

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 361 391

TM 020 492

AUTHOR Brandenburg, Ira J.
 TITLE The Special Incentive Programs (Revised). Final Evaluation Report. OREA Report.
 INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.
 PUB DATE 19 Jun 92
 NOTE 281p.
 AVAILABLE FROM Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment, Research Unit, New York City Public Schools, 110 Livingston Street, Room 507, Brooklyn, NY 11201.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC12 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Females; Immersion Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; Internship Programs; Minority Groups; Principals; *Professional Development; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; School Psychologists; Special Education; Tables (Data); Urban Schools; Vocational Education
 IDENTIFIERS *New York City Board of Education; *Special Incentive Programs NY

ABSTRACT

Nine of 10 programs, known collectively as the Special Incentive Programs of the New York City public schools, were evaluated by the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment of the New York City Board of Education. The nine programs are: (1) Intensive Teacher Institute in Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language; (2) Scholarship Program; (3) Special Education Professional in Training Program; (4) Psychologist-in-Training Program; (5) Principals' Institute; (6) Loan Forgiveness Program; (7) Substitute Vocational Assistant Program; (8) Foreign Language Immersion Program (FLIP); and (9) Assistant Principals' Internship Program. The goals of all these programs were to increase the incidence of professionals in each field, with a concentration on women and minorities. Programs were generally evaluated through participant questionnaires, and each was evaluated individually. Across all programs, out of 967 questionnaires, 424 (43.8 percent) were returned. Overall, the programs were favorably rated by participants, who had two main desires: to be treated as an individual, and to have the program fully explained before it began. Most respondents considered the programs career-enhancing, and most thought the experiential aspects were more valuable than the classroom sessions. Recommendations are made for improvement and continuation of the programs. A statistical appendix contains 10 tables of responses. The nine questionnaires are included. (SLD)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED 361 391

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ROBERT TOBIAS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."



OREA Report

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

OF THE

SPECIAL INCENTIVE PROGRAMS
(REVISED)

June 19, 1992

7M020492



NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

H. Carl McCall
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Carol A. Gresser
Westina L. Matthews
Michael J. Petrides
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra
Members

Keysha Z. McNeil
Student Advisory Member

Joseph A. Fernandez
Chancellor

DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING/RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

Robin Willner
Executive Director

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, and to maintain an environment free of sexual harassment, as required by law. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may be directed to Mercedes A. Nestfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201, Telephone: (718) 935-3320.

7/1/92

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Nine of ten programs, known collectively as the Special Incentive Programs, developed by the Division of Human Resources, Bureau of Incentives and Specialized Recruitment Programs, were evaluated by the Division of Strategic Planning and Development, Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA). The nine programs are as follows:

- Intensive Teacher Institute in Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language (ITI-BEI);
- Scholarship Program;
- Special Education Professional in Training (SEPIT);
- Psychologist-in-Training (PIT);
- Principals' Institute;
- Loan Forgiveness Program;
- Substitute Vocational Assistant (S.V.A.);
- Foreign Language Immersion Program (FLIP); and
- Assistant Principals' Internship Program (APIP).

The goals of these programs are to increase the incidence of professionals in each field, with a concentration on women and minorities.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

OREA's evaluation objectives of the Special Incentive Programs were designed to:

- determine the number of participants who successfully complete each program;
- determine the number of participants who pass relevant Board of Education/State Education Department examinations;
- determine the number of participants who, subsequent to successful program completion, hold relevant staff or administrative positions with the New York City Public Schools; and
- summarize participants' perceptions/recommendations of each program.

EVALUATION FINDINGS

The results of the evaluation showed that the programs as a whole were very successful. In terms of response rate alone, there was apparent interest on the part of program participants. Specifically, across all programs, out of 967 questionnaires sent, 424, or 43.8 percent were returned. (Two percent, N= 19

were undeliverable, because of errors and/or changes of addresses on file.)

Each of the nine programs will be discussed individually, as follows:

Intensive Teacher Institute in Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language (ITI-BEI)

In profiling the educational background and professional positions held by the 49 program respondents (representing a 61.3 percent response rate) over 80 percent of respondents were enrolled in a Master's degree program or held a Master's degree. With regard to licensing and certification, over three-quarters (77.5 percent) of the respondents completed the English as a Second Language sequence.

Nearly one-half (46.5 percent) of the respondents held New York City teaching licenses and 22.5 percent held an Ancillary English as a Second Language (E.S.L.) license. As to certification, 47 percent held permanent licenses and 24.5 percent held a one-year temporary provisional certificate in Bilingual Education or E.S.L. About 80 percent held a bilingual or E.S.L. position in the N.Y.C. public schools; and of seven respondents who did not hold such a position, all had frequent contact with Spanish- and Haitian-Creole-speaking parents and students.

Forty percent cited the ITI-BEI program's success in preparing participants very well for an Ancillary Bilingual or E.S.L. examination. In total, 85 percent gave the program a score of 3 or 4 (on a 4-point scale) as positive preparation for a future bilingual position.

The Scholarship Program

Forty percent of the 133 respondents in the Scholarship Program indicated that they were enrolled in the school psychologist program, and 18 percent were enrolled in guidance and counseling. Demographically, the sample was skewed to females (78.2 percent) and Latinos (52.6 percent). Of the 230 questionnaires sent, 90, or 41.3 percent, were received.

In all, 63.2 percent of the respondents held a bilingual scholarship. Moreover, scholarships of 70.5 percent of the respondents were in graduate level training.

In terms of the ratings that participants gave the program's faculty on a 5-point scale, about 60 percent (on average) gave top scores of 4 or 5 to the dimensions of

providing advisement, providing academic training, and scheduling classes.

Respondents assessed the program as a whole (again, on a 5-point scale) as follows: The application process received the most positive response, with 66.3 percent of the ratings at 4 or 5; the tuition payment system fell most often between ratings of 3 and 4 (61.1 percent in total); and the default/deferment of service dimensions were also typically rated in the mid-range scores of 3 or 4 (46.3 percent.) Regarding respondents' assessment of the fairness of the obligation to accept any job offered, 38.3 percent wanted to choose any school they wanted or at least have a choice of school assignments. Suggestions for improving the obligation requirement included about one-quarter of the respondents wanting one year's service obligation for each year of scholarship money (rather than two for one, as it is now); and about eight percent, part-time students, attending school over a longer period of time, wanting the obligation to be based on credits rather than on years of schooling.

Special Education Professional in Training Program (SEPIT)

As with other programs, females in the SEPIT sample of 40 respondents predominated over males (60 versus 40 percent). Ethnically, about 40 percent were whites or Latinos (42.5 percent each) and 12.5 percent were African-Americans.

Over 70 percent of the 40 respondents completed the monolingual special education sequence (72.5 percent) and 22.5 percent were in a bilingual special education sequence.

As to current employment, 90 percent of the respondents indicated that they were working on a special education line. The majority of respondents (72.5 percent, N= 29) work in the Citywide Special Education district.

In rating the program as a whole, over 90 percent felt that the coursework prepared them well to be special education professionals. Only 17.5 percent, (N= 7), of the sample thought the obligation to be assigned to any school was a very fair policy, although 45 percent (N= 18), thought it very fair to exchange tuition for service. As a result, the major suggestion regarding the program was to allow participants to choose the school in which to fulfill their service requirement (27.5 percent).

Psychologist-in-Training Program (PIT)

The 58 respondents in the Psychologists-in-Training Program tended to be female (86.2 percent), white (75.9 percent), and monolingual (69 percent). One-half of the

sample considered tuition reimbursement the most attractive feature that had influenced them to enroll in the program.

Virtually all the participants were currently working in the New York City schools. Over one-third (35 percent) had been employed in the school system for less than one year, although 16.7 percent had been there for five years or more. Twenty of the PIT graduates were working as School Psychologists, while 14 were still Psychologists-in-Training.

Principals' Institute

In total, 29 of the 33 respondents in the Principals' Institute were female (87.9 percent); and African-Americans comprised the largest single ethnic group (48.5 percent). Three respondent cohorts made up the sample, representing the academic years 1988-89, 1989-90, and 1990-91--the greatest number comprising the most recent cohort, 1990-1991.

On the whole, the participants were highly experienced people: forty percent had been in the New York City Public Schools for over 20 years. Respondents reported that they currently held licenses of Principal or Assistant Principal of Day Elementary or Junior High School (66.7 and 72.7 percent, respectively). Nearly one-half the respondents (45.5 percent) held administrative or supervisory titles.

Of those who did not report supervisory responsibilities, only four districts and seven high schools granted the respondents Level I interviews; only three granted them Level II interviews; and none gave them Level III hearings.

When asked how the Bureau of Incentives and Specialized Recruitment Programs or other Board of Education offices could help them get a suitable position, over 40 percent wanted mailings and position notices sent to their homes. Another 27.3 percent wanted the Central Board to inform candidates of genuinely open positions.

The Institute itself won a great deal of praise from its participants, but 18.2 percent of respondents complained about the scarcity of appropriate employment opportunities.

Loan Forgiveness Program

Ten of the 13 respondents who returned their questionnaires were females, and an equal number of respondents identified themselves as Latino. Almost half of the respondents were in social work (six responses), and were currently in some area of bilingual education; e.g.,

L

Bilingual School Social Worker, Bilingual Guidance Counselor and Bilingual School Psychologist.

In rating the program as a whole, seven of 13 participants gave a neutral rating of 3 (on a 5-point scale) to the ease of applying to the program, six gave scores of 4 or 5 to the sufficiency of the loan amount, but there was no discernible pattern to the responses regarding sufficiency of the loan forgiven (i.e., responses ranged across the 5-point scale).

Respondents generally praised the program for providing a rare chance to further their educations and careers. Few had any negative comments to make about the program.

Substitute Vocational Assistant Program (S.V.A.)

The nine who responded to the request for questionnaires included seven participants and two graduates. Eight of the respondents were males and one was female. Ethnically, the group was divided among five Latinos, four whites, and one African-American. Cosmetology, carpentry, auto mechanics, aviation maintenance, architectural drafting, optical mechanics, and automotive body repair and painting were the skills represented among the program participants.

When asked what type of work was done in the assigned schools, six of the seven participants and both graduates reported that they prepared and taught lessons. Four of the nine mentioned that they were currently teachers. They typically worked in the same high schools where they had served their internships.

In rating the usefulness of aspects of the program, seven of nine respondents gave scores of 3 or 4 on a 4-point scale to classroom service and worksite assignment. In fact, participants asked for more frequent work assignments. They also wanted a more challenging program, more accountability, simplification of the Optical Mechanics licensing program, and a stop to perceived decreases in S.V.A. standards.

Foreign Language Immersion Program (FLIP)

Eighty-three percent of the 24 respondents (N=20), currently worked on a bilingual line. Moreover, all four of those who did not work on a bilingual line had frequent contact with non-English-speaking students and parents.

On a 4-point scale, over 70 percent of respondents gave a 4 rating to the classwork, course materials, and free conversation program components in preparation for the auxiliary bilingual examination. Finally, the most frequent

respondent recommendations for program improvement included a follow-up refresher course (33.3 percent, N= 8), and more conversation/talks with native speakers of the foreign language, (20.8 percent, N= 5). Several respondents praised the overall program (12.5 percent, N= 3).

Assistant Principal Internship Program (APIP)

The 65 respondents to the APIP questionnaire were chiefly female (84.6 percent) and most frequently African-American (46.2 percent). About 35 percent were currently teachers, 27.7 percent were Interim Acting Assistant Principals, and fewer than 10 percent were Assistant Principals. Nearly one-half (46.2 percent) held a supervisory/administrative title. Of those without administrative or supervisory titles, 37.1 percent, (N= 13), worked in an out-of-classroom supervisory capacity.

Ratings of the usefulness of the APIP program for a supervisor or school administrator were very favorable. Over 85 percent found the school internship very useful, as was the academic coursework (65 percent, N= 42) and the topical seminars (55.8 percent, N= 24).

Respondents indicated that the Bureau of Incentives and Specialized Recruitment Programs could help APIP graduates find jobs by mailing job listings to their homes, (24.6 percent), by holding workshops on interviewing and career counseling (16.9 percent), and organizing networking meetings (10.8 percent).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, the nine programs under review received favorable ratings from their current or past participants. This was most clearly observed in the final suggestions and comments most respondents made about their program. Across the board, participants wanted two things: 1) that each one be treated as an individual, not as just another number--meaning that a lot of advisement and mentor time was needed; and 2) that the entire program, including its nuances (like the default and deferment of service policies), be thoroughly explained before the program began. Perhaps, small group orientations including distribution of written material with frequently asked questions could be implemented to further program understanding and enhancement.

With regard to the objectives of the research, a few generalizations can be made:

- The Special Incentive Programs have been able to attract women and minorities to train for and ultimately accept such administrative roles as assistant principal, school

psychologist or guidance counselor, many in bilingual positions.

- Respondents seemed eager to use the knowledge they had acquired through the program to advance their careers. All but the participants in the Psychologists-in-Training were due to, or expected to, join the New York City Public Schools.
- In general, when asked about the usefulness of aspects of a program (such as the Assistant Principals' Internship Program), respondents were very favorable about such experiential aspects of the program as the worksite assignments, but were less favorable regarding classroom learning.
- Higher-level positions, i.e., principal and assistant principal, appear to be difficult for program graduates to obtain. Respondents' recommendations for greater assistance in this area would seem warranted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the findings of ORFA's evaluation, the following recommendations are made:

- Continue the current recruitment efforts in order to maintain the programs' success in reaching their targeted populations in terms of both gender and ethnicity.
- Retain the experiential learning components and seek other means of augmenting the relevance of course content.
- Implement Career Fairs, networking, and other assertive mechanisms for securing Principal and Assistant Principal positions.
- Ensure that all participants' and graduates' addresses are accurately kept so that program participants' responsibilities in regard to program employment and repayment responsibilities can be met.
- Continue providing small-group pre-program orientations, detailing employment and repayment responsibilities, and include written materials answering frequently asked questions in lay rather than legal language.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared, and the text word processed, by Ira J. Brandenburg of the Research Unit of the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA), New York City Board of Education.

Mabel Payne and Carolyn Jarvis guided the evaluation and Nina Gottlieb and Carolyn Jarvis designed the survey forms. The report format and the editing were provided by Mabel Payne and Joan Katz.

Thanks are also due to James Reeves, who contributed much of the data tabulation and proofreading and to Adetokunbo Sosanya and Darlene Eason who tirelessly word processed this document.

Additional copies of this report are available from:

Ms. Mabel Payne
Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment
Research Unit
New York City Public Schools
110 Livingston Street, Room 507
Brooklyn, New York 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Program Objectives	1
Evaluation Objectives	2
Evaluation Methodology	2
Scope of This Report	3
II. FINDINGS	4
Intensive Teacher Institute in Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language	4
The Scholarship Program	7
Special Education Professional in Training Program	12
Psychologist-in-Training Program	14
Principals' Institute	16
Loan Forgiveness Program	19
Substitute Vocational Assistant Program	21
Foreign Language Immersion Program	24
Assistant Principal Internship Program	25
III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	28
Intensive Teacher Institute	29
The Scholarship Program	29
Special Education Professional in Training Program	30
Psychologist-in-Training Program	31
The Principals' Institute	31
Loan Forgiveness Program	32

	Page
Substitute Vocational Assistant Program	33
Foreign Language Immersion Program	33
Assistant Principal Internship Program	34
RECOMMENDATIONS	35
STATISTICAL APPENDIX	37
QUESTIONNAIRES	141

I. INTRODUCTION

The Division of Human Resources, Bureau of Incentives and Specialized Recruitment Programs, operated ten Special Incentive Programs. These programs involved contractual agreements between the New York City Public Schools and various higher education institutions located in the immediate New York City metropolitan area and in New York State.

In the fall of 1991, the Division of Strategic Planning, Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) was assigned the evaluation of nine of the ten Special Incentive Programs, which included:

- Intensive Teacher Institute in Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language (ITI-BEI);
- Scholarship Program;
- Special Education Professional in Training (SEPIT);
- Psychologist-In-Training Program (PIT);
- Principals' Institute;
- Loan Forgiveness Program;
- Substitute Vocational Assistant Program (S.V.A.);
- Foreign Language Immersion Program (FLIP); and
- Assistant Principals' Internship Program (APIP).

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Special Incentive Programs included the following:

- The Intensive Teacher Institute, Scholarship Program, Special Education Professional in Training Program, Loan Forgiveness Program, and Foreign Language Immersion Program were instituted to increase the number of women and minorities in the pool of qualified candidates for school-based pedagogical and clinical administrative and supervisory positions.

- The goal of the Psychologist-In-Training Program was an increase in the number of certified school psychologists.
- The Principals' Institute and the Assistant Principals' Internship Program were designed to increase the number of women and minorities in the pool of qualified candidates for school-based administrative and supervisory positions.
- The goal of the Substitute Vocational Assistant Program was to increase the number of vocational trade or technical teachers.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

OREA's evaluation of the programs was designed to:

- determine the number of participants who successfully completed each program;
- determine the number of participants who passed relevant Board of Education/State Education Department examinations;
- determine the number of participants who, subsequent to successful program completion, held relevant staff or administrative positions with the New York City Public Schools;
- specify demographic characteristics of program participants, including ethnicity, gender, and related career and educational experiences;
- summarize participants' perceptions of the program design and implementation; and
- present program participants' recommendations for program improvement.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

After meeting with Bureau of Incentive and Specialized Recruitment Programs personnel to determine the scope of the evaluations, between March 30 and May 15, 1992 OREA evaluators sent program-specific questionnaires by mail to 967 individuals. By April 16th OREA had received only 309 completed questionnaires. Therefore the approximately 650 respondents who had not returned a questionnaire were sent a second copy of the

document. This second mailing excluded any questionnaires returned to OREA because of an inability to locate the intended program participants. By May 15th OREA had received a total of 424 questionnaires. The distribution of all the questionnaires is indicated in Table 1 (see Page 38) of the Statistical Appendix. (Hereafter, all tables referred to in this report will be understood to be contained in this appendix.)

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

Chapter I of this report details an overview of the programs' goals and objectives. Chapter II presents the findings as they pertain to each of the evaluation objectives. Chapter III offers conclusions and recommendations for the programs' improvement.

II. FINDINGS

The following presents OREA's findings for the nine programs described above.

INTENSIVE TEACHER INSTITUTE IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (ITI-BEI)

Forty-nine (61.3 percent) of the 80 individuals who attended the Intensive Teacher Institute returned OREA's questionnaire. As indicated in Table 2 (see Page 39), about 40 percent of these respondents attended Long Island University (L.I.U.) on the Brooklyn campus, while one-quarter attended Adelphi University. Other colleges attended included N.Y.U. (12.2 percent); Fordham (10.2 percent); Baruch College and C.C.N.Y, CUNY; and St. John's University (6.1 percent each).

Over 80 percent of the respondents (81.6 percent) were enrolled in a Master's degree program or held a Master's degree. Fourteen percent did not hold this degree, and the remaining 4.1 percent did not respond to the question. Degree programs were most commonly in English as a Second Language, Bilingual Education, and Early Childhood Education (17.5 percent each), followed by Elementary Education (12.5 percent) (see Table 2, Page 47).

Over three-quarters (77.5 percent) of the respondents completed the English as a Second Language sequence. Twenty percent pursued the Bilingual Elementary sequence (20.0 percent), and one completed the Bilingual Secondary curriculum (2.5 percent).

Nearly one-half (46.5 percent) of the 49 respondents held regular New York City teaching licenses, and 22.5 percent held an ancillary English as a Second Language license. Other licenses represented were regular bilingual licenses (9.9 percent), regular E.S.L. licenses (8.5 percent) and ancillary bilingual licenses (5.6 percent). Of the eleven ITI-BEI program participants who held a bilingual license, eight spoke Spanish, two each spoke Haitian-Creole and Greek, and one spoke Italian.

Forty of the 49 respondents (81.6 percent) held a bilingual or E.S.L. position. The job title held most by respondents was E.S.L. Teacher (44.9 percent), followed by Bilingual Teacher (22.4 percent), and Teacher (unspecified) (14.3 percent). These individuals worked in a wide variety of Community School Districts (C.S.D.s). In all, 14 districts--nearly one-half of all those in the city--were represented by these respondents. Of the seven respondents who did not hold such a position, all had frequent contact with non-English-speaking students and parents. This contact took the form of teaching and interacting with Spanish and Haitian-Creole parents and students within the normal course of teaching duties. A handful--one mention each--taught in a bilingual or E.S.L. laboratory, worked in a bilingual school or school with language-related problems, or on a project for new immigrants.

With regard to New York State Certification, nearly one-half of the respondents (47 percent) held permanent certificates, while one-quarter (24.5 percent) held only one-year temporary

provisional certificates. A few held four-year temporary provisional certificates (12.2 percent) and an almost equal percentage (14.3 percent) held no certificate in Bilingual Education nor in E.S.L. The most common reasons given for not holding a certificate was that the participants were waiting for a response from New York State (six mentions) or that they are waiting to take the National Teacher's Examination (three mentions).

Respondents rated the ITI-BEI program's success in preparing them for an Ancillary Bilingual or E.S.L. examination; 40 percent thought that the program had prepared them very well (i.e., they rated the program 4 on a 4-point scale). An even larger proportion of respondents (52.5 percent) thought that the program prepared them "very well" for a bilingual or E.S.L. position. In all, 85 percent gave the program a score of 3 or 4 as positive preparation for a future position.

When asked to indicate the most useful aspects of the ITI-BEI program, one-quarter pointed to the exchange of information with other students and teachers. Eighteen percent indicated the social, cultural and anthropological courses; 16 percent the practical, hands-on activities; 12 percent the bilingual/E.S.L. classes; 10 percent the different methods of teaching E.S.L.; and ten percent the linguistics classes.

The aspects of the program indicated as least useful included theory and lecture formats that were not related to actual experience (14.3 percent), and the social/cultural courses

and difficult courses such as linguistics (8.2 percent each). On the whole, however, the negative comments were relatively few in number compared with the positive; in fact, about one-half of the respondents (46.9 percent) did not indicate any aspects that were "least useful", while virtually every respondent could name some aspect of the program that was "most useful."

Finally, when asked for suggestions to improve the program, the two most common responses were to dwell less on theory and more on practical experience (e.g., bilingual class visits) and to extend the length, frequency, and number of course offerings (18.4 percent and 10.2 percent, respectively). Three other suggestions were as follows: evaluate and develop more E.S.L. tests and materials (8.2 percent), offer E.S.L. in content areas and among more cultures, and prepare students in advance for the course (6.1 percent each).

THE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

A total of 133 out of 230 Scholarship Program participants (57.9 percent) returned the questionnaires sent to them. These 133 respondents represented the largest sample of individuals among the nine Special Incentives programs who completed questionnaires. Demographically, 78.2 percent of respondents from the Scholarship Program group were female, and slightly more than one-half (52.6 percent) were Latino.

As indicated in Table 3 (see Page 52), about 20 percent of the participants in the Scholarship Program attended L.I.U.-Brooklyn (20.3 percent), while an almost equally large percentage

(18.0 percent) attended N.Y.U. An additional 13.5 percent of participants were enrolled at Fordham University and 10.5 percent were St. John's University students. Respondents also reported enrollment in a diversity of other institutions.

Forty percent of the respondents indicated that they were enrolled in the School Psychologist program, another 18.0 percent were enrolled in guidance and counseling, 15.0 percent specialized in teaching the speech and hearing impaired, and 12.0 percent were in special education degree programs. Relatively few had opted for school social work (8.2 percent), or educational evaluation (4.5 percent). None was in the physical or occupational therapy programs.

In line with the Board's objective of increasing the number of minority group members in administrative positions, almost two-thirds of the respondents held a bilingual scholarship (63.2 percent), and only 18.0 percent received a monolingual scholarship. Scholarships of two-thirds of the respondents (67.7 percent) were in graduate-level training.

With regard to students' anticipated graduation date, over one-half (59.4 percent) expected to receive a diploma in 1992 or 1993 (27.8 percent and 31.6 percent, respectively). Another 15.8 percent expected to graduate in 1994, and 12.0 percent in the two years beyond that (1995 and 1996).

Participants rated the program's faculty on a 5-point scale:

- Overall, about 60 percent (on average) gave top scores of 5 ("excellent") or 4 to the three dimensions: "providing advisement," "providing academic training," and "scheduling classes."

- Few rated any of the three dimensions in the lowest categories of 1 or 2.

When asked for suggestions for improving the advisement component, nearly one-fifth (18.8 percent) wanted an improvement in student advisement and more communication with students. Eighteen participants (13.5 percent) thought the faculty were too overworked to provide adequate time to individual students. However, most respondents (61.6 percent) gave no suggestions regarding this issue.

In the area of "improving training," there was little consensus. The most frequent suggestions were to include an internship in the program (11.3 percent) and to add specific content areas to the curriculum, such as speech therapy, bilingual education, or social work and counseling (8.3 percent). Again, 60 percent offered no specific suggestion.

In the area of improving scheduling, participants wanted classes scheduled to fit their lifestyles (27.8 percent), as shown in Table 3 (see Page 58). In addition, they wanted classes on weekends, more evenings, earlier in the day, over summers, or over intersession.

Respondents also assessed the overall program on several dimensions. Most ratings fell near, but not at, the top of the 5-point scale; i.e., a score of 3 or 4. More specifically:

- The application process most often received the top score of 5 (22.6 percent) and the next-to-top score of 4 (45.1 percent), for a total of 67.7 percent.
- The tuition payment system was about equally divided between scores of 3 and 4 (29.3 and 27.8 percent, respectively).

- The default and deferment-of-service policies* received nearly identical scores, again concentrated in the mid-to-high range of scores, 3 and 4, (about 22 and 24 percent, respectively, for each attribute).

Overall, few participants made substantial suggestions when asked to do so for the four aspects of the program just discussed, and appearing in Table 3 (see Page 58). Of the few who did offer such suggestions: some (8.3 percent) want the application process simplified and a somewhat larger proportion (17.3 percent) want the Board of Education to pay tuition promptly (to avoid embarrassment when the college duns them). Regarding the default and deferment policies, well over 90 percent made no suggestions at all. Notes on the questionnaire implied that few respondents understood what these policies were!

When asked about the fairness of the obligation to accept any job offered and an exchange of service for tuition assistance, respondents were neutral at best. In fact, as indicated in Table 3 (see Page 62), almost one-quarter of respondents thought that an obligation to accept any job offered was "very unfair" (23.3 percent). This perception was reflected

*If a program participant has a personal situation which results in her/his inability to continuously pursue their degree, or fulfill their employment obligation, there are four basic categories of deferments and defaults available: 1--deferment of studies, where a program participant can take up to one semester of a studies off; 2--deferment of service, whereby a program participant can decline to start his/her obligatory employment for up to six months after completion of his/her studies; 3--a default due to dropping out of studies, and therefore the program participant must repay Board of Education tuition payments; and finally, 4--a default due to a participant's declining obligatory employment with the NYC Public Schools and therefore the program participant must repay Board of Education tuition payments.

in the suggestions made in response to this question. Twenty-six percent of the respondents wanted the chance to choose their own school, 12.8 percent wished their particular situation (particularly their home location) were taken into account in assigning them to a school, and 12.0 percent wanted, at the least, a choice of possible assignments.

With regard to the job obligation in exchange for tuition assistance, respondents were more positive. One-half (50.4 percent) gave ratings of 3 or 4 (out of 5) to this obligation, thinking it relatively fair to expect some obligation for the money they received. In suggesting ways to improve the obligation requirement, one-quarter (24.8 percent) wanted the obligation limited to one year of service for each year of scholarship disbursement (rather than two for one, as it is now). A few (8.3 percent), mainly part-time students who tend to go to school over a long period of time, wanted the obligation based on credits, rather than on years of training.

There was a relatively even division between respondents who reported they could, or could not, continue their education without the Scholarship Program (36.1 and 33.8 percent, respectively). Another 25.6 percent said they "might" be able to do so.

Finally, a very few respondents (generally only 2 or 3 out of a total of 133 participants) had any additional remarks or suggestions to make about the Scholarship Program. In fact, one-

quarter of the responses were more related to individual requests and comments than to program-wide concerns and issues.

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL IN TRAINING PROGRAM (SEPIT)

Forty respondents returned questionnaires relating to their participation in the Special Education Professional in Training Program out of the 145 questionnaires sent out (see Table 4, Page 68). This was a return rate of only 27.6 percent--the lowest proportion in the nine surveys. As such, the reader is cautioned not to construe the following data as representative of all program participants. As with other programs in the evaluation, females (at 60 percent) predominated over males (see Table 4, Page 77). As to ethnic composition, 42.5 percent of respondents were Latino and 42.5 percent were white; another 12.5 percent were African-American and 5.0 percent were Asian/Pacific Islander. As Table 4 (see Page 68) shows, CUNY's City College of New York (55.0 percent), L.I.U.-Brooklyn (25.0 percent) and Adelphi-Manhattan (12.5 percent) led other area schools in attendance by participants in the program.

With regard to the program sequence, 72.5 percent of respondents completed the Monolingual Special Education sequence, followed by Bilingual Special Education (22.5 percent). A tiny percentage (2.5 percent) were in the Educational Evaluation sequence.

Over one-half of the sample (52.5 percent) were appointed to District 75, and others were sent to "regular" districts. Fifty percent of the respondents were currently employed as teachers

(unspecified), another one-fifth (20 percent) as special education teachers, and 12.5 percent as bilingual special education teachers. Other appointees were serving in a varied group of titles. Ninety percent of respondents had a position on a Special Education line, as shown in Table 4 (see Page 71).

When asked to rate the degree to which program coursework prepared participants to be special education teachers, the largest proportion (57.5 percent, N= 14) of respondents rated it a median score of 3. But, combining this score of 3 with a top score of 4, over 90 percent (N= 37) felt that the coursework prepared them well.

Among specific aspects of the program, ratings of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale were recorded as follows:

- application process: 82.5 percent
- tuition payment system: 65.0 percent
- default policy: 17.5 percent (65 percent gave no response)
- deferment of service policy: 17.5 percent (62.5 percent did not respond).

When asked to suggest improvements in the application process, tuition payment system, and the default/deferment of service policies, the majority of respondents offered no clear, generalizable ideas. In the area of improving the application process, the top response, "Reduce confusion/hire more personnel," only garnered 7.5 percent of the respondents. There was greater agreement--at 20 percent--that the Board of Education should pay tuition more promptly; this was a suggestion also raised in regard to the Scholarship Program. Finally, only one

participant responded to the request for suggestions regarding the default/deferment of service policies.

With regard to the perceived fairness of various aspects of the program, only 17.5 percent (N= 7) thought the obligation to accept any job offered was a very fair policy. A much higher proportion (45 percent, N= 18) thought it very fair to exchange tuition for service, but this was still a minority opinion.

When asked to suggest improvements in the job obligation policy of the SEPIT program, the most frequent response (by 27.5 percent of the sample N= 11) was to allow the teacher to choose his or her own school; for example, possibly nearer the teacher's home. Three participants wanted their length of obligation limited to one year. However, 92.5 percent (N= 37) offered no suggestion at all regarding length of service obligation.

Finally, 40 percent of respondents said they could continue with their education, even without the SEPIT program; but 30 percent reported that they could not continue without it.

PSYCHOLOGIST-IN-TRAINING PROGRAM (PIT)

Most respondents in the Psychologist-in-Training (PIT) Program attended CUNY's City College of N.Y. or Brooklyn College (27.6 and 22.4 percent, respectively). CUNY's Queens College and Fordham University were also represented at 15.5 percent each. (See Table 5, Page 78.) Demographically, participants tended to be female (86.2 percent), white (75.9 percent), and monolingual (69.0 percent); and if bilingual, they were most often Spanish-speaking (62.5 percent).

One-half of the sample considered the tuition reimbursement feature of the program to be a major influence (scoring 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) on their decision to continue their education and/or training in school psychology. At the time of the survey, the overwhelming majority of respondents were interning in community school districts, (62.1 percent, N=36), while the next most frequent placement was in high schools, (13.6 percent, N=8). (See Table 5, Page 79.)

In asking respondents how they obtained an internship, the following was a (composite) typical course of action:

Respondents were made aware of PIT through colleagues, former Psychologists-in Training, the Board of Education, a PIT circular, or their college (10.3 percent mentions in total). Respondents applied directly to the Central Board, to a Community School Board, to their college, or to other locale (74.1 percent). The majority (56.9 percent) of the program respondents in the sample were interviewed, and 15.5 percent were placed in a school or C.S.D. (See Table 5, Page 80.)

Of the 58 individuals in the program, 54 (93.1 percent) were currently working in the New York City Public Schools. The remaining four respondents showed interest in joining the Public Schools. The C.S.D.s where most PIT graduates were currently working were C.S.D.s 11 and 22 (four mentions each), followed by C.S.D.s 1, 6, 8, 24, 28, and 31, with 3 mentions each. Other districts and high schools accepted one, two, or no PIT graduates (See Table 5, Page 83.)

As would be expected from the programs' goals--i.e., to place more school psychologists--20 of the PIT graduates were serving in that capacity; and another 14 were still classified as

Psychologists-in-Training, accounting for a total of 34 of the 58 respondents (58.6 percent). Thirty-five percent of PIT participants had been working in the New York City Public Schools under one year. The next two most frequently stated lengths of service to the school system were five or more years, and from three to less than five years, indicated by 16.7 and 14.8 percent of the respondents, respectively.

As of the time of the survey, nearly three-quarters (74.1 percent) of the PIT respondents will not have fulfilled more than one year of their obligation in the public schools by June, 1992. An equal proportion reported their total obligation at between two and three years, and only 18.9 percent cited a one-year total obligation to fulfill their service requirement.

PRINCIPALS' INSTITUTE

Again, most (30) of the 34 individuals who reported participating in this program were female. (See Table 6, Page 99.) Ethnically, 16 were African-Americans, seven each were Latinos or white, and one was an Asian/Pacific Islander.

Participants in the Principals' Institute commenced the program as a group at the start of each school semester from Fall 1988 onward. Each group's start-up semester was considered a "cohort." In this evaluation, three cohorts were questioned: Cohort I from Fall 1988, Cohort II from Spring 1989, and Cohort III from Fall 1990. The highest percentage of the respondents in our sample were in Cohort III (41.2 percent). Another 38.2

percent were in Cohort II and 20.6 percent were in Cohort I.
(See Table 6. Page 88.)

Over 29 percent of the respondents cited teaching as their current school system position, followed by Assistant or Interim Acting Assistant Principal, at 23.5 percent. Only 8.8 percent, three individuals, held interim acting principalships. The majority of the respondents (76.5 percent) worked in community school districts.

The majority of the participants were highly experienced. Over 38 percent had twenty or more years of experience in the New York City Public School System; another 38 percent have between ten and twenty years' longevity in the system.

Most respondents currently hold the N.Y.C. licenses of Principal or Assistant Principal of day elementary or junior high schools (67.6 percent and 76.5 percent, respectively). A smaller proportion had Day High School or Assistant Principal licenses (20.6 percent and 20.6 percent, respectively). In all 11 respondents held administrative or supervisory titles. (See Table 6, Page 91.)

The 11 unlicensed participants with administrative or supervisory responsibilities typically supervised or coordinated specific grades and subject matter (five mentions), or supervised such non-academic activities as the lunchroom or class trips (five mentions).

Most of those in an administrative or supervisory position, with or without the appropriate license, found out about their

current job by being recruited or interviewed by the District Superintendent (11 mentions) or were recommended by a school principal, often in the school where they had interned (four mentions). Supervisory individuals were hired as a result of an interview at the school or district (nine mentions), or were especially sought and placed by the principal (four mentions).

Regarding those who did not have supervisory responsibilities, the search for an administrative position led them to a wide variety of C.S.D.s. While three districts and seven high schools granted these individuals Level I interviews, only three granted Level II meetings--and none gave Level III hearings.

This group of respondents reported it a difficult task to climb the ladder to an administrative job. Although the group was well educated, nearly all holding a Master's degree, the Principals' Institute members felt they needed help in finding and obtaining a suitable position.

When asked how the Bureau of Incentives and Specialized Recruitment Programs or other Board offices could help them get a suitable position, over 41 percent wanted to receive mailings and position notices at their homes. Over one-quarter (26.5 percent) wanted the Central Board to recommend, or inform candidates of "real" (i.e., genuinely open) positions. They also said that the Board of Education could hold employment or networking seminars for program graduates, or develop applicant lists and note graduate accomplishments (i.e., the work experience component) in

the program for principals to see (17.6 percent mentions each). Along these same lines, it was suggested that meetings could be arranged between applicants and administrators (14.7 percent mentions). Finally, three program graduates wanted districts to be compelled to hire applicants within a definite time frame (8.8 percent).

Overall, the Institute itself won a great deal of praise from its participants. Phrases such as "the best experience of my life" were by no means rare. In this regard the Principals' Institute was a huge success. Yet, 17.6 percent also complained about the scarcity of appropriate employment opportunities; and two respondents wanted to see better, more experienced supervision in the Institute. (See Table 6, Page 96). Respondents holding a Master's degree in Education (N= 26), Master of Arts (N= 10), and Master of Science (N= 9) were the predominant educational groups.

LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM

Thirteen participants of 16 in the Loan Forgiveness Program returned a questionnaire (see Table 7, Page 100). Ten of the 13 respondents were female, versus ten males. Ten identified themselves as Latino, one as white, and two as "other."

Before they applied to the Loan Forgiveness Program, respondents were primarily students or social workers (four mentions each), with single mentions of counselor, economist, housewife, bilingual school psychologist, and school paraprofessional.

Ratings of the program by the 13 participants were as follows:

- Seven gave a neutral rating (3 on a 5-point scale) to the ease of applying to the program.
- Six gave top- and next-to-top scores (5 or 4) to the sufficiency of the loan amount each year.
- There was no discernible pattern to the responses regarding the sufficiency of the amount of the loan forgiven in total. Responses ranged across the 5-point scale.

When asked how the application process could be improved, the responses ranged from increasing the speed of processing applications and the frequency of interviewing (three mentions), to detailing the program in advance for the participants, and improving the organization and personnel of the program (two mentions each), to notifying students of their current status (one mention).

Respondents found out about their current position from the Central Board (3 mentions), from inquiries at the schools themselves and from friends and colleges (two mentions each). Their present positions were primarily in the area of bilingual education: Bilingual School Social Worker (four mentions), Bilingual Guidance Counselor, and Bilingual School Psychologist (two mentions each). Finally, respondents most frequently worked in District 75 (3 mentions).

Generally, comments and suggestions about the Loan Forgiveness Program were quite positive. As with other programs, the most frequent comment was in praise of the program as a chance participants had thought they would never have, to get an

education and, ultimately, a good career. Respondents spoke powerfully about this opportunity to earn a college degree. Accordingly, few had anything negative to say about the program, as shown in Table 7, Page 107).

However, in judging the sufficiency of the loan to be forgiven, those who found the amount forgiven to be insufficient indicated that a sufficient amount ranged between \$2,000 and \$14,999 per year (Table 7, Page 103).

If the Loan Forgiveness Program had not been available, only three respondents could have applied to the New York City Public Schools, and an additional seven might have been able to do so. An especially positive finding was that eleven of 13 respondents expected to work for the school system after their obligations were met, and the remaining two thought they might do so.

SUBSTITUTE VOCATIONAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM (SVA)

There were only nine responses to the 29 questionnaires sent to current and past participants in the Substitute Vocational Assistant (S.V.A.) Program. (See Table 8, Page 109.) In total, eight respondents were male and one was female. Ethnically, the group was divided among five Latinos, four whites, and one African-American, (multiple responses were given to this item). Six were English-speakers and four were Spanish-speakers (with one respondent bilingual in both languages).

The following trade specialties were represented among the participants: cosmetology (two mentions), carpentry, auto mechanics, aviation maintenance, and architectural drafting (one

mention each). The two graduates had specialized in optical mechanic mechanics and in automotive body repair and painting.

Classroom service by the program participants and graduates ranged across eight high schools, including Alfred E. Smith, Automotive, Aviation, Bronx Science (for architectural drafting), Mabel Dean Bacon, McKee Vocational, Harry Van Arsdale, and George Westinghouse. When asked what type of work was done in the classroom, six participants and both graduates indicated that they prepared and taught lessons. Four participants and one graduate gave exams and corrected papers; two participants reported observing lessons given by their mentors. Disciplining students, giving demonstrations, and holding parent-teacher conferences were also responsibilities cited by the group. In suggesting ways to improve classroom service, four participants and one graduate wanted more challenge and treatment as a professional.

At the worksite, participants and graduates mentioned tasks typical of their occupation. For example, the participant in cosmetology dressed hair and gave manicures, the optical mechanic prepared and dispensed lenses, and the carpenter did renovation work. (See Table 8, Page 109.)

Respondents reported completion of the program in 1985, 1986, 1987, and 1991. Eight were currently employed in the New York City Public Schools. Both participants and graduates most often indicated that they were now teachers (four mentions in

total), one participant held the title of Dean, one was an "ATR," and one was unemployed.

Many of the high schools where these S.V.A.s worked after completion of the program were the same as the schools where they served their internships, indicating retention after completion of coursework: Alfred E. Smith, Jane Addams, Automotive, Aviation, Van Arsdale, and George Westinghouse.

In rating the usefulness of aspects of the program, seven respondents gave a favorable score (3 or 4 on a 4-point scale) to classroom service and worksite assignments, and six gave these same high ratings to college coursework. Only one respondent found each of these activities of no use.

In suggesting ways to improve the work experience, three participants cited more frequent work assessments. Other single mentions included instilling the necessary skills for the job, involving the S.V.A.s in optical mechanics more in dispensing lenses and keeping records, investigating the job site before recommending it for use in the program, and involving the work site owner in the program.

In order to improve program coursework, participants and graduates again mentioned adding more challenge to the classes, including entry into regular college classes.

Finally, the overall comments and suggestions mirrored concerns and desires reported earlier: more challenge, more accountability, job assurance after graduation, simplification of

the Optical Mechanics licensing procedure, and arresting the perceived decrease in S.V.A. standards. (See Table 8, Page 115.)

FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMMERSION PROGRAM (FLIP)

A total of 24 out of 61 questionnaires were returned by participants in the Foreign Language Immersion Program (FLIP), representing a return rate of almost 40 percent.

Nearly 60 percent of the respondents in FLIP attended Baruch College-CUNY (58.3 percent), and an additional 20.8 percent attended SUNY-New Paltz, with the remainder (6.7 percent) matriculating at Molloy College.

Eighty-three percent of the 24 respondents worked on a bilingual line. However, all four of those who did not work on a bilingual line had frequent contact with non-English-speaking students and parents, since they generally worked in schools with sizable Spanish-speaking student bodies.

Over 62 percent of the respondents gave a top score of 4 to their colleges' organization, and preparation for the auxiliary bilingual examination, and for a bilingual position in the school system. Again, over 70 percent of respondents gave a top score of 4 to the classwork, course materials, and free conversation program components in preparation for the auxiliary bilingual examination. Similarly, 60 percent of the respondents gave top scores to classwork, course materials, and free conversation as useful to future bilingual work, although only one-third or fewer gave top scores to cultural activities and language laboratories as useful to a bilingual career. Open-ended responses detailing

the most and least useful aspects of the program corroborated these scores. (See Table 9, Page 123-124.)

The most frequent recommendations for program improvement included a follow-up refresher course (33.3 percent, N= 8), and more conversation/talks with native speakers of the foreign language (20.8 percent, N= 5). Several respondents praised the overall program (12.5 percent, N= 3).

ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (APIP)

Sixty-five out of 174 individuals in the Assistant Principal Internship Program (APIP) responded to the questionnaire (see Table 10, Page 126). The respondents were 84.6 percent female (N= 55), and were predominantly African-American (35.4 percent, N= 23), white (26.2 percent, N= 17) or Latino (16.9 percent, N= 11). The respondents reported that 43.1 percent participated in the program from 1988-1989, 36.9 percent from 1989-1990, and 20 percent from 1990-1991. Forty percent had worked in the school system for 20 or more years and 29.2 percent had worked in the system from 15 to 20 years. (See Table 10, Page 139.) Fewer than ten percent were actually Assistant Principals, 27.7 percent were Interim Acting Assistant Principals, while about 35 percent were teachers.

The 65 respondents reported currently working in a variety of community school districts. The most frequently cited were C.S.D. 10, at 10.8 percent, C.S.D. 25, at 9.2 percent, and C.S.D. 8, at 7.7 percent. Administrative or supervisory titles were held by only 30 respondents (46.2 percent). Of the 35 (53.8

percent) not holding these titles, 13 (37.1 percent) worked in out-of-classroom supervisory capacities, in positions involving program planning and implementation, grant writing (five), staff development (four), parent liaison (three) and other supervisory tasks.

Among the 43 respondents working in a supervisory or administrative position, either in title or not, most respondents found out about their job through the District office (23.6 percent, N= 10). In getting hired, 34.9 percent of supervisory personnel (in title or not) indicated having been interviewed for their position, while 20.9 percent had sent in a resume and 16.3 percent had completed a New York City administrative application. (See Table 10, Page 132).

Sixty percent of individuals not in an administrative or supervisory title reported actively searching for such a position; 28.6 percent were not; and 11.4 gave no response to the item. The districts where non-supervisory personnel had applied for a job included virtually all C.S.D.s in the city, but chiefly C.S.D. 26 (14.5 percent), C.S.D.s 10, 24, 30 (12.7 percent each), and C.S.D. 27 (10.9 percent). Among the most often cited methods in which the Bureau of Incentives and Specialized Recruitment Programs could reportedly help APIP graduates find jobs were the following: mail job listings to homes (24.6 percent), hold workshops on interviewing and career counseling (16.9 percent), and hold networking meetings (10.8 percent). (See Table 10, Page 138.)

Ratings of the usefulness of the APIP program for preparation to be a supervisor or school administrator were very favorable. Over 85 percent found the school internship very useful, 65 percent found the academic coursework similarly useful, and 55.8 percent considered the topical seminars to be an asset.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, the nine programs under review received very high ratings from their current or past participants, especially observable in the final suggestions and comments made by most respondents about their program. Respondents spontaneously commented that the program had been "the best experience of their lives." This was no small acclamation; it reflected the gratitude felt at being given the opportunity to get a college education, to start a career, or change their career.

Although some specific areas of a program may have received relatively lower ratings; in the main, ratings on a 5-point scale were often as high as 5; those on a 4-point scale were rated 4. This will be discussed later, when assessing each program's strengths and weaknesses.

If there was a universal weakness throughout the program, it was evident in that respondents sensed and reported many facets of disorganization on the part of the program coordinators at the Central Board, in the districts, and/or in the colleges. Participants often reported that money was greatly delayed, that faculty and mentors were not uniformly proficient, and that lectures tended to outweigh more useful hands-on experience. Across the board, respondents wanted two things: 1) that each participant be treated as an individual, not as just another number--meaning a need for a lot of advisement and mentor time-- and 2) that the pre-program orientations be revised to include

written answers to frequently asked questions in lay rather than legal language, i.e.- deferment and default policies.

The following will focus on the strengths and weaknesses of each program:

INTENSIVE TEACHER INSTITUTE IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (ITI-BEI)

Respondents felt that the program had prepared them well for a bilingual or E.S.L. position. They especially liked the active, hands-on tasks. Many of the students mentioned the free exchange of ideas to be the best aspect of the course. The lectures were sometimes characterized as tedious and irrelevant. Participants wanted more practical ideas and fewer films and "facts". As for cultural experiences, respondents valued first-hand experiences like discussions with native-born speakers, rather than old films remembered from their own early school days.

THE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

The 58 percent response to this program was especially high. Based on the response sample, the program seemed to attract a high percentage of bilingual attendees. Also, as in virtually all the programs, the makeup of the sample was heavily skewed to women. Getting more of both women and bilingual into the school system was, of course, a goal of all the programs, this one included.

Respondents anticipated a college diploma at the end of the course. Some, in part-time programs, did not expect to graduate until 1995 or 1996; these students felt that the

obligation to pay back the scholarship with service is relatively unfair to them. Like the participants in the Loan Forgiveness Program, they felt that the obligation should be based on number of credits, not years. The part-time participants must attend college for a longer period of time than the full-time students; their obligation seemed, as one participant said, like being "an indentured servant."

However, the area most negatively received by many was the obligation to serve in any school of the Central Board's choosing. They felt that they will be assigned to a school that no other teacher would want, in an area far from home. They want the choice entirely up to them (taking travel time into account), perhaps in the schools where they were interns. Barring that alternative, they would like a choice of three or four schools.

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL IN TRAINING PROGRAM (SEPIT)

Although the questionnaire return rate for this program was extremely low, the response to SEPIT was positive. Respondents felt the coursework prepared them well to be a special education professional. Respondents wanted the right to choose their own school assignment.

Ratings on the application process and tuition payment process were excellent. However, few participants seemed to understand the default and deferment of service policies.

PSYCHOLOGIST-IN-TRAINING PROGRAM (PIT)

With regard to the Psychologist-in-Training Program, the tuition reimbursement feature was a major inducement to become a School Psychologist. These were among the most enthusiastically positive respondents within the Special Incentive Programs.

Respondents expressed great interest in serving in the N.Y.C. Public Schools, and those not already placed showed positive interest in doing so. It was this group that was most lavish in praise of the program: "A chance of a lifetime," said one.

THE PRINCIPALS' INSTITUTE

The Principals' Institute is successfully meeting the goal of adding women and people of color to the administrative staff of the city's public schools. Demographically, 29 of 33 respondents were women and 16 of 33 were African-Americans. Most participants were teachers or Assistant or Interim Acting Assistant Principals, with over 20 years in the city system. Thus, the program will be producing experienced administrators in the years to come.

The drawback (as in the Assistant Principals' program) was the respondents' high degree of skepticism that they would ever secure a position vacancy after graduation from the program. Dispelling this skepticism, whether true or not, would seem crucial to long-term success in attracting new program participants, or in giving participants hope

that they will be placed. As of now there is strong disbelief that this can occur.

Another deterrent voiced by the respondents, and evidenced by the numbers, is the difficulty of passing the three-stage interview process. The data support the fact that few job-seekers ever reach the second stage of interviews, and even fewer reach the third stage. This seems to provide credence to the idea that no jobs will be given strictly on the basis of merit and experience. Yet, through all this, respondents were a very optimistic group. Praise was heaped upon the program itself; the skepticism lay outside the program's confines.

LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM

A majority of the respondents in this program were preparing for careers in school social work or special education.

Respondents gave high scores to the sufficiency of the loan offer. Respondents were so enthusiastic about the opportunity of working for the New York City Public Schools that eleven of the 13 respondents voiced their intent to continue working for the system after the loan is fully forgiven. Participants were quite effusive in their praise for the program. Without it, few could even think of getting an education of the caliber they were getting.

SUBSTITUTE VOCATIONAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM (SVA)

Only a few respondents returned their questionnaires, so it is hard to draw generalizations. Of the nine questionnaires returned, a range of vocational skills were represented, from carpentry to architectural drafting.

Like other groups, many in this program said they resented the classroom aspect of the program, but they gave high ratings to classroom service and college coursework. Most of the nine reported wanting more challenge in the program, from greater teaching involvement to attending "real" college classes. The program successfully brought its participants into the realm of academia, but reading between the lines, it seemed that several respondents felt they were getting a watered down course of study, without regard for their intelligence.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMMERSION PROGRAM (FLIP)

Most respondents in this program worked on a bilingual line. Many were already native speakers of the language they will teach in. The colleges received high scores on their organization, subject preparation for the bilingual examination, and for preparation for a bilingual teaching/support/supervisory career. Classwork, course materials, and the use of free conversation in the program received high marks, as well.

Moreover, participants saw the program as useful and fulfilling. Many hoped that an extension course will be

offered, with the emphasis on free conversation and on reading materials for those who are already fluent in the language.

ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS' INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (APIP)

Like those in the Principals' Institute, those preparing for an Assistant Principal career were laudatory about the course of study, but they had also been in the system long enough to be skeptical about their chances for a non-politically arranged job. Some were already acting in an Assistant Principals' role (many without extra pay), with 15 or more years in the system. Most important, there was the job availability problem to overcome, including the system of interviews that few seem to complete.

As with the principals, ratings of the program were favorable, with 85 percent finding the school internship, in particular, to be very useful.

With regard to the objectives of the research, a few generalizations can be made:

- The Special Incentive Programs have been able to attract women and minorities to train for, and ultimately accept, such administrative roles as assistant principal, school psychologist or guidance counselor, many in bilingual positions.
- Respondents seemed eager to use the knowledge they had acquired through the program to advance their careers. All but the participants in the Psychologists-in-Training were due to, or anticipated, joining the New York City Public Schools.
- In general, when asked about the usefulness of aspects of a program (such as the assistant principal's internship), respondents were very favorable about the experiential

aspects of the program (such as worksite assignment), but were less favorable regarding classroom learning.

- Higher level positions, (i.e. principal and assistant principal), appear to be difficult to obtain for program graduates. Respondents' recommendations for greater assistance in this area would seem warranted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the findings of OREA's evaluation, the following recommendations are made:

- Continue the current recruitment efforts in order to maintain the programs' success in reaching their targeted populations in terms of both gender and ethnicity.
- Retain the experiential learning components and seek other means of augmenting the relevance of course content.
- Implement Career Fairs, networking, and other assertive mechanisms for securing Principal and Assistant Principal positions.
- Ensure that all participants' and graduates' addresses are accurately kept so that program participants' responsibilities in regard to program employment and repayment responsibilities can be met.
- Continue providing small-group pre-program orientations, detailing employment and repayment responsibilities, and include written materials answering frequently asked questions in lay rather than legal language.

STATISTICAL APPENDIX

TABLE 1
TALLY OF QUESTIONNAIRES SENT AND RECEIVED

PROGRAM TITLE	NUMBER SENT	AMOUNT RECEIVED N	%
Intensive Teacher Institute in Bilingual and English as a Second Language	80	49	61.3
Scholarship Program	230	133	57.9
Special Education Professional Training	145	40	27.6
Psychologist In Training	178	58	32.6
Principals' Institute	54	33	61.1
Loan Forgiveness Program	16	13	81.3
Substitute Vocational Assistant Graduate	29	9	31.0
Foreign Language Immersion Program	61	24	39.3
Assistant Principals' Institute	174	65	37.4
TOTAL	967	424	43.8 ^A

^A Two percent (N=19) of the questionnaires were undeliverable due to errors and/or changes of addresses on file.

TABLE 2

STATUS AND ATTITUDES OF 1990-91 PARTICIPANTS IN THE INTENSIVE TEACHER INSTITUTE IN
 BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (ITI)
 (N=49)^A

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>College Attended</u>		
LIU- Brooklyn	20	40.8
Adelphi University	12	24.5
N.Y.U	6	12.2
Fordham University	5	10.2
CUNY	3	6.1
St. John's University	3	6.1
<u>Program Sequence Completed</u>		
English as a Second Language	36	73.5
Bilingual Education - Elementary	12	24.5
Bilingual Education - Secondary	1	2.0

^A This respondent base represents 61.3% of the 80 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 2
 INTENSIVE TEACHER INSTITUTE
 (N=49)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
Current NYC Licenses Held (Multiple Responses)		
Regular	33	46.5
Ancillary ESL	16	22.5
Regular Bilingual	7	9.9
Regular ESL	6	8.5
Ancillary Bilingual	4	5.6
No answer	5	7.0

NYS Bilingual Education or ESL Certification Currently Held		
Permanent	23	47.0
One Year Temporary Provisional	12	24.5
None Held	7	14.3
Four Year Temporary Provisional	6	12.2
No Answer	1	2.0

^A This respondent base represents 61.3% of the 80 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 2
 INTENSIVE TEACHER INSTITUTE
 (N=49)^A (Continued)

ITEM TOTAL RESPONDENTS
 N

Explanation Why Not Certified^B
 (Multiple Responses)

Awaiting Certificate/Response from State	6
Waiting to take NTE	3
Now completing necessary credits	2
On list, awaiting appointment	1
Failed NTE	1
Need Masters degree	1
Must reapply for Certificate	1

Is Current Position on Bilingual or ESL Line?	N	%
Yes	40	81.6
No	7	14.3
No answer	2	4.1

^A This respondent base represents 61.3% of the 80 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Based on 8 respondents who indicated they do not currently hold a Bilingual or ESL Certificate.

TABLE 2
 INTENSIVE TEACHER INSTITUTE
 (N=49)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Current Job Title</u>		
ESL Teacher	22	44.9
Bilingual Teacher	11	22.4
Teacher (non-spec.)	7	14.3
Elementary Teacher	2	4.1
Other ^B	7	14.3

^A This respondent base represents 61.3% of the 80 questionnaires sent to program participants.
^B "Other" includes titles with one mention each, including: Reading Specialist, Substitute Teacher, Administrative Assistant, Principal, Technician, Speech/language Teacher and P.A.T.S. Coordinator.

TABLE 2
 INTENSIVE TEACHER INSTITUTE
 (N=49)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>School Districts Where Participant Currently Works</u>		
CSD: 15 K	7	14.3
30 Q	7	14.3
17 K	5	10.2
6 M	3	6.1
2 M	2	4.1
9 X	2	4.1
18 K	2	4.1
21 K	2	4.1
23 K	2	4.1
Other ^B	6	12.2
No Answer	11	22.4

^A This respondent base represents 61% of the 80 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Other" includes CSD's with one mention each, including: CSD 3M, 10X, 13K, 20K, 24K, and outside NYC, the Carle Place school system.

TABLE 2
 INTENSIVE TEACHER INSTITUTE
 (N=49)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS N
If not on a Bilingual/ESL Line, Is there frequent contact with Non-English Speaking Students and/or Parents? ^B	
Yes	7
No	-

^A This respondent base represents 61.3% of the 80 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Based on the 7 respondents who are not on a Bilingual/ESL line.

TABLE 2
 INTENSIVE TEACHER INSTITUTE
 (N=49)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS N
Description of contact with Non-English Speaking Students and/or Parents ^B (Multiple Responses)	
Contact with Spanish-speaking students/parents	4
Contact with Haitian-Creole speaking students/parents	4
Teach Haitian-Creole students	2
Teach Bilingual/ESL lab	1
Work in a Bilingual school	1
Work with language-related problems	1
Work on project for new immigrants	1
Have Greek students	1

^A This respondent base represents 61.3% of the 80 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Based on the 7 respondents who are not on a Bilingual/ESL line.

TABLE 2
 INTENSIVE TEACHER INSTITUTE
 (N=49)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS N
<u>Languages Spoken By Bilingual License-Holders^B (Multiple Responses)</u>	
Spanish	8
Haitian-Creole	2
Greek	2
Italian	1
No Answer	1

<u>Enrollment or Completion of a Master's Degree Program?</u>	
Yes	40 81.6
No	7 14.3
No answer	2 4.1

^A This respondent base represents 61.3% of the 80 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Based on the 11 eligible respondents who hold a bilingual license.



TABLE 2
 INTENSIVE TEACHER INSTITUTE
 (N=49)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
Master Degree Program Field of Study ^B		
ESL (English as a Second Language)	7	17.5
Bilingual Education	7	17.5
Early Childhood Education	7	17.5
Elementary Education	5	12.5
Education (not specified)	3	7.5
History	2	5.0
Others ^C	7	17.5
No Answer	2	5.0

^A This respondent base represents 61.3% of the 80 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Based on the 40 respondents who have enrolled in, or completed a Masters Degree program.

^C "Others" include fields of study with one mention each: Social Studies, Supervision/Administration, Italian, Urban Education, Special Education, Math Education, and Reading/Language Arts.

TABLE 2
 INTENSIVE TEACHER INSTITUTE
 (N=49)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS									
	VERY WELL		3		2		POORLY		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Degree of Perceived Preparation For:										
Ancillary Bilingual or ESL Examination	20	40.8	15	30.6	1	2.0	1	2.0	12	24.5
Bilingual or ESL Position	28	57.1	17	34.7	4	8.2	-	-	-	-

^A This respondent base represents 61.3% of the 80 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 2
 INTENSIVE TEACHER INSTITUTE
 (N=49)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
Most Useful Aspects of ITI Program (Multiple Responses)		
Exchange of information with other teachers	12	24.5
Social/cultural/anthropology courses	9	18.4
Practical/hands-on activities	8	16.3
Bilingual/ESL classes	6	12.2
Different methods of teaching English/ESL	5	10.2
Linguistics classes	5	10.2
Able to obtain State certification in Bilingual Education	4	8.2
Content area stress	3	6.1
Expenses partly paid	3	6.1
Learning new methods of teaching Bilingual Education	2	4.1
Others ^B	12	24.5

^A This respondent base represents 61.3% of the 80 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include the following: ESL taught in non-threatening situation, testing/evaluation courses, individual attention paid to students, realistic classroom situations, and excellent instruction.

TABLE 2
 INTENSIVE TEACHER INSTITUTE
 (N=49)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
Least Useful Aspects of ITI Program (Multiple Responses)		
Theory/lecture format unrelated to actual experience	7	14.3
Social/cultural courses	4	8.2
Difficult course content (e.g. linguistics)	4	8.2
Ineffective teacher throughout course	2	4.1
Lack of input about certification process	2	4.1
No course planning for ESL/too little stress on secondary level ESL	2	4.1
Others ^B	3	6.1
None/Nothing	8	16.3
No Answer	17	34.7

^A This respondent base represents 61.3% of the 80 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include the following: Repetition of other courses, program too short, excessive bureaucracy.

TABLE 2
 INTENSIVE TEACHER INSTITUTE
 (N=49)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Suggestions to Improve Program</u> (Multiple Responses)		
Less theory/more practical experience	9	18.4
Extend length/frequency/number of course offerings	5	10.2
Develop/evaluate ESL tests/materials	4	8.2
Offer ESL in content areas among more cultures	3	6.1
Plan/describe program requirements	3	6.1
Develop secondary level ESL courses	2	4.1
Offer more linguistics courses	2	4.1
Guide certification	2	4.1
None needed/good program as it is	2	4.1
Others ^B	3	6.1
No answer	15	30.6

^A This respondent base represents 61.3% of the 80 questionnaires sent to program participants.
^B "Others" include the following, each receiving one mention: mandate short course for all teachers, offer a N.Y.C. ESL license, obtain more input from administrators.

TABLE 3
 EVALUATION BY PARTICIPANTS IN THE
 SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM (SP)
 (N=133)^A

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>University attended</u>		
LIU - Brooklyn	27	20.3
N.Y.U.	24	18.0
Fordham University	18	13.5
St. John's University	14	10.5
Columbia/Teacher's College	12	9.0
CUNY - City College of N.Y.	7	5.3
College of New Rochelle	5	3.8
CUNY - Queens College	4	3.0
Bank Street College	3	2.3
CUNY - Brooklyn College	3	2.3
Inter-American University- Puerto Rico	2	1.5
Adelphi - Manhattan	2	1.5
LIU - C.W. Post	2	1.5
Adelphi - Garden City	1	0.8
CUNY - College of Staten Is.	1	0.8
Rochester Inst. of Technology	1	0.8
Kean College of N.J.	1	0.8
Pace University	1	0.8
CUNY - Hunter College	1	0.8
Hofstra University	1	0.8
No answer	2	1.5

73

79

^A This respondent base represents 57.9% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 3

SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
(N=133)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Program Attended</u>		
School Psychology	54	40.6
Guidance and Counseling	24	18.0
Speech/hearing Impaired	20	15.0
Special Education	16	12.0
School Social Work	11	8.2
Educational Evaluation	6	4.5
No Answer	2	1.5

^A This respondent base represents 57.9% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 3

SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
(N=133)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Source of Information About Scholarship Program</u>		
Colleague/friend	43	32.3
Newspapers	33	24.8
District Offices	17	12.8
College notices/referrals	14	10.5
TV/Radio	3	2.3
UFT	3	2.3
Former participants	3	2.3
Personal inquiry	3	2.3
Posters/pamphlets	2	1.5
Supervisor	1	0.8
Workshop	1	0.8
No Answer	10	7.5

<u>Scholarship Held</u>		
Bilingual	84	63.2
Monolingual	24	18.0
No answer/not applicable	25	18.8
Graduate	90	67.7
Undergraduate	2	1.5
No answer/not applicable	41	30.8

82

83

^A This respondent base represents 57.9% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 3

SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
(N=133)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS		Rating of Faculty in Terms of									
	N	%	EXCELLENT 5	4	3	2	POOR 1	NO ANSWER				
			N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %				
<u>Year of Anticipated Graduation</u>												
1992	37	27.8										
1993	42	31.6										
1994	21	15.8										
1995	13	9.8										
1996	3	2.2										
Don't Know	10	7.5										
No answer	7	5.3										
<u>Rating of Faculty in Terms of</u>												
Providing advisement	25	18.8	55	41.4	35	26.3	11	8.3	5	3.8	2	1.5
Providing academic training	33	24.8	50	37.6	33	24.8	9	6.8	1	0.8	7	5.3
Scheduling classes	31	23.3	39	29.3	39	29.3	12	9.0	3	2.3	9	6.8

^A This respondent base represents 57.9% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.



TABLE 3

SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
(N=133)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Suggestions for Improving Advisement</u>		
Improve advisement/communication with students	25	18.8
Allow faculty more time to spend with individual students	18	13.5
Improve Board of Education relationship with program staff	3	2.2
Organize the program/course of study more professionally	3	2.2
Expedite graduate placements	2	1.5
No Answer	82	61.6

^A This respondent base represents 57.9% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 3
 SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
 (N=133)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Suggestions for Improving Training</u>		
Include internship in program	15	11.3
Add specific content areas (e.g., speech therapy, bilingual education, social work/counseling)	11	8.3
Improve standards of/innovative/flexible instruction and evaluation	8	6.0
Include more school visits, more "real work" experiences, topics	6	4.5
Attend more to individual students'needs (e.g., more respect for students, minorities)	5	3.8
Include more background information(e.g., reading assignments, undergrad coursework prior to entry into program, insight training)	4	3.0
Recruit more minority students, faculty	2	1.5
Start pre-program workshop to explain requirements/procedures of program	1	0.8
Increase Board of Education involvement in program	1	0.8
No Answer	80	60.2

83

89

^A This respondent base represents 57.9% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.



TABLE 3

SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
(N=133)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS		EXCELLENT					POOR		NO ANSWER		
	N	%	5	4	3	2	1	N	%	N	%	
<u>Suggestions for Improving Scheduling</u>												
Schedule classes to better fit students' lifestyles: weekends, evenings, earlier in day, summers, intersession	37	27.8										
Schedule more classes/classes scheduled in sequential order	12	9.0										
Plan for more flexible hours/days (e.g., part-time, working students)	8	6.0										
Offer more pre-requisites to prepare students	2	1.5										
Reduce the student/faculty ratio	1	0.8										
Avoid duplicating data needed for program and for other Board of Education needs	1	0.8										
No Answer	72	54.1										
<u>Rating of Program in Terms of Its</u>												
Application process	30	22.6	60	45.1	37	27.8	4	3.0	1	0.8	1	0.8
Tuition payment system	27	20.3	39	29.3	37	27.8	11	8.3	13	9.7	6	4.5
Default Policy	8	6.0	29	21.8	33	24.8	5	3.8	4	3.0	54	4.1
Deferment of service policy	9	6.8	30	22.6	32	24.1	9	6.7	-	-	53	39.8

^A This respondent base represents 57.9% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 3

SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
(N=133)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Suggestions for Improving Application Processes:</u>		
Improve/simplify University application and organizational processes	11	8.3
Improve advisement of new applicants	7	5.3
Be more aware of students' needs (e.g., early notice of acceptance/rejection, expedite process, choose school at time of application)	7	5.3
Schedule classes more fairly (e.g. Monday-Friday classes, more electives per semester)	2	1.5
Include more resource books regarding program content	1	0.8
No Answer	105	78.9

^A This respondent base represents 57.9% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 3

SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
(N=133)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	\bar{x}
<u>Suggestions for Improving Tuition Payment System</u>		
Have Board of Education pay tuition promptly	23	17.3
Arrange for billing to Board of Education, not to student	8	6.0
Include <u>all</u> student fees (e.g., books, supplies)	7	5.3
Institute more flexible, innovative payment procedures (e.g., vouchers, remittance by mail, flexible fee deadlines)	5	3.8
Lower/stabilize tuition	1	0.8
Other (e.g., centralize payment process in one place, computerization)	2	1.5
No Answer	87	65.4

^A This respondent base represents 57.9% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.

45

TABLE 3

SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
(N=133)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Suggestions for Improving Default Policy</u>		
Grant students more opportunity to avoid default (e.g., provide "reasonable" salary to students, extend obligation time)	4	3.0
Lower loan rate to students	2	1.5
Explain procedure to students, so they understand policy	1	0.8
Reduce obligation to one year for one year's tuition	1	0.8
No Answer	125	94.0
<u>Suggestions for Improving Deferment of Service Policy</u>		
Take students' needs into account (e.g., time to arrange schedules, more deferment time if needed/if ill)	7	5.3
Limit deferment to 1 semester	1	0.8
Eliminate program if jobs not available after graduation	1	0.8
No Answer	124	93.2

^A This respondent base represents 57.9% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 3
 SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
 (N=133)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS											
	VERY FAIR		4		3		2		1		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Perceived Fairness of</u>												
Obligation to accept any job offered	17	12.8	17	12.8	40	30.1	24	18.0	31	23.3	4	3.0
Job obligation in exchange for tuition assistance	18	13.5	33	24.8	34	25.6	24	18.0	17	12.8	7	5.3

^A This respondent base represents 57.9% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.



TABLE 3
 SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
 (N=133)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Suggestions for Improving Policy of Job Acceptance</u>		
Want chance to choose own school or where want to be employed	35	26.3
Take students' situation/home location into account	17	12.8
Want choice of possible assignments	16	12.0
Want right to refuse assignment	3	2.2
Others ^B	9	6.8
No Answer	53	39.8

^A This respondent base represents 41.3% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include making job placement easier, avoiding seniority factors, concern that policy is too much like military conscription.



TABLE 3

SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
(N=133)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Suggestion for Improving Obligation Policy</u>		
Limit obligation to one year for each year in program	33	24.8
Base obligation on credits, not years, especially for part-time students	11	8.3
Want more flexibility in fulfilling obligation (e.g., service outside city, summer programs, training while in school, fewer requirements)	6	4.5
Others ^B	7	5.3
No Answer	76	57.1

^A This respondent base represents 57.9% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" includes lowering interest rate, offering program only to new teachers, limiting obligation to a maximum of 4 years.

TABLE 3
 SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
 (N=133)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
Consider Continuing Education Without <u>Scholarship Program?</u>		
Yes	48	36.1
No	45	33.8
Maybe	34	25.6
No answer	6	4.5

65

^A This respondent base represents 57.9% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 3
 SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
 (N=133)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Final Comments and Suggestions</u>		
Improve advisement system so student knows requirements early in program	3	2.2
Make schools more accessible to students	3	2.2
Expedite Board of Education payments to schools	3	2.2
Closer relationship between program administration/school/Central Board	2	1.5
Allow students to take part in other Special Incentive programs	2	1.5
Reduce length of obligation	2	1.5
Continue option to continue program through doctorate	2	1.5
Expand funding to more students	2	1.5
Others ^B	33	24.8
No Answer	81	60.9

^A This respondent base represents 57.9% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include single mentions related to individual requests.

TABLE 3
 SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
 (N=133)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Background</u>		
Gender: Male	28	21.1
Female	104	78.2
No Answer	1	0.8
Ethnic: Latino	70	52.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	13	9.8
African American	13	9.8
White	21	15.8
Other	10	7.5
No answer	6	4.5

^A This respondent base represents 57.9% of 230 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 4
 PARTICIPANT ATTITUDES AND STATUS OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION
 PROFESSIONAL IN TRAINING PROGRAM (SEPIT)
 (N=40)^A

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>University Attended</u>		
CUNY - City College of N.Y.	22	55.0
LIU - Brooklyn	10	25.0
Adelphi - Manhatttan	5	12.5
Fordham	2	5.0
College of New Rochelle	1	2.5

<u>How Respondent Found Out</u>		
<u>About SEPIT</u>		
Friend/Colleague	17	42.5
New York Times/other newspapers	10	25.0
Board of Education staff/conference	9	22.5
School administrator	1	2.5
At college/university	1	2.5
No Answer	2	5.0

^A This respondent base represents 27.6% of the 145 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 4
 SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL IN TRAINING PROGRAM
 (N=40)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Program Sequence Completed</u>		
Special Education - Monolingual	29	72.5
Special Education - Bilingual	9	22.5
Educational Evaluation (Bilingual)	1	2.5
No Answer	1	2.5

<u>District /High School Where Appointed</u>		
CSD: 75	21	52.5
6	2	5.0
14	2	5.0
23	2	5.0
Boys & Girls H.S.	1	2.5
Geo. Westinghouse H.S.	1	2.5
Taft H.S.	1	2.5
Others ^B	9	22.5
No Answer	1	2.5

^A This respondent base represents 27.6% of the 145 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Others include the following CSD's, each receiving one mention: 1,2,7,10,11,12,17,19 and 31.



TABLE 4
 SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL IN TRAINING PROGRAM
 (N=40)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Current Title</u>		
Teacher (non-spec.)	20	50.0
Special Education Teacher	8	20.0
Bilingual Special Education Teacher	5	12.5
Vision Teacher	1	2.5
Bilingual Resource Teacher	1	2.5
Bilingual Educational Evaluator	1	2.5
MIS Teacher	1	2.5
P.P.T.	1	2.5
No Answer	2	5.0

<u>Degree to Which Course-work Prepared One for Special Education Position</u>		
Very Well:	4	14
	3	23
	2	3
	1	-
Poorly:		-

^A This respondent base represents 27.6% of the 145 questionnaires sent to program participants.



TABLE 4
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL IN TRAINING PROGRAM
(N= 40)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS		EXCELLENT					NO ANSWER		
	N	%	5	4	3	2	1	N	%	
<u>Is Position on a Special Education Line</u>										
Yes	36	90.0								
No	4	10.0								
<u>Ratings of Program Aspects</u>										
Application Process	13	32.5	20	50.0	5	12.5	-	2	5.0	-
Tuition Payment System	14	35.0	12	30.0	3	7.5	6	15.0	2	5.0
Default Policy	1	2.5	6	15.0	5	12.5	2	5.0	-	26
Deferment of Service Policy	1	2.5	6	15.0	7	17.5	-	1	2.5	25

^A This respondent base represents 27.6% of the 145 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 4
 SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL IN TRAINING PROGRAM
 (N= 40)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
Suggestions to Improve <u>Application Process</u>		
Reduce confusion/add personnel during application period	3	7.5
Want competent advisor/mentor available ^B	2	5.0
Encourage more participants to apply	1	2.5
Want easier access to administration	1	2.5
No Answer	33	82.5

^A This respondent base represents 27.6% of the 145 questionnaires sent to program participants.
^B Respondents alluded to the program coordinator, Sonia Calvo, as a role model in this regard.



TABLE 4

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL IN TRAINING PROGRAM
(N= 40)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
Suggestions to Improve <u>Payment System</u>		
Prompter payment by Board of Education	8	20.0
Increase repayment amount	2	5.0
Extend program over summer/ for additional credits	2	5.0
Others ^B	4	10.0
No Answer	24	60.0

^A This respondent base represents 27.6% of the 145 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include 4 responses, each receiving one mention: Free tuition for B.O.E. members, registration directly at bursar, more knowledgeable college staff, provide vouchers to students.

TABLE 4
 SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL IN TRAINING PROGRAM
 (N= 40)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Suggestions for Improving Default and Deferment of Service Policies</u>		
<u>Default policy: College more knowledgeable about SEPIT</u>	1	2.5
No Answer ^B	39	97.5

<u>Deferment of Service policy:</u>		
Want a 2-year deferment	1	2.5
No Answer ^B	39	97.5

^A This respondent base represents 27.6% of the 145 questionnaires sent to respondents.

^B Most of those not answering admitted not understanding the terms "Default" and "Deferment of Service."

TABLE 4
 SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL IN TRAINING PROGRAM
 (N= 40)^A (Continued)

ITEM	RESPONSES									
	VERY FAIR		3		2		1		NO ANSWER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Perceived Fairness Of</u>										
Obligation to accept any job position offered	7	17.5	10	25.0	10	25.0	7	17.5	3	7.5
Obligation to exchange Tuition Assistance For Service	18	45.0	8	20.0	11	27.5	2	5.0	-	-

^A This respondent base represents 27.6% of the 145 questionnaires sent to program participants.



TABLE 4
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL IN TRAINING PROGRAM
(N= 40)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
Suggestions for Improving <u>Job Obligation:</u>		
<u>To Accept Any Job Offered:</u>		
Allow teacher to choose school (e.g., nearer home)	11	27.5
Allow transfer option	1	2.5
Balance type of school appointments	1	2.5
Disclose policy <u>before</u> enrollment	1	2.5
No Answer	26	65.0
<u>Regarding Length of Obligation:</u>		
Limit obligation to one year	3	7.5
No Answer	37	92.5

^A This respondent base represents 27.6% of the 145 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 4

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL IN TRAINING PROGRAM
(N= 40)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Considered Continuing One's Education in Field Without SEPIT Program?</u>		
Yes	16	40.0
No	11	27.5
No answer	2	5.0
Maybe	11	27.5
<u>Background</u>		
Gender: Male	14	35.0
Female	24	60.0
No answer	2	5.0
<u>Ethnic: (Multiple Responses)</u>		
White	17	42.5
Latino	17	42.5
African-American	5	12.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	5.0
Other	5	12.5
No answer	3	7.5
Bilingual Language Spoken: Spanish	10	100.0

^A This respondent base represents 27.6% of the 145 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 5
 ATTITUDES AND STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE
 PSYCHOLOGIST-IN-TRAINING PROGRAM (PIT)
 (N=58)^A

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>College Attended</u>		
CUNY - City College of N.Y.	16	27.6
CUNY - Brooklyn College	13	22.4
CUNY - Queens College	9	15.5
Fordham University	9	15.5
LIU	5	8.6
New Rochelle	3	5.2
St. John's University	3	5.2

^A This respondent base represents 32.6% of the 178 questionnaires sent to participants.

TABLE 5
 PSYCHOLOGIST-IN-TRAINING PROGRAM
 (N=58)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
District/High School Where Applicant Interned		
CSD:		
31	6	10.3
11	4	6.9
22	4	6.9
28	3	5.2
29	3	5.2
6	2	3.4
7	2	3.4
9	2	3.4
20	2	3.4
30	2	3.4
Columbus H.S.	2	3.4
Walton H.S.	2	3.4
Board of Education	1	1.7
Others ^B	10	17.2
Decision Pending	3	5.2
No Answer	10	17.2

^A This respondent base represents 32.6% of the 178 questionnaires sent to participants.

^B "Others" include the following ten CSD's and High Schools, each receiving one mention:
 1, 2, 12, 23, 24, 32, and Clara Barton, Erasmus Hall, Edison, and Francis Lewis H.S.

TABLE 5
 PSYCHOLOGIST-IN-TRAINING PROGRAM
 (N=58)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
Process of Getting Internship (Multiple Responses)		
1. Made aware of PIT through colleague/former PIT's/Board of Education/PIT Circular/College	6	10.3
2. Applied to Board of Education/CSD/through college/unspecified	43	74.1
3. Submitted resume/complied with other PIT requirements/attended PIT workshop	4	6.9
4. Interviewed	33	56.9
5. Application processed by Board/enclosed references, transcripts, completed required credits	8	13.8
6. Accepted into program/placed on waiting list	5	8.6
7. Placed in school/District	9	15.5
8. Requested placement in a particular District/Borough	5	8.6
9. Awaiting assignment/asked for release as Teacher-on-Waiver	3	5.2
No Answer	4	6.9

^A This respondent base represents 32.6% of the 178 questionnaires sent to participants.

TABLE 5
 PSYCHOLOGIST-IN-TRAINING PROGRAM
 (N=58)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
Degree of Influence of the Tuition Reimbursement Program on Decision to Continue Education/ <u>Training in School Psychology</u>		
Major Influence:		
5	14	24.1
4	15	29.9
3	6	10.3
2	8	13.8
1	15	25.9
No Influence:	-	-
No Answer	-	-

Working Status in NYC <u>Public Schools</u>		
Presently working?		
Interest in working in Public Schools? ^B		
54	93.1	2 3.4
2	100.0	- -
		2 3.4
		- -

^A This respondent base represents 32.6% of the 178 questionnaires sent to participants.
^B Based on 2 eligible respondents who are not currently employed in the Public Schools.



TABLE 5
 PSYCHOLOGIST-IN-TRAINING PROGRAM
 (N=58)^A (Continued)

ITEM	FULFILLED BY JUNE, 1992 N	%	TOTAL OBLIGATION N	%
Service Obligation to NYC Public Schools				
None	25	43.1	11	18.9
1 Year	18	31.0	25	43.1
2 Years	12	20.7	18	31.0
3 Years	1	1.7		
No answer	2	3.4	4	6.9

82

^A This respondent base represents 32.6% of the 178 questionnaires sent to participants.



TABLE 5
 PSYCHOLOGIST-IN-TRAINING PROGRAM
 (N=58)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Background</u>		
Gender: Male	8	13.8
Female	50	86.2
Ethnic: (Multiple responses)		
White	44	75.9
Latino	3	5.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	5.2
African American	4	6.9
Other	4	6.9
No Answer	1	1.7
Bilingual? Yes	16	27.6
No	40	69.0
No Answer	2	3.4
If Bilingual, What Language? ^B (Multiple Responses)		
Spanish	10	62.5
Chinese	3	18.8
Haitian-Creole	1	6.2
Other	3	18.8

^A This respondent base represents 32.6% of the 178 questionnaires sent to participants.

^B Based on the sixteen eligible respondents, who are bilingual.

TABLE 5
 PSYCHOLOGIST-IN-TRAINING PROGRAM
 (N=58)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Districts/High Schools Where Currently Working^B</u>		
CSD: 11	4	7.4
22	4	7.4
1	3	5.2
6	3	5.2
8	3	5.2
24	3	5.2
28	3	5.2
31	3	5.2
7	2	3.7
12	2	3.7
20	2	3.7
23	2	3.7
30	2	3.7
Others ^C	13	24.1
No Answer	5	9.2

^A This respondent base represents 32.6% of the 178 questionnaires sent to participants.

^B Based on 54 respondents currently working in the NYC Public Schools

^C "Others" include the following 13 CSD's and High Schools each receiving one mention: 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 19, 21, 75, Midwood, Bushwick, Francis Lewis, Van Kuren, and Taft High Schools; two mentioned working as Substance Abuse Prevention and Intervention Specialists in unspecified CSOS; and one is working in a private parochial school.

TABLE 5
 PSYCHOLOGIST-IN-TRAINING PROGRAM
 (N=58)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Current Title in Public Schools^B</u>		
School Psychologist	20	37.0
Psychologist-In-Training (PIT)	14	25.9
Special Education Teacher	4	7.4
Teacher (unspecified)	4	7.4
School Social Worker	3	5.6
Bilingual School Psychologist	3	5.6
Bilingual Education Evaluator	1	1.8
Assistant to DASE	1	1.8
Office Associate	1	1.8
No Answer	3	5.6

^A This respondent base represents 32.6% of the 178 questionnaires sent to participants.
^B Based on 54 respondents currently working in the NYC Public Schools.

TABLE 5
 PSYCHOLOGIST-IN-TRAINING PROGRAM
 (N=58)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
Length of Time Working NYC Public Schools ^B		
Under 1 year	19	35.2
1-Under 2 years	6	11.1
2-Under 3 years	5	9.2
3-Under 5 years	8	14.8
5 years or more	9	16.7
No Answer	7	13.0

^A This respondent base represents 32.6% of the 178 questionnaires sent to participants.
^B Based on 54 respondents currently working in the NYC Public Schools.

TABLE 5
 PSYCHOLOGIST-IN-TRAINING PROGRAM
 (N=58)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Other Comments/Suggestions</u>		
Effusive praise for the program	19	32.8
Maintain quality of mentors/offer mentors incentives	7	12.8
Speed tuition reimbursements	3	5.2
Make placement fairer/known to applicants earlier	3	5.2
Others ^c	5	8.6
No Answer	21	36.2

^A This respondent base represents 32.6% of the 178 questionnaires sent to participants.
^B Based on 54 respondents currently working in the NYC Public Schools.
^C "Others" include such comments as reduction of bureaucracy, increase publicity about program, and request to work in more than one school setting.

TABLE 6
 PROFILE OF FORMER PRINCIPALS INSTITUTE
 PARTICIPANTS (PI)
 (N=33)^A

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS N	%
<u>Participated in Cohort</u>		
I	7	21.2
II	12	36.4
III	14	42.4
Current Position in School System (Multiple Responses)	10	30.3
Teacher (non-spec.)	7	20.2
Assistant/Interim Acting Assistant Principal	4	12.1
Coordinator/Grade Guide	3	9.1
Interim Acting Principal	2	6.1
School Director	2	6.1
Dean	2	6.1
Administrative Asst.	2	6.1
Director/Asst. Director of Funded Programs	2	6.1
Others ^B	3	9.1

^A This respondent base represents 61.1% of the 54 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include 3 positions, each receiving one mention: Supervisor/Special Education, Special Education Teacher, and Administrative Intern.



TABLE 6

PRINCIPALS INSTITUTE
(N=33)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Districts and High Schools Where Currently Working</u>		
CSD: 13	3	9.1
1	2	6.1
22	2	6.1
23	2	6.1
27	2	6.1
89	2	6.1
Others ^B	18	54.5
No Answer	2	6.1

^A This respondent base represents 61.1% of the 54 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include 11 community districts and 7 high schools, each receiving one mention: CSD 2,6,7,9,10,11,12,15,26,31 and 32, and Townsend Harris, Graphic Communications, Laguardia, Bergtraum, Midtown West, Paul Robeson, and Murrow H.S.



TABLE 6

PRINCIPALS INSTITUTE
(N=33)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Years in School System</u>		
Under 5	1	3.0
5 - under 10	5	15.2
10 - under 15	8	24.2
15 - under 20	5	15.2
20 + Years	13	39.4
No Answer	1	3.0

^A This respondent base represents 61.1% of the 54 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 6

PRINCIPALS INSTITUTE
(N=33)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS			
	<u>N</u>	<u>YES</u> <u>%</u>	<u>NO</u> <u>%</u>	<u>NO ANSWER</u> <u>N</u> <u>%</u>
<u>Current Title Is</u>				
Administrative or Supervisory?	15	45.5	18 54.5	- -
Not administrative or supervisory (i.e. coordinator, administrative assistant)?	11	61.1	7 38.9	- -
Applied for any administrative or supervisory position? ^B	11	61.1	6 33.3	1 5.6

^A This respondent base represents 61.1% of the 54 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Based on the 18 respondents who have no administrative/supervisory responsibility (whether in title or in practice).

TABLE 6
 PRINCIPALS INSTITUTE
 (N=33)^A (Continued)

ITEM
 TOTAL RESPONDENTS
 N

If in Administrative/Supervisory Position, Description of Current Position: ^B (Multiple Responses)	
Supervise/coordinate grades and subjects	11
Supervise non-academic functions (e.g., lunchroom, trips)	5
Maintain discipline	3
Staff/teacher training/development	3
Handle student clerical work (e.g., transcripts, senior certification)	2
Chapter I management/seek grants	2
Teach	2
Others ^C	3

^A This respondent base represents 61.1% of the 54 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Based on the 15 respondents who hold an administrative/supervisory position.

^C Others include the following, each receiving one mention: dean, teacher, test/evaluate.

TABLE 6
 PRINCIPALS INSTITUTE
 (N=33)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS N
If in an Administrative/Supervisory Position (Licensed or Unlicensed). <u>How You Found Out About Position^B</u>	
Interview at School/District	6
Selected/placed by Principal	5
Worked as District Coordinator	1
Met with Screening Committee (including parents)	1
Participant developed position	1
Friend passed on word of availability	1

^A This respondent base represents 61.1% of the 54 questionnaires sent to program participants.
^B Based on the 15 respondents in a licensed or unlicensed administrative/supervisory position.



TABLE 6

PRINCIPALS INSTITUTE
(N=33)^A (Continued)

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES

If Not Administrative/Supervisory,
Districts and High Schools Applied
To and Level of Interview (I, II or III)^B

ITEM	Applied To	Level I	Level II	Level III
CSD: 26	3	-	-	-
2	2	-	-	-
13	2	1	-	-
15	2	1	-	-
23	2	1	-	-
28	2	-	-	-
Fashion Industries HS	2	2	2	1
M.L. King H. S.	2	2	-	-
Flushing H.S.	2	2	1	-
Alternative H.S. (unnamed)	2	2	-	-
Others ^C	18	3	1	-

^A This respondent base represents 61.1% of the 54 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Includes 11 respondents who do not hold administrative/supervisory positions.

^C "Others" includes the following CSDs and High Schools, each receiving one mention: 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 19, 22, 27, 29, 31 75 (one level I interview) and Bushwick (level I and II interview), Fort Hamilton (level I interview), Townsend Harris (level I interview) and Dodge H.S.

TABLE 6

PRINCIPALS INSTITUTE
(N=33)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
How Bureau of Incentives and Specialized Recruitment Programs or other Board Offices Can Help Find Positions for Graduates (Multiple Responses)		
Personal mailings of ads/positions	14	30.4
Recommend/interview/inform candidates for new "real" positions	9	19.6
Develop applicant lists/note accomplishments for principals	6	13.0
Hold employment/networking seminars for graduates	6	13.0
Hold meetings between applicants/administrators	5	10.9
Limit time for Board/Districts to hire applicants	3	6.5
Others ^B	3	6.5

^A This respondent base represents 61.1% of the 54 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include such ideas as reduction of bureaucracy in hiring, stress need for diversity in hiring.



TABLE 6
 PRINCIPALS INSTITUTE
 (N=33)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS N	%
Other Comment and Suggestions (Multiple Responses)		
Participant praise for Institute	6	14.6
More opportunities wanted for jobs/ inconsistent, prejudicial hiring practices	6	14.6
Want better supervision, experienced administrators	2	4.9
Others ^B	7	17.1
No Answer	20	48.8

^A This respondent base represents 61.1% of the 54 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include 7 comments, each receiving one mention, including: newsletter for graduates, more testing of student results, exposing interns to many school situations, teaching moral/self values.

TABLE 6
 PRINCIPALS INSTITUTE
 (N=33)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONSES N	%
<u>Background</u>		
Highest Educational Degree (Multiple Responses)		
MED	21	47.7
MA	11	25.0
MS	7	15.9
MFA	1	2.3
MBA	1	2.3
ED.D.	1	2.3
Other	2	4.6

^A This respondent base represents 61.1% of the 54 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 6
 PRINCIPALS INSTITUTE
 (N=33)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONSES	
	N	%
Current NYC Supervisory Licenses Held (Multiple Responses)		
Asst. Principal - Day Elem./JHS	21	33.3
Principal - Day Elem./JHS	18	28.6
Principal - Day HS	6	9.5
Asst. Principal - Day H.S. Admin	5	7.9
Principal - Independent Alternative School	5	7.9
Asst. Principal - Day H.S. Supv.	4	6.3
Principal - Special Ed.	2	3.7
Asst. Principal - Special Ed.	2	3.7
Principal - Independent Alternative School	5	18.5

^A This respondent base represents 61.1% of the 54 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 6

PRINCIPALS INSTITUTE
(N=33)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Background</u>		
Gender: Male	4	12.1
Female	29	87.9
Ethnic (Multiple Responses):		
African American	16	48.5
Latino	7	21.2
White	7	21.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	3.0
No answer	4	12.1

^A This respondent base represents 61.1% of the 54 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 7
 PROFILE AND ATTITUDES OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE
 LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM (LF)
 (N=13)^A

ITEM	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONSES
<u>Field of Specialization</u>	
School Social Work	6
Special Education	3
School psychology	2
Guidance and Counseling	2
<u>Profession Before Applying to Program</u>	
Student	4
Social Worker	4
Others ^B	5

^A This respondent base represents 81.3% of the 16 questionnaires sent to program participants.
^B "Others" include positions with one mention each: Counselor, economist, housewife, bilingual school psychologist, school para professional.

TABLE 7
 LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM
 (N=13)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONSES
<u>How Applicant Found Out About Program</u>	
New York Times/other newspaper ad	7
School notification/fellow student	4
Board of Education	1
No Answer	1
<u>Rating of the Application Process for the Program</u>	
Very Easy:	
1	2
2	3
3	7
4	-
Very Difficult:	
5	1

^A This respondent base represents 81.3% of the 16 questionnaires sent to program participants.



TABLE 7
 LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM
 (N=13)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONSES		
<u>How Application Process Could Be Improved</u>			
Increase speed of processing applications/ file applications earlier/have more frequent interview periods	3		
Detail process for student	2		
Improve organization/personnel	2		
Notify student of current status	1		
No change necessary	3		
No Answer	2		

	SUFFICIENT	INSUFFICIENT	NO ANSWER
	5	4	3
			1
		2	
Sufficiency of the <u>Loan Amount</u>			
Forgiven Each Year	2	4	1
Forgiven <u>In Total</u>	2	3	1
		2	2

^A This respondent base represents 81.3% of the 16 questionnaires sent to program participants.



TABLE 7
 LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM
 (N=13)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONSES	PER YEAR	IN TOTAL
Sufficient Amount of Loan To Be Forgiven ^B			
Under \$2000		-	1
\$2000 - \$4999		1	-
\$5000 - \$14,999		3	1
\$15,000 or more		-	2
Don't Know		2	2

^A This respondent base represents 81.3% of the 16 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Based on six respondents who found the amount forgiven to be "insufficient".

TABLE 7
 LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM
 (N=13)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONSES
<u>Present Position</u>	
Bilingual School Social Worker	4
Bilingual Guidance Counselor	2
Bilingual School Psychologist	2
Others ^B	2
No Answer	3

104

^A This respondent base represents 81.3% of the 16 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include the titles Teacher and Social Worker, with one mention each

TABLE 7
 LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM
 (N=13)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONSES
<u>Districts and High Schools</u>	
<u>Where Now Working</u>	
CSD:	75
	4
	10
	20
	22
Eastern District HS	3
Brandeis HS	1
Seward Park HS	1
F.D. Roosevelt HS	1
	1
	1
	1
	1
	1
	1
No Answer	2

^A This respondent base represents 81.3% of the 16 questionnaires sent to program participants.



TABLE 7
 LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM
 (N=13)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONSES
How Applicant Found Out About <u>Current Position</u>	
Board of Education	3
Inquired at (nearby) school	2
Friend/colleague	2
Others ^B	4
No Answer	2

^A This respondent base represents 81.3% of the 16 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include the following, with one mention each: school chairperson, self, list of openings was paraprofessional at school.

TABLE 7

LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM
(N=13)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONSES		
	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>MAYBE</u>
If Program Were <u>Not</u> Available, Would You Have Applied to the NYC Public School System?	3	3	7
Intend to Continue Employment With NYC School System <u>After</u> Loan is Repaid?	11	-	2

	<u>TOTAL NO. OF RESPONSES</u>		
<u>Other Suggestions/Comments</u>			
Praise for program		3	
Pay back full amount of loan		2	
Issue awards in September		1	
Object to ethnic labeling		1	
No Answer			6

^A This respondent base represents 81.3% of the 16 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 7
 LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM
 (N=13)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONSES
<u>Background</u>	
Gender: Male	3
Female	10
Ethnic: Latino	10
White	1
Other	2

^A This respondent base represents 68.8% of the 16 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 8
ATTITUDES AND PROFILE OF SUBSTITUTE VOCATIONAL
ASSISTANT PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS (SVA)
(N=9)^A

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS

Program Completed in

1985	2
1986	1
1987	3
1991	2
No Answer	1

VERY USEFUL	4	3	2	1	NOT USEFUL AT ALL
-------------	---	---	---	---	----------------------

Usefulness of Program Aspects
in Becoming a Vocational Trade
Teacher

Classroom service	2	5	1	1
Work site assignment	4	3	1	1
College coursework	3	3	2	1

^A This respondent base represents 31.0% of the 29 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 8
 SUBSTITUTE VOCATIONAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM
 (N=9)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Type of Work Done in Classroom (<u>Multiple Responses</u>)	
Prepared/taught lesson/tutored individuals/groups/assisted teacher	8
Gave exams/corrected papers	5
Observed mentor's lessons	2
Disciplined students	1
Gave demonstrations	1
Held parent-teacher conferences	1
No Answer	1

^A This respondent base represents 31.0% of the 29 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 8
 SUBSTITUTE VOCATIONAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM
 (N=9)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Suggestions for Improving <u>Classroom Service</u>	
Add more challenge to program/more responsibilities/regard as a "professional"	5
Improve quality of mentors	1
Monitor friendships with A.V.A.'s	1
Prepare model curriculum for S.V.A.'s	1
No Answer	1

111

^A This respondent base represents 31.0% of the 29 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 8
 SUBSTITUTE VOCATIONAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM
 (N=9)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
<u>Work Done at Worksite</u>	
Cosmetology:	2
Carpentry:	1
Auto Mechanics:	1
Optical Mechanics:	1
Aviation Maintenance:	1
Architectural Drafting:	1
Automotive Body Repair/Painting:	1

^A This respondent base represents 31.0% of the 29 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 8
 SUBSTITUTE VOCATIONAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM
 (N=9)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
<u>Suggestions for Improving Occupational Work Experience</u>	
Mor frequent work assessment	3
Instill all necessary skills	1
Involve SVA's (in Optical Mechanics) in dispensing/recordkeeping	1
Investigate job site before sending SVA's	1
More work site involvement by business owner	1
No Answer	2

^A This respondent base represents 31.0% of the 29 questionnaires sent to program participants.



TABLE 8
 SUBSTITUTE VOCATIONAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM
 (N=9)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
<u>Suggestions for Improving Program Coursework</u>	
More challenge for students/include regular college classes	3
More observation before course instruction	1
Segregate SVA's from other students	1
Have colleges include SVA's into their trade departments	1
No Answer	3
<hr/>	
<u>Employed by NYC Public Schools</u>	
Yes	8
No	1

^A This respondent base represents 31.0% of the 29 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 8
 SUBSTITUTE VOCATIONAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM
 (N=9)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
<u>High School where Employed</u>	
Alfred E. Smith	3
Jane addams	1
Automotive	1
Aviation	1
Van Arsdale	1
Geo. Westinghouse	1
No Answer	1
<u>Description of Graduates' Current Job</u>	
Teacher (Auto Body Repair)	3
Dean	1
ATR	1
Not employed	1
No Answer	1

^A This respondent base represents 31.0% of the 29 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 8
 SUBSTITUTE VOCATIONAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM
 (N=9)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
<u>Background</u>	
Gender: Male	6
Female	3
Ethnic (Multiple Responses):	
Latino	5
White	4
African American	1

^A This respondent base represents 31.0% of the 29 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 8
 SUBSTITUTE VOCATIONAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM
 (N=9)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS
<u>Other Comments and Suggestions</u>	
Want more challenge	1
Want more accountability	1
Stop decrease in quality of SVA standards	1
Assure graduates of jobs	1
Simplify Optical Mechanics licensing procedure	1
No answer	4
<u>Languages Spoken (Multiple Responses)</u>	
English	6
Spanish	4

^A This respondent base represents 31.0% of the 29 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 9
 ATTITUDES OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMMERSION
 PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS (FLIP)
 (N=24)^A

ITEM	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>College Attended</u>		
CUNY - Baruch College	14	58.3
Molloy College	4	16.7
SUNY - New Paltz	5	20.8
No Answer	1	4.2

	YES		NO	
	N	%	N	%
<u>Current Position</u>				
Is Current Position on a Bilingual Line?	20	83.3	4	16.7
If <u>NOT</u> on a Bilingual Line, Is there Frequent contact with Spanish/Haitian-Creole Students/Parents? ^B	1	100.0	-	-

Current Position

Is Current Position on a Bilingual Line?

20 83.3 4 16.7

If NOT on a Bilingual Line, Is there Frequent contact with Spanish/Haitian-Creole Students/Parents?^B

1 100.0 - -

^A This respondent base represents 39.3% of the 61 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Based on the 4 respondents who are not on a bilingual line.

TABLE 9
FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMMERSION PROGRAM
(N=24)^A (Continued)

ITEM	RESPONSES			
	VERY WELL	3	2	POORLY
	4	N	N	1
	%	%	%	%
Ratings of Program at the <u>College in Terms of</u>				
Organization	20	83.3	4	16.7
Preparation for the Auxiliary Bilingual Examination	17	70.8	6	25.0
Preparation for a Bilingual Position	15	62.5	7	29.2
			2	8.3

^A This respondent base represents 39.3% of the 61 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 9
 FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMMERSION PROGRAM
 (N=24)^A (Continued)

ITEM	RESPONSES				
	VERY USEFUL	NOT USEFUL	NO ANSWER		
	<u>4</u> N %	<u>3</u> N %	<u>2</u> N %	<u>1</u> N %	<u></u> N %
Usefulness of Aspects of the Immersion Program to Prepare for Auxiliary Bilingual Exam					
Cultural Activities	8 33.3	10 41.7	2 8.3	4 16.7	-
Classwork	18 75.0	6 25.0	-	-	-
Course Material	17 70.8	7 29.2	-	-	-
Free Conversation	19 79.2	2 8.3	3 12.5	-	-
Language Lab	9 37.5	3 12.5	3 12.5	4 16.7	5 20.8
Usefulness of Aspects of the Immersion Program to Prepare for Bilingual Work					
Cultural Activities	8 33.3	8 33.3	5 20.8	3 12.5	-
Classwork	15 62.5	6 25.0	3 12.5	-	-
Course Materials	14 58.3	7 29.2	3 12.5	-	-
Free Conversation	16 66.7	7 29.2	1 4.2	-	-
Language Lab	7 29.2	6 25.0	3 12.5	3 12.5	5 20.8

^A This respondent base represents 39.3% of the 61 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 9
FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMMERSION PROGRAM
(N=24)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
School Districts and High Schools Where Employed		
CSD:		
6	4	16.7
11	2	8.3
14	2	8.3
Others ^B	12	50.0
No Answer	4	16.7

^A This respondent base represents 39.3% of the 61 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include one mention each for CSD 1,2,4,5,6,7,8,12,21,27,32, and Liberty H.S.

TABLE 9
FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMMERSION PROGRAM
(N=24)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS
If Not on Bilingual Line, Describe Contact With Spanish/Haitian-Creole <u>Speaking Students/Parents</u> ^B	
Majority of students are Hispanic, speak Spanish	1
Students/parents are bilingual	1
School required a bilingual Speech Therapist	1
Counsel Spanish-speaking students/parents	1

^A This respondent base represents 39.3% of the 61 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Based on 4 respondents who are not on a bilingual line.

TABLE 9
FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMMERSION PROGRAM
(N=24)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL NO. OF RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
Most Useful Aspects of Immersion Program (Multiple Responses)		
Free/job-related conversation	11	45.8
Writing/composition	7	29.2
Course materials (non-sp.)	3	12.5
Discussion with non-English-speakers	2	8.3
Others ^B	9	37.5

^A This respondent base represents 39.3% of the 61 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include 9 remarks, each receiving one mention, including: Gave me confidence, quality of instructor, cultural activities, grammar, interviews in language, etc.

TABLE 9
FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMMERSION PROGRAM
(N=24)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONSES	
	N	%
<u>Least Useful Aspects of Immersion Program</u>		
Cultural discussions/activities films	6	25.0
Language lab	3	12.5
Too many/too few "street" idioms	2	8.3
Reading comprehension	2	8.3
Classwork (non-spec.)	1	4.2
Writing compositions	1	4.2
Loss of skills over summer	1	4.2
No Answer	8	33.3

^A This respondent base represents 39.3% of the 61 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 9
 FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMMERSION PROGRAM
 (N=24)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONSES	
	N	%
<u>Recommendations for Improving Program</u>		
Add follow-up refresher course	8	33.3
More free/guided conversation/idioms/ talks with native speakers	5	20.8
Overall praise for program	3	12.5
Teach culture through activities, not with films	2	8.3
Others ^B	6	25.0

^A This respondent base represents 39.3% of the 61 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include suggestions of more (or less) writing, more class materials, and statement of clearer course objectives, each of which received one mention.

TABLE 10
 ATTITUDES AND PROFILE OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL
 INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (APIP)
 (N=65)^A

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
Year of Program <u>Participation</u>		
1988-89	28	43.1
1989-90	24	36.9
1990-91	13	20.0

^A This respondent base represents 37.4% of the 174 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 10
ATTITUDES AND PROFILE OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL
INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (APIP)
(N=65)^A

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Current Position</u>		
Teacher	23	35.4
Interim Acting Asst. Principal	18	27.7
Assistant Principal	4	6.2
Administrative Asst.	4	6.2
Staff Developer	3	4.6
Program Coordinator	3	4.6
Others ^B	8	12.3

^A This respondent base represents 37.4% of the 174 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include 8 positions, each receiving one mention, including Peer Coach, Supervisor, Dean, Principal, ADIP Facilitator, etc.

TABLE 10
 ATTITUDES AND PROFILE OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL
 INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (APIP)
 (N=65)^A

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Districts Where Now Employed</u>		
CSD: 10	7	10.8
25	6	9.2
8	5	7.7
20	4	6.2
24	4	6.2
26	4	6.2
2	3	4.6
5	3	4.6
21	3	4.6
31	3	4.6
11	2	3.1
18	2	3.1
22	2	3.1
28	2	3.1
32	2	3.1
Others ^B	8	12.3

^A This respondent base represents 37.4% of the 174 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include 8 CSDs: 9, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 23, and 75.

TABLE 10
 ATTITUDES AND PROFILE OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL
 INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (APIP)
 (N=65)^A

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS		NO ANSWER	
	YES N	% %	NO N	% %
Is Current Position an Administrative or Supervisory Title?	30	46.2	35	53.8
If <u>Not</u> in an Administrative or Supervisory Title, is Work Out-of-Classroom, Untitled Supervisory Capacity? ^B	13	37.2	20	57.1
			2	5.7

^A This respondent base represents 37.4% of the 174 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Based on 35 respondents who do not hold an administrative or supervisory title.

TABLE 10
 ATTITUDES AND PROFILE OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL
 INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (APIP)
 (N=65)^A

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS N
Describe If Acting in an Administrative/ Supervisory Position ^B (Multiple Responses)	
Program planning/implementation/ grant writing	5
Staff development	4
Parent liaison	3
Disciplinarian	2
Fulfill duties of Asst. Principal	2
Monitor student/teacher progress	2
No Answer	1

^A This respondent base represents 37.4% of the 174 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Based on 13 respondents who are acting in an administrative/supervisory position.



TABLE 10
 ATTITUDES AND PROFILE OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL
 INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (APIP)
 (N=65)^A

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
How Applicant Found Out About Position Opening ^B		
Placed by district	10	23.2
In school where they interned	4	9.3
Applied to ad	3	7.0
Posted at school	3	7.0
Supt. informed of opening	2	4.7
Board of education circular	2	4.7
Others ^C	4	9.3

^A This respondent base represents 37.4% of the 174 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Based on 43 respondents who are in, or acting in, an administrative/supervisory position.

^C "Others" includes 4 items, each receiving one mention.



TABLE 10
 ATTITUDES AND PROFILE OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL
 INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (APIP)
 (N=65)^A

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
<u>Process Used to Get Hired^B</u>		
Interviewed	15	34.9
Sent in resume	9	20.9
Completed NYC Administrative application	7	16.3
Wrote to District Superintendent	2	4.6
Followed the C-30 process	2	4.6
Others ^C	5	11.6

^A This respondent base represents 37.4% of the 174 questionnaires sent to program participants.
^B Based on 43 respondents who are acting in an administrative/supervisory position.
^C "Others" includes 5 items, each receiving one mention.



TABLE 10
 ATTITUDES AND PROFILE OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL
 INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (APIP)
 (N=65)^A

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS				
	Applied N %	Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IIII
Districts Applied To If <u>Not</u> in an Administrative/Supervisory Position, and Level of Interview Attained (I, II, III) ^{B,C} (Multiple Responses)					
CSD: 26	8	14.5	2	-	-
10	7	12.7	3	2	-
24	7	12.7	1	-	-
30	7	12.7	1	-	-
27	6	10.9	2	1	-
12	5	9.1	2	1	-
22	5	9.1	2	1	-
20	4	7.3	2	1	1
23	4	7.3	1	1	1
28	4	7.3	1	1	1
29	4	7.3	1	-	-

^A This respondent base represents 37.4% of the 174 questionnaires sent to program participants.
^B Includes 20 respondents who do not work in an administrative/supervisory capacity.
^C Based on 55 respondents who do not hold a licensed or unlicensed supervisory/administrative position.

TABLE 10
 ATTITUDES AND PROFILE OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL
 INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (APIP)
 (N=65)^A

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS			
	Applied N %	Level 1	Level 11	Level 111
6	3	5.4	-	-
16	3	5.4	2	-
19	3	5.4	-	-
21	3	5.4	-	-
25	3	5.4	-	-
2	2	3.6	1	-
4	2	3.6	-	-
5	2	3.6	2	1
7	2	3.6	-	-
11	2	3.6	1	-
18	2	3.6	1	-
Others ^B	7	12.7	3	1

^A This respondent base represents 37.4% of the 174 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include 7 districts receiving one mention each: 1, 9, 13, (with one level I interview), 17 (with one level I, II, III interview each), 31 (with one level I interview), and 32. One district is located outside NYC.

TABLE 10
 ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL INTERNSHIP PROGRAM
 (N=65)^A (Continued)

ITEM	RESPONSES					NO ANSWER
	4	3	2	1		
	N	N	N	N	N	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Ratings of Aspects of Program in Terms of Usefulness as a School Supervisor/Administrator ^B						
Academic Coursework	28	12	27.9	3	7.0	-
School Internship	37	2	4.7	-	-	4
Topical Seminars	24	13	30.2	2	4.7	4

^A This respondent base represents 37.4% of the 174 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Based on 43 respondents who are working as an out-of-classroom, untitled supervisor, or who now work under an administrative/supervisory title.



TABLE 10
 ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL INTERNSHIP PROGRAM
 (N=65)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
If NOT in an Administrative/Supervisory Title, Is There an <u>Active Search Ongoing?</u> ^B		
Yes	21	60.0
No	10	28.6
No Answer	4	11.4

^A This respondent base represents 37.4% of the 174 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B Based on 35 respondents who are not in an administrative/supervisory title.

TABLE 10
 ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL INTERNSHIP PROGRAM
 (N=65)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
How Bureau of Incentives and Specialized Recruitment Programs Can Assist After Graduation		
Mail job listings to homes	16	24.6
Hold workshops on interviewing/counseling	11	16.9
Hold networking meetings	7	10.8
Publish list of APIP graduates	6	9.2
List job opportunities	4	6.2
Work more closely with District School Board	3	4.6
Hold "job fairs"	3	4.6
Mandate Districts to hire APIP graduates	2	3.2
Hold meetings to make applicants aware of vacancies	2	3.2
Others ^B	12	18.5

^A This respondent base represents 37.4% of the 174 questionnaires sent to program participants.

^B "Others" include 12 suggestions, each receiving one mention.

TABLE 10

ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL INTERNSHIP PROGRAM
(N=65)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%

Years Worked in NYC
Public School System?

0 - Under 5	7	10.8
5 - Under 10	8	12.3
10 - Under 15	19	29.2
15 - Under 20	26	40.0
20 or more	5	7.7
No Answer		

Highest Educational Degree

BA/BS	3	4.6
MA/MS	43	66.2
MED.	10	15.4
MBA	1	1.5
MSC.	1	1.5
Prof. Diploma Certificate	4	6.2
SAS	1	1.5
No Answer	2	3.1

^A This respondent base represents 31% of the 174 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 10
 ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL INTERNSHIP PROGRAM
 (N=65)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	
	N	%
Current NYC Supervisory Licenses (Multiple Responses)		
Principal - Day Elem./JHS	30	46.2
Asst. Principal - Day Elem./JHS	60	92.3
Asst. Principal - Special Educ.	1	1.5
Educational Admin. - Levels I & II	1	1.5
Educational Admin. - Levels II & III	1	1.5
No Answer	1	1.5

^A This respondent base represents 37.4% of the 174 questionnaires sent to program participants.

TABLE 10
 ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL INTERNSHIP PROGRAM
 (N=65)^A (Continued)

ITEM	TOTAL RESPONDENTS N	%
<u>Background</u>		
Gender: Male	10	15.4
Female	55	84.6
Ethnic: (Multiple Responses)	30	46.2
African American	19	29.2
White	11	17.0
Latino	1	1.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	13	20.0
Other		

^A This respondent base represents 37.4% of the 174 questionnaires sent to program participants.

QUESTIONNAIRES

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT

ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL INTERNSHIP PROGRAM
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

The Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment has been asked to conduct a follow-up study of former Assistant Principal Internship Program participants. Your answers to the questions below will help us improve the program and will provide useful information to educational policymakers.

Please return the questionnaire directly to OREA in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope. Your answers are confidential.

Thank you for your cooperation.

-
1. In which year were you a participant? (Please circle one.)
a. 1988-89 b. 1989-90 c. 1990-91

2. What is your present position within the school system (as of March 1, 1992)?

Position: _____

District _____ School _____

3. Is this an administrative or supervisory title?
a. Yes b. No
4. If you are not presently working in an administrative or supervisory title, are you working in an out-of-classroom, untitled supervisory capacity, i.e., coordinator, administrative assistant, etc. (Please circle one.)
a. Yes b. No

If yes, please describe your present position below.

If no, please go to question 7.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT

**FOREIGN LANGUAGE IMMERSION PROGRAM
PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE**

The Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment has been asked to evaluate the Summer 1991 Foreign Language Immersion Program. Your answers to the questions below will help us evaluate the program and will provide useful information to educational policymakers. Your answers are confidential.

Thank you for your assistance.

-
1. What college did you attend? (Please circle one.)
- a. Baruch College
 - b. City College of New York
 - c. Molloy College
 - d. New Paltz (SUNY)
2. How well was the immersion program organized at the college? (Circle 1 - poorly to 4 - very well.)
- Poorly 1 2 3 4 Very Well
3. In general, how well did the immersion program prepare you for the Ancillary Bilingual Examination? (Circle 1 - poorly to 4 - very well.)
- Poorly 1 2 3 4 Very Well
4. Please rate how useful the following aspects of the immersion program were in preparing you to take the Ancillary Bilingual Examination. (Circle 1 - not useful at all to 4 - very useful.)
- | | <u>Not Useful</u> | | | <u>Very Useful</u> | |
|------------------------|-------------------|---|---|--------------------|--|
| a. Cultural activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| b. Classwork | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| c. Course materials | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| d. Free conversation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| e. Language Lab | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
5. In general, how well did the immersion program prepare you to work in a bilingual position? (Circle 1 - poorly to 4 - very well.)

Poorly 1 2 3 4 Very Well

6. Please rate how useful the following aspects of the immersion program were in preparing you to work in a bilingual position. (Circle 1 - not useful at all to 4 - very useful.)

	<u>Not Useful</u>			<u>Very Useful</u>
a. Cultural activities	1	2	3	4
b. Classwork	1	2	3	4
c. Course materials	1	2	3	4
d. Free conversation	1	2	3	4
e. Language Lab	1	2	3	4

7. What is your present position in the school system (as of February 1992)?

Title: _____ District/School: _____

8. Is this position on a bilingual line? Yes No

9. If you are not working on a bilingual line, do you have frequent contact with Spanish- or Haitian Creole-speaking students and/or parents?

a. Yes b. No

Please describe _____

10. What was the most useful aspect of the immersion program?

11. What was the least useful aspect of the immersion program?

12. Do you have any recommendations for improving the program?

OFFICE OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND ASSESSMENT

**LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM
PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE**

The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment has been asked to evaluate the Loan Forgiveness Program. Your answers to the questions below will help us evaluate the program and will provide useful information to educational policymakers.

Please return the questionnaire directly to OREA in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope. Your answers are confidential.

Thank you for your assistance.

-
1. What is your field of specialization?
 - a. Special education
 - b. School Social Work
 - c. Educational Evaluation
 - d. Speech Pathology
 - e. School Psychology
 - f. Physical Therapy
 - g. Guidance and Counseling
 - h. Occupational Therapy

 2. What was your profession before applying to the program?

 3. How did you find out about this program?

 4. Please rate the application process for the Loan Forgiveness Program. (Circle 1 - very easy to 5 - very difficult).
- VERY EASY 1 2 3 4 5 VERY DIFFICULT
- How would you improve the application process?

OFFICE OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND ASSESSMENT

**PSYCHOLOGIST-IN-TRAINING PROGRAM
PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE**

The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment has been asked to evaluate the Psychologist-In-Training Program. Your answers to the questions below will help us evaluate the program, and will provide useful information to educational policy makers. Participation is of course voluntary. However, your participation is important to the continued funding of the project.

Please return the questionnaire directly to OREA in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope. Your answers are confidential.

Thank you for your assistance.

-
1. What college did you attend? (Please circle).
- | | | | |
|----|------------------------|----|----------------------|
| a. | Brooklyn College | f. | Pace University |
| b. | City College | g. | Queens College |
| c. | Fordham University | h. | St John's University |
| d. | Long Island University | i. | Columbia University |
| e. | New York University | j. | Yeshiva University |
2. How much influence did the Tuition Reimbursement program have in your decision to continue with your education/training in school psychology? (Circle 1 - none at all to 5 - a major influence).
- | | | | | | | |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| NONE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | MAJOR |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
3. Where did you do your internship?
- District/School: _____
4. Please describe the process you followed to get the internship.

5. Are you presently working for the New York City Public Schools?

YES

NO

If no, please go to question 7.

6. If yes, where are you working, and how long have you held your position there?

Title: _____ District/School: _____

How long have you been working there: _____

Please go to question 8.

7. If you are not currently working in the New York City Public School system, are you still interested in obtaining a position in the New York City Public Schools?

YES

NO

Where are you presently working?

Title: _____ District/School: _____

8. How much of your service obligation to the New York City Public Schools will you have fulfilled as of June, 1992? (Please circle one).

- a. None
- b. One year
- c. Two years
- d. Three years

8a. How long is/was your total service obligation? (Please circle one).

- a. One year
- b. Two years
- c. Three years

9. Your gender. (Please check). Female _____ Male _____

10. Your ethnic background. (Please check).

Asian/Pacific Islander_____ African American_____
Latino_____ White_____ Other_____

11. Are you bilingual?

YES NO
If yes, in what language? Spanish____ Haitian-Creole____
Chinese____ Other_____

12. Do you have any other comments
or suggestions?

OFFICE OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND ASSESSMENT
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL IN TRAINING PROGRAM

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment has been asked to evaluate the Special Education Professional in Training (SEPIT) Program. Your answers to the questions below will help us evaluate the program and provide useful information to educational policymakers.

Please return the questionnaire directly to OREA in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope. Your answers are confidential.

Thank you for your assistance.

1. What program sequence did you complete? (Please circle one).

- a. Special Education - Monolingual
- b. Special Education - Bilingual
- c. Educational Evaluation

If bilingual, please specify language. _____

2. Which university did you attend? (Please circle one).

- a. Adelphi University (Garden City)
- b. Adelphi University (Manhattan)
- c. City College of NY (CUNY)
- d. College of Staten Island (CUNY)
- e. College of New Rochelle
- f. Fordham University
- g. Hofstra University
- h. Long Island University - Brooklyn
- j. Mercy College
- k. St. Johns University

3. How did you find out about the SEPIT Program?

4. In general, how well did the college coursework prepare you to work in a special education position? (Circle 1 - poorly to 4 - very well.)

Poorly 1 2 3 4 Very Well

5. What is your present position in the school system (as of February 1992)?

Title: _____ District/School: _____

6. Is this position on a special education line?

Yes No

7. Please rate the following aspects of the program with which you have had experience. (Circle 1 - poor to 5 - excellent).

_____ Poor

Excellent

a. Application process 1 2 3 4 5

What suggestions do you have for improving the application process?

b. Tuition payment system 1 2 3 4 5

What suggestions do you have for improving the tuition payment system?

c. Default policy 1 2 3 4 5

What suggestions do you have for improving the default policy?

d. Deferment of service policy 1 2 3 4 5

What suggestions do you have for improving the deferment of service policy?

8. How do you feel about being obligated to accept a job position wherever it is offered? (Circle 1 - unfair to 5 - very fair).

VERY UNFAIR 1 2 3 4 5 VERY FAIR

What suggestions do you have for improving this policy?

9. Please rate the service obligation required in exchange for tuition assistance (e.g., is it long enough, too long, etc). (Circle 1 - unfair to 5 - very fair).

VERY UNFAIR 1 2 3 4 5 VERY FAIR

What suggestions do you have for improving the service obligation system?

10. Would you have considered continuing your education in this field without the SEPIT Program? (Please circle one answer).

YES

NO

MAYBE

11. Your gender. (Please check). Female _____ Male _____

12. Your ethnic background. (Please check).

Asian/Pacific Islander _____ African American _____

Latino _____ White _____ Other _____

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT

**SUBSTITUTE VOCATIONAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM
GRADUATE QUESTIONNAIRE**

The Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment (OREA) has been asked to conduct a follow-up study of former Substitute Vocational Assistant Program participants. Your answers to the questions below will help us improve the program and will provide useful information to educational policymakers.

Please return the questionnaire directly to OREA in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope. Your answers are confidential.

Thank you for your cooperation.

-
1. In which year did you finish the program? 19_____
 2. In which trade area did you specialize?

 3. Please rate the following aspects of the SVA program in terms of their usefulness to you in preparing to be a vocational trade teacher. Circle 1 - not useful at all to 4 - very useful.

a. Classroom service	1	2	3	4
b. Work site assignment	1	2	3	4
c. College coursework	1	2	3	4
 4. In what high school did you complete your classroom service?

 5. Please describe the work you did in the high school to which you were assigned.
 6. What suggestions do you have for improving the classroom service aspect of the program?

Please complete the opposite page.

7. Please describe the work you did at your assigned work site.

8. What suggestions do you have for improving the occupational work experience aspect of the program?

9. What suggestions do you have for improving the college coursework aspect of the program?

10. Are you presently working as a vocational trade teacher?
(Circle one.)

Yes

No

If yes, what courses do you teach? _____

If no, what is your current job? _____

11. Are you employed by the New York City public schools?
(Circle one.)

Yes

No

If yes, in which school? _____

12. Your gender. (Please check.) Female _____ Male _____

13. Your ethnic background. (Please check.)

Asian/Pacific Islander _____ African American _____

Latino _____ White _____ Other _____

14. What languages do you speak? (Please check all that apply.)

English _____ Spanish _____ Haitian/Creole _____

Chinese _____ Other _____

Specify

15. Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

271

THANK YOU!

272

156

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT

PRINCIPALS INSTITUTE
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

The Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment has been asked to conduct a follow-up study of former Principals Institute participants. Your answers to the questions below will help us improve the program and will provide useful information to educational policymakers.

Please return the questionnaire directly to OREA in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope. Your answers are confidential.

Thank you for your continued cooperation.

1. In which cohort were you a participant? (Please circle one.)

a. Cohort I b. Cohort II c. Cohort III

2. What is your present position within the school system (as of March 1, 1992)?

Position: _____

District _____ School _____

3. Is this an administrative or supervisory title?

a. Yes b. No

4. If you are not presently working in an administrative or supervisory title, are you working in an out-of-classroom, untitled supervisory capacity, i.e., coordinator, administrative assistant, etc. (Please circle one.)

a. Yes b. No

If yes, please describe your present position below.

If no, please go to question 6.

5. If you are working in either a licensed or unlicensed supervisory capacity, how did you find out about the position opening?

Please describe the process you followed to get hired.

Please go to question 8.

6. If you are not working in an administrative or supervisory position, have you applied for any administrative or supervisory openings?

a. Yes b. No

If yes, to which districts and schools have you applied?

Of the districts above, in which districts and schools have you had Level I interviews?

Of the districts above, in which districts and schools have you had Level II interviews?

Of the districts above, in which districts and schools have you had Level III interviews?

7. Are you still actively seeking an administrative or supervisory position?

a. Yes b. No

8. How do you think the Bureau of Incentive and Specialized Recruitment Programs or other central Board of Education offices can assist Principals Institute participants in finding supervisory positions after graduation?

9. For how many years have you worked in the New York City public school system? _____ years
10. Please check your highest educational degree.
 MA _____ MS _____ MFA _____ MEd _____
 MPh _____ EdD _____ PhD _____ Other _____
 Specify _____
11. Please check all current New York City supervisory licenses.
 _____ Principal - Day Elementary/Junior High
 _____ Assistant Principal - Day Elementary/Junior High
 _____ Principal - Special Education
 _____ Assistant Principal - Special Education
 _____ Principal - Day High School
 _____ Assistant Principal - Day High School, Administrative
 _____ Assistant Principal - Day High School, Supervision
 _____ Principal - Independent Alternative School
 _____ Educational Administrator - Levels I & II
 _____ Educational Administrator - Levels II & III
12. Your gender. (Please check) Female _____ Male _____
13. Your ethnic background. (Please check.)
 Asian/Pacific Islander _____ African American _____
 Latino _____ White _____ Other _____
14. Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE!

OFFICE OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND ASSESSMENT

**SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE**

The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment has been asked to evaluate the Scholarship Program. Your answers to the questions below will help us evaluate the program and provide useful information to educational policymakers. Please return the questionnaire directly to OREA in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope. Your answers are confidential.

Thank you for your assistance.

1. What program are you in? (Please circle one).

- a. Special Education
- b. Educational Evaluation
- c. School Psychology
- d. Guidance and Counseling
- e. School Social Work
- f. Speech and Hearing Handicapped
- g. Physical Therapy
- h. Occupational Therapy

1a. Which university do you attend? (Please circle one).

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Adelphi University (Garden City) | 17. Hofstra University |
| 2. Adelphi University (Manhattan) | 18. Kean College of NJ |
| 3. Alfred University | 19. LIU - Brooklyn |
| 4. Bank Street College | 20. LIU - C.W. Post |
| 5. CUNY - Baruch College | 21. LIU - Westchester |
| 6. CUNY - Brooklyn College | 22. Manhattan College |
| 7. CUNY - City College | 23. Mercy College |
| 8. CUNY - College of Staten Island | 24. NYU |
| 9. CUNY - Hunter College | 25. Pace University |
| 10. CUNY - Lehman College | 26. Rochester Inst.
of Technology |
| 11. CUNY - Medgar Evers | 27. St. John's Univ. |
| 12. CUNY - Queens College | 28. SUNY - Cortland |
| 13. College of Mount St. Vincent | 29. CUNY - Geneseo |
| 14. College of New Rochelle | 30. Wagner College |
| 15. Columbia Univ, /Teachers College | 31. Yeshiva University |
| 16. Fordham University | |

2. What kind of scholarship do you have? (Please circle one from each column).

- | | |
|----------------|------------------|
| a. monolingual | c. undergraduate |
| b. bilingual | d. graduate |

3. When do you anticipate graduating from your program?

4. How did you find out about the Scholarship Program?

5. Please rate the faculty at your university in terms of: (Circle 1 - poor to 5 - excellent).

	<u>Poor</u>			<u>Excellent</u>	
a. providing advisement	1	2	3	4	5

What suggestions do you have for improving advisement?

b. providing academic training	1	2	3	4	5
--------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

What suggestions do you have for improving your training?

c. scheduling of classes	1	2	3	4	5
--------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

What suggestions do you have for improving the scheduling?

6. Please rate all of the following aspects of the program with which you have had experience. (Circle 1 - poor to 5 - excellent).

	<u>Poor</u>			<u>Excellent</u>	
a. Application process	1	2	3	4	5

What suggestions do you have for improving this process?

	<u>Poor</u>				<u>Excellent</u>	
b. Tuition payment system	1	2	3	4	5	

What suggestions do you have for improving this system?

c. Default policy	1	2	3	4	5
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---

What suggestions do you have for improving this policy?

d. Deferment of service policy	1	2	3	4	5
--------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

What suggestions do you have for improving this policy?

7. How do you feel about being obligated to accept a job position wherever it is offered? (Circle 1 - unfair to 5 - very fair).

VERY UNFAIR 1 2 3 4 5 VERY FAIR

What suggestions do you have for improving this policy?

8. Please rate the service obligation required in exchange for tuition assistance (e.g., is it long enough, too long, etc). (Circle 1 - unfair to 5 - very fair).

VERY UNFAIR 1 2 3 4 5 VERY FAIR

What suggestions do you have for improving the service obligation system?

9. Would you have considered continuing your education in this field without the Scholarship Program? (Please circle one answer).

YES

NO

MAYBE

10. Your gender. (Please check). Female _____ Male _____

11. Your ethnic background. (Please check).

Asian/Pacific Islander _____ African American _____

Latino _____ White _____ Other _____

12. Do you have any other suggestions or comments?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE!

7. If you are not working on a bilingual or ESL line, do you have frequent contact with Spanish-, Haitian Creole-, or other non-English speaking students and/or parents?

a. Yes b. No

Please describe _____

8. What New York City license(s) do you presently hold? (Circle all that apply.)

a. Regular d. Regular Bilingual
b. Ancillary Bilingual e. Regular ESL
c. Ancillary ESL

For bilingual licenses, specify the language _____

9. What New York State certification in Bilingual Education or ESL do you presently hold?

a. Permanent
b. Four year Temporary Provisional
c. One year Temporary Provisional
d. None

10. If you have not yet been certified, please explain.

11. Have you enrolled in or completed a Masters degree program?

a. Yes b. No Field of Study _____

11. What was the most useful aspect of the ITI program?

12. What was the least useful aspect of the ITI program?

13. What suggestions do you have for improving the program?

