

5. What were the major reasons given by candidates for choosing an alternative preparation program?

Choose up to 4, and rank them from 1-4, with most often mentioned (1) and least often mentioned (4).

	Rank for Top 4 Most Often Mentioned
<input type="checkbox"/> Liked the practical hands-on approach	□
<input type="checkbox"/> Wanted the opportunity to work or continue working in the school system and become certified at the same time	□
<input type="checkbox"/> Liked the flexibility offered (for example, in the timeline for completion of major program components)	□
<input type="checkbox"/> Needed to sustain income while working toward certification	□
<input type="checkbox"/> Wanted a lower cost route to certification	□
<input type="checkbox"/> Wanted an accelerated path to certification	□
<input type="checkbox"/> Already had an advanced degree (Master's or higher)	□
<input type="checkbox"/> Wanted training before teaching	□
<input type="checkbox"/> Wanted support while teaching	□
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify.) _____	□

Pre-employment Training

Please complete based on the pre-employment training that took place between July 1 and June 30 of this reporting period.

6. How many candidates entered pre-employment training between July 1 and June 30? _____

7. When was pre-employment training offered? Month ____/Day ____/Year ____ to Month ____/Day ____/Year ____
 Month ____/Day ____/Year ____ to Month ____/Day ____/Year ____

8. Please provide the following information about the pre-employment training.

Can credits be applied to a post-graduate program? Yes, all Yes, some No
 Can participants acquire a Master's degree through this program? Yes No

9. What was the format of the pre-employment training? (Check only one.)

Face-to-face Online Blended

10. How satisfied were participants with their pre-employment training?

Number of Participants
Responding

Please note the number of participants responding, using the following scale: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree.

	SD	D	N	A	SA
Participants thought the training gave them the knowledge and skills needed to be effective classroom teachers.					
Participants thought that the training overall was of high quality.					
Participants thought the instructors had the expertise needed to teach them effectively.					
Participants felt that they were prepared to move forward in the program.					

11. What is the total number of participants on whom you reported in the previous question? _____

Internship

Please complete based on internships that took place between July 1 and June 30 of this reporting period.

12. How many participants entered the internship between July 1 and June 30? _____

13. Was the option to complete the internship outside the participating district(s) necessary for participants? (For example, for a military person or spouse, the internship might be served at a Department of Defense school.)

Yes No

14. If Yes for Question 13: How many participants completed their internships outside the participating district(s)?

15. If Yes for Question 13: What were the reasons that participants completed their internships outside the participating district(s)? (Check all that apply.)

- Program needed to accommodate military personnel and their spouses who were stationed elsewhere.
- Program needed to accommodate out of state students.
- An appropriate placement (grade level and/or content match) was not available in the district.
- A participant was employed in a private or parochial school when the program began.

16. What other accommodations were offered to participants?

Number of Participants
Accommodated in this Way

<input type="checkbox"/>	A timeline with flexible exit and re-entry points to accommodate candidates whose ability to proceed with a cohort is impacted by military deployment or other life situations	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Credit for experience for military personnel and others	

17. How long were the internships of the participants in your alternative preparation program?

(Report the number of participants in the boxes below.)

4 weeks 5-7 weeks 8 weeks More than 8 weeks

18. Are internships and preemployment training concurrent?

Yes, for all participants Yes, for some participants No

19. What factors were considered in making decisions about reducing the length of participants' internships from 8 weeks down to 4-7 weeks?

- Previous teaching experience
- Previous experience as a trainer in a corporate or military setting
- Other (Please specify.) _____
- No internships were reduced below 8 weeks.

20. How many teacher candidates served their internships in the following settings? (Report the number of participants in the boxes below.)

	Number of Participants
In a classroom taught regularly by a highly qualified teacher	
In the classroom to which they would be assigned as the resident teacher, with a supervisor serving as teacher of record during the internship	
During summer school in a classroom with a highly qualified teacher	
Under some other arrangement. (Please describe.)	

21. How many participants served their internship in more than one setting, such as for dual certification programs?

--

22. Identify the number of participants who were supervised by each category described.

(Report the number of participants in the boxes below)

		Number of Participants
A highly qualified classroom teacher who supervised the intern in addition to providing regular classroom instruction to K-12 students		
A supervisor without full-time teaching responsibilities hired specifically to supervise participants in this alternative preparation program		
A supervisory team ¹		
Other (Please specify.)		

¹ A supervisory team consists of two or more individuals who provide coordinated daily supervision to the intern. One member of the supervisory team must be highly qualified for the classroom in which the internship is occurring and must be named teacher of record for that classroom during the internship.

23. How satisfied were participants with their pre-employment internship experience?

Please note the number of participants responding, using the following scale: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree.

	Number of Participants				
	SD	D	N	A	SA
Participants thought their internship assignments (i.e., school, content, and grade level) gave them the knowledge and skills needed to be effective teachers.					
Participants felt that their relationship with their supervisor(s) was positive and contributed to their growth and development.					
Participants felt that they received adequate support from their supervisor and others.					
Participants felt that the internship was tailored to their background and experiences.					
Participants thought that other required activities that took place during the internship (for example, meetings or seminars) contributed to their growth and development.					

24. What is the total number of participants on whom you reported in the previous question?

Mentor Training

25. How many mentors provided services to program residents (first and second year residents) during the reporting period?

26. Whom did you draw upon to serve as mentors for the resident teachers in this program? (Check all that apply.)

- Existing school-based staff (e.g., department chairs, master teachers)
- Existing district-level staff (e.g., system-wide mentors for new teachers)
- Retired teachers/administrators
- Other (Please specify.) _____

27. Which of the following did mentors receive in connection with this specific alternative preparation program? (Check all that apply.)

- Training on adult learning/the mentoring process
- Orientation to the overall design and intent of the program
- Information about the training that resident teachers would be receiving
- Information about the strengths and weaknesses of the individual candidates
- Other (Please specify.) _____

28. How do mentors rate their satisfaction with their own training? (Provide number of mentors.)

Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied
<input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>

Residency - First Year

Please complete based on the *first year* residency that took place between July 1 and June 30 of this reporting period. All programs should complete this section.

29. How many participants began the residency utilizing the Resident Teacher Certificate between July 1 and June 30? _____

Mentoring During First-Year Residency

30. During the first-year residency, how many participants continued to work with the same mentor who was assigned to them as a supervisor for the internship?

31. On average, how many residents are assigned to each mentor during the first year residency period?

32. On average, how many sessions each month do mentors have with participants?

During the first two months of the residency	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>
During the remainder of the first year of residency	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>

33. How satisfied were participants with the mentoring they received during the first year residency period?

	Number of Participants				
	SD	D	N	A	SA
Please note the number of participants responding, using the following scale: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree.					
Participants thought the mentoring gave them the knowledge and skills needed to be effective classroom teachers.					
Participants thought that the mentoring overall was of high quality.					
Participants thought the mentors had the expertise needed to teach them effectively.					

34. What is the total number of participants on whom you reported in the previous question? _____

Training During First Year Residency

35. What was the format of the training that first year residents received during the residency period? (Check only one.)

- Face-to-face
- Online
- Blended

36. How satisfied were participants with the training they received during the first year residency period?

Number of Participants				
SD	D	N	A	SA

Please note the number of participants responding, using the following scale: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree.

Participants thought the training gave them the knowledge and skills needed to be effective classroom teachers.					
Participants thought that the training overall was of high quality.					
Participants thought the instructors had the expertise needed to teach them effectively.					
Participants felt that they were prepared to move forward in the program.					

37. What is the total number of participants on whom you reported in the previous question? _____

RESIDENT TEACHER PERFORMANCE

Performance based on Principal Ratings

38. Number of first year resident teachers whose principals rate their preparedness to teach:

Unprepared	Adequately prepared	Well prepared
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

39. Compared to other new teachers in their building, what is the total number of first year resident teachers whose principals consider their overall teaching performance to be:

Worse than others	On a par with others	Superior to others
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

40. Compared to other new teachers in their building, what is the total number of first year resident teachers whose principals consider their content knowledge to be:

Worse than others	On a par with others	Superior to others
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

41. Compared to other new teachers in their building, what is the total number of first year resident teachers whose principals consider their ability to teach students with special needs to be:

Worse than others	On a par with others	Superior to others
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

42. Compared to other new teachers in their building, what is the total number of first year resident teachers whose principals consider their ability to relate to students from a variety of cultural, racial, and socio-economic backgrounds to be:

Worse than others	On a par with others	Superior to others
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

43. Compared to other new teachers in their building, what is the total number of first year resident teachers whose principals consider their ability to provide differentiated instruction to students to be:

Worse than others	On a par with others	Superior to others
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

44. Compared to other new teachers in their building, what is the total number of first year resident teachers whose principals consider their ability to effectively manage a classroom to be:

Worse than others	On a par with others	Superior to others
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Performance based on Mentor Assessments

45. Number of first year resident teachers whose mentors rate their preparedness to teach:

Unprepared	Adequately prepared	Well prepared
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

46. Number of first year resident teachers whose mentors consider their overall teaching performance to be:

Poor to Fair	Average	Good to Excellent
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

47. Number of first year resident teachers whose mentors consider their content knowledge to be:

Poor to Fair	Average	Good to Excellent
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

48. Number of first year resident teachers whose mentors consider their competency to teach students with special needs to be:

Poor to Fair	Average	Good to Excellent
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

49. Number of first year resident teachers whose mentors consider their ability to relate to students from a variety of cultural, racial, and socio-economic backgrounds to be:

Poor to Fair	Average	Good to Excellent
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

50. Number of first year resident teachers whose mentors consider their ability to provide differentiated instruction to students to be:

Poor to Fair	Average	Good to Excellent
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

51. Number of first year resident teachers whose mentors consider their ability to effectively manage a classroom to be:

Poor to Fair	Average	Good to Excellent
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Residency - Second Year (if applicable)

Please complete based on any *second year* residencies that took place between July 1 and June 30 of this reporting period. Candidates may complete a second year of the residency because the program design requires a second year or because program directors have determined that a second year is needed. If your program did not have any candidates engage in a second year residency during the reporting period, please skip to question 76.

52. How many participants began a second year residency between July 1 and June 30? _____
- How many of these were completing the second year of a 2-year program? _____
- How many of these were completing a second year for another reason? _____

Mentoring During Second Year Residency

53. For how many second year residents was mentoring provided?
- If zero, skip to question 59.
54. During the second year residency, how many participants continued to work with the same mentor who was assigned to them for the first year residency?
55. On average, how many residents are assigned to each mentor during the second year residency period?
56. On average, how many sessions each month do mentors have with second year residents?
57. How satisfied were participants with the mentoring they received during the second year residency period?

Number of Participants

Please note the number of participants responding, using the following scale: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree.

	SD	D	N	A	SA
Participants thought the mentoring gave them the knowledge and skills needed to be effective classroom teachers.					
Participants thought that the mentoring overall was of high quality.					
Participants thought the mentors had the expertise needed to teach them effectively.					

58. What is the total number of participants on whom you reported in the previous question? _____

Training During Residency

59. What was the format of the training that residents received during the second year residency period? (Check only one.)

- Face-to-face Online Blended

60. How satisfied were participants with the training they received during the second year residency period?

Number of Participants

Please note the number of participants responding, using the following scale: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree.

	SD	D	N	A	SA
Participants thought the training gave them the knowledge and skills needed to be effective classroom teachers.					
Participants thought that the training overall was of high quality.					
Participants thought the instructors had the expertise needed to teach them effectively.					
Participants felt that they were prepared to move forward in the program.					

61. What is the total number of participants on whom you reported in the previous question? _____

RESIDENT TEACHER PERFORMANCE

Performance based on Principal Ratings

62. Number of second year resident teachers whose principals rate their preparedness to teach:

Unprepared	Adequately prepared	Well prepared
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

63. Compared to other new teachers in their building, what is the total number of second year resident teachers whose principals consider their overall teaching performance to be:

Worse than others	On a par with others	Superior to others
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

64. Compared to other new teachers in their building, what is the total number of second year resident teachers whose principals consider their content knowledge to be:

Worse than others	On a par with others	Superior to others
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

65. Compared to other new teachers in their building, what is the total number of second year resident teachers whose principals consider their ability to teach students with special needs to be:

Worse than others	On a par with others	Superior to others
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

66. Compared to other new teachers in their building, what is the total number of second year resident teachers whose principals consider their ability to relate to students from a variety of cultural, racial, and socio-economic backgrounds to be:

Worse than others	On a par with others	Superior to others
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

67. Number of second year resident teachers whose mentors consider their ability to provide differentiated instruction to students to be:

Poor to Fair	Average	Good to Excellent
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

68. Compared to other new teachers in their building, what is the total number of second year resident teachers whose principals consider their ability to effectively manage a classroom to be:

Worse than others	On a par with others	Superior to others
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Performance based on Mentor Assessments

If none of your second-year residents were mentored, skip to question 76.

69. Number of second year resident teachers whose mentors rate their preparedness to teach:

Unprepared	Adequately prepared	Well prepared
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

70. Number of second year resident teachers whose mentors consider their overall teaching performance to be:

Poor to Fair	Average	Good to Excellent
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

71. Number of second year resident teachers whose mentors consider their content knowledge to be:

Poor to Fair <input type="text"/>	Average <input type="text"/>	Good to Excellent <input type="text"/>
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

72. Number of second year resident teachers whose mentors consider their competency to teach students with special needs to be:

Poor to Fair <input type="text"/>	Average <input type="text"/>	Good to Excellent <input type="text"/>
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

73. Number of second year resident teachers whose mentors consider their ability to relate to students from a variety of cultural, racial, and socio-economic backgrounds to be:

Poor to Fair <input type="text"/>	Average <input type="text"/>	Good to Excellent <input type="text"/>
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

74. Number of second year resident teachers whose mentors consider their ability to provide differentiated instruction to students to be:

Poor to Fair <input type="text"/>	Average <input type="text"/>	Good to Excellent <input type="text"/>
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

75. Number of second year resident teachers whose mentors consider their ability to effectively manage a classroom to be:

Poor to Fair <input type="text"/>	Average <input type="text"/>	Good to Excellent <input type="text"/>
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

Program Improvement

		Yes	No
76.	Does your program assess teacher candidates using state-recognized standards (e.g., INTASC, EDOT, CEC, VSC, MD Teacher Technology Standards and/or Core Learning Goals)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
77.	Is data on candidates' performance collected, analyzed, and reviewed (at internship entry and exit, at the close of each quarter or semester during the residency, etc.) ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
78.	Is this data used for program improvement?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
79.	Is feedback given to candidates regularly (at internship entry and exit, at the close of each quarter or semester during the residency, etc.) regarding their performance on desired outcomes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

80. What are the reasons that participants left the program during the reporting period?

	Number of Participants Who Left for this Reason
Counseled Out	
Personal Situation	
Chose leave of absence	
Perceived lack of support	
Chose to teach in a private, parochial, or charter school	
Accepted a job as a conditional teacher due to not qualifying for the RTC	
Moved to non-teaching position in a Maryland public school system	
Chose not to teach at all	
Other (Please specify .)	

81. Are the partners in this alternative preparation program planning to continue the program next year? Yes No Not Sure
82. If Yes to Question 81: Will the program be substantially the same? Yes No Not Sure

83. If No to Question 81: How will the program differ from the alternative preparation program reported on here? (Check all areas in which you expect to make changes.)

Program Component			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recruiting	<input type="checkbox"/>	Training during Residency
<input type="checkbox"/>	Selection	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mentoring
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pre-employment training	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (Briefly describe.)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Internship	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (Briefly describe.)

Program Management

84. How many people serve on your program's governing board? (Some other names for this type of group are steering committee, coordinating council, and advisory board.)

Number of Members

Total Number of Board Members

IHE or Other Provider Representatives

IHE/Provider - Administrator

IHE/Provider - Instructor

IHE/Provider - Supervisor or Mentor

Other IHE/Provider Representatives

LSS Representatives

District Level Personnel

Human Resources

Instructional Staff

Building Level Administrator

Classroom or Resource Teacher

Mentor or Supervisor

Other LSS Representative

Business Partner

Other

85. How often does the full board usually meet?

- Monthly Bimonthly Once a Semester Once a Year Only As Needed (irregularly)

Summary Statistics for this Reporting Period

For each, report on the number who engaged in the program in this way between July 1 and June 30.

Number who applied to the program (from #1 above)

0

Number who began the pre-employment training (from #6 above)

0

Number who began the internship (from #12 above)

0

Number who were eligible for an RTC and began the residency (from #29 above)

0

Number who began their second year as a resident teacher (from #52 above)

0

Number who became eligible for the SPCI - all Praxis scores received, etc.

Name of the Individual Completing this Report _____

Position Title _____

Phone Number _____

Email Address _____

Thank You!

Director of Certification and Accreditation
Maryland State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

For questions, contact Michelle Dunkle
mdunkle@msde.state.md.us