



The Honorable Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger
and
The Honorable Members of the Legislature

On behalf of the California Student Aid Commission (Commission), I am pleased to submit the 2005-2006 Assumption Program of Loans for Education (APLE) Report to the Legislature, pursuant to California Education Code Section 69612 which created the APLE program.

In keeping with the mission of the Commission, "Making education beyond high school financially accessible to all Californians," the APLE program was created to encourage participation among California teachers into teaching shortage areas throughout California. Over its several years of operation, the APLE program has developed into a productive and effective program which today, has provided awards for 56,192 participants. Participants actively serve in teaching shortage areas throughout California and in unrepresented subject areas such as science and mathematics. The APLE program has provided California teachers an educational opportunity by providing valuable services to California students and schools. The growth, development and popularity of the APLE program ensure continued program success.

The success of the APLE program is further demonstrated by the number of awards offered and the number of participating teachers. APLE is so popular and successful that its model has been developed into several loan assumption programs such as the National Guard APLE (NG APLE) and the State Nursing APLE for Nursing Faculty (SNAPLE NF). Furthermore, there are currently several proposed bills under consideration which would create new additional APLE programs to benefit California.

The following 2005-2006 APLE report provides information specific to Legislative reporting requirements while summarizing the growth of the program. The report provides data which demonstrates the achievements of the APLE program over the last three comparable years.

Please feel free to contact my office at (916) 526-8271 with any questions or comments you may have regarding this report.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Diana Fuentes-Michel".

Diana Fuentes-Michel
Executive Director
California Student Aid Commission



Mission

Making education beyond high school financially accessible to all Californians.

www.csac.ca.gov

This report to the Legislature on the APLE Program complies with the California Education Code Section 69612 to 69616 which requires:

§69615.4. The commission shall report annually to the Legislature regarding all of the following, on the basis of sex, age, and ethnicity:

- (a) The total number of program participants.*
- (b) The number of agreements entered into with juniors, seniors, students enrolled in teacher training programs, and persons who agree to enroll in teacher trainee programs or teacher internship programs.*
- (c) The number of participants who agree to teach in a subject matter shortage area.*
- (d) The number of participants who agree to teach in schools with a high ratio of pupils from low-income families and in high-priority schools.*
- (e) The number of participants who agree to teach in schools serving rural areas.*
- (f) The number of participants who agree to teach in schools with a high percentage of teachers holding emergency permits.*
- (g) The number of participants who receive a loan assumption benefit, classified by payment year.*
- (h) The number of participants who have participated in the Science, Mathematics, and Technology Teacher Pipeline Program established by Chapter 1271 of the Statutes of 1993.*
- (i) The number of out-of-state teachers who enter into agreements.*
- (j) The number of participants who have participated in teacher trainee programs or teacher internship programs, classified by school district or county office of education.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ASSUMPTION PROGRAM OF LOANS FOR EDUCATION HISTORY	1
Purpose	
Legislative History	
ALL ABOUT APPLE.....	2
Selection of Teacher Shortage Areas	
Selection of Participating Institutions	
Program Eligibility Requirements	
Benefits	
Application and Selection Process	
Segmental Distribution	
Loan Assumption Agreements	
Agreements Not Redeemed	
WHO RECEIVES AN APPLE.....	6
Age	
Ethnicity	
Gender	
Distribution by Teacher Shortage Area	
APPLE PERFORMANCE	9
Program Participation	
Retention Rates and Loan Assumption Benefit Payments	
Conclusion	

APPENDICES

A. Number of Agreements Allocated by Institution and Segment.....	13-15
B. 2005-2006 Program Participants by Teacher Shortage Area, Education Level, and Gender	16
C. 2005-2006 Program Participants by Teacher Shortage Area and Ethnicity.....	17
D. 2005-2006 Program Participants by Teacher Shortage Area and Age Group	18
E. History of Allocation, Awards and Loan Assumption Payments 1986-1987 through 2005-2006.....	19

ASSUMPTION PROGRAM OF LOANS FOR EDUCATION HISTORY

PURPOSE

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

Specifically, the Legislature intended that the APPLE program:

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

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

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

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

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

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

- The modification of the previous 10-unit-per-semester requirement modified to allow half-time enrollment as defined by the teaching institution.
- The addition of schools ranked in the lowest 20th percentile of the Academic Performance Index (API) to the list of existing teacher shortage areas.
- An increase in the maximum benefit amount, from \$8,000 to \$11,000.
- An increase, from three to four, in the number of years required to teach to receive maximum benefits.
- The addition of a \$1,000 bonus per year for participants who perform teaching service in math, science, or special education. (An additional \$1,000 per year of loan assumption benefits may be provided if the school is also ranked in the lowest 20th percentile of the API).
- In 2003-2003, an additional 1,000 awards were authorized, bringing the total to 7,500. In 2003-2004, an additional 200 were authorized, bringing the total to 7,700. And in 2003-2004, there was a decrease in authorized awards of 200, making the total number of awards 7,500. In 2005-2006, an additional 500 awards were authorized bringing the total to 8,000.
- Appendix E provides a historical summary of APLE allocations, loan assumption payments and projected payments.

ALL ABOUT APLE

SELECTION OF TEACHER SHORTAGE AREAS

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

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

SELECTION OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

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

There were 89 institutions with CCTC-approved teacher-training programs for the 2005-2006 academic year. Each eligible institution received at least one application after signing the Commission's APLE Participation Agreement. The remaining applications were distributed to institutions in proportion to the number of credentials recommended to CCTC during the previous year by each institution. (See Appendix A for details.)

There were no more than 500 APLE awards designated to help recruit out-of-state teachers to relocate and teach in California and 500 APLE awards are designated for the eight California District Intern Programs. The out-of-state applicants may apply to, and be nominated by, a California County Office of Education and district interns are nominated by the District Intern Coordinators.

PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

Applicants must meet specified conditions which include:

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

BENEFITS

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

TABLE 1

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

APPLICATION AND SELECTION PROCESS

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

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

Table 2

SELECTION CRITERIA USED BY PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS IN 2005-2006		
	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools Using Criteria
Grade Point Average	63	25.9
Faculty Recommendations	54	22.3
Interviews	27	11.1
Volunteer Work Experience	27	11.1
Essays	18	7.4
Test Scores	18	7.4
Extra Curricular Activities	18	7.4
Other Criteria	18	7.4

Each institution nominates the most qualified candidates to fill the initial allocation of awards from the Commission by the priority deadline. Institutions with additional qualified candidates may submit a list containing alternate nominees, ranked in priority order, for use during the reallocation process. Alternate candidates are selected based on the number of unused allocations from other institutions until all authorized allocations are filled. Of the total 8,000 applications allocated, no more than 500 applications are allocated to County Offices of Education for recruitment of out-of-state candidates and an additional 500 are set aside for the eight District Intern Program participating institutions. The remaining 7,000 applications are for colleges and universities with teacher certification programs. The Commission reviews all nominations for program eligibility. Commission staff checks for any discrepancies on the application and withdraws any applications that do not meet the program requirements. The Commission was authorized to allocate 8,000 APLE agreements for the 2005-2006 academic year.

SEGMENTAL DISTRIBUTION

Three of the five postsecondary education segments in California have qualified teacher preparation programs: the University of California (UC); the California State University (CSU); and independent colleges and universities (ICU). Table 3 demonstrates that in 2005-2006, the segments were represented by the following percentages: Private Colleges and Universities 41.7%; California State University 48.7%; University of California 6.4%; District Intern Program 2.3% and County Office of Education and for Out-of-State 0.9%. In comparison to 2004-2005, Private Colleges and Universities 49.8%; California State University 37.4%; University of California 8.2%; District Intern Program 3.6% and County Office of Education and for Out-of-State 1.0%. This demonstrates increased participation from California State University and District Intern Programs. With decreased participation among the Private Colleges and Universities, University of California and County Office of Education.

Table 3

APLE APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED FOR 2005-2006				
	Applications – Ineligible = Total Ineligible Submitted Applicants Applications Submitted			Percent Segmental Distribution of Eligible Applicant
California State University	3,515	0	3,515	48.7
Private Colleges and Universities	3,008	0	3,008	41.7
University of California	461	0	461	6.4
District Intern Program	165	0	165	2.3
County Offices of Education and for Out-of-State Recruitment	66	0	66	0.9
Total	7,215	0	7,215	100

LOAN ASSUMPTION AGREEMENTS

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

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

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

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

AGREEMENTS NOT REDEEMED

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

Table 4

AGREEMENTS GRANTED BUT NOT REDEEMED BY STUDENTS						
	2003-2004		2004-2005		2005-2006	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agreements not signed and returned	671	98.4	942	99.8	1,917	99.9
Agreements declined	11	1.6	2	0.2	2	0.1
Total	682	100	944	100	1,919	100

Note: Total applicants for allocation for: 2003-2004 is 7,700, 2004-2005 is 7,500 and 2005-2006 is 8,000.

By the end of the 2005-2006, the Commission selected 7,215 applicants as recipients from participating postsecondary institutions, including 66 recipients for the APLE for Out-of-State Teachers Program and 165 for the District Intern Program.

WHO RECEIVES AN APLE

AGE

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

If one assumes that “traditional” participants are thirty years old or younger and “non-traditional” participants are thirty-one or older, the “non-traditional” students continue to maintain their presence. In 2003-2004, “non-traditional” students represented 37.9 percent of all participants; this population decreased to 36.1 percent in 2004-2005 and increased to 37.6 percent in 2005-2006.

Table 5A

DISTRIBUTION OF APLE PARTICIPANTS BY AGE						
	2003-2004		2004-2005		2005-2006	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
20 and under	66	0.9	266	4.0	68	1.0
21-25	2,553	34.5	2,292	34.5	2,574	35.6
26-30	1,995	26.8	1,689	25.4	1,861	25.7
31-35	1,067	14.3	884	13.3	922	12.8
36-40	620	8.3	495	7.4	630	8.7
41-45	469	6.3	436	6.6	471	6.6
46 and older	662	8.9	586	8.8	689	9.6
Total	7,432	100	6,648	100	7,215	100

ETHNICITY

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

Table 5B

DISTRIBUTION OF APLE PARTICIPANTS BY ETHNICITY							
	2003-2004		2004-2005		2005-2006		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Asian	471	6.3	394	5.9	401	5.6	
African-American	589	7.9	476	7.25	434	6.0	
Latino	1,955	26.3	1,716	25.8	1,983	27.5	
Caucasian	3,646	49.1	3,201	48.1	3,503	48.5	
Other	677	9.1	664	10.0	655	9.1	
No Response*	94	1.3	197	3.0	239	3.3	
Total	7,432	100	6,648	100	7,215	100	

*Responses to questions on ethnicity are voluntary

GENDER

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

Table 5C

DISTRIBUTION OF APLE PARTICIPANTS BY GENDER					
	2001-2001	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Male	26.5	27.0	26.5	27.5	25.7
Female	73.5	73.0	73.5	72.5	74.3
Total	100	100	100	100	100

DISTRIBUTION BY TEACHER SHORTAGE AREA

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

Table 5D

DISTRIBUTION OF APLE PARTICIPANTS BY TEACHER SHORTAGE AREA AND ETHNICITY						
Subject	2003-2004		2004-2005		2005-2006	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mathematics	596	8.0	547	8.2	656	9.1
Music	0	0	0	0	54	0.7
Science	437	6.0	432	6.5	418	5.8
Bilingual Education	1	0	0	0	0	0
Reading Specialist	28	0	46	0.7	63	0.9
English	0	0	1	0	21	0.3
Special Education	1,258	17.0	1,357	20.6	1,461	20.1
Foreign Language	139	2.0	149	2.2	170	2.4
School Type*						
Low-Income	3,234	44.0	2,903	43.7	2,992	41.5
Low-Performing	1,520	20.0	1,039	15.6	1,159	16.1
Rural Area	149	2.0	148	2.2	178	2.5
High Percentage of Emergency Permit Teachers	70	1.0	23	0.3	43	0.6
State Special Schools	0	0	3	0	0	0
Self-Contained Classroom	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	7,432	100	6,648	100	7,215	100

*Priority shortage areas. Math, Science and Special Education APLE participants have increased slightly since academic years 2004-2005 to academic years 2005 -2006 which could be due to the bonuses offered to participants that qualify to teach in those areas.

The following provides explanations for the various APLE school types:

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

APLE PERFORMANCE

PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

Since the program's inception in 1986-1987, the Commission has received a total of 56,192 participants. In 2004-2005, there were a total of 48,977 participants in the APLE program. In 2005-2006, the APLE program added 7,215 for academic year 2005-2006 which represents a 14.7 percent growth rate over one year.

The Commission may withdraw participants after the receipt of program benefits. There were 1,686 participants who received the maximum benefits (four years of benefits) and 49 had their entire outstanding student loans paid-in-full. Others were removed because they did not provide consecutive teaching service or had loans in default status. Table 6 shows the distribution of the 2,072 participants withdrawn after receiving benefits during the 2005-2006 school years.

Table 6

APPLICANTS WITHDRAWN FROM APLE AFTER RECEIPT OF BENEFITS 2005-2006 ACADEMIC YEAR		
	Number	Percent
Received maximum benefits	1,686	81.4
All eligible loans paid in full	49	2.3
Did not teach consecutive years	335	16.2
Defaulted loans	2	0.1
Total	2,072	100

RETENTION RATES AND LOAN ASSUMPTION BENEFIT PAYMENTS

In addition to recruitment, the APLE serves to encourage new teachers to stay in specified shortage areas within the profession for at least four years. As reflected in Table 7, 45.1 percent of the APLE participants who taught during the 2002-2003 academic year and received their first year of loan assumption benefits in 2003-2004 continued to teach for four consecutive years. 60.7 percent of the 4,211 participants who taught in 2003-2004 and received their first year of benefits in 2004-2005 continued to teach for three consecutive years. However, many of the non-participants who are no longer receiving loan assumption payments did not necessarily leave the field of teaching. Some may not have maintained program requirements and are no longer eligible for benefits. Once participants have their eligible loans paid in full they are no longer included in the historical data beyond the reported year.

Table 7

RETENTION RATES FOR APLE PARTICIPANTS							
Benefits Received After 1st Year of Teaching		Benefits Received for Subsequent Years					
		2nd Year		3rd Year		4th Year	
Fiscal Year	Number	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
2003-2004	3,738	3,440	92.0	2,660	71.2	1,686	45.1
2004-2005	4,211	3,649	86.7	2,555	60.7		
2005-2006	3,900	3,103	79.6				
2006-2007	4,705						

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

Table 8 provides a breakdown of the 12,715 types of loans that were assumed for fiscal year 2005-2006. The loan assumption benefit recipients taught during the 2004-2005 academic year. Of all the loans, Commission-guaranteed loans account for 36.6 percent of the total loans assumed for fiscal year 2005-2006, increased from 35.7 percent of the total loans assumed for the prior fiscal year (2004-2005).

Table 8

TOTAL NUMBER OF LOANS AND LOAN ASSUMPTION PAYMENTS BY LOAN TYPE TEACHING SCHOOL YEAR 2005-2006 PAID FISCAL YEAR 2006-2007			
	Number	Amount (\$)	Percent
Commission Guaranteed Loans*	4,658	12,87,28	36.6
Consolidated Student Loans	3,333	9,421,095	26.3
US Department of Education Direct Student Loans	2,211	6,241,585	17.4
Stafford Loans (Guaranteed by other guarantors)	1,517	4,238,459	11.9
US Department of Education Direct Consolidation Loans	832	2,372,321	6.5
Private Educational Loans	67	178,632	0.5
Institution-based Loans and University Loans	54	148,712	0.4
Federal Perkins Loans	43	84,680	0.3
Total	12,715	\$35,472,912	100

* Loans guaranteed by the California Student Aid Commission.

Table 9 provides the number of APLE participants who received loan assumption benefits after each year of providing teaching service. The table reflects current fiscal data. Final fiscal reporting will be incorporated into the 2006-2007 APLE Report.

Table 9

TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS AND LOAN ASSUMPTION PAYMENTS MADE BY YEAR OF TEACHING SERVICE								
Year of Service	Taught 2002-2003 Paid FY 2003		Taught 2003-2004 Paid FY 2004		Taught 2004-2005 Paid FY 2005		Taught 2005-2006 Paid FY 2006	
	Number	Amount (\$)	Number	Amount (\$)	Number	Amount (\$)	Number	Amount (\$)
First	3,738	8,625,403	4,211	9,953,049	3,900	9,409,276	4,705	10,736,000
Second	2,974	9,604,663	3,440	11,155,083	3,649	12,064,092	3,103	10,552,878
Third	2,024	6,171,833	2,475	8,114,288	2,660	8,781,304	2,555	8,577,335
Fourth	851	2,542,392	1,490	4,736,476	1,882	5,762,633	1,686	5,606,698
Total	9,587	\$26,944,291	11,616	\$33,958,896	12,091	\$36,017,305	12,049	\$35,472,911

Note: Amounts have been rounded to nearest dollar. Late payments may be made beyond reporting period due to late paperwork and processing and reported as such. To dated, there are approximately 8,000,000 in loan assumption benefits that can be paid to eligible participants.

CONCLUSION

This report presents the success to date of the 2005-2006 APLE program. The Commission in collaboration with the participating institutions has issued 7,215 of the 8,000 loan assumption agreements which bring the cumulative total number of participants in the APLE to 56,192.

With continued collaboration efforts, the Commission and the institutions strive to successfully deliver the APLE program. In the 2005-2006 reporting period, the APLE program has continued to grow and develop and as a result, allocations are being met in a record number, as compared to previous academic periods. The Commission in partnership with the California State University Chancellor's Office has developed outreach efforts which successfully promote APLE program by providing APLE information and award availability. The Commission expects to see continued program growth and therefore meet allocation authority.

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

The success of the APLE program is further demonstrated by several similarly modeled programs now available to California students. These additional loan assumption programs include: the National Guard APLE (NG APLE), State Nursing APLE for Nursing Faculty (SNAPLE NF), and State Nursing APLE for Nurses in State Facilities (SNAPLE NSF). The APLE program has been so well accepted that as of reporting, there are several proposed bills under consideration which would create new APLE programs to benefit California.

The APLE has experienced growth in both the number of participants and the amount of loan assumption payments. Through the joint efforts of the Commission and the participating schools, 7,215 of the 8,000 loan assumption agreements were issued during the 2005-2006 academic year. The commitment of APLE participants to teach in shortage areas is of great benefit to the children of California and contributes directly to the State's commitment to improve K-12 education.

APPENDICES

PROGRAM PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS

FOR THE

2005-2006 YEAR

APPENDIX A

Number of Agreements At the University of California		
	Initial Applications Allocated	Total Agreements Granted
Berkeley	22	21
Davis	42	56
Irvine	49	53
Los Angeles	74	154
Riverside	44	44
San Diego	21	28
Santa Barbara	31	59
Santa Cruz	33	36
Sub-Total	316	461

Number of Agreements At the California State University		
	Initial Applications Allocated	Total Agreements Granted
Bakersfield	172	212
Channel Islands	29	56
Chico	126	156
Dominguez Hills	316	187
East Bay	144	77
Fresno	207	206
Fullerton	267	229
Humboldt	65	63
Long Beach	312	285
Los Angeles	353	108
Monterey	88	68
Northridge	319	226
Pomona	127	110
Sacramento	207	162
San Bernardino	272	362
San Diego	217	190
San Francisco	282	178
San Jose	169	67
San Luis Obispo	81	76
San Marcos	152	118
Sonoma	106	133
Stanislaus	154	146
Sub-Total	4,165	3,515



2005-2006 REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

Number of Agreements At the California Independent Institutions		
	Initial Applications Allocated	Total Agreements Granted
Argosy University, Orange	8	3
Alliant International University	18	20
Antioch University	6	14
Azusa Pacific University	201	568
Bethany Bible College	7	2
Biola University	21	16
California Baptist College	41	39
California Lutheran University	35	29
CalTEACH	0	8
Chapman College	437	409
Christian Heritage	11	0
Claremont Graduate School	33	103
Concordia University	32	19
Dominican College	40	47
Fresno Pacific College	37	98
Holy Names College	11	11
Hope International University	6	1
InterAmerican College	1	4
John F. Kennedy University	10	6
La Sierra University	6	0
Loyola Marymount University	54	45
Mills College	15	18
Mount St. Mary's College	17	16
National University	886	564
New College	6	23
Norte Dame de Namur	38	2
Occidental College	7	17
Pacific Oaks College	12	6
Pacific Union College	8	3
Patten College	7	6
Pepperdine University	69	72
Point Loma Nazarene	50	92
Saint Mary's College	39	29
San Diego Christian College	0	6
Santa Clara University	18	13
Simpson College	23	33
Stanford University	14	45
The Master's College	10	0
Touro University	2	13
The National Hispanic University	15	17
University of La Verne	88	150
University of Phoenix	4	184
University of Redlands	40	96
University of San Diego	23	11
University of San Francisco	31	36
University of Southern California	23	55
University of the Pacific	20	38
Vanguard University	13	14
Westmont College	4	1
Whittier College	22	6
Sub-Total	2,519	3,008
Out of State	500	66

Number of Agreements At the District Intern Programs		
	Initial Applications Allocated	Total Agreements Granted
Compton Unified School District	11	2
Long Beach Unified School	11	1
Los Angeles Unified School District	387	24
Ontario-Montclair School District	20	5
Orange County Dept. of Education	2	12
Project Impact	20	96
Project Pipeline	26	15
San Diego City School (BECA)	23	10
Sub-Total	500	165
Grand Total	8,000	7,215

APPENDIX B

2005-2006 Program Participants by Subject Shortage Area Or School Type, Educational Level, and Gender																
SUBJECT AREA	Junior		Senior		5th Year Undergraduate		Teacher Training Programs		District Intern Program		Internship Program		Out-of-State		Total Awards	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Mathematics	11	12	56	82	8	12	192	233	12	6	11	15	4	2	294	362
Music	0	3	6	9	1	0	19	12	1	0	2	1	0	0	29	25
Science	1	6	24	37	8	6	110	175	6	6	10	20	6	4	165	253
Special Education	7	27	65	223	13	33	241	731	20	36	12	48	2	3	360	1,101
Reading Specialist	0	3	2	11	0	1	13	29	1	0	1	1	1	0	18	45
English	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	15
Foreign Language	1	6	24	0	0	4	25	88	1	2	5	8	0	1	37	133
SCHOOL TYPE*																
Low-Income	20	88	110	503	32	86	393	1,619	6	24	21	58	13	19	595	2,397
Low-Performing	10	22	52	193	12	25	204	578	4	10	9	30	4	6	295	864
Rural Area	2	4	15	33	1	8	28	83	0	0	0	3	1	0	47	131
High Percentage of Emergency Permits	1	2	3	8	0	3	4	20	0	1	1	0	0	0	9	34
State Special School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	53	173	338	1,123	75	179	1,235	3,580	85	72	72	185	31	35	1,855	5,360

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

*School Types:

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX C

2005-2006 Program Participation by Subject Shortage Area or School Type and Ethnicity												
SUBJECT AREA	Asian		African-American		Latino		Caucasian		Other		No Response	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Mathematics	79	19.7	41	9.0	122	6.0	333	9.5	62	9.0	19	8.0
Music	7	1.7	0	0	13	1.0	27	0.8	6	1.0	1	0
Science	45	11.2	17	4.0	64	3.0	236	6.7	42	6.0	14	6.0
Special Education	0	0	1	0.	4	0	8	0.2	2	0	6	3.0
Reading Specialist	38	9.5	107	25.0	278	14.0	847	24.2	129	20.0	62	26.0
English	2	0.5	3	1.0	21	1.0	34	1.0	2	0	1	0
Foreign Language	3	0.7	2	0	111	6.0	32	0.9	17	3.0	5	2.0
SCHOOL TYPE*												
Low-Income	143	35.7	166	38.0	919	46.0	1,389	39.7	270	41.0	105	44.0
Low-Performing	80	2.0.	86	20.0	393	20.0	478	13.6	101	15.0	21	9.0
Rural Area	3	0.7	8	2.0	42	2.0	102	2.9	18	3.0	5	2.0
High Percentage of Emergency Permits	1	0.2	3	1.0	16	1.0	17	0.5	6	1.0	0	0
State Special School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	401	100	434	100	1,983	100	3,503	100	655	100	239	100

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

*School Types:

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX D

2005-2006 Program Participants By Subject Shortage Area or School Type and Age Group														
SUBJECT AREA	20 and under		21-25		26-30		31-35		36-40		41-45		46 and Older	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Mathematics	7	10.3	272	10.6	158	8.5	59	6.0	53	8.4	41	9.0	66	9.6
Music	0	0	31	1.2	9	0.5	7	1.0	0	0	3	1.0	4	0.6
Science	1	1.5	160	6.2	129	6.9	48	5.0	30	4.8	15	3.0	35	5.1
Special Education	1	1.5	4	0.21	6	0.3	4	0	3	0.5	1	0	2	0.3
Reading Specialist	3	4.4	259	10.1	365	19.6	222	24.0	177	28.1	161	34.0	274	39.8
English	1	1.5	13	0.5	23	1.2	7	1.0	6	1.0	4	1.0	9	1.3
Foreign Language	2	2.9	69	2.7	45	2.4	16	2.0	15	2.4	10	2.0	13	1.9
SCHOOL TYPE*														
Low-Income	41	60.3	1,226	47.6	771	41.4	380	41.0	233	37.0	156	33.0	185	26.9
Low-Performing	7	10.3	465	18.1	305	16.4	152	16.0	90	14.3	64	14.0	76	11.0
Rural Area	1	1.5	60	2.3	37	2.0	24	3.0	20	3.2	15	3.0	21	3.0
High Percentage of Emergency Permits	4	5.9	15	0.6	13	0.7	3	0	3	0.5	1	0	4	0.6
State Special School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	38	100	2,574	100	1,861	100	922	100	630	100	471	100	689	100

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

*School Types:

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX E

HISTORY OF ALLOCATIONS, AWARDS, LOAN ASSUMPTION PAYMENTS AND PROJECTED PAYMENTS						
Academic Year	Authorized Agreement Allocation	Number of Participants Awarded	Distributions Of Allocation	Local Assistance Paid	Number of Teachers Paid	Payments Made by Fiscal Year
1986-1987	500	436	All to Participating Colleges	\$0.00		1987-1988
1987-1988	500	500	All to Participating Colleges	\$313,977	162	1988-1989
1988-1989	500	500	All to Participating Colleges	\$853,709	379	1989-1990
1989-1990	500	500	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,280,693	573	1990-1991
1990-1991	500	500	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,558,256	664	1991-1992
1991-1992	500	500	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,571,627	662	1992-1993
1992-1993	500	424	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,610,286	660	1993-1994
1993-1994	400	400	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,607,366	661	1994-1995
1994-1995	400	400	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,611,971	654	1995-1996
1995-1996	400	400	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,678,859	742	1996-1997
1996-1997	400	400	All to Participating Colleges	\$1,898,786	749	1997-1998
1997-1998	400	400	All to Participating Colleges	\$2,121,353	830	1998-1999
1998-1999	4,500	3,805	Participating Institutions, 500-OS, 500-DI	\$2,113,856	798	1999-2000
1999-2000	5,500	5,485	Participating Institutions, 500-OS, 500-DI	\$4,994,065	2,172	2000-2001
2000-2001	6,500	7,500	Participating Institutions, 500-OS, 500-DI	\$11,603,484	4,460	2001-2002
2001-2002	6,500	6,487	Participating Institutions, 500-OS, 500-DI	\$19,401,877	6,974	2002-2003
2002-2003	7,500	7,500	Participating Institutions, 500-OS, 500-DI	\$26,944,291	9,587	2003-2004
2003-2004	7,700	7,432	Participating Institutions, 500-OS, 500-DI	\$33,958,896	11,616	2004-2005
2004-2005	7,500	6,648	Participating Institutions, 500-OS, 500-DI	\$36,017,306	12,091	2005-2006
2005-2006	8,000	7,215	Participating Institutions, 500-OS, 500-DI	\$35,472,912*	12,715*	2006-2007

*As of reporting period, April 1, 2007