| Graduate Impact Data Summary and Analysis  |          |   |                           |              |
|--|----------|---|---------------------------|--------------|
| Overall  |          | 1144 of P12 students were impacted  |                           |              |
| N=22   |          | 80% overall average met goals with students. All assessments were school approved SLOs. |                           |              |
| 22% return   |          | 88% overall showed gains. Remove the lowest 2 schools and it jumps to 91%.              |                           |              |
| 20% Verified by administrators   |          | 9 out of 22 had 100% gains.   |                           |              |
| Year = 22  | N        | % goals met   | % increase                | Elem Ed = 10 |
| Year 1=10  | 266      | 81  | 94                        | ECED-=6      |
| Year 2=8   | 266      | 81  | 94                        | Sec=5        |
| Year 3=4   | 116      | 76  | 94                        | Music=1      |
| Administrator Verification Summary and Anal  | ysis     |   |                           |              |
| 20% of Administrators responded. N=20  |          |   |                           |              |
| 100% of Graduates/Completers met or exceeded   | schoo    | l expectations for impa   | cting student learning.   |              |
| On average 82% of students taught by graduates   | showe    | ed gains.   |                           |              |
| 9/20 had gains for 95% or higher of their students                                     | S.       |   |                           |              |
| Administrator's ratings of employed graduates/co                                       | mplete   | rs.   |                           |              |
| 1. Evaluate the planning capability of the teacher.                                    |          |   |                           | 3.55         |
| 2. Evaluate the instruction capability of the teacher.                                 |          |   |                           | 3.40         |
| 3. Evaluate classroom management and discipline.                                       |          |   |                           | 3.45         |
| 4. Evaluate impact on student learning.  |          |   |                           | 3.65         |
| 7. Evaluate professionalism.   |          |   |                           | 4.00         |
| 8. Evaluate your overall satisfaction with NGU graduates based on level of experience. |          |   |                           | 3.80         |
|  |          |   |                           |              |
| Administrators report that:  | ,        | •   |                           |              |
| EA, CO and RA came to us from NGU and they a   | are am   | ong our best teachers.  |                           |              |
| CC is an excellent role model for our young peop                                       | le, and  | a very valuable memb  | er of our staff.          |              |
| CE does an awesome job. We need more teachers like                                     | her. Sh  | e is truly an asset to our  | staff.                    |              |
| She keeps students engaged in her lessons. She works                                   | hard to  | ensure to students are le   | arning the content.       |              |
| I have been thrilled with NGU graduates.   |          |   |                           |              |
| MG showed tremendous growth as a 1st year teacher,                                     | both pr  | ofessionally and instructi  | onally. She is very coach | nable.       |
| I am most always very pleased with NGU graduates, a seek them out to employment.       | nd       |   |                           |              |
| CO is reflective and thoughtful and already one of our                                 | better t | teachers. (1st year teache  | r)                        |              |