



COMMISSION ON  
TEACHER CREDENTIALING  
*Ensuring Educator Excellence*

**Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
Biennial Report  
Academic Years 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>University of San Diego</b>
<b>Date report is submitted</b>	<b>September 15, 2011</b>
<b>Program documented in this report</b>	<b>Administrative Services Credential Programs</b>
<b>Name of Program</b>	<b>Preliminary Administrative Services Professional Administrative Services</b>
<b>Credential awarded</b>	<b>Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Professional Administrative Services Credential</b>
<b>Is this program offered at more than one site? No</b>	
<b>If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered</b>	
<b>Program Contact</b>	<b>Steven Gelb, Ph.D., Associate Dean</b>
<b>Phone #</b>	<b>619-260-4893</b>
<b>E-Mail</b>	<b>sgelb@sandiego.edu</b>
<b>If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	<b>Paula S. Krist, Ph.D.</b>
<b>Phone #</b>	<b>619 – 260 - 4270</b>
<b>E-mail</b>	<b>pkrist@sandiego.edu</b>

**UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO  
SCHOOL OF LEADERSHIP AND EDUCATION SCIENCES**

**OVERVIEW**

At the University of San Diego, the School of Leadership and Education Sciences offers four credential programs. K-12 multiple subjects and single subject credential candidates, and candidates in special education credential areas are within the Department of Learning and Teaching. Administration credential candidates are part of the Educational Leadership Development Academy in the Department of Leadership Studies. Candidates seeking the credential in school counseling are served by the Department of Counseling and Marriage and Family Therapy.

All of the credential programs are aligned with the overarching School of Leadership and Education Sciences conceptual framework called ACE: academic excellence, critical inquiry, reflection; community and service; and, ethics, values and diversity. The ACE themes are an integral part of the program and candidate assessment system.

All of the credential programs are administered on campus at the University of San Diego, except for the Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing Credential. The DHH credential is administered at the John Tracy Clinic in Los Angeles, a facility renowned for its work with families of the deaf and hard of hearing. Although candidates are admitted to credential programs through a common process, their progress toward the credential is overseen and maintained by the appropriate department. Each program has distinct midpoint and endpoint assessments that emphasize the specialized skills appropriate to that credential area. Records are kept in each department and summarized with assistance from the Office of Assessment Support.

Because USD became part of the first cohort of universities involved in NCATE's Transformation Initiative option, the Commission changed our cohort placement from Orange to Red. Therefore, in this Biennial Report, we are presenting summaries for the past three years, 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. Section B is included in each report

The first section is the biennial report for the Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credential programs. Appendix A includes data from a recent alumni survey conducted by *Eduventures*.

## **SECTION A – ADMINISTRATION SERVICES CREDENTIAL PROGRAM INFORMATION**

### **I. Contextual Information**

Based on a philosophy of learning through reflective practice, the Educational Leadership Development Academy (ELDA) program is designed for administrative services credential candidates to learn, practice and achieve the California Professional Standards for School Leaders (CPSEL) standards. The program is based on the core belief that the continuous focus on increasing the leaders' knowledge and skills is essential in order to build systemic capacity. In the ELDA program the content of all courses is aligned with the CPSELS that are aligned with the standards of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC).

The ELDA Program is offered only on campus at USD. There are no on-line courses. The program operates in cohorts. Each year the Tier I Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (Aspiring Leaders Program) admits a new cohort of candidates. Since the Tier I program generally takes two years to complete the coursework and the apprenticeship, there are always two cohorts of Tier I Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (Aspiring Leaders) candidates attending classes. Occasionally, a candidate opts to take the coursework and carry out the 40 days of the practicum in one year, thus completing the program one year ahead of others in the cohort. This has not happened within the three year period of this report.

Tier I (Aspiring Leader) candidates are required to carry out a twenty-day apprenticeship each year, during their schools' summer recess. The candidate is assigned to apprentice with an exemplary principal, and s/he observes and practices with the administrator, and sometimes leads activities at the site, under the guidance of the mentor principal. The apprentice is closely monitored and guided by the University supervisor. With the completion of the two-year Tier I program, candidates will have spent 40 days in a structured, rigorous apprenticeship, experiencing with the mentor principal authentic workplace activities that take place in schools, and working with the mentor principal to problem-solve concerns and issues. ELDA coursework provides an integrated approach to leadership development that involves adult learning theory, mentoring relationships and reflective practice, all of which yield the best preparation for instructional leadership. The opportunity to apprentice with an exemplary principal provides the opportunity to combine theory with practice.

In July 2008, 15 candidates from Cohort 7, and one candidate from Cohort 8 completed the Preliminary Administrative Services program. Beginning in Sept. 2008, Cohort 9 (18 candidates) started the Aspiring Leaders coursework, while Cohort 8 (15 candidates) began their second year of the program. In 2009, Cohort 10 began with 13 candidates because one candidate took a leave of absence. Twelve of the original 13 Cohort 10 candidates completed the program in May 2011. Fourteen candidates in Cohort 11 began the program the Fall 2010. Ten Cohort 11 candidates are expected to return in Fall 2011 for year 2 of the program.

For the New Leaders Program (leading to the Tier II Professional Administrative Services Credential) the number of applicants to the program is low, and candidates do not apply to the ELDA Tier II program every year. This is due to the fact that candidate enrollment has

decreased in the school districts in San Diego County and fewer candidates are being appointed to administrative positions.

<b>Program Specific Credential Information Preliminary Administrative Services</b>		
	<i>Preliminary Tier New and Returning Candidates</i>	<i>Preliminary Tier Completers</i>
<b>2008 - 2009</b>	29	4
<b>2009 -2010</b>	32	13
<b>2010 - 2011</b>	23	12

<b>Program Specific Credential Information: Professional Administrative Services</b>		
	<i>Professional Tier New and Returning Candidates</i>	<i>Professional Tier Completers</i>
<b>2008 - 2009</b>	2	2
<b>2009 -2010</b>	4	3
<b>2010 - 2011</b>	0	0

**Course of Study (Curriculum and Practicum Experience)**

There are several options a candidate has to earn an Administrative Services Credential:

- Aspiring Leaders Cohort (Tier I) program
- New Leaders (Tier II) program
- Master’s program Leadership Studies

## II. Assessment of Candidates

There are multiple means of candidate assessment throughout the programs. A rich assessment system supports candidates to master the academic content, and become self-reflective, emotionally intelligent and globally empathetic leaders, developing traits that are identified as important in the adult education and leadership development literature.

The table below lists the instruments and experiences on which all credential candidates are assessed:

**Professional Administrative Credential Candidate Assessments**

<i>When</i>	<i>What</i>	<i>Who</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
Group orientation meeting for beginning candidates	Discussion of various assessments, courses, Portfolio and expectations	Faculty, Program Administrators and Candidates	Knowledge of assessment during program, and outcomes
Continuing assessment in coursework	Embedded assignments	Course Instructors	Development of knowledge/skills measured against portfolio and CPSEL rubrics
Midpoint	Course Evaluation Practicum Triad Meetings	(Program Faculty University Supervisors and/or Cooperating Mentor Principals)	Formative and summative candidate assessment
	Embedded assignments	Course Instructors	
	Practicum evaluations	Program Director, Faculty	
	Roundtable discussion	Program Director, University Supervisors Faculty	
Exit assessment	Comprehensive evaluation of candidates progress Portfolio Assessment and Presentation	Credential Analyst, Program Director, Mentor Principal, University Supervisor, Home School Principal	Recommendation or non-recommendation for credential

### **Candidate Assessment/Program Performance Information**

Primary Candidate assessments used throughout the program and to the point of recommending the candidates for the Tier I Preliminary Administrative Services credential are:

- Candidate Evaluation of Practicum Semester 2
- Candidate Evaluation of Practicum Semester 3
- Candidate Final evaluation, (end of fourth semester)
- Candidate performance on Oral Defense of Fieldwork Portfolio/Platform, and review of culminating portfolio/educational platform statement.
- Centerpiece assessments in every ELDA course which provide information on candidate's skills and knowledge.

Candidates are assessed on their work in the practicum using the above-mentioned documents. The Candidate Evaluation of the Practicum is based on the ISLIC and CPSEL standards. The ELDA program has created a Rubric for Assessing Leadership Skills/Outcomes for LEAD 597/8 P (Practicum). The Rubric for Assessing Leadership Skills/Outcomes is used by university supervisors and mentor/supervising principals to assess candidates' work in the practicum, and to determine candidates' growth in leadership skills and knowledge. The rubric also is used to evaluate satisfactory completion of the CPSEL standards. Data are collected for three consecutive semesters to determine candidate growth in leadership skill development, and to document specific experiences during the practicum that led to increased knowledge, skills, and habits of mind leading to increased leadership skill development.

Each Tier I and Tier II course contains a centerpiece assessment of a candidate's skills and knowledge. In LEAD 552, School Law and Educational Practice, the Centerpiece assessment consists of candidate performance on the midterm and final exam. The instructor uses a rubric to score these exams.

Candidates who have completed the Tier I (Aspiring Leaders) program are required to present an oral defense of their fieldwork portfolio to a group of critical friends. Scorers also review portfolio artifacts/reflections and the candidate's educational platform. The candidate's oral defense of the portfolio and the review of the artifacts/reflections and the platform are scored on a rubric that uses the CPSEL Standards as criteria.

### **Additional information about candidate and program completer performance/program effectiveness**

Tier I (Aspiring Leaders) candidates complete a mid-program survey (after completing the first year of the program) and an end-of program survey (at the completion of the program) to provide information about their experience in the program. This information is used by program directors and faculty members to ensure effectiveness of courses and other parts of the program.

In addition, candidates evaluate individual course instructors and content at the end of each semester using SurveyDig, a tool that is embedded in the university's student accounts. Ratings for courses in both levels of the administrative services programs are consistently high.

Employers of Tier I and Tier II program completers who are appointed to an administrative position are surveyed to provide information on the effectiveness of the candidate as a leader.

Data collected 2009-10:

**End of program survey for cohort 9 (program completers), Question 1** *“The ELDA program has met my expectations.”*

Number of candidates who responded to Question 1 on the end of program survey: 11

Percent of candidates who expressed satisfaction with the ELDA program: 100%

**Employer survey of ELDA graduates who were appointed to an administrative position.**

Of the Cohort 8 Tier I (Aspiring Leaders) candidates who completed the program, 3 candidates, 15% were appointed to an administrative position. 29% of employers responded to the survey. 100% of employers who responded said they would hire an ELDA graduate in the future. There were no Cohort 9 program completers who were appointed to an administrative position within one year of completing the Tier I program.

### III. Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

The ELDA program uses these four key assessments: centerpiece assessment, practicum assessment, the fieldwork portfolio, and assessment of candidates' oral defense of the fieldwork portfolio.

	<b>Cohort 9 # assessed</b>	<b>Cohort 9 # passed</b>	<b>Cohort 10 # assessed</b>	<b>Cohort 10 # passed</b>	<b>Cohort 11 # assessed</b>	<b>Cohort 11 # passed</b>
Centerpiece assessment	14	14	13	13	NA	NA
Practicum evaluation Semester 2	14	14	13	13	13	13
Oral Defense of the fieldwork portfolio Semester 4	13	13	9	9	Scheduled for Spring 2012	Scheduled for Spring 2012

#### **Analysis of Centerpiece assessment for LEAD 552 School Law and Educational Practice for ELDA (Cohorts 8, 9)**

The Aspiring Leader Cohort 8 member who earned an Incomplete for LEAD 553 in Spring 2008 was able to remediate the problem and subsequently passed the final examination for the course. The centerpiece assessment was under revision at the time Cohort 10 would have completed it and those data are not available.

#### **Analysis of Semester 2 Evaluation of Practicum**

Tier I candidates have completed the first 20 days of their apprenticeship when they are graded for the Semester 2 evaluation of the Practicum. Candidates are rated on every CPSEL standard, and they must receive, on average, a passing grade (5) in order to get a passing grade in the course. The grade for this course is Pass/Fail. Overall, data indicate that Tier I candidates in cohorts 8, 9, and 10 are performing well in their work in the second semester of the apprenticeship.

#### **Analysis of Semester 4 Evaluation of Practicum (program completers)**

Tier I candidates have completed all 40 days of their apprenticeship, as well as all of the coursework when they are graded for the Semester 4 (Final) evaluation of the Practicum. The grade for this course is a letter grade. A review and analysis of the grades for the Semester 4 Practicum evaluation reveals that candidates completed the second 20 days of the practicum at a



much higher level with higher grades on the rubric than the same candidates earned on the Semester 2 evaluation of the Practicum. This is consistent with the ELDA belief that a continuum of coursework, mentoring relationships, reflective practice, and exposure to authentic workplace activities combining theory and practice leads to stronger leadership skill development.

<b>Analysis of Tier I fieldwork portfolio and platform (program completers)</b>
---

**2008-2010** (scale 1 – 10)

CPSEL Standard	Cohort 8 n = 14	Cohort 9 n = 13
1	7.93	7.63
2	7.60	7.63
3	7.75	7.74
4	7.85	7.70
5	7.56	7.59
6	7.59	7.43
7	8.28	8.01
Educational Platform Presentation	7.76	7.69

**2010-2011** (scale 1 – 7)

CPSEL Standard	Cohort 10 n = 9
1	6.24
2	6.17
3	6.29
4	6.00
5	6.25
6	6.13
7	6.65
Educational Platform Presentation	5.69

Overall data indicates that Tier I candidates in all cohorts earned high scores on each of the CPSEL standards when they presented the Oral Defense of the Fieldwork Portfolio/platform.. No candidate scored below a “B” on the oral defense of the fieldwork portfolio and platform.

In 2010-2011, the rubric used to assess the Oral Defense of the Fieldwork Platform and the Fieldwork platform used a scale of 1-7, a truncated version of the scale used in earlier years. See the next section for an explanation of the change in the scale.

**End of program survey for Cohort 8 and 9, Question 1: “The ELDA program has met my expectations”**

All of the Tier 1 respondents of the end of program survey either agree or strongly agree with this item. It is evident that candidates feel the ELDA program provides a valuable learning experience on which learning focuses on the development of strong instructional leaders capable of creating a vision and culture for improvement, and on mobilizing resources to accelerate the learning for all candidates.

#### **IV. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance**

At University Supervisor meetings and at the ELDA Faculty Retreat, analysis of assessment data for candidates is reviewed. Discussions are held at both forums to plan for program improvement. Changes made since the last Biennial Report seem to be effective. These changes were made to help candidates perform better on tasks related to Standards 3 and 6.

- University supervisors have been working with supervising and mentor principals and the candidates to ensure that opportunities are provided for candidates to have more in-depth experiences related to Standards 3 and 6.
- The ELDA Director ensured that more Special Topics presentations by sitting principals will include experiences related to Standards 3 and 6.
- The instructor for EDLD 552, School Law and Educational Practice, started to emphasize school leadership experiences related to Standard 6. For the Special Topics classes, EDLD 583/584, the instructor added presentations by practicing school principals on how to build community /business partnerships and political support for the school, how to work with Board of Education members, how to seek policy information that might benefit the school and how to engage in a variety of forums to influence policy.

Data analysis reveals candidates in Cohorts 9 and 10 have improved in their performance on tasks related to Standards 3 and 6. In fact, performance across the standards seems to be more consistent than previously.

The program directors who began in Fall 2010 met with the Director of Assessment Support to examine assessment data from previous years. The discussion focused on the rubric used to assess Tier I and Tier II candidates' fieldwork portfolios. The rubric used a 10-point scale across criteria for CPSEL standards, with a 10 being described as performance exhibited by an experienced administrator. The intention was that the rubric could be used to assess candidate performance in both the Tier I and the Tier II programs; Tier I candidates' highest performance would be at 6 or 7 and Tier II candidates' highest performance would be at an 8 or 9. The scale for Tier I candidate portfolios needed to be truncated because supervisors showed a tendency to use the highest scores on the 1-10 scale (i.e., 8, 9, and 10) for Tier I candidates.

## Changes in the Administrative Services Programs

2008-2010

- Started World Educational Leadership Link (WELL) Project
- Hired new university supervisors that diversified the pool
- Expanded field placement criteria and began the process of including mentor principals from private, charter and other alternative educational settings making more purposeful placements commensurate with changing educational paradigms.
- Expanded recruitment to include a larger geographic the pool of applicants
- Created a Superintendent’s Collaborative for San Diego county districts

2010-2011

- Two new directors appointed for the ELDA Tier I and Tier II programs: Dr. Rose Martinez and Dr. Richard Thome
- Redesigned the course sequence for Tier I (Aspiring Leaders) credential programs
- Created the *Transformation Initiative field experience* to integrate the mentoring/supervision and evaluation process for Tier I candidates
- Worked closely with other departments (Counseling, Learning and Teaching, CEPAL, Non-Profit) to “bridge” relations with the Tier I Program
- All candidates are required to become certified PACT assessors.
- Truncated portfolio rubric for Tier I candidate portfolio evaluation to a 7-point scale, reserving scores of 8-10 for Tier II candidates
- Participated in *Eduventures* alumni survey (completers from 2008 – 2010 were invited to respond) to benchmark against other programs
- Operationalized use of *Foliotek* electronic portfolio system for launch of electronic artifact submission Fall 2011

## Planned Change in Assessment of the Administrative Services Programs

Although there are many points of assessment throughout the Tier I and Tier II programs, the data have been used at the individual candidate level, primarily. The director, supervisor and mentor principal use performance evaluations to foster candidate growth in the CPSEL standards. We recognize that we have not retained the data in a form that will allow us to examine the program as systematically as we would like to. With the use of *FolioTek* to collect student artifacts, we expect to be able to take more refined looks across each of the programs and to be able to assess the quality of each of the programs, as well as individual candidate performance.

## SECTION B: ALL PROGRAMS

There have been changes for the School of Leadership and Education Sciences that have affected all of the credential programs at the University of San Diego. The most important are summarized on the following table:

<b>SOLES changes</b>	
2008-2009	Electronic delivery of teacher candidate and counseling intern evaluations.
2008-2009	Revision of Task Stream DRF for teacher candidate embedded signature assignments
2008-2009	Electronic delivery of teacher candidate and counseling intern evaluations
Spring 2009 Fall 2010	SOLES hosted PACT assessor training for USD and other San Diego area assessors, including some USD supervisors
Summer 2010	SOLES PEU approved to be part of first cohort in NCATE's Transformation Initiative Option
Fall 2009	School Counseling Program hired two tenure-track faculty members
2009-2010	Liberal Studies Program Review
2009-2010	Creation of Liberal Studies Liberal Studies Advisory Council (to replace the TEG) comprised of faculty from SOLES and the College of Arts and Science faculty
2009-2010	Revision of assignments and rubrics for embedded signature assignments in teacher credential programs to better align with PACT
2010-2011	First Administrative Credential Candidates trained as PACT assessors
Spring 2010	Migration of all surveys and evaluations to Qualtrics survey software to increase efficiency of administration, data analysis and program improvement
Spring 2010	Course evaluations moved to electronic format, SurveyDig
Fall 2010	SOLES hosted PACT/TPAC conference

In our 2008 Biennial Report, SOLES identified five areas that all of the SOLES credential programs targeted for improvement during the next two years:

1. The three departments in the School of Leadership and Education Sciences that offer and oversee credential programs have recognized the fact that increased communication among the programs would benefit all of the credential candidates. The programs indicate they plan to develop stronger ties among candidates in different credential programs. We will examine the standards for each credential area to determine common courses, shared experiences and opportunities for collaborative interdisciplinary activities. The Associate Dean will lead monthly meetings of the credential areas to expedite this process; the first meeting will be in November 2008.
  - Since 2008 a great deal of structured collaboration between the school counseling program and the department of teaching and learning has occurred around action research. The annual conference to showcase both programs candidates' action research projects has required close collaboration between faculty and candidates across programs. In addition, Dr. Rowell from the school counseling program, and

Dr. Inoue from the department of learning and teaching, have co-taught a combined section of research methods for candidates from both programs. More recently faculty from the administrative services credential have begun collaborating with faculty from the department of learning and teaching around USD's Transformation Initiative (TI) that features mentorship of preliminary multiple and single subject credential candidates by administrative services level one candidates.

2. All areas have started to examine their mechanisms for assessing and documenting student learning. Increased effort will be placed on the organization and recording of direct evidence of student learning. In addition, the increased dialogue across the programs noted above will provide an opportunity for faculty to share best practices in teaching and assessment.
  - The cross-program activities in action research and the Transformation Initiative feature collaborations around the assessment of student learning. In the past three years the department of learning and teaching has developed and piloted the use of a rigorous action research project rubric to support and critique candidates' projects aimed at documenting increases in student learning. The TI collaboration between administrative services and teacher education candidates focuses on improving teacher candidates' lessons and increasing student learning.
3. All SOLES programs will increase dialogue and training for full-time and part-time faculty regarding "ACE" themes and performance indicators associated with the themes.
  - Full and part-time faculty in the department of learning and teaching have been in dialogue regarding the development and assessment of embedded signature assignments derived from objectives linked to "ACE" themes in the multiple and single subject credential courses. More work needs to be done to increase dialogue with the school counseling and administrative services full and part-time faculty.
4. SOLES programs will work to refine the documentation of assessment activities and faculty actions based on assessment data. SOLES Director of Assessment is examining electronic management systems to determine the best way for the school to record its more coordinated program assessment data in a SOLES Director of Assessment is examining electronic management systems to determine the best way for the school to record its program assessment data, analysis, and actions via a centralized system.
  - We have made three important improvements in terms of electronic management of data. First, we have migrated all surveys and evaluations for teacher and school counselor fieldwork to Qualtrics survey software. Survey implementation and data analysis are facilitated by the Office of Assessment Support. Second, we moved our course evaluations to SurveyDig, which is a tool that allows candidates to evaluate courses and instructors through their university email accounts. Third, the Office of Assessment Support adopted the use of Task Stream's Accountability Management System (AMS) system to document program level assessment for non-credential programs.
5. Full time faculty will provide leadership, support and mentorship for part-time faculty. This will include the appointment of lead faculty for each course and the development of standardized syllabi and assessments.

- The last three years have seen a number of personnel and organization changes in the leadership of credential programs, and because of this, monitoring of the quality of leadership by lead faculty has been spotty. The newly appointed chairs of the department of learning and teaching and the new department of counseling and marital family are committed to supervising this process closely. Under the leadership of Dr. Paula Krist, Assistant Dean of Assessment Support, standardization of assessments and use of electronic data tracking systems has continued to move forward.

In the next two years SOLES will focus on the following areas of development across the professional education unit:

1. Development of SOLES Strategic Plan 2012-2017
2. Unit-wide assessment of candidate dispositions.
3. Faculty involvement in the use of TaskStream AMS. Ideally, the Office of Assessment Support will create a faculty team who will be able to work together to assess the assessment plans and results of SOLES programs.
4. Continued enhancement of electronic documentation and assessment of candidate performance. Administrative Services programs have decided to adopt FolioTec to collect candidate artifacts and portfolios electronically beginning in 2011-2012.

**APPENDIX A**  
**Preliminary Administrative Services Credential**  
**Additional Data**



Schools of Education  
Learning Collaborative  
August 2011

**Teacher and Administrator Preparation Program Outcomes:  
University of San Diego's School of Leadership and Education Studies Alumni**  
*2011 Collaborative and Custom Survey Responses*

*The primary goals of this study are to assist University of San Diego in understanding the strengths and areas for improvement for its teacher and administrator preparation programs, to compare the responses from University of San Diego's responding alumni to those from the SOE-LC's national dataset, and, in the future, to allow University of San Diego to gauge any changes in graduates' perceptions of preparedness across core teaching and administration competency areas from year to year.*

### ***Background and Key Questions***

---

As a member of Eduventures' Schools of Education Learning Collaborative (SOE-LC), the University of San Diego (USD) elected to participate this year in a survey of its recent graduates. Moving forward, Eduventures will conduct a yearly alumni survey each spring of alumni from the schools in its SOE-LC with core teaching competency questions mapped to INTASC standards and core administrator competency questions mapped to ISLLC standards. Doing so will allow Eduventures to develop a regular, yearly national dataset.

This particular study of USD graduates involved the development of a web-based survey with questions based on INTASC and ISLLC standards to assess the preparation and career outcomes for its teacher and administrator program graduates. In addition to the standard questions used to build a national benchmark, USD had the opportunity to choose or create custom questions specifically for their alumni.

*The key questions addressed in this investigation were:*

- How well prepared were USD teacher education and administrator program graduates to enter their professional fields?
- Which of USD's particular program features are strongly linked to teacher and administrator preparedness?
- How successful are USD graduates in securing employment in the field for which they were trained?
- Where are USD graduates working?



Beginning in April, 2011, USD alumni were emailed an invitation to participate in the survey. Surveys remained in the field through June, during which time alumni were emailed multiple reminders to complete the survey. Across the SOE-LC, the survey yielded a total of 1,426 responses, with 971 alumni completing the full survey. On behalf of USD, Eduventures collected a total of 15 responses, with 10 alumni completing the entire survey. The overall response rate (including incomplete responses) was 83.33%. While the full dataset is sizeable in scope, it is important to recognize that it may not be a nationally representative sample. However, there are benefits in benchmarking Fordham's graduates' responses against the broader dataset to identify any trends or differences.

*If you would like any additional analysis or data-cuts of your alumni responses following your review of this benchmarking data, or if you would like to arrange an analyst discussion to review the findings with you and/or your colleagues, please contact any member of the SOE-LC research team or contact Kristen Hewett at [khewett@eduventures.com](mailto:khewett@eduventures.com).*

### ***Executive Summary***

---

Key trends among USD survey responses include:

- The majority of respondents (64.3%) most recently earned an Administrative Credential from USD. The most common program for enrollment was Preliminary Administrative Services (Credential). The most common graduation year of respondents was 2010.
- 91.7% of respondents completed less than 20% of their degree online.
- Survey respondents who graduated from an administrator preparation program felt that their USD program prepared them well in the areas of School Improvement and Instructional Leadership.
  - The same group feels less prepared for issues surrounding School Management, and Assessment and Use of Data.
- All 11 respondents to questions about employment are employed. 45.5% of those respondents are employed in a field directly related to their training at USD and 36.4% are employed in a field somewhat related to their training at USD.
  - Specifically, 44.4 % of respondents are School Vice Principals, and 33.3 % are Teacher Leaders at a PK-12 school. 77.8% work in an urban setting, and 77.8% of employed respondents work in a public school.
- Nearly 80% of respondents had a field placement of some duration during their studies at USD.
- Respondents are most commonly certified in Educational Administration (40.0%); Educational Leadership (33.3%); and English as a Second Language (33.3%)
- The most common respondent is a Hispanic woman between the ages of 35 and 44 who earns \$60,000-\$69,999 annually.
- Respondents were most satisfied with the timing, quality, and experience of their fieldwork/practicum/internship.
  - They were also highly satisfied with the quality of overall advising.
- Respondents were less satisfied with assistance finding employment and feedback from instructors/supervisors.
- In order to feel connected to USD, most respondents said they would want to: aid admissions in the recruitment of new students; mentor new students; and receive alumni emails.

## ***Discussion***

---

The results of this survey offer several actionable takeaways for USD. First, USD may want to consider carefully how its coursework supports future administrators with issues of School Management, especially with regards to recruitment and hiring of strong teachers, and Assessment and Use of Data, especially with regards to evaluating regularly school culture and climate. USD can also refine and evaluate its course offerings in the field of Educational Administration, and devote energy to incorporating innovations in the field into that program, as this is the most popular area of study among respondents. Finally, since online education is not currently a significant element of respondents' education at USD, USD could explore or deepen its online offerings. SOE analysts can augment any of these conversations through pre-existing and future collaborative research, or by facilitating conversations between USD and other members of our Learning Collaborative who have expertise and experience in these areas.

## ***Participating Members***

---

CUNY Lehman College  
Fordham University  
George Mason University  
Indiana University  
Kutztown University  
Loyola Maryland University  
North Carolina A&T

North Georgia College and State University  
Ohio University  
Western Michigan University  
University of Akron  
University of New Orleans  
University of Pittsburgh  
University of San Diego

## ***Survey Results***

---

*Please note the following:*

- The number of respondents may vary among questions, as not all respondents answered the survey in full. The number of respondents for teacher and administrator specific questions may be less than the overall N because not all respondents were directed to each question. Frequencies that outline the survey responses for all collaborative and custom questions are provided below. Should USD seek additional cross-tabulations of this data, or seek to disaggregate this data in any ways, the SOE-LC team is happy to conduct further analysis upon request.*
- Throughout the results presented on the following pages, “No response” encompasses both those respondents that chose not to answer the question as well as those that were not directed to the question. For example, teacher education graduates were not directed to answer any questions for administrator graduates, and those that indicated that they were not currently employed were not directed to answer any questions regarding their employment.*

**Background Information**

**What degree or certificate did you most recently receive from the University of San Diego’s SOLES?**  
 (Degrees are divided into categories for benchmarking purposes.)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Degree Category	Bachelors	0	.0%	403	31.4%
	Certificate	0	.0%	62	4.8%
	Credential	9	64.3%	18	1.4%
	Doctorate	0	.0%	102	7.9%
	Endorsement	0	.0%	3	.2%
	Masters	5	35.7%	669	52.1%
	Professional Diploma	0	.0%	20	1.6%
	Specialist	0	.0%	8	.6%

**What degree or certificate did you most recently receive from the University of San Diego’s SOLES? (USD only)**

Response	Frequency	Count
Preliminary Administrative Services (Credential)	78.6%	11
Professional Administrative Services (Credential)	21.4%	3
Leadership Studies (M.A.)	35.7%	5
I did not complete a program	0.0%	0
	Valid responses	14
	Total responses	15

**Which of the following SOLES programs were you most recently enrolled in? (USD only)**  
 (Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

Response	Frequency	Count
Preliminary Administrative Services (Credential)	78.6%	11
Professional Administrative Services (Credential)	21.4%	3
Leadership Studies (M.A.)	35.7%	5
I did not complete a program	0.0%	0
	Valid responses	14
	Total responses	15

**Where did you complete the majority of your coursework?**  
 (Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Online Completion	Between 20% and 80% of my program was completed online	0	.0%	96	8.2%
	Less than 20% of my program was completed online	11	91.7%	1064	90.4%
	More than 80% of my program was completed online	1	8.3%	17	1.4%

**In what year did you complete your program?**  
 (Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Completion Year	2008	1	8.3%	164	13.7%
	2009	0	.0%	254	21.2%
	2010	10	83.3%	266	22.2%
	Before 2008	1	8.3%	511	42.7%
	Did not complete	0	.0%	2	.2%

**In what year did you complete your program? (USD only)**  
 (Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

Response	Frequency	Count
2010	83.3%	10
2009	0.0%	0
2008	8.3%	1
2007	0.0%	0
2006	0.0%	0
2005	8.3%	1
2004	0.0%	0
2003	0.0%	0
2002	0.0%	0
2001	0.0%	0
2000	0.0%	0
Before 2000	0.0%	0
	Valid responses	12
	Total responses	12

## ***Administrator Preparation Section***

Survey respondents who indicated that they had completed a administrator preparation program through USD were directed to answer the following questions. In this section, respondents were asked how well their administrator preparation program prepared them for specific components of their work as teachers, on a scale of 1 (Very unprepared) to 5 (Very well prepared).

### **School Management (Administrators Only)**

**Please indicate how well your program prepared you for the following challenges:**

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Develop and implement a strategic plan in collaboration with key stakeholders.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	2	1.5%
	Neutral	0	.0%	6	4.5%
	Prepared	2	20.0%	49	36.8%
	Very Well Prepared	8	80.0%	75	56.4%
Develop and effectively communicate the school's vision.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	2	1.5%
	Neutral	0	.0%	4	3.1%
	Prepared	1	10.0%	43	33.1%
	Very Well Prepared	9	90.0%	81	62.3%
Identify and obtain financial, human, and material resources to support the school's vision.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	2	1.6%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	7	5.5%
	Neutral	3	30.0%	12	9.4%
	Prepared	2	20.0%	61	47.7%
	Very Well Prepared	5	50.0%	46	35.9%

Build a safe and supportive learning environment.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	3	2.3%
	Neutral	0	.0%	5	3.9%
	Prepared	3	30.0%	47	36.4%
	Very Well Prepared	7	70.0%	74	57.4%
Ensure school equipment and systems operate efficiently and effectively.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	2	1.6%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	8	6.4%
	Neutral	2	20.0%	28	22.4%
	Prepared	3	30.0%	41	32.8%
	Very Well Prepared	5	50.0%	46	36.8%
Identify and resolve problems in a timely manner.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	2	1.5%
	Neutral	0	.0%	1	.7%
	Prepared	3	30.0%	54	40.3%
	Very Well Prepared	7	70.0%	77	57.5%
Recruit and hire strong teachers and staff and execute HR functions.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	2	1.7%
	Unprepared	2	20.0%	8	6.8%
	Neutral	0	.0%	12	10.3%
	Prepared	4	40.0%	49	41.9%
	Very Well Prepared	4	40.0%	46	39.3%



## School Improvement (Administrators Only)

Please indicate how well your program prepared you for the following challenges:

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Develop and implement a continuous school improvement strategy.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	4	3.1%
	Neutral	0	.0%	7	5.4%
	Prepared	0	.0%	47	36.2%
	Very Well Prepared	10	100.0%	72	55.4%
Involve families, the community, and all students and staff in school improvement efforts.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	4	3.1%
	Neutral	1	10.0%	10	7.9%
	Prepared	1	10.0%	47	37.0%
	Very Well Prepared	8	80.0%	65	51.2%
Regularly monitor, evaluate, and revise school improvement plans.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	3	2.3%
	Neutral	1	10.0%	11	8.6%
	Prepared	3	30.0%	43	33.6%
	Very Well Prepared	6	60.0%	70	54.7%
Identify and implement professional development that is responsive to the needs of students and teachers.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	2	1.6%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	3	2.3%
	Neutral	0	.0%	13	10.1%
	Prepared	2	20.0%	42	32.6%
	Very Well Prepared	8	80.0%	69	53.5%

Identify and address barriers to student learning.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	2	1.5%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	3	2.2%
	Neutral	0	.0%	12	8.8%
	Prepared	2	20.0%	50	36.5%
	Very Well Prepared	8	80.0%	70	51.1%

### **Instructional Leadership (Administrators Only)**

**Please indicate how well your program prepared you for the following challenges:**

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Understand and apply student development, learning, and motivational theories.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	4	3.1%
	Neutral	1	10.0%	12	9.3%
	Prepared	4	40.0%	47	36.4%
	Very Well Prepared	5	50.0%	65	50.4%
Apply/model curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and refinement.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	4	3.2%
	Neutral	0	.0%	14	11.1%
	Prepared	2	20.0%	43	34.1%
	Very Well Prepared	8	80.0%	64	50.8%
Apply/model principles of effective instruction.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	4	3.1%
	Neutral	0	.0%	10	7.9%
	Prepared	2	20.0%	45	35.4%
	Very Well Prepared	8	80.0%	67	52.8%

Implement and uphold high standards for student learning.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Neutral	0	.0%	6	4.7%
	Prepared	1	10.0%	43	33.6%
	Very Well Prepared	9	90.0%	77	60.2%
Implement and uphold high standards for teacher/staff performance.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	2	1.6%
	Neutral	0	.0%	7	5.6%
	Prepared	1	10.0%	48	38.7%
	Very Well Prepared	9	90.0%	66	53.2%
Effectively apply and assess technologies for teaching and learning.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	7	5.5%
	Neutral	1	10.0%	15	11.8%
	Prepared	3	30.0%	49	38.6%
	Very Well Prepared	6	60.0%	55	43.3%
Apply/model instruction for a diverse group of learners.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	5	4.0%
	Neutral	0	.0%	7	5.6%
	Prepared	2	20.0%	46	36.8%
	Very Well Prepared	8	80.0%	66	52.8%

**Assessment and Use of Data (Administrators Only)**

**Please indicate how well your program prepared you for the following challenges:**

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Implement a variety of data collection and data analysis strategies.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	3	2.2%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	6	4.5%
	Neutral	1	10.0%	16	11.9%
	Prepared	3	30.0%	47	35.1%
	Very Well Prepared	6	60.0%	62	46.3%
Leverage key information sources for decision-making and for developing the school's vision.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	3	2.3%
	Neutral	1	10.0%	15	11.6%
	Prepared	3	30.0%	45	34.9%
	Very Well Prepared	6	60.0%	65	50.4%
Make curriculum decisions based on research.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	4	3.1%
	Neutral	0	.0%	12	9.4%
	Prepared	3	30.0%	45	35.2%
	Very Well Prepared	7	70.0%	67	52.3%
Assess the school culture and climate on a regular basis.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	4	3.1%
	Neutral	1	10.0%	10	7.7%
	Prepared	4	40.0%	39	30.0%
	Very Well Prepared	5	50.0%	77	59.2%

Employ a variety of supervisory and evaluation models.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	7	5.5%
	Neutral	1	10.0%	14	10.9%
	Prepared	3	30.0%	40	31.3%
	Very Well Prepared	6	60.0%	66	51.6%

**Communicating and Collaborating (Administrators Only)**

**Please indicate how well your program prepared you for the following challenges:**

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Communicate effectively with students and families.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	2	1.6%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Neutral	0	.0%	12	9.3%
	Prepared	2	20.0%	44	34.1%
	Very Well Prepared	8	80.0%	70	54.3%
Communicate effectively with teachers and staff.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	2	1.6%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Neutral	0	.0%	11	8.5%
	Prepared	2	20.0%	39	30.2%
	Very Well Prepared	8	80.0%	76	58.9%
Build consensus and effectively negotiate.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	2	1.5%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	4	3.1%
	Neutral	0	.0%	15	11.5%
	Prepared	2	20.0%	44	33.6%
	Very Well Prepared	8	80.0%	66	50.4%

Build and maintain relationships with community stakeholders to support school goals.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	2	1.6%
	Unprepared	1	10.0%	4	3.2%
	Neutral	0	.0%	9	7.3%
	Prepared	2	20.0%	40	32.3%
	Very Well Prepared	7	70.0%	69	55.6%
Establish effective media relations.	Very Unprepared	1	10.0%	3	2.5%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	12	9.9%
	Neutral	2	20.0%	22	18.2%
	Prepared	3	30.0%	43	35.5%
	Very Well Prepared	4	40.0%	41	33.9%

**Ethics (Administrators Only)**

Please indicate how well your program prepared you for the following challenges:

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Demonstrate a personal and professional code of ethics.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Neutral	1	9.1%	5	3.8%
	Prepared	0	.0%	34	25.6%
	Very Well Prepared	10	90.9%	93	69.9%
Demonstrate values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Neutral	1	9.1%	5	3.8%
	Prepared	0	.0%	33	24.8%
	Very Well Prepared	10	90.9%	94	70.7%
Demonstrate appreciation for and sensitivity to the diversity in the school and community.	Very Unprepared	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Unprepared	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Neutral	1	9.1%	5	3.8%
	Prepared	0	.0%	33	25.2%
	Very Well Prepared	10	90.9%	92	70.2%

## ***Employment Section***

---

In this section, all survey participants were asked to respond to questions regarding their current employment. Respondents who indicated that they currently work as teachers were asked which subject areas they were teaching. Respondents who indicated that they work in a school were asked to describe the general location and type of the school. To assist USD in identifying graduates' places of employment, respondents were asked to provide more detailed employer information. This data is organized in an Excel file that accompanies this report.

### **Are you currently employed?**

(Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Currently Employed	No, and I am not actively seeking employment	0	.0%	44	4.5%
	No, but I am actively seeking employment	0	.0%	95	9.8%
	Yes	11	100.0%	832	85.7%



**Are you currently employed in a position for which you were trained at SOLES?**

(Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Position Relation	Employed in field directly related to my training	5	45.5%	599	72.3%
	Employed in field not related to my training	2	18.2%	43	5.2%
	Employed in field somewhat related to my training	4	36.4%	187	22.6%

**What best describes your current position?**

(Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Current Position	Counselor	0	.0%	19	2.4%
	Curriculum developer	0	.0%	2	.3%
	District Assistant Superintendent	0	.0%	7	.9%
	District Superintendent	0	.0%	2	.3%
	Education technology specialist	0	.0%	8	1.0%
	Evaluator	0	.0%	4	.5%
	Full-time student	0	.0%	8	1.0%
	Human resources specialist	0	.0%	1	.1%
	Non-education related occupation	0	.0%	9	1.1%

Other (please specify):	1	11.1%	102	12.9%
Policymaker	0	.0%	3	.4%
Reading specialist	0	.0%	12	1.5%
Researcher	0	.0%	3	.4%
School Principal	1	11.1%	11	1.4%
School Vice Principal	4	44.4%	18	2.3%
School or district administrator	0	.0%	18	2.3%
School psychologist	0	.0%	12	1.5%
Special education teacher in PK-12	0	.0%	82	10.4%
Teacher in PK-12	0	.0%	368	46.6%
Teacher leader in PK-12	3	33.3%	46	5.8%
University or college administrator	0	.0%	24	3.0%
University or college faculty/professor	0	.0%	30	3.8%

**USD Respondents' Specified "Other" Current Positions**

Resource Teacher

**Which of the following subject areas are you currently teaching? (Current Teachers Only)**

(Respondents were allowed to choose **up to two** responses)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Adult education		0	.0%	2	.1%
Art		0	.0%	13	.9%
Biology		0	.0%	12	.9%
Business		0	.0%	1	.1%
Chemistry		0	.0%	11	.8%
General Education		0	.0%	72	5.1%
German		0	.0%	2	.1%
Earth Science		0	.0%	11	.8%
English or language arts		0	.0%	94	6.7%
English as a second language (ESL)		3	20.0%	21	1.5%
Family and Consumer Science		0	.0%	1	.1%
French		0	.0%	3	.2%
General Science		0	.0%	14	1.0%
Health		0	.0%	6	.4%
History/Social Studies		0	.0%	59	4.2%
Mathematics		0	.0%	67	4.7%
Music/Choral		0	.0%	5	.4%
Music/Instrumental		0	.0%	4	.3%
Physical Education		0	.0%	11	.8%
Physics		0	.0%	6	.4%
Reading		0	.0%	42	3.0%
Spanish		0	.0%	16	1.1%

Special education		0	.0%	74	5.2%
Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages		0	.0%	5	.4%
Technology Education		0	.0%	4	.3%
Theater		0	.0%	2	.1%
Trade and Industrial Education		0	.0%	3	.2%
All or most subjects in my grade		0	.0%	83	5.9%
Other (please specify):		0	.0%	32	2.3%

**What best describes your current place of employment? (Select one)**

(Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Employment Place	Community or two-year college	0	.0%	13	1.6%
	Early childhood setting	0	.0%	25	3.2%
	Elementary school	2	22.2%	228	28.9%
	Four-year college or university	0	.0%	54	6.9%
	Government (local, state, federal; excluding educational institutions)	0	.0%	9	1.1%
	Healthcare (including mental health setting)	0	.0%	7	.9%
	Middle school	2	22.2%	127	16.1%
	Multi-level school (e.g., K-12 school)	3	33.3%	64	8.1%

	Other, please specify:	0	.0%	37	4.7%
	Private sector or industry	0	.0%	14	1.8%
	Research center or policy think tank	0	.0%	4	.5%
	School district office	0	.0%	23	2.9%
	Secondary school	2	22.2%	180	22.8%
	Self-employed	0	.0%	3	.4%

**If you work in a school/college setting, which best describes where your school/college is located? (School Employees Only)**  
 (Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
School Location	I do not work in a school/college setting	0	.0%	18	2.5%
	Other	0	.0%	16	2.2%
	Rural	0	.0%	93	13.0%
	Suburban	2	22.2%	311	43.6%
	Urban	7	77.8%	275	38.6%

**If your current position is in a school/college setting, please indicate the type of school/college: (School Employees Only)**

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
School Type	Charter	0	.0%	61	8.6%
	My current position is not in a school/college setting	1	11.1%	26	3.7%
	Other (please specify):	0	.0%	16	2.3%
	Parochial	1	11.1%	36	5.1%
	Private	0	.0%	55	7.7%
	Public	7	77.8%	516	72.7%

**If your current position is not related to your education at USD’s SOLES, please indicate which best describes your situation.**  
 (Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Position Not Related	I decided not to pursue a career related to my degree	0	.0%	10	23.3%
	I found a better position in another field	0	.0%	7	16.3%
	I was unable to find a position related to my education	1	50.0%	12	27.9%
	Other (please indicate):	0	.0%	12	27.9%
	The timing is not yet right for pursuing a career related to my education	1	50.0%	2	4.7%

***Program Features Section***

---

**During the program which fulfilled requirements for your initial certification/licensure, how long was your total field placement time?**

(Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Field Placement Length	1 – 3 months	4	36.4%	144	15.4%
	10 – 12 months	0	.0%	93	9.9%
	4 – 6 months	1	9.1%	271	28.9%
	7 – 9 months	0	.0%	103	11.0%
	I did not have a field placement	2	18.2%	220	23.5%
	Less than one month	1	9.1%	30	3.2%
	More than 12 months	3	27.3%	77	8.2%



**Which of the following components were part of the program which fulfilled requirements for your initial certification or licensure?**

(Respondents were allowed to choose **multiple** responses)

	USD			
	USD		All Others	
	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Mentoring or Induction program	8	53.3%	296	21.0%
Fieldwork was in a location (rural, suburban, urban) similar to my first job	9	60.0%	483	34.2%
Fieldwork was at a grade level that matched that of my first job	3	20.0%	343	24.3%
Coursework in child development	0	.0%	263	18.6%
Fieldwork occurred in a professional development school	1	6.7%	103	7.3%
Coursework on adapting instruction to a diverse set of learners	3	20.0%	306	21.7%
Subject/content-specific coursework	4	26.7%	429	30.4%
Subject-specific pedagogy	2	13.3%	310	22.0%
None of the above	0	.0%	136	9.6%

**Certification Section**

**Do you currently hold certification or licensure to practice in the area for which you were trained at SOLES?**

(Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Certification	No	0	.0%	143	15.2%
	Yes	9	100.0%	799	84.8%

**What best describes the level of certification or licensure you hold in the area for which you were trained at SOLES?**

(Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Certification Level	Advanced certification or licensure	2	20.0%	284	35.7%
	Initial certification or licensure	7	70.0%	468	58.8%
	Not applicable	0	.0%	17	2.1%
	Other, please specify:	1	10.0%	27	3.4%

USD Respondents' Specified "Other" Certification Level
Admin Credential

**In which state(s) do you hold certification or licensure in the area for which you were trained at SOLES?**

(Respondents could choose **multiple** responses)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Certification State	Alabama	0	.0%	1	.1%
	Alaska	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Arizona	0	.0%	4	.5%
	Arkansas	0	.0%	0	.0%
	California	10	100.0%	50	6.3%
	Colorado	0	.0%	1	.1%
	Connecticut	0	.0%	3	.4%
	DC	0	.0%	1	.1%
	Delaware	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Florida	0	.0%	3	.4%
	Georgia	0	.0%	34	4.3%
	Hawaii	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Idaho	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Illinois	0	.0%	5	.6%
	In a US territory	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Indiana	0	.0%	85	10.7%
	Iowa	0	.0%	1	.1%
	Kansas	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Kentucky	0	.0%	2	.3%
	Louisiana	0	.0%	81	10.2%
Maine	0	.0%	0	.0%	
Maryland	0	.0%	5	.6%	
Massachusetts	0	.0%	1	.1%	
Michigan	0	.0%	62	7.8%	

Minnesota	0	.0%	0	.0%
Mississippi	0	.0%	0	.0%
Missouri	0	.0%	1	.1%
Montana	0	.0%	0	.0%
Nebraska	0	.0%	0	.0%
Nevada	0	.0%	2	.3%
New Hampshire	0	.0%	0	.0%
New Jersey	0	.0%	22	2.8%
New Mexico	0	.0%	0	.0%
New York	0	.0%	121	15.3%
North Carolina	0	.0%	19	2.4%
North Dakota	0	.0%	0	.0%
Ohio	0	.0%	106	13.4%
Oklahoma	0	.0%	1	.1%
Oregon	0	.0%	0	.0%
Pennsylvania	0	.0%	98	12.4%
Puerto Rico	0	.0%	0	.0%
Rhode Island	0	.0%	0	.0%
South Carolina	0	.0%	3	.4%
South Dakota	0	.0%	0	.0%
Tennessee	0	.0%	0	.0%
Texas	0	.0%	1	.1%
Utah	0	.0%	0	.0%
Vermont	0	.0%	0	.0%
Virginia	0	.0%	76	9.6%
Washington	0	.0%	2	.3%
West Virginia	0	.0%	2	.3%
Wisconsin	0	.0%	0	.0%
Wyoming	0	.0%	0	.0%

**If you hold certification or licensure in more than one state, please choose the additional state. Skip this question if you do not hold more than one state certification or licensure.**

(Respondents could choose **multiple** responses)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Second Certification State	Alabama	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Alaska	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Arizona	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Arkansas	0	.0%	0	.0%
	California	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Colorado	0	.0%	4	3.1%
	Connecticut	0	.0%	6	4.7%
	DC	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Delaware	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Florida	0	.0%	2	1.6%
	Georgia	0	.0%	5	3.9%
	Hawaii	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Idaho	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Illinois	0	.0%	5	3.9%
	In a US territory	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Indiana	0	.0%	7	5.4%
	Iowa	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Kansas	0	.0%	1	.8%
	Kentucky	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Louisiana	0	.0%	4	3.1%
Maine	0	.0%	0	.0%	
Maryland	0	.0%	5	3.9%	

Massachusetts	0	.0%	5	3.9%
Michigan	0	.0%	1	.8%
Minnesota	0	.0%	0	.0%
Mississippi	0	.0%	2	1.6%
Missouri	0	.0%	3	2.3%
Montana	0	.0%	0	.0%
Nebraska	0	.0%	0	.0%
Nevada	0	.0%	0	.0%
New Hampshire	0	.0%	0	.0%
New Jersey	0	.0%	13	10.1%
New Mexico	0	.0%	1	.8%
New York	0	.0%	17	13.2%
North Carolina	0	.0%	9	7.0%
North Dakota	0	.0%	0	.0%
Ohio	0	.0%	3	2.3%
Oklahoma	0	.0%	0	.0%
Oregon	0	.0%	0	.0%
Pennsylvania	0	.0%	12	9.3%
Puerto Rico	0	.0%	0	.0%
Rhode Island	0	.0%	1	.8%
South Carolina	0	.0%	3	2.3%
South Dakota	0	.0%	1	.8%
Tennessee	0	.0%	3	2.3%
Texas	1	100.0%	7	5.4%
Utah	0	.0%	0	.0%
Vermont	0	.0%	1	.8%
Virginia	0	.0%	6	4.7%
Washington	0	.0%	1	.8%
West Virginia	0	.0%	0	.0%

	Wisconsin	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Wyoming	0	.0%	0	.0%

**In which areas are you certified?**

(Respondents could choose **multiple** responses)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Adult education		1	6.7%	5	.4%
Art		0	.0%	19	1.3%
Bilingual Education		3	20.0%	15	1.1%
Biology		0	.0%	22	1.6%
Business		0	.0%	7	.5%
Chemistry		0	.0%	14	1.0%
Counseling Psychology		0	.0%	13	.9%
General Education		2	13.3%	65	4.6%
German		0	.0%	2	.1%
Earth Science		0	.0%	7	.5%
Educational Administration		6	40.0%	70	5.0%
Educational Leadership		5	33.3%	56	4.0%
Elementary Education		2	13.3%	287	20.3%
English or language arts		0	.0%	126	8.9%
English as a second language (ESL)		5	33.3%	37	2.6%
Family and Consumer Science		0	.0%	4	.3%
French		0	.0%	5	.4%

General Science		0	.0%	33	2.3%
Health		0	.0%	16	1.1%
High School		1	6.7%	61	4.3%
History/Social Studies		0	.0%	93	6.6%
Mathematics		0	.0%	64	4.5%
Mental Health Counseling		0	.0%	1	.1%
Middle School		1	6.7%	86	6.1%
Music/Choral		0	.0%	5	.4%
Music/Instrumental		0	.0%	7	.5%
Physical Education		0	.0%	25	1.8%
Physics		0	.0%	8	.6%
Principalship		1	6.7%	32	2.3%
Reading		1	6.7%	79	5.6%
School Psychology		0	.0%	21	1.5%
Spanish		3	20.0%	28	2.0%
Special education		0	.0%	134	9.5%
Superintendency		0	.0%	18	1.3%
Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages		1	6.7%	12	.9%
Technology Education		0	.0%	13	.9%
Theater		0	.0%	4	.3%
Trade and Industrial Education		0	.0%	1	.1%
Other (please specify):		0	.0%	96	6.8%



**Demographics Section**

---

**What is your gender?**

(Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Gender	Female	7	70.0%	711	77.4%
	Male	3	30.0%	208	22.6%

**What is your race/ethnicity?**

(Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Ethnicity	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	.0%	28	3.0%
	Black, non-Hispanic	0	.0%	68	7.4%
	Hispanic	7	70.0%	48	5.2%
	Other:	0	.0%	16	1.7%
	Prefer not to answer	0	.0%	34	3.7%
	White, non-Hispanic	3	30.0%	725	78.9%

**What is your current salary?**

(Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Salary	\$20,000-\$29,999 per year	0	.0%	0	.0%
	\$100,000-\$119,999 per year	0	.0%	30	3.6%
	\$120,000 or more per year	0	.0%	27	3.2%
	\$30,000-\$39,999 per year	0	.0%	165	19.6%
	\$40,000-\$49,999 per year	1	10.0%	180	21.4%
	\$50,000-\$59,999 per year	1	10.0%	108	12.8%
	\$60,000-\$69,999 per year	4	40.0%	70	8.3%
	\$70,000-\$79,999 per year	0	.0%	35	4.2%
	\$80,000-\$99,999 per year	2	20.0%	42	5.0%
	Less than \$19,999 per year	1	10.0%	83	9.8%
	Not Applicable	0	.0%	47	5.6%
	Prefer not to answer	1	10.0%	56	6.6%

**What is your age?**

(Respondents could only choose a **single** response)

		USD			
		USD		All Others	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Age	18-24	0	.0%	124	13.7%
	25-34	2	22.2%	382	42.1%
	35-44	4	44.4%	150	16.5%
	45-54	2	22.2%	137	15.1%
	55-64	1	11.1%	80	8.8%
	65-74	0	.0%	15	1.7%
	75-84	0	.0%	5	.6%
	85-99	0	.0%	1	.1%
	Prefer not to answer	0	.0%	14	1.5%

*University of San Diego's Custom Questions Section*

---

**In addition to the standard collaborative questions used to build a national benchmark, USD had the opportunity to choose or create custom questions specifically for their alumni. The following section presents alumni responses to USD's custom questions.**

**How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your educational experiences, related to work on your most recent SOLES degree, certificate, or endorsement coursework?**

		Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	N/A	Total	Mean	Std Dev
Program coverage of relevant content	Count	0	0	0	2	<b>8</b>	0	<b>10</b>	4.800	0.422
	% by Row	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	<b>80.0%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		
Sequencing of content across program courses	Count	0	0	1	3	<b>6</b>	0	<b>10</b>	4.500	0.707
	% by Row	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	30.0%	<b>60.0%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		
Availability of courses	Count	0	0	1	1	<b>8</b>	0	<b>10</b>	4.700	0.675
	% by Row	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	<b>80.0%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		
The length of the program	Count	1	0	0	3	<b>6</b>	0	<b>10</b>	4.300	1.252
	% by Row	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.0%	<b>60.0%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		
Program flexibility	Count	1	0	1	1	<b>7</b>	0	<b>10</b>	4.300	1.337
	% by Row	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	<b>70.0%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		
Quality of instruction in your courses	Count	1	1	0	1	<b>6</b>	0	<b>9</b>	4.111	1.537
	% by Row	11.1%	11.1%	0.0%	11.1%	<b>66.7%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		

The academic quality of students with whom you took your courses	Count	0	0	1	1	<b>8</b>	0	<b>10</b>	4.700	0.675
	% by Row	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	<b>80.0%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		
The diversity of students with whom you took your courses	Count	0	1	0	3	<b>6</b>	0	<b>10</b>	4.400	0.966
	% by Row	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	30.0%	<b>60.0%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		
Accessibility of instructors	Count	0	0	1	3	<b>6</b>	0	<b>10</b>	4.500	0.707
	% by Row	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	30.0%	<b>60.0%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		
Feedback from instructors/supervisors	Count	2	1	0	2	<b>5</b>	0	<b>10</b>	3.700	1.703
	% by Row	20.0%	10.0%	0.0%	20.0%	<b>50.0%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		
Quality of your field experience(s)/ practicum(s)/ internship(s)	Count	0	1	0	1	<b>8</b>	0	<b>10</b>	4.600	0.966
	% by Row	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%	<b>80.0%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		
Timing of your field experience(s)/ practicum(s)/ internship(s)	Count	0	0	0	1	<b>9</b>	0	<b>10</b>	4.900	0.316
	% by Row	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	<b>90.0%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		
Availability of field experience, practicum, or internship	Count	0	0	0	1	<b>8</b>	0	<b>9</b>	4.889	0.333
	% by Row	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	<b>88.9%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		
Quality of advising	Count	0	1	0	1	<b>8</b>	0	<b>10</b>	4.600	0.966
	% by Row	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%	<b>80.0%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		
Assistance with finding employment	Count	<b>4</b>	1	0	1	2	2	<b>10</b>	3.200	2.201
	% by Row	<b>40.0%</b>	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%	20.0%	20.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		

Assistance with the certification process	Count	1	0	0	2	<b>6</b>	0	<b>9</b>	4.333	1.323
	% by Row	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	<b>66.7%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		
The overall program experience	Count	0	1	1	2	<b>6</b>	0	<b>10</b>	4.300	1.059
	% by Row	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	20.0%	<b>60.0%</b>	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>		
Total	Count	10	7	6	29	113	2	167	N/A	N/A
	% by Row	6.0%	4.2%	3.6%	17.4%	67.7%	1.2%	100.0%		

**Please rate your agreement with the following statements:**

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	Mean	Std Dev
When I graduated, I was very satisfied with the program.	Count	0	2	2	0	5	9	3.889	1.364
	% by Row	0.0%	22.2%	22.2%	0.0%	55.6%	100.0%		
Reflecting on my experience now, I am very satisfied with the program.	Count	0	2	2	0	5	9	3.889	1.364
	% by Row	0.0%	22.2%	22.2%	0.0%	55.6%	100.0%		
Total	Count	0	4	4	0	10	18	N/A	N/A
	% by Row	0.0%	22.2%	22.2%	0.0%	55.6%	100.0%		

**Which of the following alumni services would make you feel most connected with SOLES? (Select all that apply)**

(Respondents were allowed to choose **multiple** responses)

Response	Frequency	Count
Aiding Admissions in recruiting new students	33.3%	3
Mentoring current students	33.3%	3
Alumni e-mails	33.3%	3
Alumni networking events	22.2%	2
Alumni publications	0.0%	0
Education career fairs	22.2%	2
Career counseling	22.2%	2
Online alumni network	11.1%	1
Web-based job postings / resume referral system	11.1%	1
Career workshops, lectures, or seminars	22.2%	2
I am not interested in alumni services	11.1%	1
Other (specify):	0.0%	0
	Valid responses	9
	Total responses	10