



**COLORADO**  
Department of Education

# Technical Report: 2024 Educator Preparation Program Initial Completers Survey

Educator Talent, Research & Impact

November 2024

---

Educator Talent  
201 E. Colfax Ave., Denver, CO 80203  
720-765-5665  
[EdTalentResearch@cde.state.co.us](mailto:EdTalentResearch@cde.state.co.us)

# Table of Contents

<b>Background and Methodology</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Overview of Technical Report</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Respondent Characteristics</b>	<b>5</b>
<hr/>	
Table 1. Job Class	5
Table 2. Gender	5
Table 3. Race/Ethnicity	5
Table 4. Educator Preparation Program	5
Table 5. Years of Teaching Experience	6
Table 6. Completion of Dual Endorsement Program	6
Table 7. Endorsement Area for Non-Dual Endorsement	7
Table 8. Endorsement Area for Dual Endorsement	8
Table 9: Grade band	8
Table 10: Subject area taught	9
Table 11: Would choose same preparation program	9
Table 12. Reasons respondents would choose same preparation program	9
Table 13. Reasons respondents would not choose same preparation program	10
<b>Item-Level Rating Scale Results</b>	<b>11</b>
<hr/>	
Table 14. Item-Factor Alignment	11
Table 15: Develop and implement lessons that make cross-curricular connections and emphasize literacy and numeracy.	12
Table 16: Demonstrate knowledge of content and evidence-based instructional practices.	12
Table 17: Provide instruction aligned with the Colorado Academic Standards.	12
Table 18: Foster an efficient and nurturing learning environment.	13
Table 19: Demonstrate respect for diversity, while fostering an inclusive community for all students.	13
Table 20: Adapt instruction for students' varying levels of ability, needs, and interests.	13
Table 21: Work collaboratively with families for the benefit of students.	14
Table 22: Demonstrate knowledge about the ways learning takes place, including student development.	14
Table 23: Use formal and informal methods to assess learning, provide feedback, and use results.	14
Table 24: Integrate and utilize appropriate available technology.	15
Table 25: Establish high expectations and support development of critical-thinking and problem-solving skills.	15
Table 26: Provide students with opportunities to work in teams and develop leadership.	15
Table 27: Model and promote effective communication.	16
Table 28: Demonstrate high standards for professional conduct.	16



Table 29: Link professional growth to professional goals.	16
Table 30: Respond to a complex, dynamic environment.	17
Table 31: Demonstrate high levels of student learning, growth, and academic achievement.	17
Table 32: Demonstrate high levels of student growth in postsecondary and workforce readiness.	17

---

## Factor Level Results 18

Table 33: Descriptive Statistics for TOS and MSL Factor Scores	18
--	----

---

## Disaggregated Results 18

Table 34: Disaggregated by Gender	18
Table 35: Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity	19
Table 36: Disaggregated by Rural Status	19
Table 37: Disaggregated by Educator Preparation Program	20
Table 38: Disaggregated by Program Type	21

---

## District-Level Variables 22

Table 39: Disaggregated by District	22
Table 40: Disaggregated by Math Achievement	23
Table 41: Disaggregated by Gender	23
Table 42: Disaggregated by Percent Free and Reduced Lunch	23
Table 43: Disaggregated by Rural Status	24

---

## School-Level Variables 25

Table 44: Disaggregated by Math Achievement	25
Table 45: Disaggregated by English Achievement	25
Table 46: Disaggregated by Percent Minority	26
Table 46: Disaggregated by Percent Free and Reduced Lunch	26



## Background and Methodology

---

In collaboration with the Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform Center (CEEDAR) and the Colorado Preparing Excellent Educators and Leaders Network (CO-PEEL), the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) developed and administered an Educator Preparation Program Initial Completers survey. Designed to gather feedback on the adequacy of preparation to teach using Colorado's Teacher Quality Standards, the survey provides insights into new educator perceptions of their preparation program.

The survey was designed for Colorado educators who attended a Colorado-approved educator preparation program. Out of 3,664 educators who held an active initial teacher license between May 1, 2023, and April 30, 2024, 889 completed the survey, resulting in a 24% response rate. Of these, 372 were issued their first initial teacher's license during that period; these respondents represented 45 Colorado-approved educator preparation programs. According to the CDE's Human Resource database, only 265 of these educators were employed in a Colorado public school during the 2023-24 school year. Highlights from the survey results are provided below. Future surveys should address survey persistence to increase the response rate.

## Overview of Technical Report

---

This report describes the technical results of the CDE Educator Preparation Program Initial Completers Survey. In addition to presenting the results of each individual survey item, this technical report describes the 372 survey respondents' characteristics and affiliations, as well as Teacher Quality Standards (TQS) and Measure of Student Learning factor scores disaggregated by individual, school, and district characteristics. Specifically, survey factor scores are disaggregated by:

- District of employment
- District geographic context (rural, urban, suburban) and student characteristics (FRPL, race/ethnicity, achievement)
- School of employment
- School context and student characteristics
- Position
- Gender
- Race & Ethnicity
- Years of experience
- Preparation program completed
- Colorado Measures of Academic Success (Percent Met or Exceeded) Mathematics and English Language Arts

An overview of the survey, methodology, and high-level findings can be found in the [Educator Preparation Program Initial Completers Survey Summary report](#).

Note: Data is not reported for programs with five or fewer respondents to preserve the confidentiality of individual candidates.



## Respondent Characteristics

Table 1. Job Class

	N	Percent
Missing	107	28.8%
Extra-Curricular Activity/Coach	1	0.3%
Librarian/Media Consultant	1	0.3%
System Support	1	0.3%
Teacher, Permanent Substitute	1	0.3%
Teacher, Regular	206	55.4%
Teacher, Special Education	35	9.4%
Teacher, Title I	13	3.5%
Teaching Assistant, Regular Ed	5	1.3%
Teaching Assistant, Special Ed	2	0.5%

Table 2. Gender

	N	Percent
Missing	107	28.8%
Female	211	56.7%
Male	53	14.2%
Non-Binary	1	0.3%

Table 3. Race/Ethnicity

	N	Percent
Missing	107	28.7%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3	0.8%
Asian	3	0.8%
Black	6	1.6%
Hispanic	32	8.4%
Two or More Races	6	1.6%
White	215	57.8%

Table 4. Educator Preparation Program

	N	Percent
Adams State University (Traditional)	2	0.5%
Centennial BOCES	9	2.4%
Colorado Christian University (Alternative)	8	2.1%
Colorado Christian University (Traditional)	16	4.2%
Colorado College	3	0.8%
Colorado Mesa University	15	4.0%
Colorado Mountain College (Alternative)	2	0.5%
Colorado Mountain College (Traditional)	2	0.5%



Colorado River BOCES	4	1.1%
Colorado State University, Fort Collins	11	3.0%
Colorado State University, Global Campus (Alternative)	2	0.5%
Colorado State University, Pueblo (Alternative)	1	0.3%
Colorado State University, Pueblo (Traditional)	8	2.2%
Denver Public Schools	2	0.5%
Douglas County School District	1	0.3%
East Central BOCES	10	2.6%
Fort Lewis College (Traditional)	6	1.6%
Friends Teacher Preparation	2	0.5%
Metropolitan State University (Alternative)	7	1.9%
Metropolitan State University (Traditional)	34	9.1%
Mountain BOCES	6	1.6%
Northeast BOCES	6	1.6%
Northwest BOCES	3	0.8%
Pikes Peak BOCES	2	0.5%
Public Education & Business Coalition Teacher Residency	9	2.4%
Pueblo District 70	1	0.3%
Regis University	8	2.2%
Relay Graduate School of Education (Traditional)	6	1.6%
Rocky Mountain College of Art + Design	1	0.3%
San Luis Valley BOCES	2	0.5%
Southeastern BOCES	5	1.3%
Stanley British Primary Teacher Preparation	1	0.3%
Teach For America	1	0.3%
University of Colorado, Boulder (Alternative)	1	0.3%
University of Colorado, Boulder (Traditional)	8	2.2%
University of Colorado, Colorado Springs (Alternative)	4	1.1%
University of Colorado, Colorado Springs (Traditional)	14	3.8%
University of Colorado, Denver (Traditional)	16	4.3%
University of Colorado, Denver: ASPIRE to Teach (Alternative)	66	17.7%
University of Denver	9	2.4%
University of Northern Colorado (Alternative)	4	1.1%
University of Northern Colorado (Traditional)	39	10.5%
West Central Licensing (Uncompahgre BOCES)	1	0.3%
Western State Colorado University (Alternative)	7	1.9%
Western State Colorado University (Traditional)	7	1.9%

Table 5. Years of Teaching Experience

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Years' Teaching Experience	271	0	11	1.01	1.596

Table 6. Completion of Dual Endorsement Program

	N	Percent
Yes	65	17.5%
No	307	82.5%



Table 7. Endorsement Area for Non-Dual Endorsement

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Missing	65	17.5%
Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources	1	0.3%
Business	1	0.3%
Business and Marketing	3	0.8%
Computer Science	1	0.3%
Culturally & Linguistically Diverse Bilingual Education Specialist	1	0.3%
Culturally & Linguistically Diverse Education	8	2.2%
Drama Theatre Arts	3	0.8%
Early Childhood Education	14	3.8%
ECE Special Education	1	0.3%
Elementary Education	73	19.6%
English Language Arts	27	7.3%
Family and Consumer Sciences	2	0.5%
Health	2	0.5%
Instructional Technology Teacher	1	0.3%
Mathematics, Middle School	5	1.3%
Mathematics, Secondary (Grades 7-12)	25	6.7%
Music	11	3.0%
Physical Education	17	4.5%
Science	30	7.9%
Social Studies	19	5.1%
Special Education Specialist Deaf/Hard of Hearing	1	0.3%
Special Education, Generalist	34	9.1%
Technology Education	2	0.5%
Visual Arts	15	4.0%
World Languages (American Sign Language, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Latin, Mandarin Chinese, Russian, Spanish)	12	3.2%



**Table 8. Endorsement Area for Dual Endorsement**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Non-Dual Endorsement</b>	307	82.5%
Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources	-	-
Business	-	-
Business and Marketing	1	0.3%
Computer Science	1	-
Culturally & Linguistically Diverse Bilingual Education Specialist	1	0.3%
Culturally & Linguistically Diverse Education	32	8.6%
Dance	-	-
Drama Theatre Arts	1	0.3%
Early Childhood Education	6	1.6%
ECE Special Education Specialist	-	-
ECE Special Education	4	1.1%
Elementary Education	28	7.4%
English Language Arts	9	2.4%
Family and Consumer Sciences	1	0.3%
Gifted and Talented Specialist	-	-
Gifted Education, Core	-	-
Gifted Education, Specialist	-	-
Health	-	-
Instructional Technology Teacher	-	-
Marketing	-	-
Mathematics, Middle School	2	0.5%
Mathematics, Secondary (Grades 7-12)	2	0.5%
Music	2	0.5%
Physical Education	1	0.3%
Reading Specialist	-	-
Reading Teacher	-	-
Science	4	1.1%
Social Studies	3	0.8%
Special Education Specialist Deaf/Hard of Hearing	-	-
Special Education, Generalist	19	5.1%
Special Education, Specialist	-	-
Special Education Specialist, Visually Impaired	1	0.3%
Speech	-	-
Technology Education	1	0.3%
Trade and Industry Education	-	-
Visual Arts	1	0.3%
World Languages (American Sign Language, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Latin, Mandarin Chinese, Russian, Spanish)	3	0.8%

**Table 9: Grade band**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Preschool	8	2.2%
K-5 (Elementary School)	167	44.9%
6-8 (Middle School)	80	21.5%
9-12 (High School)	117	31.5%





Table 10: Subject area taught

	Frequency	Percent
Agriculture	1	0.3%
Art	15	3.9%
Business/Marketing	3	0.8%
Computer Science	3	0.8%
English Language Arts	83	22.3%
Family and Consumer Education	3	0.8%
Mathematics	58	15.6%
Music	12	3.2%
Physical Curriculum (e.g. Health, P.E.)	15	3.9%
Science	31	8.3%
Social Studies	23	6.2%
Special Education	37	9.9%
Technology Education	1	0.3%
World Languages	13	3.5%
Other	74	19.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>372</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 11: Would choose same preparation program

	N	Percent
Yes	291	78.2%
No	29	7.8%
Don't Know	52	14.0%

Table 12. Reasons respondents would choose same preparation program

	N
I received adequate support, coaching, and/or mentoring.	241
The program's atmosphere/culture was positive and facilitated my learning.	229
I feel the preparation program adequately prepared me for a teaching position.	223
The time commitment was appropriate and feasible.	214
I received adequate advising throughout the program.	209
The coursework was appropriately challenging.	205
The program was flexible and/or adjusted to meet my needs.	196
There were many opportunities to collaborate with my peers.	174
My clinical experiences during the program were sufficient.	154
The travel expectations were appropriate and feasible.	124



Table 13. Reasons respondents would not choose same preparation program

	N
I feel the preparation program did not adequately prepare me for a teaching position.	18
I did not receive sufficient support, coaching, and/or mentoring.	13
The time commitment was too strenuous.	10
My clinical experiences were not sufficient.	6
The program's atmosphere/culture was not conducive to learning.	5
The coursework was not challenging enough.	4
The travel expectations were not appropriate/feasible.	4
The program was not flexible and/or did not adjust to meet my needs.	3
The coursework was too challenging.	0
There were no/minimal opportunities to collaborate with my peers.	0

**Summary:** Survey respondents are largely regular teachers, female, White, and within their first two years of teaching. They come from a variety of CO institutions with the largest representation from the University of Colorado- Denver (ASPIRE). The most common endorsement was Elementary education (19.6%). Special Education Generalist (9.1%), Science (7.9%) and English Language Arts (7.3%) are the next most prevalent endorsements. Finally, more than three-quarters of respondents (78.2%) indicated that they would choose the same preparation program.



## Item-Level Rating Scale Results

The results that follow are frequencies of rating scale responses for items related to TQs or MSLs. The rating scale was 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, and 4=strongly agree. Table 14 aligns the individual items to their respective TQS or MSL survey question code. For this iteration of the survey one TQS question on instruction was asked twice and one TQS question on professionalism was not included.

**Table 14. Item-Factor Alignment**

Item	TQS or MSL Factor
<b>Item stem:</b> To what extent do you agree that your preparation program adequately prepared you to:	
Provide instruction aligned with the Colorado Academic Standards.	TQS 1 – Content knowledge
Develop and implement lessons that make cross-curricular connections and emphasize literacy and numeracy.	TQS 1 – Content knowledge
Demonstrate knowledge of content and evidence-based instructional practices.	TQS 1 – Content knowledge
Foster an efficient and nurturing learning environment.	TQS 2 – Learning environment
Demonstrate respect for diversity, while fostering an inclusive community for all students.	TQS 2 – Learning environment
Adapt instruction for students' varying levels of ability, needs, and interests.	TQS 2 – Learning environment
Work collaboratively with families for the benefit of students.	TQS 2 – Learning environment
Demonstrate knowledge about the ways learning takes place, including student development.	TQS 3 – Instruction
Use formal and informal methods to assess learning, provide feedback, and use results.	TQS 3 – Instruction
Integrate and utilize appropriate available technology.	TQS 3 – Instruction
Establish high expectations and support development of critical-thinking and problem-solving skills.	TQS 3 – Instruction
Provide students with opportunities to work in teams and develop leadership.*	TQS 3 – Instruction
Model and promote effective communication.	TQS 3 – Instruction
Demonstrate high standards for professional conduct.	TQS 4 – Professionalism
Link professional growth to professional goals.	TQS 4 – Professionalism
Respond to a complex, dynamic environment.	TQS 4 – Professionalism
Demonstrate leadership in the school, community, and teaching profession. †	TQS 4 – Professionalism
Demonstrate high levels of student learning, growth, and academic achievement.	MSL - Student learning
Demonstrate high levels of student growth in postsecondary and workforce readiness.	MSL - Student learning

\*Asked twice

†Not asked at all



The following 18 tables describe the frequency of rating scale responses for the 18 items that were aligned to the TQS or MSL factors.

**Table 15: Develop and implement lessons that make cross-curricular connections and emphasize literacy and numeracy.**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	14	3.8%
<b>Disagree</b>	24	6.5%
<b>Agree</b>	150	40.3%
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	184	49.5%

**Table 16: Demonstrate knowledge of content and evidence-based instructional practices.**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	14	3.8%
<b>Disagree</b>	17	4.6%
<b>Agree</b>	126	33.9%
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	213	57.3%
<b>Missing</b>	2	0.5%

**Table 17: Provide instruction aligned with the Colorado Academic Standards.**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	15	4.0%
<b>Disagree</b>	16	4.3%
<b>Agree</b>	123	33.1%
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	216	58.1%
<b>Missing</b>	2	0.5%



Table 18: Foster an efficient and nurturing learning environment.

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Strongly Disagree	13	3.5%
Disagree	22	5.9%
Agree	119	32.0%
Strongly Agree	215	57.8%
Missing	3	0.8%

Table 19: Demonstrate respect for diversity, while fostering an inclusive community for all students.

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Strongly Disagree	11	3.0%
Disagree	12	3.2%
Agree	104	28.0%
Strongly Agree	242	65.1%
Missing	3	0.8%

Table 20: Adapt instruction for students' varying levels of ability, needs, and interests.

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Strongly Disagree	14	3.8%
Disagree	35	9.5%
Agree	126	33.9%
Strongly Agree	193	51.9%
Missing	4	1.1%

Table 21: Work collaboratively with families for the benefit of students.

	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	18	4.9%
Disagree	62	17.0%
Agree	167	44.9%
Strongly Agree	117	31.5%
Missing	8	2.2%

Table 22: Demonstrate knowledge about the ways learning takes place, including student development.

	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	14	3.8%
Disagree	21	5.7%
Agree	145	39.0%
Strongly Agree	190	51.1%
Missing	2	0.5%

Table 23: Use formal and informal methods to assess learning, provide feedback, and use results.

	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	15	4.0%
Disagree	18	4.8%
Agree	137	36.8%
Strongly Agree	202	54.3%



Table 24: Integrate and utilize appropriate available technology.

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Strongly Disagree	14	3.8%
Disagree	40	10.8%
Agree	162	43.5%
Strongly Agree	153	41.1%
Missing	3	0.8%

Table 25: Establish high expectations and support development of critical-thinking and problem-solving skills.

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Strongly Disagree	13	3.5%
Disagree	25	6.7%
Agree	147	39.5%
Strongly Agree	186	50.0%
Missing	1	0.3%

Table 26: Provide students with opportunities to work in teams and develop leadership.

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Strongly Disagree	12	3.2%
Disagree	22	5.9%
Agree	164	44.1%
Strongly Agree	171	46.0%
Missing	3	0.8%



Table 27: Model and promote effective communication.

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	11	3.0%
<b>Disagree</b>	26	7.0%
<b>Agree</b>	152	40.9%
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	180	48.4%
<b>Missing</b>	3	0.8%

Table 28: Demonstrate high standards for professional conduct.

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	11	3.0%
<b>Disagree</b>	13	3.5%
<b>Agree</b>	128	34.4%
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	216	58.1%
<b>Missing</b>	4	1.1%

Table 29: Link professional growth to professional goals.

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	17	4.6%
<b>Disagree</b>	38	10.2%
<b>Agree</b>	137	36.8%
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	175	47.0%
<b>Missing</b>	5	1.3%





Table 30: Respond to a complex, dynamic environment.

	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	14	3.8%
Disagree	46	12.4%
Agree	141	37.9%
Strongly Agree	165	44.4%
Missing	6	1.6%

Table 31: Demonstrate high levels of student learning, growth, and academic achievement.

	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	11	2.9%
Disagree	20	5.3%
Agree	162	42.6%
Strongly Agree	184	48.4%
Missing	3	0.8%

Table 32: Demonstrate high levels of student growth in postsecondary and workforce readiness.

	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	17	4.6%
Disagree	44	11.8%
Agree	153	41.1%
Strongly Agree	132	35.5%
Missing	26	7.0%

**Summary.** Without exception, for each of the 18 questions, agree and strongly agree are the most frequently selected responses.



## Factor Level Results

Factor scores for each of the TQS and the MSL factor were calculated by averaging the ratings across all items aligned with the given TQS or MSL. In the factor results, mean scores above 2.5 suggest general agreement with items and less than 2.5 suggest general disagreement. Average factor scores for all TQs or MSLs indicates general agreement.

**Table 33: Descriptive Statistics for TQS and MSL Factor Scores**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
<b>Content Knowledge</b>	372	1.00	4.00	3.42	0.69239
<b>Learning Environment</b>	372	1.00	4.00	3.35	0.66753
<b>Instruction</b>	372	1.00	4.00	3.34	0.64858
<b>Professionalism</b>	372	1.00	4.00	3.33	0.70810
<b>Student Learning</b>	372	1.00	4.00	3.24	0.73008

## Disaggregated Results

In the tables provided below, the average factor scores for the factors labeled 1 MSL and 4 TQS are broken down by survey respondent demographic data and institutional information. For example, in the table directly below, the average score for the MSL Student Learning factor is 3.22 for females and 3.20 for males.

**Table 34: Disaggregated by Gender**

Gender		Student Learning	Content Knowledge	Learning Environment	Instruction	Professionalism
	Mean	3.27	3.42	3.34	3.34	3.33
	N	107	107	107	107	107
<b>Female</b>	Mean	3.22	3.43	3.35	3.34	3.35
	N	211	211	211	211	211
<b>Male</b>	Mean	3.20	3.37	3.32	3.33	3.25
	N	53	53	53	53	53
<b>Non-Binary</b>	Mean	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
	N	1	1	1	1	1
<b>Total</b>	Mean	3.24	3.42	3.35	3.34	3.33
	N	372	372	372	372	372



Table 35: Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity		Student Learning	Content Knowledge	Learning Environment	Instruction	Professionalism
	Mean	3.27	3.42	3.34	3.34	3.33
	N	107	107	107	107	107
<b>American Indian or Alaska Native</b>	Mean	2.83	3.56	3.42	3.44	3.50
	N	3	3	3	3	3
<b>Asian</b>	Mean	3.33	3.44	3.50	3.39	3.22
	N	3	3	3	3	3
<b>Black</b>	Mean	3.67	3.67	3.58	3.67	3.67
	N	6	6	6	6	6
<b>Hispanic</b>	Mean	3.10	3.31	3.32	3.26	3.25
	N	32	32	32	32	32
<b>Two or More Races</b>	Mean	3.63	3.83	3.50	3.42	3.39
	N	6	6	6	6	6
<b>White</b>	Mean	3.22	3.42	3.34	3.34	3.33
	N	215	215	215	215	215
<b>Total</b>	Mean	3.2372	3.4194	3.35	3.34	3.33
	N	372	372	372	372	372

Table 36: Disaggregated by Rural Status

Rural Status		Student Learning	Content Knowledge	Learning Environment	Instruction	Professionalism
	Mean	3.27	3.42	3.34	3.34	3.33
	N	107	107	107	107	107
<b>Non-Rural</b>	Mean	3.18	3.37	3.31	3.30	3.27
	N	209	209	209	209	209
<b>Rural</b>	Mean	3.41	3.67	3.54	3.58	3.61
	N	35	35	35	35	35
<b>Small Rural</b>	Mean	3.33	3.51	3.47	3.37	3.42
	N	21	21	21	21	21
<b>Total</b>	Mean	3.24	3.42	3.35	3.34	3.33
	N	372	372	372	372	372



Table 37: Disaggregated by Educator Preparation Program

Institution Name		Student Learning	Content Knowledge	Learning Environment	Instruction	Professionalism
<b>Centennial BOCES</b>	Mean	2.92	3.15	3.25	3.22	3.15
	N	9	9	9	9	9
<b>Colorado Christian University (Alternative)</b>	Mean	2.97	3.08	3.06	3.08	3.21
	N	8	8	8	8	8
<b>Colorado Christian University (Traditional)</b>	Mean	3.31	3.56	3.48	3.47	3.56
	N	16	16	16	16	16
<b>Colorado Mesa University</b>	Mean	3.48	3.56	3.58	3.51	3.43
	N	15	15	15	15	15
<b>Colorado State University, Fort Collins</b>	Mean	3.36	3.73	3.36	3.33	3.24
	N	11	11	11	11	11
<b>Colorado State University, Pueblo (Traditional)</b>	Mean	3.19	3.42	3.14	3.44	3.50
	N	8	8	8	8	8
<b>East Central BOCES</b>	Mean	3.38	3.70	3.60	3.57	3.52
	N	10	10	10	10	10
<b>Fort Lewis College (Traditional)</b>	Mean	2.71	2.94	2.94	2.63	2.81
	N	6	6	6	6	6
<b>Metropolitan State University (Alternative)</b>	Mean	3.64	3.29	3.21	3.36	3.62
	N	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Metropolitan State University (Traditional)</b>	Mean	3.04	3.17	3.03	3.13	3.03
	N	34	34	34	34	34
<b>Mountain BOCES</b>	Mean	3.42	3.61	3.44	3.42	3.44
	N	6	6	6	6	6
<b>Northeast BOCES</b>	Mean	3.50	3.56	3.67	3.58	3.67
	N	6	6	6	6	6
<b>Public Education &amp; Business Coalition Teacher Residency</b>	Mean	3.06	3.04	3.06	3.17	3.15
	N	9	9	9	9	9
<b>Regis University</b>	Mean	3.31	3.46	3.16	3.13	3.21
	N	8	8	8	8	8
<b>Relay Graduate School of Education (Traditional)</b>	Mean	3.38	3.50	3.25	3.36	3.28
	N	6	6	6	6	6
<b>Southeastern BOCES</b>	Mean	3.25	3.50	3.53	3.48	3.43
	N	5	5	5	5	5
<b>University of Colorado, Boulder (Traditional)</b>	Mean	3.13	3.25	3.23	3.20	2.79
	N	8	8	8	8	8
<b>University of Colorado, Colorado Springs (Traditional)</b>	Mean	3.29	3.62	3.34	3.36	3.48
	N	14	14	14	14	14
<b>University of Colorado, Denver (Traditional)</b>	Mean	3.31	3.60	3.66	3.57	3.40
	N	16	16	16	16	16
<b>University of Colorado, Denver: ASPIRE to Teach (Alternative)</b>	Mean	3.29	3.45	3.46	3.43	3.40
	N	66	66	66	66	66
<b>University of Denver</b>	Mean	3.31	3.41	3.36	3.33	3.26
	N	9	9	9	9	9



<b>University of Northern Colorado (Traditional)</b>	Mean	3.17	3.42	3.24	3.31	3.31
	N	39	39	39	39	39
<b>Western State Colorado University (Alternative)</b>	Mean	3.11	3.38	3.18	3.21	3.48
	N	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Western State Colorado University (Traditional)</b>	Mean	3.39	3.71	3.54	3.55	3.67
	N	7	7	7	7	7

Table 38: Disaggregated by Program Type

<b>Program Type</b>		<b>Student Learning</b>	<b>Content Knowledge</b>	<b>Learning Environment</b>	<b>Instruction</b>	<b>Professionalism</b>
<b>Alternative</b>	Mean	3.25	3.40	3.40	3.38	3.38
	N	167	167	167	167	167
<b>Traditional</b>	Mean	3.23	3.44	3.30	3.32	3.29
	N	205	205	205	205	205
<b>Total</b>	Mean	3.24	3.42	3.35	3.34	3.33
	N	372	372	372	372	372



## District-Level Variables

In the following tables, district level average factor scores for the 1 MSL and 4 TQS factors are provided for each ordinal level of the variable indicated in the table title (after the \*). Like the above tables, in the table directly below, the average MSL Student Learning factor score for teachers in Academy 20 is 2.89. In the next table, the average MSL Student Learning factor score for school districts with 0-33.3% of their students meeting or exceeding state standards on the CMAS math test is 3.23, and in districts with 33.4-66.6% of their students meeting or exceeding state standards on the CMAS math test is 3.20.

**Table 39: Disaggregated by District**

District Name		Student Learning	Content Knowledge	Learning Environment	Instruction	Professionalism
	Mean	3.27	3.42	3.34	3.34	3.33
	N	107	107	107	107	107
<b>Academy 20</b>	Mean	2.89	3.29	3.29	3.05	3.00
	N	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Adams-Arapahoe 28J</b>	Mean	3.40	3.44	3.35	3.33	3.24
	N	12	12	12	12	12
<b>Boulder Valley Re 2</b>	Mean	3.39	3.71	3.52	3.77	3.48
	N	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Cherry Creek 5</b>	Mean	2.85	3.13	3.05	3.10	3.07
	N	5	5	5	5	5
<b>Colorado Springs 11</b>	Mean	3.68	3.81	3.54	3.67	3.57
	N	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Denver County 1</b>	Mean	2.96	3.22	3.05	3.05	3.00
	N	30	30	30	30	30
<b>District 49</b>	Mean	3.18	3.18	3.14	3.21	3.39
	N	11	11	11	11	11
<b>Douglas County Re 1</b>	Mean	3.19	3.35	3.31	3.28	3.21
	N	29	29	29	29	29
<b>Jefferson County R-1</b>	Mean	3.36	3.49	3.52	3.39	3.49
	N	11	11	11	11	11
<b>Mesa County Valley 51</b>	Mean	3.40	3.53	3.65	3.43	3.53
	N	5	5	5	5	5
<b>Montrose County RE-1J</b>	Mean	3.75	3.72	3.58	3.64	3.78
	N	6	6	6	6	6
<b>Poudre R-1</b>	Mean	3.28	3.29	3.38	3.35	3.50
	N	8	8	8	8	8
<b>Pueblo City 60</b>	Mean	3.40	3.80	3.53	3.70	3.67
	N	5	5	5	5	5



District Name		Student Learning	Content Knowledge	Learning Environment	Instruction	Professionalism
Thompson R2-J	Mean	3.00	3.33	2.96	3.14	3.17
	N	6	6	6	6	6
Total	Mean	3.24	3.42	3.35	3.34	3.33
	N	372	372	372	372	372

Table 40: Disaggregated by Math Achievement

Percent Exceeded/Met Expectations DIST_Math		Student Learning	Content Knowledge	Learning Environment	Instruction	Professionalism
0-33.3%	Mean	3.23	3.40	3.31	3.33	3.31
	N	143	143	143	143	143
33.4-66.6%	Mean	3.20	3.44	3.39	3.36	3.34
	N	105	105	105	105	105
Total	Mean	3.22	3.42	3.34	3.34	3.32
	N	248	248	248	248	248

Table 41: Disaggregated by Gender

Percent Exceeded/Met Expectations DIST_ELA		Student Learning	Content Knowledge	Learning Environment	Instruction	Professionalism
0-33.3%	Mean	3.22	3.48	3.37	3.34	3.27
	N	42	42	42	42	42
33.4-66.6%	Mean	3.20	3.39	3.32	3.32	3.31
	N	207	207	207	207	207
66.7-100%	Mean	3.35	3.80	3.83	3.68	3.77
	N	5	5	5	5	5
Total	Mean	3.21	3.41	3.34	3.33	3.32
	N	254	254	254	254	254

Table 42: Disaggregated by Percent Free and Reduced Lunch

Free and Reduced Lunch		Student Learning	Content Knowledge	Learning Environment	Instruction	Professionalism
0-33.3%	Mean	3.22	3.45	3.40	3.38	3.34
	N	91	91	91	91	91
33.4-66.6%	Mean	3.20	3.37	3.28	3.29	3.30
	N	138	138	138	138	138
66.7-100%	Mean	3.35	3.58	3.49	3.48	3.43
	N	34	34	34	34	34
Total	Mean	3.23	3.42	3.35	3.34	3.33
	N	263	263	263	263	263



Table 43: Disaggregated by Rural Status

Rural Status		Student Learning	Content Knowledge	Learning Environment	Instruction	Professionalism
<b>Small Rural</b>	Mean	3.33	3.51	3.47	3.37	3.42
	N	21	21	21	21	21
<b>Rural</b>	Mean	3.41	3.67	3.54	3.58	3.61
	N	35	35	35	35	35
<b>Non-Rural</b>	Mean	3.18	3.37	3.31	3.30	3.27
	N	209	209	209	209	209
<b>Total</b>	Mean	3.22	3.42	3.35	3.34	3.33
	N	265	265	265	265	265





## School-Level Variables

Like the District Level Variables tables above, school level average factor scores for the 1 MSL and 4 TQS factors are provided for each ordinal level of the variable indicated in the table title (after the \*). In the table below, the average MSL Student Learning factor score for schools with 0-33.3% of their students meeting or exceeding state standards on the CMAS math test is 3.21, and in schools with 33.4-66.6% of their students meeting or exceeding state standards on the CMAS math test is 3.22 and in schools with 66.7-100% of their students meeting or exceeding state standards on CMAS math test is 3.50. This means that educators working in schools where two-thirds or more students exceeded or met CMAS math expectations felt more prepared by their educator preparation program.

**Table 44: Disaggregated by Math Achievement**

Percent Exceeded/Met Expectations	School_Math	Student Learning	Content Knowledge	Learning Environment	Instruction	Professionalism
0-33.3%	Mean	3.21	3.41	3.22	3.30	3.33
	N	49	49	49	49	49
33.4-66.6%	Mean	3.22	3.47	3.40	3.39	3.39
	N	70	70	70	70	70
66.7-100%	Mean	3.50	3.63	3.50	3.52	3.44
	N	9	9	9	9	9
<b>Total</b>	Mean	3.24	3.46	3.34	3.36	3.37
	N	128	128	128	128	128

**Table 45: Disaggregated by English Achievement**

Percent Exceeded/Met Expectations	School_ELA	Student Learning	Content Knowledge	Learning Environment	Instruction	Professionalism
0-33.3%	Mean	3.23	3.43	3.35	3.31	3.27
	N	45	45	45	45	45
33.4-66.6%	Mean	3.21	3.44	3.32	3.37	3.38
	N	85	85	85	85	85
66.7-100%	Mean	3.33	3.52	3.49	3.44	3.41
	N	25	25	25	25	25
<b>Total</b>	Mean	3.23	3.45	3.35	3.36	3.35
	N	155	155	155	155	155



**Table 46: Disaggregated by Percent Minority**

PCTMinority_School		Student Learning	Content Knowledge	Learning Environment	Instruction	Professionalism
<b>0-33.3%</b>	Mean	3.18	3.50	3.42	3.38	3.35
	N	79	79	79	79	79
<b>33.4-66.6%</b>	Mean	3.25	3.38	3.32	3.34	3.34
	N	109	109	109	109	109
<b>66.7-100%</b>	Mean	3.21	3.41	3.29	3.31	3.26
	N	72	72	72	72	72
<b>Total</b>	Mean	3.22	3.42	3.34	3.34	3.32
	N	260	260	260	260	260

**Table 46: Disaggregated by Percent Free and Reduced Lunch**

FRL_School		Student Learning	Content Knowledge	Learning Environment	Instruction	Professionalism
<b>0-33.3%</b>	Mean	3.21	3.48	3.38	3.37	3.31
	N	92	92	92	92	92
<b>33-4-66.6%</b>	Mean	3.26	3.42	3.35	3.36	3.38
	N	84	84	84	84	84
<b>66.7-100%</b>	Mean	3.17	3.37	3.28	3.27	3.24
	N	72	72	72	72	72
<b>Total</b>	Mean	3.22	3.43	3.34	3.34	3.31
	N	248	248	248	248	248