

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. 2003-2004 Program Participants by Teacher Shortage Area, Education Level, and Gender	16
C. 2003-2004 Program Participants by Teacher Shortage Area and Ethnicity.....	17
D. 2003-2004 Program Participants by Teacher Shortage Area and Age Group	18
E. History of Allocation, Awards and Loan Assumption Payments 1986-1987 through 2003-2004.....	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.
- 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 were 78 institutions with CCTC-approved teacher-training programs for the 2003-2004 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 no more than 500 APPLE awards 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 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 2003-2004		
	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools Using Criteria
Grade Point Average	39	26.8
Faculty Recommendations	25	17.2
Essays	18	12.4
Interviews	18	12.4
Test Scores	12	8.4
Other Criteria	14	9.7
Volunteer Work Experience	11	7.6
Extra Curricular Activities	8	5.5

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 authorized allocations are filled. Of the total 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 6,700 applications are for colleges and universities with teacher certification programs. The Commission was authorized to allocate 7,700 APLE agreements for the 2003-2004 academic years. The Commission reviews all nominations for program eligibility. Commission staff check for any discrepancies on the application and withdraws any applications that do not meet the program requirements.

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 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%. In comparison to 2002-2003: Private Colleges and Universities 7.2%; California State University 40.3%; University of California 48.3%; District Intern Program 1.3% and County Office of Education and for Out-of-State 2.9%. This demonstrates increased participation from Private Colleges and Universities and District Intern Programs with decreased participation among the California State University, University of California and County Office of Education.

Table 3

APLE APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED FOR 2003-2004				
	Applications – Ineligible = Total Ineligible Submitted Applicants Applications Submitted			Percent Segmental Distribution of Eligible Applicant
Private Colleges and Universities	3,792	0	3,792	51.1
California State University	2,722	0	2,722	36.6
University of California	628	0	628	8.4
District Intern Program	190	0	190	2.6
County Office of Education and for Out-of-State Recruitment	100	0	100	1.3
Total	7,432	0	7,432	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						
	2001-2002		2002-2003		2003-2004	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agreements not signed and returned	398	90.9	779	93.7	671	98.9
Agreements declined	40	9.1	51	6.3	11	1.1
Total	438	100	830	100	682	100

Note: Total applicants for allocation from 2001-2002 = 6,500; 2002-2003 = 7,500; 2003-2004 = 7,700.

By the end of 2003-2004, the Commission successfully selected 7,432 applicants as recipients from participating postsecondary institutions, including 100 recipients for the APLE for Out-of-State Teachers Program and 190 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 an increase 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 2001-2002, “non-traditional” students represented 48.9 percent of all participants; this population decreased to 43.6 percent in 2002-2003 in and decreased to 37.9 percent in 2003-2004.

Table 5A

DISTRIBUTION OF APLE PARTICIPANTS BY AGE						
	2001-2002		2002-2003		2003-2004	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
20 and under	0	0.0	1	0.0	66	0.9
21-25	1,066	16.4	1,896	25.3	2,553	34.4
26-30	2,254	34.7	2,330	31.1	1,995	26.8
31-35	1,185	18.2	1,237	16.5	1,067	14.4
36-40	637	9.8	674	9.0	620	8.3
41-45	533	8.2	505	6.7	469	6.3
45 and older	825	12.7	857	11.4	662	8.9
Total	6,500	100	7,500	100	7,432	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						
	2001-2002		2002-2003		2003-2004	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Asian	304	4.7	373	5.0	471	6.3
African-American	444	6.8	563	7.5	589	7.9
Latino	1,622	25.0	1,936	25.8	1,955	26.3
Caucasian	3,248	50.0	3,743	49.9	3,646	49.1
Other	882	13.6	853	11.4	677	9.1
No Response*	0	0	32	0.4	94	1.3
Total	6,500	100	7,500	100	7,432	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					
	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Male	25.2	25.0	26.5	27.0	26.5
Female	74.8	75.0	73.5	73.0	73.5
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 AND BY TEACHER SHORTAGE AREA						
Subject	2001-2002		2002-2003		2003-2004	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mathematics	373	5.8	489	6.5	596	8.0
Science	339	5.2	336	4.5	437	5.9
Bilingual Education	295	4.6	0	0.0	1	0.0
Reading Specialist	38	0.6	51	0.7	28	0.4
English						
Special Education	830	12.8	1,020	13.6	1,258	16.9
Foreign Language	0	0.0	109	145.3	139	1.5
School Type*						
Low-Income	2,884	44.5	3,239	43.2	3,234	43.5
Low-Performing	1,452	22.4	1,956	26.1	1,520	20.9
Rural Area	155	2.4	169	2.3	149	2.0
High Percentage of Emergency Permit Teachers	119	1.8	127	1.7	70	.9
State Special Schools	2	0.3	4	5.3	0	0.0
Self-Contained Classroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	6,487	100	7,500	100	7,432	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 42,329 participants. In 2002-2003, there were a total of 34,897 participants in the APLE program. In 2003-2004, the APLE program added 7,432 for academic year 2003-2004 which represents a 21.3 percent growth rate over one year.

The Commission may withdraw participants after the receipt of program benefits. There were 1,449 participants who received the maximum benefits (four years of benefits) and 74 had their entire outstanding student loans paid-in-full. Others were removed because they did not provide consecutive teaching service. Table 6 shows the distribution of the 2,176 participants withdrawn after receiving benefits during the 2003-2004 school years.

Table 6

APPLICANTS WITHDRAWN FROM APLE AFTER RECEIPT OF BENEFITS 2003-2004 ACADEMIC YEAR		
	Number	Percent
Received maximum benefits	1,449	66.6
All eligible loans paid in full	74	3.4
Did not teach consecutive years	653	30.0
Defaulted loans	0	0
Total	2,176	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, 57.4 percent of the APLE participants who taught during the 2000-2001 academic year and received their first year of loan assumption benefits in 2001-2002 continued to teach for four consecutive years. The data reflects that 73.5 percent of the 3,366 participants who taught in 2001-2002 and received their first year of benefits in 2002-2003 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
2001-2002	2,594	2,366	91.2	2,024	78.0	1,490	57.4
2002-2003	3,366	2,974	88.4	2,475	73.5		
2003-2004	3,738	3,440	92.0				
2004-2005	4,211						

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 12,114 types of loans that were assumed for fiscal year 2004-2005. The loan assumption benefit recipients taught during the 2002-2003 academic year. Of all the loans, Commission-guaranteed loans account for 35.6 percent of the total loans assumed for fiscal year 2003-2004, increased from 34.7 percent of the total loans assumed for the prior fiscal year (2002-2003).

Table 8

TOTAL NUMBER OF LOANS AND LOAN ASSUMPTION PAYMENTS BY LOAN TYPE TEACHING SCHOOL YEAR 2003-2004 PAID FISCAL YEAR 2004-2005			
	Number	Amount (\$)	Percent
Commission Guaranteed Loans*	4,353	11,858,990	35.6
US Department of Education Direct Student Loans	2,793	7,777,512	23.1
Consolidated Student Loans	2,432	7,289,081	20.1
Stafford Loans (Guaranteed by other guarantors)	1,680	4,465,755	13.9
US Department of Education Direct Consolidation Loans	764	2,337,034	6.3
Private Educational Loans	67	174,598	0.6
Institution-based Loans and University Loans	23	51,966	0.2
Federal Perkins Loans	2	3,960	0.0
Total	12,114	\$33,958,896	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

Year of Service	Taught 2000-2001 Paid FY 2001		Taught 2001-2002 Paid FY 2002		Taught 2002-2003 Paid FY 2003		Taught 2003-2004 Paid FY 2004	
	Number	Amount (\$)	Number	Amount (\$)	Number	Amount (\$)	Number	Amount (\$)
First	2,594	5,939,505	3,366	7,762,658	3,738	8,625,403	4,211	9,953,049
Second	1,341	4,339,710	2,366	7,666,294	2,974	9,604,663	3,440	11,155,083
Third	236	754,928	1,140	3,581,820	2,024	6,171,833	2,475	8,114,288
Fourth	202	628,459	186	573,976	851	2,542,392	1,490	4,736,476
Total	4,373	\$11,662,602	7,058	\$19,584,748	9,587	\$26,944,291	11,616	\$33,958,896

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

CONCLUSION

This report presents the success of the 2003-2004 APLE program. During the 2003-2004 participation period, the Commission and institutions experienced challenges in meeting the maximum allocations as institutions were required to increase their outreach efforts for the additional new awards. This made it difficult for the Commission to offer new awards to people in a timely manner. Through the joint efforts of the Commission and the participating schools, 7,432 of the 7,700 loan assumption agreements were issued during the 2003-2004 academic year. This brings the cumulative total number of participants in the APLE to 42,329.

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 APLE has experienced growth in both the number of participants and the amount of loan assumption payments. Through the joint efforts of the Commission and the participating schools, 7,432 loan assumption agreements were issued during the 2003-2004 academic year. 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

2003-2004 YEAR

APPENDIX A

Number of Agreements At the University of California		
	Initial Applications Allocated	Total Agreements Granted
Berkeley	27	53
Davis	29	89
Irvine	31	57
Los Angeles	49	205
Riverside	35	100
San Diego	19	24
Santa Barbara	29	45
Santa Cruz	19	55
Sub-Total	238	628

Number of Agreements At the California State University		
	Initial Applications Allocated	Total Agreements Granted
Bakersfield	126	148
Channel Islands	1	22
Chico	121	116
Dominguez Hills	208	212
East Bay	143	58
Fresno	162	146
Fullerton	202	154
Humboldt	45	45
Long Beach	193	185
Los Angeles	255	217
Monterey	32	46
Northridge	246	140
Pomona	112	50
Sacramento	173	239
San Bernardino	174	236
San Diego	190	243
San Francisco	144	89
San Jose	129	43
San Luis Obispo	44	35
San Marcos	128	105
Sonoma	58	70
Stanislaus	128	123
Sub-Total	3,014	2,722



2003-2004 REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

Number of Agreements At the California Independent Institutions		
	Initial Applications Allocated	Total Agreements Granted
Argosy University, Orange	1	105
Alliant International University	18	30
Antioch University	6	17
Azusa Pacific University	112	439
Bethany Bible College	8	1
Biola University	21	26
California Baptist College	35	65
California Lutheran University	37	53
Chapman College	402	503
Christian Heritage	13	0
Claremont Graduate School	29	128
Concordia University	37	19
Dominican College	34	48
Fresno Pacific College	32	81
Holy Names College	11	13
Hope International University	7	5
John F. Kennedy University	6	10
La Sierra University	6	8
Loyola Marymount University	33	119
Mills College	12	35
Mount St. Mary's College	9	16
National University	872	1132
New College	2	19
Norte Dame de Namur	32	14
Nova Southeastern University	1	5
Occidental College	4	10
Pacific Oaks College	13	19
Pacific Union College	11	12
Patten College	5	14
Pepperdine University	55	79
Point Loma Nazarene	1	136
Saint Mary's College	39	18
San Diego Christian College	0	13
Santa Clara University	18	3
Simpson College	23	34
Stanford University	14	31
The Master's College	6	3
The National Hispanic University	15	13
University of La Verne	88	196
University of Phoenix	4	128
University of Redlands	40	50
University of San Diego	23	8
University of San Francisco	31	32
University of Southern California	23	25
University of the Pacific	20	34
Vanguard University	13	24
Westmont College	4	3
Whittier College	22	16
Sub-Total	2,248	3,792
Out of State	500	100

Number of Agreements At the District Intern Programs		
	Initial Applications Allocated	Total Agreements Granted
Compton Unified School District	11	8
Long Beach Unified School	11	8
Los Angeles Unified School District	387	42
Ontario-Montclair School District	20	7
Orange County Dept. of Education	2	7
Project Impact	20	87
Project Pipeline	26	10
San Diego City School(BECA)	23	21
Sub-Total	500	190
Unassigned Late Allocations	1,200	0
Grand Total	7,700	7,432

APPENDIX B

2003-2004 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	1	3	17	25	9	10	220	217	10	4	42	24	7	7	306	290
Science	1	2	8	6	5	8	141	199	6	7	16	27	3	8	180	257
Bilingual Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Special Education	2	12	8	60	5	14	297	710	5	25	29	75	3	13	349	909
Reading Specialist	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	27
Foreign Language	2	1	6	6	0	3	36	72	0	1	3	9	0	0	47	92
SCHOOL TYPE*																
Low-Income	5	68	54	245	16	98	512	1,914	20	65	46	150	12	29	665	2569
Low-Performing	3	17	21	82	10	37	283	866	18	27	26	113	3	14	364	1156
Rural Area	0	3	5	14	1	8	24	83	3	5	1	2	0	0	34	115
High Percentage of Emergency Permits	0	2	2	6	1	1	13	35	5	2	1	1	0	1	22	48
State Special School							0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0
Total	14	108	121	446	47	179	1,527	4,121	67	136	164	402	28	72	1,968	5,464

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

2003-2004 Program Participation by Subject Shortage Area or School Type and Ethnicity												
SUBJECT AREA	Asian		African-American		Latino		Caucasian		Other		No Response	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Mathematics	74	15.7	40	6.8	128	6.5	297	8.1	51	7.5	6	6.4
Science	42	8.9	24	4.1	66	3.4	257	7.0	40	5.9	8	8.5
Bilingual Education	0	0	0	0	1	0.1	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
Special Education	55	11.5	13	22.8	193	9.9	725	19.9	129	19.1	22	23.4
Reading Specialist	0	0	1	0.2	11	0.6	14	0.4	2	0.3	0	0
Foreign Language	2	0.4	2	0.3	81	4.1	45	1.2	8	1.2	1	1.1
SCHOOL TYPE*												
Low-Income	197	41.8	215	36.5	979	50.1	1526	41.9	277	40.9	40	42.6
Low-Performing	97	20.6	160	27.2	447	22.9	651	17.9	149	22.0	16	17.0
Rural Area	2	0.4	4	0.7	34	1.4	99	2.7	10	1.5	0	0
High Percentage of Emergency Permits	2	0.4	9	1.5	15	0.8	32	0.9	11	1.6	1	1.1
State Special School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	471	100	589	100	1955	100	3,646	100	677	100	94	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

2003-2004 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	5	7.6	210	8.2	148	7.4	79	7.4	54	8.7	33	7.0	67	10.0
Science	2	3.0	141	5.5	159	8.0	52	4.9	22	3.5	22	5.0	39	6.0
Bilingual Education	0	0.0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special Education	1	1.5	229	9.0	347	17.4	226	21.2	127	20.5	115	25.0	213	32.0
Reading Specialist	0	0	2	0.1	9	0.5	5	0.5	7	1.1	3	1.0	2	0
Foreign Language	2	3.0	54	2.1	32	1.6	18	1.7	14	2.3	8	2.0	11	2.0
SCHOOL TYPE*														
Low-Income	34	51.5	1286	50.4	843	42.3	437	41.0	250	40.3	189	40.0	195	29.0
Low-Performing	19	28.8	558	21.9	411	20.6	214	20.1	125	20.2	81	17.0	112	17.0
Rural Area	3	4.5	50	2.0	33	1.7	24	2.2	14	2.3	8	2.0	17	3.0
High Percentage of Emergency Permits	0	0	22	0.9	13	0.7	12	1.1	7	1.1	10	2.0	6	1.0
State Special School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	66	100	2,553	100	1,995	100	1,067	100	620	100	469	100	662	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	\$33,958,869	12,411	2004-2005