

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ASSUMPTION PROGRAM OF LOANS FOR EDUCATION HISTORY1

Purpose
Legislative History

ALL ABOUT APPLE.....2

Selection of Teacher Shortage Areas
Selection of Participating Institutions
Program Eligibility Requirements
Benefits
Application and Selection Process
Segmental Distribution
Loan Assumption Agreements
Agreements Not Redeemed

WHO RECEIVES AN APPLE.....6

Age
Ethnicity
Gender
Distribution by Teacher Shortage Area

APPLE PERFORMANCE9

Program Participation
Retention Rates and Loan Assumption Benefit Payments
Conclusion

APPENDICES

A. Number of Agreements Allocated by Institution and Segment.....	13-15
B. 2004-2005 Program Participants by Teacher Shortage Area, Education Level, and Gender	16
C. 2004-2005 Program Participants by Teacher Shortage Area and Ethnicity.....	17
D. 2004-2005 Program Participants by Teacher Shortage Area and Age Group	18
E. History of Allocation, Awards and Loan Assumption Payments 1986-1987 through 2004-2005.....	19

ASSUMPTION PROGRAM OF LOANS FOR EDUCATION HISTORY

PURPOSE

The Assumption Program of Loans for Education (APLE), described in California Education Code (Education Code) Sections 69612 to 69616, was designed by the Legislature to address California's growing shortage of quality classroom teachers in specific subject areas, such as math or science; teachers of children with special needs; and teachers for schools serving children from low-income families.

Specifically, the Legislature intended that the APLE program:

- *Identify subject areas with shortages of teachers. It should provide incentives to attract students to the teaching profession, particularly in identified subject shortage areas, as well as assistance to new credential recipients to obtain a teaching position in a subject shortage area.*
- *Identify schools serving children from low-income families. It should provide incentives to students pursuing a teaching credential to teach in these schools.*
- *Encourage postsecondary students, particularly economically disadvantaged students, to pursue a teaching career.*
- *Encourage teacher trainee or interns to complete additional coursework to obtain a teaching credential by providing financial incentives.*

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The Legislature has demonstrated consistent policy and fiscal support for the APLE, starting in 1983 with the enactment of legislation that focused on credentialed teachers Chapter 498, Statutes of 1983 (SB 813). The enactment of Chapter 1483, Statutes of 1985 (SB 1208) and Chapter 1124, Statutes of 1986 (AB 3263) altered the focus of the APLE to concentrate on non-credentialed individuals who were training to become fully credentialed teachers in areas where critical teacher shortages had been identified or in schools serving a large population of students from low-income families.

Chapter 330, Statutes of 1998 (SB 1564) increased the number of APLE awards from 400 to 4,500. This bill also increased the benefit limit and the number of years (from three to four years) a participant must teach to receive full APLE benefits. Chapter 667, Statutes of 1999 (AB 1118) provided an additional 1,000 allocations to the APLE bringing the total number of potential new participants to 5,500 for the 1999-2000 academic year.

Chapter 70, Statutes of 2000 (SB 1666), made significant changes to the administration of the APLE and to program benefits. The following provisions were phased in over a two-year period beginning in 2000-2001.

- The addition of 1,000 awards to the APLE, bringing the total awards to 6,500.
- The allocation of up to 500 awards to County Offices of Education for nominations of out-of-state teachers as an incentive to teach in California.
- The designation of 100 awards for individuals who agreed to teach in school districts serving rural areas.
- The designation of 100 awards for individuals who agreed to teach in school districts with a high percentage of teachers holding emergency teaching permits.

- The modification of the previous 10-unit-per-semester requirement modified to allow half-time enrollment as defined by the teaching institution.
- The addition of schools ranked in the lowest 20th percentile of the Academic Performance Index (API) to the list of existing teacher shortage areas.
- An increase in the maximum benefit amount, from \$8,000 to \$11,000.
- An increase, from three to four, in the number of years required to teach to receive maximum benefits.
- The addition of a \$1,000 bonus per year for participants who perform teaching service in math, science, or special education. (An additional \$1,000 per year of loan assumption benefits may be provided if the school is also ranked in the lowest 20th percentile of the API).
- In 2003-2003, an additional 1,000 awards were authorized, bringing the total to 7,500. In 2003-2004, an additional 200 were authorized, bringing the total to 7,700. And in 2003-2004, there was a decrease in authorized awards of 200, making the total number of awards 7,500.
- Appendix E provides a historical summary of APPLE allocations, loan assumption payments and projected payments.

ALL ABOUT APPLE

SELECTION OF TEACHER SHORTAGE AREAS

The Education Code gives the California Superintendent of Public Instruction the responsibility of annually providing the Commission with lists of:

- Teaching subjects with a critical shortage of teachers.
- Schools that serve a large population of students from low-income families.
- Schools with a high percentage of teachers holding emergency permits.
- Schools serving rural areas.
- Low-performing schools.

SELECTION OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Education Code Section 69613 defines an eligible institution as one that participates in state and federal financial aid programs and maintains a program of professional preparation that has been approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC).

There are 79 institutions with CCTC-approved teacher-training programs for the 2004-2005 academic year. Each eligible institution received at least one application after signing the Commission's APPLE Participation Agreement. The remaining applications were distributed to institutions in proportion to the number of credentials recommended to CCTC during the previous year by each institution. (See Appendix A for details.)

There are 500 APPLE awards are designated to help recruit out-of-state teachers to relocate and teach in California and 500 APPLE awards are designated for the eight California District Intern Programs. The out-of-state applicants may apply to, and be nominated by, a California County Office of Education and district interns are nominated by the District Intern Coordinators.

PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

Applicants must meet specified conditions which include:

- Completion of the equivalent of at least 60 semester, or 90 quarter units of postsecondary education prior to receipt of award.
- Enrollment in or admission to: 1) a program leading to a baccalaureate degree, or 2) a program of professional teacher preparation approved by the CCTC. The program must include a student teaching requirement and authorize service for kindergarten or grades 1 through 12.
- Maintenance of at least half-time enrollment of undergraduate or teacher preparation course work as determined by the institution.
- Maintenance of satisfactory progress toward credential objective.
- Determination by a participating postsecondary institution that the applicant has outstanding ability on the basis of criteria determined by the institution.
- Receipt of, or approval to receive, an educational loan made pursuant to 20 U.S.C. Section 1071 et seq., or any educational loan approved by the California Student Aid Commission, to meet the costs of obtaining an initial teaching credential.
- Agreement to provide up to four consecutive years of teaching service in a California public school in one of the subject shortage areas or in certain designated schools.
- Provide first year of eligible teaching service within 36 months from obtaining their initial teaching credential.

BENEFITS

The Commission is authorized to assume up to \$11,000 (\$19,000 if student qualifies for bonuses) in outstanding educational loan balances for participants who provide up to four consecutive years of qualified full-time teaching in a public California K-12 school. Table 1 illustrates the benefits by year.

TABLE 1

APLE PROGRAM BENEFITS				
After Completion of:		General Participants	Bonus Amount (Teaching, math, science or special education)	Additional Bonus (Teaching math, science or special education in a bottom 20% low-performing school)
	First year:	\$2,000	\$1,000 (Total \$3,000)	\$1,000 (Total \$4,000)
	Second year:	\$3,000	\$1,000 (Total \$4,000)	\$1,000 (Total \$5,000)
	Third year:	\$3,000	\$1,000 (Total \$4,000)	\$1,000 (Total \$5,000)
	Fourth year:	\$3,000	\$1,000 (Total \$4,000)	\$1,000 (Total \$5,000)
Total		\$11,000	\$15,000	\$19,000 Maximum

APPLICATION AND SELECTION PROCESS

The APLE application process begins in April at participating institutions. Each institution is allocated a limited number of APLE applications based on the number of teaching credentials recommended to CCTC in the prior academic year. Students interested in applying must submit an application to the campus APLE Coordinator.

The application is reviewed for completeness, for eligibility based on program requirements, and ranked by specific selection criteria chosen by the school. Although the Commission administers the APLE, participating institutions are given latitude in choosing the selection criteria for their applicants. Grade point average and faculty recommendations continue to be the most commonly used criteria for selecting participants (see Table 2).

Table 2

SELECTION CRITERIA USED BY PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS IN 2004-2005		
	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools Using Criteria
Grade Point Average	65	28.9
Interviews	35	15.6
Faculty Recommendations	29	12.9
Essays	24	10.7
Test Scores	24	10.7
Volunteer Work Experience	24	10.7
Extra Curricular Activities	12	5.3
Other Criteria	12	5.3

Each institution nominates the most qualified candidates to fill the initial allocation of awards from the Commission by the priority deadline. Institutions with additional qualified candidates may submit a list containing alternate nominees, ranked in priority order, for use during the reallocation process. Alternate candidates are selected based on the number of unused allocations from other institutions until all allocations are filled. Of the total 7,500 applications allocated, no more than 500 applications are allocated to County Offices of Education for recruitment of out-of-state candidates and an additional 500 are set aside for the eight District Intern Program participating institutions. The remaining applications are for colleges and universities with teacher certification programs. The Commission was authorized to allocate 6,500 APLE agreements for the 2004-2005 academic year.

SEGMENTAL DISTRIBUTION

Three of the five postsecondary education segments in California have qualified teacher preparation programs: the University of California (UC); the California State University (CSU); and independent colleges and universities (ICU). Table 3 demonstrates that in 2004-2005, segmental distribution is as follows: Private Colleges and Universities 49.8%; California State University 37.4%; University of California 8.2%; District Intern Program 3.6% and County Office of Education and for Out-of-State 1.0%. In comparison to 2003-2004, the segments were represented by the following percentages: Private Colleges and Universities 51.1%; California State University 36.6%; University of California 8.4%; District Intern Program 2.6% and County Office of Education and for Out-of-State 1.3. This demonstrates a slight decreased participation from Private Colleges and Universities and California State University, University of California and District Intern Programs, with increased participation among the County Office of Education.

Table 3

APLE APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED FOR 2004-2005				
	Applications – Ineligible = Total Ineligible Submitted Applicants Applications Submitted			Percent Segmental Distribution of Eligible Applicant
Private Colleges and Universities	3,314	0	3,314	49.8
California State University	2,490	0	2,490	37.4
University of California	547	0	547	8.2
District Intern Program	236	0	236	3.6
County Offices of Education and for Out-of-State Recruitment	61	0	61	1.0
Total	6,648	0	6,648	100

LOAN ASSUMPTION AGREEMENTS

Nominees that meet all program eligibility requirements are sent a Loan Assumption Agreement (Agreement) that must be signed and returned to the Commission. The Agreement authorizes the Commission to make loan assumption payments if the participant complies with all APLE requirements.

In accordance with the Education Code 69613.2, the Commission begins loan assumption payments upon verification that the participant has:

- Received a teaching credential that requires a baccalaureate degree (other than an emergency credential) authorizing service for kindergarten or any of the grades 1 through 12; and
- Provided eligible full-time classroom instruction in an applicable California public school for one school year.

An applicant who signed an Agreement to obtain a teaching credential in a designated Teacher Shortage Area may not change their area unless the area ceases to be a shortage area, or the applicant receives the Commission's written approval.

AGREEMENTS NOT REDEEMED

Most applicants redeem their Agreement after the nomination process. However, as seen in Table 4, some students simply fail to sign and return the agreement. Commission staff send non-respondents a letter requesting the signed agreement or a reason for declining. Every effort is made to obtain a positive contact and have the agreement redeemed. All remaining awards are reallocated to other qualified applicants when the Agreement is not returned or is declined.

Table 4

AGREEMENTS GRANTED BUT NOT REDEEMED BY STUDENTS						
	2002-2003		2003-2004		2004-2005	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agreements not signed and returned	779	93.9	671	98.4	942	99.8
Agreements declined	51	6.1	11	1.6	2	0.2
Total	830	100	682	100	944	100

Note: Total applicants for allocation from 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 is 7,500 per academic period.

By the end of the 2004-2005, the Commission selected 6,648 applicants as recipients from participating postsecondary institutions, including 61 recipients for the APLE for Out-of-State Teachers Program and 236 for the District Intern Program.

WHO RECEIVES AN APLE

AGE

Table 5A illustrates the distribution of APLE participants by age group for the past three years. It appears that there was a very slight decrease in participants in the 21-25 age group from the prior year.

If one assumes that “traditional” participants are thirty years old or younger and “non-traditional” participants are thirty-one or older, the “non-traditional” students continue to maintain their presence. In 2003-2004, “non-traditional” students represented 42.4 percent of all participants; this population decreased to 36.1 percent in 2004-2005.

Table 5A

DISTRIBUTION OF APLE PARTICIPANTS BY AGE						
	2002-2003		2003-2004		2004-2005	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
20 and under	1	0	66	1.0	266	4.0
21-25	1,896	25.3	2,553	34.4	2,292	34.5
26-30	2,330	31.1	1,995	26.8	1,689	25.4
31-35	1,237	16.5	1,067	14.3	884	13.3
36-40	674	9.0	620	8.3	495	7.5
41-45	505	6.7	469	6.3	436	6.6
46 and older	857	11.4	662	8.9	586	8.8
Total	7,500	100	7,432	100	6,648	100

ETHNICITY

Ethnic background has no bearing on the distribution of APLE awards or the selection of recipients. Participants are not required to report their ethnicity during the application process and the Commission does not require the school to report a nominee's ethnicity. The APLE application contains an optional question regarding ethnicity and participants may choose whether to respond or not. Table 5B reflects the distribution of APLE participants by the self-reported ethnicity for the three most recent academic years. The relative representation has remained fairly steady for the past three years (with some slight changes year to year).

Table 5B

DISTRIBUTION OF APLE PARTICIPANTS BY ETHNICITY						
	2002-2003		2003-2004		2004-2005	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Asian	373	4.9	471	6.3	394	5.9
African-American	563	7.5	589	7.9	476	7.2
Latino	1,936	25.8	1,955	26.3	1716	25.8
Caucasian	3,743	49.9	3,646	49.1	3201	48.2
Other	853	11.5	677	9.1	664	10.0
No Response*	32	0.4	94	1.3	197	2.3
Total	7,500	100	7,432	100	6,648	100

*Responses to questions on ethnicity are voluntary

GENDER

The gender split within the APLE program (see Table 5C) mirrors the gender split seen in postsecondary education as a whole. While there are small fluctuations from year to year, women continue to participate in APLE at a higher rate than men.

Table 5C

DISTRIBUTION OF APLE PARTICIPANTS BY GENDER					
	2000-2001	2001-2001	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Male	25.0	26.5	27.0	26.5	27.5
Female	75.0	73.5	73.0	73.5	72.5
Total	100	100	100	100	100

DISTRIBUTION BY TEACHER SHORTAGE AREA

Table 5D on the following page, displays the distribution of APLE participants by Teacher Shortage Area. Legislative mandates and changes in subject shortage areas require the addition or deletion of subject areas over time.

Table 5D

DISTRIBUTION OF APLE PARTICIPANTS BY TEACHER SHORTAGE AREA						
Subject	2002-2003		2003-2004		2004-2005	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mathematics	489	6.5	596	8.0	547	8.2
Science	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bilingual Education	336	4.5	437	6.0	432	6.5
Reading Specialist	0	0	1	0	0	0
English	51	0.7	28	0	46	0.7
Special Education	0	0	0	0	1	0
Foreign Language	1,020	13.5	1,258	17.0	1,357	20.6
School Type*	109	1.5	139	2.0	149	2.2
Low-Income						
Low-Performing	3,239	43.1	3,234	44.0	2,903	43.7
Rural Area	1,956	26.1	1,520	20.0	1,039	15.6
High Percentage of Emergency Permit Teachers	169	2.3	149	2.0	148	2.2
State Special Schools	127	1.7	70	1.0	23	0.3
Self-Contained Classroom	4	0.1	0	0	3	0
Total	7,500	100	7,432	100	6,648	100

*Priority shortage areas. Math, Science and Special Education APLE participants have increased slightly since academic years 2002-2003 to academic years 2003-2004 which could be due to the bonuses offered to participants that qualify to teach in those areas.

The following provides explanations for the various APLE school types:

- **Low-Income School:** Based on the percentage of students who qualified for the Free or Reduced Price Lunch Program, or the percentage of students whose families qualified under the CalWorks criteria, whichever was greater.
- **Low-Performing School:** Schools that have low academic achievement, in the bottom 20 percent, as measured by Academic Performance Index (API) state ranks of 5 or less.
- **Rural Area School:** Schools that serve rural areas or small towns identified by the U.S. Census Bureau data as rural or small town.
- **High Percentage of Emergency Permit Teachers:** Schools with 20 percent or more of teachers teaching with emergency permits.
- **State Special School:** School for the Blind in Fremont and two Schools for the Deaf, one in Riverside and one in Fremont.
- **Self-Contained Classroom:** Teachers teaching in a public school that serves pupils in kindergarten or grades one to eight, inclusive.

APLE PERFORMANCE

PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

Since the program's inception in 1986-1987, the Commission has received a total of 48,977 participants. In 2003-2004, there were a total of 42,329 participants in the APLE program. In 2004-2005, the APLE program added 6,648 for academic year 2003-2004 which represents a 15.7 percent growth rate over one year.

The Commission may withdraw participants after the receipt of program benefits. There were 1,886 participants who received the maximum benefits (four years of benefits) and 82 had their entire outstanding student loans paid-in-full. Others were removed because they did not provide consecutive teaching service or had loans in default status. Table 6 shows the distribution of the 1,974 participants withdrawn after receiving benefits during the 2004-2005 school year.

Table 6

APPLICANTS WITHDRAWN FROM APLE AFTER RECEIPT OF BENEFITS 2004-2005 ACADEMIC YEAR		
	Number	Percent
Received maximum benefits	1,886	95.5
All eligible loans paid in full	82	4.2
Did not teach consecutive years	6	0.3
Defaulted loans	0	0
Total	1,974	100

RETENTION RATES AND LOAN ASSUMPTION BENEFIT PAYMENTS

In addition to recruitment, the APLE serves to encourage new teachers to stay in specified shortage areas within the profession for at least four years. As reflected in Table 7, 55.9 percent of the APLE participants who taught during the 2002-2003 academic year and received their first year of loan assumption benefits in 2003-2004 continued to teach for four consecutive years. The data show that 71.2 percent of the 3,738 participants who taught in 2003-2004 and received their first year of benefits in 2004-2005 continued to teach for three consecutive years. However, many of the non-participants who are no longer receiving loan assumption payments did not necessarily leave the field of teaching. Some may not have maintained program requirements and are no longer eligible for benefits. Once participants have their eligible loans paid in full they are no longer included in the historical data beyond the reported year.

Table 7

RETENTION RATES FOR APLE PARTICIPANTS							
Benefits Received After 1st Year of Teaching		Benefits Received for Subsequent Years					
Fiscal Year	Number	2nd Year		3rd Year		4th Year	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
2002-2003	3,366	2,974	88.3	2,475	73.5	1,882	55.9
2003-2004	3,738	3,440	92.0	2,660	71.2		
2004-2005	4,211	3,649	86.7				
2005-2006	3,900						

Note: *As of report date. Participants who are eligible for benefits will continue to receive them through the fourth year.

Table 8 provides a breakdown of the 12,510 types of loans that were assumed for fiscal year 2004-2005. The loan assumption benefit recipients taught during the 2004-2005 academic year. Of all the loans, Commission-guaranteed loans account for 35.7 percent of the total loans assumed for fiscal year 2004-2005, a slight increase from 35.6 percent of the total loans assumed for the prior fiscal year (2003-2004).

Table 8

TOTAL NUMBER OF LOANS AND LOAN ASSUMPTION PAYMENTS BY LOAN TYPE TEACHING SCHOOL YEAR 2004-2005 PAID FISCAL YEAR 2005-2006			
	Number	Amount (\$)	Percent
Commission Guaranteed Loans*	4,468	12,592,151	35.7
Consolidated Student Loans	3,134	9,503,273	25.0
US Department of Education Direct Student Loans	2,409	7,010,969	19.3
Stafford Loans (Guaranteed by other guarantors)	1,506	4,139,279	12.0
US Department of Education Direct Consolidation Loans	811	2,457,367	6.5
Private Educational Loans	130	202,230	1.0
Institution-based Loans and University Loans	52	112,034	0.4
Federal Perkins Loans	0	0	0
Total	12,510	\$36,017,306	100

* Loans guaranteed by the California Student Aid Commission.

Table 9 provides the number of APLE participants who received loan assumption benefits after each year of providing teaching service.

Table 9

TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS AND LOAN ASSUMPTION PAYMENTS MADE BY YEAR OF TEACHING SERVICE								
Year of Service	Taught 2001-2002 Paid FY 2002		Taught 2002-2003 Paid FY 2003		Taught 2003-2004 Paid FY 2004		Taught 2004-2005 Paid FY 2005	
	Number	Amount (\$)	Number	Amount (\$)	Number	Amount (\$)	Number	Amount (\$)
First	3,366	7,762,658	3,738	8,625,403	4,211	9,953,049	3,900	9,409,276
Second	2,366	7,666,294	2,974	9,604,663	3,440	11,155,083	3,649	12,064,092
Third	1,140	3,581,820	2,024	6,171,833	2,475	8,114,288	2,660	8,781,304
Fourth	186	573,976	851	2,542,392	1,490	4,736,476	1,882	5,762,633
Total	7,058	\$19,584,748	9,587	\$26,944,291	11,616	\$33,958,896	12,091	\$36,017,305

Note: Amounts have been rounded to nearest dollar. Late payments may be made beyond the reporting period due to late paperwork submission and processing and reported as such.

CONCLUSION

This report presents the success of the 2004-2005 APLE program. During the 2004-2005 participation period, the Commission experienced significant challenges in trying to meet the 7,500 authorized allocations. The Commission had met original allocation but given the late signing of the California State Budget, the Commission didn't get the additional allocation until after the budget had been signed. This made it difficult for the Commission to offer new awards to people in a timely manner. The Commission informed institutions but they had already started their application process and some had even completed and closed their APLE allocations. The Commission continues to work closely with participating institutions to assist in promoting the APLE program in order to meet the maximum allocations, as demonstrated that in recent years, as the APLE awards have increased and the program continues to gain momentum and popularity. Through the joint efforts of the Commission and the participating schools, 6,648 of the 7,500 loan assumption agreements were issued during the 2004-2005 academic year. This brings the cumulative total number of participants in the APLE to 48,977.

With sufficient awards available and well-defined statutory priorities, the Commission offers loan assumption benefits to students who are serious about their educational and career goals. Timely allocations prior to the start of the award year help schools identify high-quality program participants while applicants are being selected for admission into a teacher preparation program. This assures students that the State of California will provide financial relief and other support during their early years teaching in California's neediest schools. The commitment of APLE participants to teach in shortage areas is of great benefit to the children of California and contributes directly to the State's commitment to improve K-12 education.

APPENDICES

PROGRAM PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS

FOR THE

2004-2005 YEAR

APPENDIX A

Number of Agreements At the University of California		
	Initial Applications Allocated	Total Agreements Granted
Berkeley	20	42
Davis	41	66
Irvine	58	58
Los Angeles	69	169
Riverside	51	82
San Diego	25	27
Santa Barbara	37	51
Santa Cruz	33	52
Sub-Total	334	547

Number of Agreements At the California State University		
	Initial Applications Allocated	Total Agreements Granted
Bakersfield	141	135
Channel Islands	16	24
Chico	136	103
Dominguez Hills	223	126
East Bay	158	46
Fresno	178	180
Fullerton	217	198
Humboldt	60	27
Long Beach	280	222
Los Angeles	270	151
Monterey	47	36
Northridge	261	155
Pomona	129	39
Sacramento	188	195
San Bernardino	189	206
San Diego	205	215
San Francisco	159	80
San Jose	144	47
San Luis Obispo	59	45
San Marcos	143	93
Sonoma	73	57
Stanislaus	143	110
Sub-Total	3,347	2,490

Number of Agreements At the California Independent Institutions		
	Initial Applications Allocated	Total Agreements Granted
Argosy University, Orange	16	19
Alliant International University	34	16
Antioch University	22	23
Azusa Pacific University	128	500
Bethany Bible College	34	2
Biola University	37	23
California Baptist College	51	74
California Lutheran University	52	52
Chapman College	418	363
Christian Heritage	29	0
Claremont Graduate School	45	60
Concordia University	53	26
Dominican College	50	65
Fresno Pacific College	47	127
Holy Names College	37	8
Hope International University	23	0
John F. Kennedy University	22	10
La Sierra University	22	0
Loyola Marymount University	49	57
Mills College	28	20
Mount St. Mary's College	25	13
National University	888	932
New College	18	25
Norte Dame de Namur	48	1
Nova Southeastern University	17	0
Occidental College	20	18
Pacific Oaks College	29	18
Pacific Union College	27	12
Patten College	21	8
Pepperdine University	81	70
Point Loma Nazarene	17	104
Saint Mary's College	55	25
San Diego Christian College	16	3
Santa Clara University	34	2
Simpson College	39	21
Stanford University	30	38
The Master's College	22	1
Touro University	16	2
The National Hispanic University	31	7
University of La Verne	104	134
University of Phoenix	20	211
University of Redlands	56	59
University of San Diego	24	10
University of San Francisco	31	38
University of Southern California	25	35
University of the Pacific	52	40
Vanguard University	15	22
Westmont College	16	0
Whittier College	21	20
Sub-Total	2,995	3,314
Out of State	500	61

Number of Agreements At the District Intern Programs		
	Initial Applications Allocated	Total Agreements Granted
Compton Unified School District	11	0
Long Beach Unified School	11	0
Los Angeles Unified School District	387	54
Ontario-Montclair School District	20	1
Orange County Dept. of Education	2	3
Project Impact	20	141
Project Pipeline	26	29
San Diego City School (BECA)	23	8
Sub-Total	500	236
Grand Total	7,500	6,648

APPENDIX B

2004-2005 Program Participants by Subject Shortage Area Or School Type, Educational Level, and Gender																
SUBJECT AREA	Junior		Senior		5th Year Undergraduate		Teacher Training Programs		District Intern Program		Internship Program		Out-of-State		Total Awards	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Mathematics	10	9	34	44	14	13	171	182	18	8	16	18	4	6	267	280
Science	3	3	20	39	12	9	118	182	5	12	9	13	2	5	169	263
Bilingual Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special Education	13	28	46	159	26	48	244	638	24	59	19	48	1	9	373	989
Reading Specialist	0	1	1	5	0	3	6	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	33
English	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Foreign Language	5	3	9	21	2	4	25	70	3	5	1	0	0	0	45	104
SCHOOL TYPE*																
Low-Income	18	92	107	436	53	148	392	1433	31	37	42	94	9	13	652	2,253
Low-Performing	5	27	40	138	17	31	171	534	8	11	12	33	3	9	256	783
Rural Area	1	8	5	13	4	6	22	76	3	2	2	4	0	0	37	109
High Percentage of Emergency Permits	0	0	2	2	1	1	5	9	1	2	0	0	0	0	9	14
State Special School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Total	55	171	264	857	129	263	1,155	3,150	93	136	103	211	19	42	1,818	4,830

Note: M=Male, F=Female. Totals may not add up due to independent rounding.

*School Types:

Low-Income School: Based on the percentage of students who qualified for the Free or Reduced Price Lunch Program, or the percentage of students whose families qualified under the CalWORKS criteria, whichever was greater.

Low-Performing School: Schools that have low academic achievement, in the bottom 20 percent, as measured by Academic Performance Index State Ranks of 5 or less.

Rural Area School: Schools serving areas of California defined by the U.S Census as rural or small town.

High Percentage of Emergency Permit Teachers: Schools with 20 percent or more of teachers teaching with emergency permits.

State Special School: School for the Blind in Fremont and two Schools for the Deaf, one in Riverside and one in Fremont.

APPENDIX C

2004-2005 Program Participation by Subject Shortage Area or School Type and Ethnicity												
SUBJECT AREA	Asian		African-American		Latino		Caucasian		Other		No Response	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Mathematics	64	16.2	40	8.4	98	5.7	269	8.4	61	9.2	15	7.6
Science	34	8.6	18	3.8	64	3.7	236	7.4	57	8.6	23	11.7
Bilingual Education	0	0	0	0	1	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special Education	48	12.2	133	27.9	216	12.6	794	24.8	120	18.1	49	24.9
Reading Specialist	4	1.0	1	0.2	10	0.6	19	0.6	6	1.0	1	0.5
English	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.2	1	0.5
Foreign Language	3	0.8	3	0.6	89	5.2	40	1.3	6	1.0	8	4.0
SCHOOL TYPE*												
Low-Income	178	45.2	190	39.9	883	51.5	1285	40.1	293	44.1	75	37.1
Low-Performing	58	14.7	78	16.4	318	18.5	460	14.4	106	15.9	18	9.1
Rural Area	4	1.0	9	1.9	32	1.9	87	2.7	11	1.7	5	2.5
High Percentage of	1	0.3	4	0.8	3	0.2	10	0.3	3	0.5	2	1.0
Emergency Permits												
State Special School	0	0	0	0	2	0.1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total	394	100	476	100	1,716	100	3,201	100	664	100	197	100

Note: # = Number of Participant. % = Percentage of Participants. Totals may not add up due to rounding. Responses to questions on ethnicity are voluntary.

*School Types:

Low-Income School: Based on the percentage of students who qualified for the Free or Reduced Price Lunch Program, or the percentage of students whose families qualified under the CalWORKS criteria, whichever was greater.

Low-Performing School: Schools that have low academic achievement, in the bottom 20 percent, as measured by Academic Performance Index State Ranks of 5 or less.

Rural Area School: Schools serving areas of California defined by the U.S Census as rural or small town.

High Percentage of Emergency Permit Teachers: Schools with 20 percent or more of teachers teaching with emergency permits.

State Special School: School for the Blind in Fremont and two Schools for the Deaf, one in Riverside and one in Fremont.

APPENDIX D

2004-2005 Program Participants														
By Subject Shortage Area or School Type and Age Group														
SUBJECT AREA	20 and under		21-25		26-30		31-35		36-40		41-45		46 and Older	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Mathematics	29	10.9	203	8.9	125	7.4	72	8.1	39	7.9	30	6.9	49	8.4
Science	17	6.4	154	6.7	146	8.6	53	6.0	19	3.8	21	4.8	23	3.9
Bilingual Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special Education	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reading Specialist	74	27.4	259	11.3	322	19.1	197	22.3	144	29.1	142	32.6	225	38.4
English	1	0.4	11	0.5	14	0.8	2	0.2	3	0.6	4	0.9	5	0.9
Foreign Language	7	2.6	56	2.4	45	2.7	13	1.5	9	1.8	10	2.3	8	1.4
SCHOOL TYPE*														
Low-Income	97	36.5	1170	51.0	732	43.3	369	41.7	196	39.6	151	34.6	188	32.1
Low-Performing	29	10.9	373	16.3	269	15.9	161	18.2	72	14.5	64	14.7	71	12.1
Rural Area	8	3.0	60	2.6	30	1.8	17	1.9	10	2.0	12	2.8	11	1.9
High Percentage of Emergency Permits	4	1.5	4	0.2	6	0.4	0	0	3	0.6	2	0.5	4	0.7
State Special School	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.3
Total	266	100	2,292	100	1,689	100	884	100	495	100	436	100	586	100

Note: # = Number of Participant. % = Percentage of Participants. Totals may not add up due to rounding.

*School Types:

Low-Income School: Based on the percentage of students who qualified for the Free or Reduced Price Lunch Program, or the percentage of students whose families qualified under the CalWORKS criteria, whichever was greater.

Low-Performing School: Schools that have low academic achievement, in the bottom 20 percent, as measured by Academic Performance Index State Ranks of 5 or less.

Rural Area School: Schools serving areas of California defined by the U.S Census as rural or small town.

High Percentage of Emergency Permit Teachers: Schools with 20 percent or more of teachers teaching with emergency permits.

State Special School: School for the Blind in Fremont and two Schools for the Deaf, one in Riverside and one in Fremont.

APPENDIX E

HISTORY OF ALLOCATIONS, AWARDS, LOAN ASSUMPTION PAYMENTS AND PROJECTED PAYMENTS						
Academic Year	Authorized Agreement Allocation	Number of Participants Awarded	Distributions Of Allocation	Local Assistance Paid	Number of Teachers Paid	Payments Made by Fiscal Year
1986-1987	500	436	All to Participating Colleges	\$0.00		1987-1988
1987-1988	500	500	All to Participating Colleges	\$313,977	162	1988-1989
1988-1989	500	500	All to Participating Colleges	\$853,709	379	1989-1990
1989-1990	500	500	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,280,693	573	1990-1991
1990-1991	500	500	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,558,256	664	1991-1992
1991-1992	500	500	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,571,627	662	1992-1993
1992-1993	500	424	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,610,286	660	1993-1994
1993-1994	400	400	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,607,366	661	1994-1995
1994-1995	400	400	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,611,971	654	1995-1996
1995-1996	400	400	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,678,859	742	1996-1997
1996-1997	400	400	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,898,786	749	1997-1998
1997-1998	400	400	All to Participating Colleges	\$2,121,353	830	1998-1999
1998-1999	4,500	3,805	Participating Institutions, 500-OS, 500-DI	\$2,113,856	798	1999-2000
1999-2000	5,500	5,485	Participating Institutions, 500-OS, 500-DI	\$4,994,065	2,172	2000-2001
2000-2001	6,500	7,500	Participating Institutions, 500-OS, 500-DI	\$11,603,484	4,460	2001-2002
2001-2002	6,500	6,487	Participating Institutions, 500-OS, 500-DI	\$19,401,877	6,974	2002-2003
2002-2003	7,500	7,500	Participating Institutions, 500-OS, 500-DI	\$26,944,291	9,587	2003-2004
2003-2004	7,700	7,432	Participating Institutions, 500-OS, 500-DI	\$34,023,000	11,616	2004-2005
2004-2005	7,500	6,648	Participating Institutions, 500-OS, 500-DI	\$36,017,305	12,091	2005-2006