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

CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Your program and Support Provider

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

	Program		Statewide	
	40	97.6%	10113	99.6%
1 = At the time of hire or before beginning work with students	18	45.0%	4228	41.8%
2 = Within one to two months of beginning my assignment	15	37.5%	2455	24.3%
3 = Within three to five months of beginning my assignment	0	0.0%	308	3.0%
4 = More than five months after beginning my assignment	2	5.0%	468	4.6%
5 = One year or more after beginning my assignment	5	12.5%	2654	26.2%
Mean : SD	2.03	1.35	2.49	1.66

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

	Program		Statewide	
	40	97.6%	10091	99.4%
1 = Within one month of enrolling in the program	37	92.5%	8786	87.1%
2 = Within two months of enrolling in the program	3	7.5%	826	8.2%
3 = More than three months after enrolling in the program	0	0.0%	205	2.0%
4 = I was assigned a Support Provider but never worked with him/her	0	0.0%	33	0.3%
5 = I was never assigned a Support Provider	0	0.0%	241	2.4%
Mean : SD	1.08	0.27	1.23	0.72

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

	Program		Statewide	
	40	97.6%	10096	99.5%
1 = Less than 1 school year	1	2.5%	319	3.2%
2 = 1 school year	3	7.5%	1632	16.2%
3 = More than 1 school year but less than 2 school years	0	0.0%	340	3.4%
4 = 2 school years	36	90.0%	7604	75.3%
5 = More than 2 school years	0	0.0%	201	2.0%
Mean : SD	3.78	0.70	3.57	0.89

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

	4a. Modeling instruction while I observed				4b. Identifying Resources				4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction				4d. Teaching Practices			
	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	40	97.6%	10067	99.2%	40	97.6%	10066	99.2%	40	97.6%	10060	99.1%	40	97.6%	10043	98.9%
1 = Very Helpful	34	85.0%	5582	55.4%	38	95.0%	6352	63.1%	37	92.5%	6934	68.9%	36	90.0%	6348	63.2%
2 = Helpful	4	10.0%	2615	26.0%	2	5.0%	2721	27.0%	3	7.5%	2323	23.1%	4	10.0%	2777	27.7%
3 = Somewhat helpful	1	2.5%	1171	11.6%	0	0.0%	831	8.3%	0	0.0%	646	6.4%	0	0.0%	775	7.7%
4 = Not at all helpful	1	2.5%	699	6.9%	0	0.0%	162	1.6%	0	0.0%	157	1.6%	0	0.0%	143	1.4%
Mean : SD	1.23	0.62	1.70	0.93	1.05	0.22	1.48	0.72	1.08	0.27	1.41	0.68	1.10	0.30	1.47	0.70

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

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

CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

	4e. Content Support				4f. Instructional Design and Planning				4g. Creating and Maintaining a Safe and Positive Climate				4h. Using strategies to support English Learners			
	Program		**Statewide**		**Program**		**Statewide**		**Program**		**Statewide**		**Program**		**Statewide**	
	40	97.6%	10040	98.9%	40	97.6%	10041	98.9%	39	95.1%	10047	99.0%	40	97.6%	10037	98.9%
1 = Very Helpful	33	82.5%	5336	53.1%	32	80.0%	5547	55.2%	33	84.6%	6318	62.9%	31	77.5%	5218	52.0%
2 = Helpful	6	15.0%	2901	28.9%	8	20.0%	3049	30.4%	5	12.8%	2736	27.2%	7	17.5%	3221	32.1%
3 = Somewhat helpful	1	2.5%	1357	13.5%	0	0.0%	1162	11.6%	1	2.6%	804	8.0%	2	5.0%	1274	12.7%
4 = Not at all helpful	0	0.0%	446	4.4%	0	0.0%	283	2.8%	0	0.0%	189	1.9%	0	0.0%	324	3.2%
Mean : SD	1.20	0.46	1.69	0.87	1.20	0.41	1.62	0.80	1.18	0.45	1.49	0.72	1.28	0.55	1.67	0.82

	4i. Using strategies to support students with disabilities				4j. Minimizing bias and using culturally responsive pedagogy				4k. Setting and reaching Professional Learning Goals			
	Program		**Statewide**		**Program**		**Statewide**		**Program**		**Statewide**	
	40	97.6%	10025	98.8%	40	97.6%	10045	99.0%	40	97.6%	10041	98.9%
1 = Very Helpful	31	77.5%	4881	48.7%	32	80.0%	5481	54.6%	36	90.0%	6683	66.6%
2 = Helpful	7	17.5%	3329	33.2%	8	20.0%	3210	32.0%	3	7.5%	2583	25.7%
3 = Somewhat helpful	2	5.0%	1475	14.7%	0	0.0%	1045	10.4%	1	2.5%	622	6.2%
4 = Not at all helpful	0	0.0%	340	3.4%	0	0.0%	309	3.1%	0	0.0%	153	1.5%
Mean : SD	1.28	0.55	1.73	0.83	1.20	0.41	1.62	0.79	1.13	0.40	1.43	0.68

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

	Program		**Statewide**	
	39	95.1%	9626	94.8%
1 = Well matched	39	100.0%	8370	87.0%
2 = Somewhat well matched	0	0.0%	999	10.4%
3 = Not well matched	0	0.0%	257	2.7%
Mean : SD	1.00	0.00	1.16	0.43

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

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

	Program	**Statewide**	
	0	1039	82.7%
Grade level or subject area experience or background	0	644	62.0%
Familiarity with site resources, expectations, policies, and procedures	0	234	22.5%
Schedules /opportunities to meet	0	293	28.2%
Personality, disposition, and working style	0	296	28.5%
Teaching philosophy and style	0	198	19.1%

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

	Program		**Statewide**	
	0		1234	98.2%
1 = Yes			262	21.2%
2 = To some extent, but not fully			483	39.1%
3 = No			489	39.6%
Mean : SD			2.18	0.76

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

Date: 11/3/2017

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

CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

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

	Program		Statewide	
	39	95.1%	9597	94.5%
1 = Daily	3	7.7%	873	9.1%
2 = Two or three times per week	12	30.8%	2194	22.9%
3 = Weekly	24	61.5%	4840	50.4%
4 = Twice per month	0	0.0%	1324	13.8%
5 = Less than twice per month	0	0.0%	366	3.8%
Mean : SD	2.54	0.64	2.80	0.92

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)?

	Program		Statewide	
	39	95.1%	9577	94.3%
1 = More than ten times during the entire program	17	43.6%	2291	23.9%
2 = 6-10 times during the entire program	20	51.3%	3156	33.0%
3 = 3-5 times during the entire program	2	5.1%	3318	34.6%
4 = Once or twice during the entire program	0	0.0%	684	7.1%
5 = I was not observed by my Support Provider	0	0.0%	128	1.3%
Mean : SD	1.62	0.59	2.29	0.95

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

	Program		Statewide	
	39	95.1%	9576	94.3%
1 = Significantly more time	2	5.1%	359	3.7%
2 = A little more time	4	10.3%	1265	13.2%
3 = The same amount of time I had	32	82.1%	7427	77.6%
4 = A little less time	1	2.6%	419	4.4%
5 = Much less time	0	0.0%	106	1.1%
Mean : SD	2.82	0.56	2.86	0.59

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

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

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

	Program		Statewide	
	38	92.7%	9536	93.9%
1 = Strong	32	86.5%	4776	51.3%
2 = Moderate	4	10.8%	3923	42.1%
3 = Weak	1	2.7%	620	6.7%
Not applicable to me **	1	-	217	-
Mean : SD	1.16	0.44	1.55	0.62

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

	Program		Statewide	
	38	92.7%	9531	93.9%
1 = Very Strong	19	52.8%	2991	36.0%
2 = Strong	13	36.1%	3784	45.6%
3 = Not Strong	4	11.1%	1524	18.4%
I do not have sufficient information to answer this question **	2	-	1232	-
Mean : SD	1.58	0.69	1.82	0.72

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

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

CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

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

	12a. Collection and analysis of evidence of my teaching practice				12b. Analysis of my students' work				12c. Observation of experienced teachers				12d. Examination of my teaching practice against the CSTP (e.g., the Continuum of Teaching Practice)			
	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	38	92.7%	9517	93.8%	38	92.7%	9518	93.8%	38	92.7%	9511	93.7%	38	92.7%	9495	93.5%
1 = Extensive impact	30	78.9%	6157	64.9%	31	81.6%	6831	72.0%	29	82.9%	6483	72.6%	27	71.1%	5354	57.5%
2 = Limited impact	8	21.1%	3064	32.3%	6	15.8%	2435	25.7%	6	17.1%	2244	25.1%	8	21.1%	3434	36.9%
3 = No impact	0	0.0%	268	2.8%	1	2.6%	216	2.3%	0	0.0%	205	2.3%	3	7.9%	528	5.7%
I did not participate in this activity **	0	-	28	-	0	-	36	-	3	-	579	-	0	-	179	-
Mean : SD	1.21	0.41	1.38	0.54	1.21	0.47	1.30	0.51	1.17	0.38	1.30	0.50	1.37	0.63	1.48	0.60

	12e. Development of my Individual Induction Plan (IIP)/Individual Learning Plan (ILP)				12f. Professional Learning as identified on my IIP or ILP				12g. Collaboration with colleagues			
	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	37	90.2%	9496	93.5%	38	92.7%	9492	93.5%	38	92.7%	9489	93.5%
1 = Extensive impact	28	75.7%	5607	59.8%	29	76.3%	5643	60.4%	35	92.1%	7458	79.2%
2 = Limited impact	7	18.9%	3278	35.0%	8	21.1%	3324	35.6%	3	7.9%	1744	18.5%
3 = No impact	2	5.4%	489	5.2%	1	2.6%	373	4.0%	0	0.0%	217	2.3%
I did not participate in this activity **	0	-	122	-	0	-	152	-	0	-	70	-
Mean : SD	1.30	0.57	1.45	0.59	1.26	0.50	1.44	0.57	1.08	0.27	1.23	0.47

Impact of Induction on Teaching Practice

Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

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

	13a. Connect classroom learning to the real world				13b. Engage students in inquiry, problem solving, and reflection to promote their critical thinking				13c. Meet the instructional needs of English learners				13d. Identify and address special learning needs with appropriate teaching strategies			
	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	37	90.2%	9345	92.1%	38	92.7%	9337	92.0%	38	92.7%	9337	92.0%	38	92.7%	9334	92.0%
1 = Very well	22	59.5%	3682	39.4%	23	60.5%	4150	44.4%	15	39.5%	3515	37.6%	19	50.0%	3717	39.8%
2 = Well	8	21.6%	3537	37.8%	8	21.1%	3393	36.3%	15	39.5%	3494	37.4%	14	36.8%	3477	37.3%
3 = Adequately	5	13.5%	1624	17.4%	6	15.8%	1432	15.3%	7	18.4%	1911	20.5%	4	10.5%	1719	18.4%
4 = Poorly	1	2.7%	326	3.5%	1	2.6%	239	2.6%	1	2.6%	297	3.2%	1	2.6%	304	3.3%
5 = Not at all	1	2.7%	176	1.9%	0	0.0%	123	1.3%	0	0.0%	120	1.3%	0	0.0%	117	1.3%
Mean : SD	1.68	1.00	1.91	0.93	1.61	0.86	1.80	0.88	1.84	0.82	1.93	0.91	1.66	0.78	1.89	0.90

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

Date: 11/3/2017

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

CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning

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

	14a. Establish and maintain a safe and respectful learning environment for all students				14b. Create a productive learning environment with high expectations for all students			
	Program		**Statewide**		**Program**		**Statewide**	
	38	92.7%	9332	91.9%	38	92.7%	9331	91.9%
1 = Very well	28	73.7%	4979	53.4%	28	73.7%	4995	53.5%
2 = Well	7	18.4%	2944	31.5%	7	18.4%	3001	32.2%
3 = Adequately	1	2.6%	1154	12.4%	2	5.3%	1092	11.7%
4 = Poorly	1	2.6%	120	1.3%	1	2.6%	122	1.3%
5 = Not at all	1	2.6%	135	1.4%	0	0.0%	121	1.3%
Mean : SD	1.42	0.89	1.66	0.85	1.37	0.71	1.65	0.83

Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning

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

	15a. Use effective instructional strategies to teach specific subject matter and skills				15b. Select, adapt, and develop materials, resources, and technologies to make subject matter accessible to all students			
	Program		**Statewide**		**Program**		**Statewide**	
	38	92.7%	9326	91.9%	38	92.7%	9320	91.8%
1 = Very well	27	71.1%	4388	47.1%	26	68.4%	4452	47.8%
2 = Well	9	23.7%	3322	35.6%	10	26.3%	3237	34.7%
3 = Adequately	1	2.6%	1272	13.6%	1	2.6%	1299	13.9%
4 = Poorly	1	2.6%	224	2.4%	1	2.6%	213	2.3%
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	120	1.3%	0	0.0%	119	1.3%
Mean : SD	1.37	0.67	1.75	0.87	1.39	0.68	1.75	0.87

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students

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

	16a. Plan instruction based on students' prior knowledge, academic readiness, language proficiency, cultural background, and individual development				16b. Plan and adapt instruction that incorporates appropriate strategies, resources and technologies to meet the learning needs of all students			
	Program		**Statewide**		**Program**		**Statewide**	
	38	92.7%	9321	91.8%	38	92.7%	9323	91.8%
1 = Very well	24	63.2%	4220	45.3%	27	71.1%	4386	47.0%
2 = Well	12	31.6%	3478	37.3%	8	21.1%	3407	36.5%
3 = Adequately	1	2.6%	1344	14.4%	1	2.6%	1267	13.6%
4 = Poorly	1	2.6%	174	1.9%	2	5.3%	162	1.7%
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	105	1.1%	0	0.0%	101	1.1%
Mean : SD	1.45	0.69	1.76	0.85	1.42	0.79	1.73	0.84

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

Date: 11/3/2017

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

CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

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-assessment, goal setting, and monitoring progress				17b. Give productive feedback to students to guide their learning			
	Program		**Statewide**		**Program**		**Statewide**	
	38	92.7%	9316	91.8%	38	92.7%	9318	91.8%
1 = Very well	18	47.4%	3689	39.6%	19	50.0%	3832	41.1%
2 = Well	12	31.6%	3489	37.5%	11	28.9%	3546	38.1%
3 = Adequately	7	18.4%	1721	18.5%	7	18.4%	1576	16.9%
4 = Poorly	1	2.6%	272	2.9%	1	2.6%	228	2.4%
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	145	1.6%	0	0.0%	136	1.5%
Mean : SD	1.76	0.85	1.89	0.91	1.74	0.86	1.85	0.89

Developing as a Professional Educator

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

	18a. Evaluate the effects of actions on student learning and modify plans accordingly				18b. Work with colleagues to improve instruction			
	Program		**Statewide**		**Program**		**Statewide**	
	38	92.7%	9318	91.8%	38	92.7%	9321	91.8%
1 = Very well	27	71.1%	4238	45.5%	29	76.3%	4603	49.4%
2 = Well	7	18.4%	3477	37.3%	7	18.4%	3041	32.6%
3 = Adequately	4	10.5%	1373	14.7%	2	5.3%	1320	14.2%
4 = Poorly	0	0.0%	134	1.4%	0	0.0%	208	2.2%
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	96	1.0%	0	0.0%	149	1.6%
Mean : SD	1.39	0.68	1.75	0.83	1.29	0.57	1.74	0.90

	19. Overall, **how effective was your induction program at developing the skills, habits, or tools you needed to grow your teaching practice?**				20. Overall, **how effective was your induction program at developing the skills, habits, or tools you needed to continue in your career as a teacher?**			
	Program		**Statewide**		**Program**		**Statewide**	
	38	92.7%	9305	91.7%	38	92.7%	9308	91.7%
1 = Very effective	27	71.1%	4324	46.5%	28	73.7%	4406	47.3%
2 = Effective	9	23.7%	3483	37.4%	8	21.1%	3451	37.1%
3 = Somewhat effective	2	5.3%	1269	13.6%	2	5.3%	1215	13.1%
4 = Not at all effective	0	0.0%	229	2.5%	0	0.0%	236	2.5%
Mean : SD	1.34	0.58	1.72	0.79	1.32	0.57	1.71	0.79

** Responses of "Don't Know" or variations on "N/A" are excluded from the percentage calculations.
Date: 11/3/2017

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

CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Demographic Information

21. Are you Hispanic or Latino?

	Program		Statewide	
	37	90.2%	9237	91.0%
No, not Hispanic or Latino	*		6776	73.4%
Yes, Hispanic or Latino	*		2461	26.6%

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

	Program		Statewide	
	37	90.2%	9270	91.3%
Public	36	87.8%	7517	74.1%
Charter	*		1652	16.3%
Private	*		577	5.7%
Non-public special education	*		19	0.2%
Other	*		57	0.6%

24. What is your gender?

	Program		Statewide	
	36	87.8%	9256	91.2%
Female	25	69.4%	6802	73.5%
Male	*		2274	24.6%
Decline to state	*		180	1.9%

22. What is your race? Mark all that apply

	Program		Statewide	
	33	80.5%	8278	81.5%
American Indian or Alaska Native	*		398	3.9%
Chinese	*		349	3.4%
Japanese	*		157	1.5%
Korean	*		169	1.7%
Vietnamese	*		118	1.2%
Asian Indian	*		98	1.0%
Laotian	*		16	0.2%
Cambodian	*		17	0.2%
Filipino	*		242	2.4%
Hmong	*		27	0.3%
Other Asian	*		106	1.0%
Black or African American	*		349	3.4%
Hawaiian	*		35	0.3%
Guamanian	*		20	0.2%
Samoan	*		12	0.1%
Tahitian	*		8	0.1%
Other Pacific Islander	*		29	0.3%
White	31	75.6%	6966	68.6%

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

	Number of Program Completers Asked to Participate in Survey	# and % of Respondents	
Program:	43	41	*95.4 %*
Statewide:	10694	10151	*94.9 %*

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

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

Date: 11/3/2017

Clear Education Specialist Program Completer Survey - 2017

CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Information about your program and working with your Support Provider

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

		Program		Statewide	
		9	100.0%	2243	99.9%
1 =	At the time of hire or before beginning work with students	2	22.2%	803	35.8%
2 =	Within one to two months of beginning my assignment	3	33.3%	396	17.7%
3 =	Within three to five months of beginning my assignment	0	0.0%	72	3.2%
4 =	More than five months after beginning my assignment	1	11.1%	107	4.8%
5 =	One year or more after beginning my assignment	3	33.3%	865	38.6%
	Mean : SD	3.00	1.73	2.93	1.79

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

		Program		Statewide	
		9	100.0%	2235	99.5%
1 =	Within one month of enrolling in the program	9	100.0%	1860	83.2%
2 =	Within two months of enrolling in the program	0	0.0%	210	9.4%
3 =	More than three months after enrolling in the program	0	0.0%	85	3.8%
4 =	I was assigned a Support Provider but never worked with him/her	0	0.0%	11	0.5%
5 =	I was never assigned a Support Provider	0	0.0%	69	3.1%
	Mean : SD	1.00	0.00	1.31	0.83

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

		Program		Statewide	
		9	100.0%	2233	99.4%
1 =	Less than 1 school year	0	0.0%	147	6.6%
2 =	1 school year	4	44.4%	778	34.8%
3 =	More than 1 school year but less than 2 school years	0	0.0%	161	7.2%
4 =	2 school years	5	55.6%	1074	48.1%
5 =	More than 2 school years	0	0.0%	73	3.3%
	Mean : SD	3.11	1.05	3.07	1.10

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

	4a. Modeling instruction while I observed				4b. Identifying Resources				4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction				4d. Teaching Practices			
	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	9	100.0%	2222	98.9%	9	100.0%	2219	98.8%	9	100.0%	2214	98.6%	9	100.0%	2218	98.8%
1 = Very Helpful	4	44.4%	1258	56.6%	8	88.9%	1409	63.5%	7	77.8%	1449	65.4%	6	66.7%	1320	59.5%
2 = Helpful	4	44.4%	584	26.3%	0	0.0%	580	26.1%	2	22.2%	564	25.5%	2	22.2%	673	30.3%
3 = Somewhat helpful	1	11.1%	265	11.9%	1	11.1%	190	8.6%	0	0.0%	159	7.2%	1	11.1%	188	8.5%
4 = Not at all helpful	0	0.0%	115	5.2%	0	0.0%	40	1.8%	0	0.0%	42	1.9%	0	0.0%	37	1.7%
Mean : SD	1.67	0.71	1.66	0.88	1.22	0.67	1.49	0.73	1.22	0.44	1.46	0.71	1.44	0.73	1.52	0.72

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

Clear Education Specialist Program Completer Survey - 2017

CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

	4e. Content Support		4f. Instructional Design and Planning		4g. Creating and Maintaining a Safe and Positive Climate		4h. Using strategies to support English Learners	
	Program	Statewide	Program	Statewide	Program	Statewide	Program	Statewide
	9 100.0%	2213 98.5%	9 100.0%	2212 98.5%	9 100.0%	2210 98.4%	9 100.0%	2213 98.5%
1 = Very Helpful	6 66.7%	1231 55.6%	4 44.4%	1205 54.5%	7 77.8%	1360 61.5%	3 33.3%	1113 50.3%
2 = Helpful	3 33.3%	664 30.0%	5 55.6%	694 31.4%	1 11.1%	628 28.4%	5 55.6%	748 33.8%
3 = Somewhat helpful	0 0.0%	254 11.5%	0 0.0%	254 11.5%	1 11.1%	174 7.9%	1 11.1%	274 12.4%
4 = Not at all helpful	0 0.0%	64 2.9%	0 0.0%	59 2.7%	0 0.0%	48 2.2%	0 0.0%	78 3.5%
Mean : SD	1.33 0.50	1.62 0.80	1.56 0.53	1.62 0.79	1.33 0.71	1.51 0.73	1.78 0.67	1.69 0.82

	4i. Using strategies to support students with disabilities		4j. Minimizing bias and using culturally responsive pedagogy		4k. Setting and reaching Professional Learning Goals	
	Program	Statewide	Program	Statewide	Program	Statewide
	9 100.0%	2209 98.4%	9 100.0%	2204 98.1%	9 100.0%	2209 98.4%
1 = Very Helpful	8 88.9%	1503 68.0%	6 66.7%	1247 56.6%	8 88.9%	1395 63.2%
2 = Helpful	0 0.0%	502 22.7%	3 33.3%	712 32.3%	1 11.1%	616 27.9%
3 = Somewhat helpful	1 11.1%	166 7.5%	0 0.0%	185 8.4%	0 0.0%	148 6.7%
4 = Not at all helpful	0 0.0%	38 1.7%	0 0.0%	60 2.7%	0 0.0%	50 2.3%
Mean : SD	1.22 0.67	1.43 0.71	1.33 0.50	1.57 0.76	1.11 0.33	1.48 0.72

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

	Program	Statewide
	8 88.9%	2050 91.3%
1 = Well matched	7 87.5%	1742 85.0%
2 = Somewhat well matched	1 12.5%	240 11.7%
3 = Not well matched	0 0.0%	68 3.3%
Mean : SD	1.13 0.35	1.18 0.46

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

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

	Program	Statewide
	1 100.0%	295 95.8%
Grade level or subject area experience or background	1 100.0%	154 52.2%
Familiarity with site resources, expectations, policies, and procedures	1 100.0%	78 26.4%
Schedules /opportunities to meet	0 0.0%	87 29.5%
Personality, disposition, and working style	0 0.0%	64 21.7%
Teaching philosophy and style	0 0.0%	51 17.3%

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

	Program	Statewide
	1 100.0%	300 97.4%
1 = Yes	1 100.0%	90 30.0%
2 = To some extent, but not fully	0 0.0%	121 40.3%
3 = No	0 0.0%	89 29.7%

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

Date: 11/3/2017

Clear Education Specialist Program Completer Survey - 2017

CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

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

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

	Program		Statewide	
	8	88.9%	2062	91.8%
1 = Daily	0	0.0%	202	9.8%
2 = Two or three times per week	2	25.0%	462	22.4%
3 = Weekly	6	75.0%	936	45.4%
4 = Twice per month	0	0.0%	329	16.0%
5 = Less than twice per month	0	0.0%	133	6.5%
Mean : SD	2.75	0.46	2.87	1.01

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)?

	Program		Statewide	
	8	88.9%	2058	91.6%
1 = More than ten times during the entire program	0	0.0%	478	23.2%
2 = 6-10 times during the entire program	6	75.0%	613	29.8%
3 = 3-5 times during the entire program	2	25.0%	722	35.1%
4 = Once or twice during the entire program	0	0.0%	187	9.1%
5 = I was not observed by my Support Provider	0	0.0%	58	2.8%
Mean : SD	2.25	0.46	2.38	1.03

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

	Program		Statewide	
	8	88.9%	2058	91.6%
1 = Significantly more time	0	0.0%	103	5.0%
2 = A little more time	0	0.0%	252	12.2%
3 = The same amount of time I had	8	100.0%	1618	78.6%
4 = A little less time	0	0.0%	61	3.0%
5 = Much less time	0	0.0%	24	1.2%
Mean : SD	3.00	0.00	2.83	0.61

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.

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

	Program		Statewide	
	7	77.8%	1992	88.7%
1 = Strong	5	71.4%	981	50.7%
2 = Moderate	2	28.6%	817	42.2%
3 = Weak	0	0.0%	136	7.0%
Not applicable to me **	0	-	58	-
Mean : SD	1.29	0.49	1.56	0.62

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

	Program		Statewide	
	7	77.8%	1991	88.6%
1 = Very Strong	2	33.3%	615	35.6%
2 = Strong	4	66.7%	786	45.5%
3 = Not Strong	0	0.0%	328	19.0%
I do not have sufficient information to answer this question **	1	-	262	-
Mean : SD	1.67	0.52	1.83	0.72

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

Date: 11/3/2017

Clear Education Specialist Program Completer Survey - 2017

CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

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

	12a. Collection and analysis of evidence of my teaching practice				12b. Analysis of my students' work				12c. Observation of experienced teachers				12d. Examination of my teaching practice against the CSTP (e.g., the Continuum of Teaching Practice)			
	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	7	77.8%	1992	88.7%	7	77.8%	1992	88.7%	7	77.8%	1989	88.6%	7	77.8%	1980	88.2%
1 = Extensive impact	5	71.4%	1326	67.1%	4	57.1%	1427	72.6%	6	85.7%	1340	71.2%	4	57.1%	1207	62.8%
2 = Limited impact	2	28.6%	595	30.1%	3	42.9%	492	25.0%	1	14.3%	503	26.7%	3	42.9%	645	33.6%
3 = No impact	0	0.0%	54	2.7%	0	0.0%	46	2.3%	0	0.0%	40	2.1%	0	0.0%	70	3.6%
I did not participate in this activity **	0	-	17	-	0	-	27	-	0	-	106	-	0	-	58	-
Mean : SD	1.29	0.49	1.36	0.53	1.43	0.53	1.30	0.51	1.14	0.38	1.31	0.51	1.43	0.53	1.41	0.56

	12e. Development of my Individual Induction Plan (IIP)/Individual Learning Plan (ILP)				12f. Professional Learning as identified on my IIP or ILP				12g. Collaboration with colleagues			
	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	7	77.8%	1985	88.4%	7	77.8%	1985	88.4%	7	77.8%	1990	88.6%
1 = Extensive impact	4	57.1%	1280	65.1%	4	57.1%	1324	67.4%	7	100.0%	1589	80.3%
2 = Limited impact	3	42.9%	607	30.9%	3	42.9%	575	29.3%	0	0.0%	361	18.3%
3 = No impact	0	0.0%	78	4.0%	0	0.0%	65	3.3%	0	0.0%	28	1.4%
I did not participate in this activity **	0	-	20	-	0	-	21	-	0	-	12	-
Mean : SD	1.43	0.53	1.39	0.56	1.43	0.53	1.36	0.54	1.00	0.00	1.21	0.44

Impact of Induction on Teaching Practice

Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

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

	13a. Connect classroom learning to the real world				13b. Engage students in inquiry, problem solving, and reflection to promote their critical thinking				13c. Meet the instructional needs of English learners				13d. Identify and address special learning needs with appropriate teaching strategies			
	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	7	77.8%	1955	87.0%	7	77.8%	1953	87.0%	7	77.8%	1952	86.9%	7	77.8%	1948	86.7%
1 = Very well	3	42.9%	889	45.5%	4	57.1%	873	44.7%	2	28.6%	806	41.3%	4	57.1%	1176	60.4%
2 = Well	3	42.9%	700	35.8%	2	28.6%	692	35.4%	4	57.1%	707	36.2%	3	42.9%	484	24.8%
3 = Adequately	1	14.3%	284	14.5%	1	14.3%	307	15.7%	1	14.3%	363	18.6%	0	0.0%	232	11.9%
4 = Poorly	0	0.0%	54	2.8%	0	0.0%	53	2.7%	0	0.0%	46	2.4%	0	0.0%	36	1.8%
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	28	1.4%	0	0.0%	28	1.4%	0	0.0%	30	1.5%	0	0.0%	20	1.0%
Mean : SD	1.71	0.76	1.79	0.89	1.57	0.79	1.81	0.90	1.86	0.69	1.87	0.90	1.43	0.53	1.58	0.85

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

Date: 11/3/2017

Clear Education Specialist Program Completer Survey - 2017

CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning

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

	14a. Establish and maintain a safe and respectful learning environment for all students				14b. Create a productive learning environment with high expectations for all students				14c. Prevent behavior problems by intervening early using strategies matched to student's current learning and behavior level			
	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	7	77.8%	1952	86.9%	7	77.8%	1948	86.7%	7	77.8%	1945	86.6%
1 = Very well	5	71.4%	1112	57.0%	5	71.4%	1101	56.5%	4	57.1%	934	48.0%
2 = Well	2	28.6%	561	28.7%	2	28.6%	595	30.5%	3	42.9%	646	33.2%
3 = Adequately	0	0.0%	230	11.8%	0	0.0%	210	10.8%	0	0.0%	273	14.0%
4 = Poorly	0	0.0%	17	0.9%	0	0.0%	15	0.8%	0	0.0%	59	3.0%
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	32	1.6%	0	0.0%	27	1.4%	0	0.0%	33	1.7%
Mean : SD	1.29	0.49	1.61	0.85	1.29	0.49	1.60	0.82	1.43	0.53	1.77	0.92

Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning

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

	15a. Use effective instructional strategies to teach specific subject matter and skills				15b. Select, adapt, and develop materials, resources, and technologies to make subject matter accessible to all students				15c. Expand expertise with evidence-based instructional and assistive technology to support student access to challenging content?			
	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	7	77.8%	1945	86.6%	7	77.8%	1946	86.6%	7	77.8%	1944	86.6%
1 = Very well	4	57.1%	938	48.2%	4	57.1%	985	50.6%	5	71.4%	902	46.4%
2 = Well	2	28.6%	681	35.0%	3	42.9%	652	33.5%	2	28.6%	684	35.2%
3 = Adequately	1	14.3%	259	13.3%	0	0.0%	253	13.0%	0	0.0%	282	14.5%
4 = Poorly	0	0.0%	42	2.2%	0	0.0%	31	1.6%	0	0.0%	48	2.5%
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	25	1.3%	0	0.0%	25	1.3%	0	0.0%	28	1.4%
Mean : SD	1.57	0.79	1.73	0.86	1.43	0.53	1.69	0.85	1.29	0.49	1.77	0.89

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

Date: 11/3/2017

Clear Education Specialist Program Completer Survey - 2017

CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

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?

	16a. Plan instruction based on students' prior knowledge, academic readiness, language proficiency, cultural background, and individual development				16b. Plan and adapt instruction that incorporates appropriate strategies, resources and technologies to meet the learning needs of all students				16c. Develop IFSP/IEP goals and objectives that are measurable and obtainable				16d. Plan for instruction by incorporating all relevant IFSP/IEP information behavior and academic information			
	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	7	77.8%	1912	85.1%	7	77.8%	1910	85.0%	7	77.8%	1903	84.7%	7	77.8%	1904	84.8%
1 = Very well	4	57.1%	919	48.1%	4	57.1%	970	50.8%	5	71.4%	964	50.7%	4	57.1%	915	48.1%
2 = Well	2	28.6%	690	36.1%	3	42.9%	663	34.7%	2	28.6%	558	29.3%	2	28.6%	626	32.9%
3 = Adequately	1	14.3%	252	13.2%	0	0.0%	226	11.8%	0	0.0%	275	14.5%	1	14.3%	275	14.4%
4 = Poorly	0	0.0%	26	1.4%	0	0.0%	28	1.5%	0	0.0%	53	2.8%	0	0.0%	40	2.1%
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	25	1.3%	0	0.0%	23	1.2%	0	0.0%	53	2.8%	0	0.0%	48	2.5%
Mean : SD	1.57	0.79	1.72	0.84	1.43	0.53	1.68	0.83	1.29	0.49	1.78	0.98	1.57	0.79	1.78	0.94

Assessing Students for Learning

	16e. Ensure students with exceptionalities receive appropriate instruction and support within the least restrictive environment					17a. Involve all students in self-assessment, goal setting, and monitoring progress			
	Program		Statewide			Program		Statewide	
	7	77.8%	1904	84.8%		7	77.8%	1910	85.0%
1 = Very well	4	57.1%	985	51.7%		4	57.1%	778	40.7%
2 = Well	2	28.6%	596	31.3%		2	28.6%	710	37.2%
3 = Adequately	0	0.0%	250	13.1%		0	0.0%	339	17.7%
4 = Poorly	1	14.3%	41	2.2%		1	14.3%	50	2.6%
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	32	1.7%		0	0.0%	33	1.7%
Mean : SD	1.71	1.11	1.71	0.89		1.71	1.11	1.87	0.91

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

	17b. Give productive feedback to students to guide their learning				17c. Collect and utilize data to ensure educational benefit when aligning assessment data with goals and services within the least restrictive environment				17d. Appropriately modify and accommodate state and local assessments based on students' learning and accessibility needs			
	Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide		Program		Statewide	
	7	77.8%	1912	85.1%	7	77.8%	1909	85.0%	7	77.8%	1910	85.0%
1 = Very well	4	57.1%	854	44.7%	4	57.1%	928	48.6%	4	57.1%	851	44.6%
2 = Well	2	28.6%	713	37.3%	3	42.9%	671	35.1%	2	28.6%	682	35.7%
3 = Adequately	1	14.3%	283	14.8%	0	0.0%	253	13.3%	1	14.3%	283	14.8%
4 = Poorly	0	0.0%	38	2.0%	0	0.0%	37	1.9%	0	0.0%	50	2.6%
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	24	1.3%	0	0.0%	20	1.0%	0	0.0%	44	2.3%
Mean : SD	1.57	0.79	1.78	0.86	1.43	0.53	1.72	0.84	1.57	0.79	1.82	0.94

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

Clear Education Specialist Program Completer Survey - 2017

CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

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 accordingly

	Program		Statewide	
	7	77.8%	1914	85.2%
1 = Very well	4	57.1%	932	48.7%
2 = Well	2	28.6%	657	34.3%
3 = Adequately	1	14.3%	280	14.6%
4 = Poorly	0	0.0%	26	1.4%
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	19	1.0%
Mean : SD	1.57	0.79	1.72	0.83

18b. Work with colleagues to improve instruction

	Program		Statewide	
	7	77.8%	1917	85.4%
1 = Very well	3	42.9%	997	52.0%
2 = Well	3	42.9%	620	32.3%
3 = Adequately	1	14.3%	246	12.8%
4 = Poorly	0	0.0%	33	1.7%
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	21	1.1%
Mean : SD	1.71	0.76	1.68	0.84

18c. Provide a continuum of support for consultation, collaboration, co-teaching to mentoring with multi or interdisciplinary team members

	Program		Statewide	
	7	77.8%	1916	85.3%
1 = Very well	3	42.9%	886	46.2%
2 = Well	3	42.9%	675	35.2%
3 = Adequately	0	0.0%	273	14.2%
4 = Poorly	1	14.3%	48	2.5%
5 = Not at all	0	0.0%	34	1.8%
Mean : SD	1.86	1.07	1.78	0.90

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

	Program		Statewide	
	7	77.8%	1909	85.0%
1 = Very effective	4	57.1%	966	50.6%
2 = Effective	3	42.9%	723	37.9%
3 = Somewhat effective	0	0.0%	188	9.8%
4 = Not at all effective	0	0.0%	32	1.7%
Mean : SD	1.43	0.53	1.63	0.73

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

	Program		Statewide	
	7	77.8%	1911	85.1%
1 = Very effective	4	57.1%	985	51.5%
2 = Effective	3	42.9%	696	36.4%
3 = Somewhat effective	0	0.0%	196	10.3%
4 = Not at all effective	0	0.0%	34	1.8%
Mean : SD	1.43	0.53	1.62	0.74

Demographic Information

Demographic section omitted as the number of survey responders is too small for reporting.

	Number of Program Completers Asked to Participate in Survey	# and % of Respondents	
Program:	9	9	100.0 %
Statewide:	2412	2246	93.1 %

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

** Responses of "Don't Know" or variations on "N/A" are excluded from the percentage calculations.
Date: 11/3/2017