	98.7%						
UC, IRVINE	53	51	96.2%	64	63	98.4%				22	22	100.0%

Institution	Multiple Subject			Single Subject			Education Specialist			Administrative Services		
	# Comple- ters	# of Responses	% Respond	# Comple- ters	# of Responses	% Respond	# Comple- ters	# of Responses	% Respond	# Comple- ters	# of Responses	% Respond
UC, LOS ANGELES	65	63	96.9%	97	94	96.9%	8	7	87.5%	30	27	90.0%
UC, RIVERSIDE	45	42	93.3%	69	66	95.7%	12	12	100.0%			
UC, SAN DIEGO	34	33	97.1%	41	38	92.7%	3	*	*			
UC, SANTA BARBARA	36	35	97.2%	35	31	88.6%	9	9	100.0%			
UC, SANTA CRUZ	31	31	100.0%	37	37	100.0%						
UNITED STATES UNIVERSITY	1	*	*	5	5	100.0%						
UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE	68	66	97.1%	59	57	96.6%	16	16	100.0%	15	15	100.0%
UNIVERSITY OF PHOENIX	73	71	97.3%	60	58	96.7%				5	5	100.0%
UNIVERSITY OF REDLANDS	131	126	96.2%	117	112	95.7%	23	21	91.3%	8	7	87.5%
UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO	41	37	90.2%	30	27	90.0%	8	8	100.0%	17	17	100.0%
UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO	71	66	93.0%	53	48	90.6%	14	14	100.0%			
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	59	57	96.6%	65	65	100.0%	16	16	100.0%	12	12	100.0%
UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC	80	72	90.0%	38	35	92.1%	25	22	88.0%	5	*	*
VANGUARD UNIVERSITY	19	19	100.0%	26	26	100.0%						
VENTURA COE							1	*	*			
WESTERN GOVERNORS UNIVERSITY	67	63	94.0%	46	46	100.0%						
WESTMONT COLLEGE	8	7	87.5%	5	5	100.0%						
WHITTIER COLLEGE	4	*	*	14	14	100.0%	6	6	100.0%			
WILLIAM JESSUP UNIVERSITY	40	40	100.0%	14	12	85.7%						
WISEBURN SCHOOL DISTRICT							3	*	*			
Totals	4355	4213	96.7%	3814	3699	97.0%	2080	2000	96.2%	2307	2217	96.1%

Appendix C

Completer Survey Response Rates by Institution – Clear Credentials

* Indicates no report was produced for the program/institution because of low number of respondents. Blank cell indicates the program is not offered at the institution

Institution	General Education (MS/SS)			Education Specialist Clear		
	# Program Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents	# Program Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
ALHAMBRA USD	13	13	100.0%	4	*	*
ALLIANT INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY				12	11	91.7%
ANAHEIM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT	29	29	100.0%			
ANAHEIM UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	12	11	91.7%			
ANIMO LEADERSHIP CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL (GREEN DOT PUBLIC SCHOOLS)	8	8	100.0%			
ANTELOPE VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	20	19	95.0%	5	*	*
ANTIOCH UNIVERSITY	28	24	85.7%			
ANTIOCH USD	21	21	100.0%	6	*	*
ARCADIA USD	12	12	100.0%			
ASPIRE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	89	82	92.1%	10	9	90.0%
AZUSA PACIFIC UNIVERSITY	35	32	91.4%	74	70	94.6%
BAKERSFIELD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	55	55	100.0%	10	10	100.0%
BALDWIN PARK USD	14	14	100.0%			
BAY AREA SCHOOL OF ENTERPRISE (REACH INSTITUTE)	41	38	92.7%			
BELLFLOWER USD	24	22	91.7%			
BIOLA UNIVERSITY	14	13	92.9%			
BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY				1	*	*
BRENTWOOD UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT	43	40	93.0%	14	13	92.9%
BURBANK USD	41	38	92.7%			
BUTTE COE	5	*	*			
CAL POLY, SAN LUIS OBISPO				1	*	*
CALIFORNIA LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY				1	*	*
CALIFORNIA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF, FREMONT				1	*	*
CAMPBELL UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT	84	79	94.0%	10	10	100.0%
CAPISTRANO USD	52	47	90.4%	15	12	80.0%
CENTRAL USD	30	29	96.7%			
CERES USD	16	16	100.0%			

Institution	General Education (MS/SS)			Education Specialist Clear		
	# Program Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents	# Program Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
CHAFFEY JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	22	21	95.5%			
CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY	3	*	*			
CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT	80	76	95.0%			
CLAREMONT GRADUATE UNIVERSITY	24	24	100.0%	4	*	*
CLOVIS USD	43	41	95.3%	9	9	100.0%
COMPTON USD	9	8	88.9%			
CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY IRVINE	15	13	86.7%	3	*	*
CONEJO VALLEY USD	10	10	100.0%	5	5	100.0%
CONTRA COSTA COE	169	160	94.7%	31	31	100.0%
CORONA-NORCO USD	26	26	100.0%	10	10	100.0%
CSU, BAKERSFIELD				6	5	83.3%
CSU, DOMINGUEZ HILLS	1	*	*	22	21	95.5%
CSU, FRESNO	2	*	*	23	21	91.3%
CSU, FULLERTON	118	110	93.2%	90	84	93.3%
CSU, LONG BEACH	9	8	88.9%	10	10	100.0%
CSU, LOS ANGELES	3	*	*	57	53	93.0%
CSU, MONTEREY BAY				8	7	87.5%
CSU, NORTHRIDGE	63	57	90.5%	58	56	96.6%
CSU, SACRAMENTO	8	*	*			
CSU, SAN BERNARDINO	3	*	*	1	*	*
CSU, SAN MARCOS	1	*	*			
CSU, STANISLAUS	1	*	*			
CULVER CITY USD	22	21	95.5%			
CUPERTINO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT	35	30	85.7%	5	*	*
DAVIS JOINT USD	69	68	98.6%	32	28	87.5%
DOS PALOS ORO LOMA JOINT USD	6	6	100.0%			
EL DORADO COE	89	85	95.5%	23	22	95.7%
EL RANCHO USD	3	*	*	6	6	100.0%
ELK GROVE USD	78	74	94.9%	22	22	100.0%
ENCINITAS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT	22	21	95.5%			

Institution	General Education (MS/SS)			Education Specialist Clear		
	# Program Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents	# Program Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
ESCONDIDO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT	24	23	95.8%			
ETIWANDA SCHOOL DISTRICT	24	21	87.5%	6	5	83.3%
EVERGREEN SCHOOL DISTRICT	5	5	100.0%			
FONTANA USD	24	24	100.0%	13	12	92.3%
FREMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	15	15	100.0%	6	5	83.3%
FREMONT USD	63	62	98.4%	15	13	86.7%
FRESNO COE	98	93	94.9%	32	28	87.5%
FRESNO PACIFIC UNIVERSITY	11	10	90.9%	3	*	*
FRESNO USD	139	135	97.1%			
FULLERTON SCHOOL DISTRICT	33	33	100.0%			
GARDEN GROVE USD	33	32	97.0%			
GROSSMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	14	14	100.0%			
HACIENDA LA PUENTE USD	12	12	100.0%	2	*	*
HANFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT	22	20	90.9%			
HAYWARD USD	31	29	93.5%	9	8	88.9%
HEBREW UNION COLLEGE	12	9	75.0%			
HIGH TECH HIGH	63	59	93.7%	16	14	87.5%
HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY				1	*	*
IMPERIAL COE	45	44	97.8%			
IRVINE USD	70	65	92.9%	16	15	93.8%
KEPPEL UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT	3	*	*			
KERN COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS	143	142	99.3%	26	26	100.0%
KERN HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	70	69	98.6%	4	*	*
KINGS COE	30	30	100.0%	5	5	100.0%
LA MESA-SPRING VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT	2	*	*			
LA SIERRA UNIVERSITY	3	*	*			
LANCASTER SCHOOL DISTRICT	19	19	100.0%	5	5	100.0%
LODI USD	38	34	89.5%			
LONG BEACH USD	47	44	93.6%	11	11	100.0%
LOS ANGELES COE	276	261	94.6%	108	98	90.7%

Institution	General Education (MS/SS)			Education Specialist Clear		
	# Program Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents	# Program Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
LOS ANGELES USD	416	394	94.7%	147	133	90.5%
LOS BANOS USD	23	20	87.0%	1	*	*
LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY	32	28	87.5%			
MADERA COE				2	*	*
MADERA USD	45	41	91.1%			
MANTECA USD	26	24	92.3%			
MARIN COE	58	55	94.8%	3	*	*
MERCED COE	47	45	95.7%			
MERCED UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	20	20	100.0%	10	10	100.0%
MILPITAS USD	17	16	94.1%			
MODESTO CITY SCHOOLS	41	40	97.6%	7	7	100.0%
MONTEBELLO USD	19	19	100.0%			
MONTEREY COE	79	71	89.9%	5	*	*
MOUNT SAINT MARY'S UNIVERSITY	33	32	97.0%			
MT. DIABLO USD	19	19	100.0%			
MT. DIABLO USD - FORTUNE SCHOOL	30	26	86.7%			
MURRIETA VALLEY USD	16	16	100.0%	3	*	*
NAPA COE	33	31	93.9%	6	6	100.0%
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY	28	22	78.6%	29	28	96.6%
NEW HAVEN USD	31	28	90.3%	21	19	90.5%
NEWARK USD	27	26	96.3%	38	37	97.4%
OAK GROVE SCHOOL DISTRICT	8	8	100.0%			
OAKLAND USD	84	77	91.7%	18	15	83.3%
OCEAN VIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT	34	33	97.1%			
ONTARIO-MONTCLAIR SCHOOL DISTRICT	15	14	93.3%			
ORANGE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	105	101	96.2%	7	6	85.7%
ORANGE USD	41	39	95.1%	24	23	95.8%
PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE	2	*	*			
PALMDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT	7	7	100.0%			
PALMDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT	11	11	100.0%	5	*	*

Institution	General Education (MS/SS)			Education Specialist Clear		
	# Program Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents	# Program Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
PALO ALTO USD	28	25	89.3%			
PALOS VERDES PENINSULA USD	48	48	100.0%			
PANAMA-BUENA VISTA UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT	27	26	96.3%	8	8	100.0%
PARAMOUNT USD	30	29	96.7%			
PASADENA USD	27	25	92.6%			
PLACENTIA-YORBA LINDA USD	30	29	96.7%			
PLACER COE	90	87	96.7%	13	12	92.3%
PLEASANTON USD	194	186	95.9%	15	15	100.0%
POINT LOMA NAZARENE UNIVERSITY	9	7	77.8%	30	28	93.3%
POMONA USD	12	11	91.7%			
POWAY USD	45	40	88.9%	11	9	81.8%
PUC SCHOOLS	56	54	96.4%			
REDWOOD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	4	*	*			
RIALTO USD	41	40	97.6%	17	17	100.0%
RIVERSIDE COE	1181	1142	96.7%	218	208	95.4%
RIVERSIDE USD	71	68	95.8%	16	16	100.0%
ROWLAND USD	11	11	100.0%			
SACRAMENTO CITY USD	46	42	91.3%	15	14	93.3%
SACRAMENTO COE	244	233	95.5%	54	51	94.4%
SADDLEBACK VALLEY USD	18	18	100.0%			
SAN BERNARDINO CITY USD	54	50	92.6%	19	19	100.0%
SAN DIEGO COE	154	145	94.2%	97	90	92.8%
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY	325	302	92.9%	36	33	91.7%
SAN DIEGO USD	116	111	95.7%	35	33	94.3%
SAN DIEGUITO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	15	14	93.3%	1	*	*
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY				27	25	92.6%
SAN FRANCISCO USD	145	133	91.7%			
SAN GABRIEL USD	30	29	96.7%			
SAN JOAQUIN COE	1	*	*			
SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY				1	*	*

Institution	General Education (MS/SS)			Education Specialist Clear		
	# Program Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents	# Program Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
SAN JOSE USD	75	68	90.7%	5	5	100.0%
SAN JUAN USD	51	48	94.1%	12	12	100.0%
SAN LUIS OBISPO COE	56	55	98.2%	16	15	93.8%
SAN MARCOS USD	58	55	94.8%	18	17	94.4%
SAN MATEO - FOSTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	35	33	94.3%	6	5	83.3%
SAN MATEO COE	138	128	92.8%	23	22	95.7%
SAN RAMON VALLEY USD	63	61	96.8%	5	5	100.0%
SANGER USD	35	35	100.0%			
SANTA ANA USD	46	45	97.8%	13	11	84.6%
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY EDUCATION OFFICE	126	120	95.2%	10	10	100.0%
SANTA CLARA COE				13	13	100.0%
SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY	10	9	90.0%			
SANTA CLARA USD	31	30	96.8%	3	*	*
SANTA CRUZ COE	296	281	94.9%	47	46	97.9%
SANTA MONICA-MALIBU USD	6	5	83.3%	1	*	*
SAUGUS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT	18	17	94.4%	5	5	100.0%
SCHOOL FOR INTEGRATED ACADEMICS AND TECHNOLOGY (SIA TECH)	13	10	76.9%	1	*	*
SELMA USD	36	35	97.2%	4	*	*
SEQUOIA UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	32	32	100.0%	7	7	100.0%
SONOMA COE	234	222	94.9%	38	35	92.1%
SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY	1	*	*	11	10	90.9%
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO USD	24	24	100.0%			
STANISLAUS COE	107	105	98.1%	28	25	89.3%
STOCKTON USD	20	20	100.0%	3	*	*
SUMMIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS	15	13	86.7%	1	*	*
SUTTER COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS	104	99	95.2%	21	20	95.2%
SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	33	32	97.0%			
TEACHERS COLLEGE OF SAN JOAQUIN	80	74	92.5%	42	36	85.7%
TEHAMA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	119	113	95.0%	25	24	96.0%
TEMPLE CITY USD	13	13	100.0%			

Institution	General Education (MS/SS)			Education Specialist Clear		
	# Program Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents	# Program Completers	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
TORRANCE USD	34	29	85.3%			
TOURO UNIVERSITY				1	*	*
TRACY USD	7	6	85.7%	3	*	*
TULARE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	11	10	90.9%	2	*	*
TULARE COE	129	123	95.3%	31	29	93.5%
TUSTIN USD	29	29	100.0%	1	*	*
UC, LOS ANGELES	240	230	95.8%	46	45	97.8%
UC, RIVERSIDE	9	8	88.9%			
UC, SAN DIEGO	400	375	93.8%			
UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE	3	*	*			
VALLEJO CITY USD	23	23	100.0%			
VENTURA COE	228	219	96.1%	54	50	92.6%
VISALIA USD	63	59	93.7%			
VISTA USD	38	37	97.4%	5	5	100.0%
WALNUT VALLEY USD	68	68	100.0%	21	19	90.5%
WASHINGTON USD	20	19	95.0%			
WEST CONTRA COSTA USD	51	48	94.1%	9	9	100.0%
WEST COVINA USD	39	38	97.4%	11	9	81.8%
WESTSIDE UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT	7	6	85.7%			
WHITTIER COLLEGE	3	*	*			
WILLIAM S. HART UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	29	28	96.6%	11	10	90.9%
WISEBURN SCHOOL DISTRICT				51	41	80.4%
Totals	10694	10151	94.9%	2410	2245	93.2%