AAQEP Annual Report for 2024

Provider/Program Name:	Manhattan University Teacher Education Programs
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or "n/a" if not yet accredited):	July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024

PART I: Publicly Available Program Performance and Candidate Achievement Data

1. Overview and Context

This overview describes the mission and context of the educator preparation provider and the programs included in its AAQEP review.

In the tradition of Saint John Baptist de La Salle, the "Patron of all Teachers," the University prepares dedicated professionals for careers in teaching and leadership. A strong liberal arts and sciences education emphasizes effective communication, critical thinking, scientific literacy, and multicultural awareness. Coursework and practical experiences in Education provide those skills necessary for work in a school setting. The University seeks to develop broadly educated teachers and leaders who possess the competencies necessary for certification in their area of study or for graduate study.

The Teacher Preparation Programs at Manhattan University simultaneously meet the requirement for excellence in the Liberal Arts and Sciences, academic concentrations, and pedagogy; as well as standards established by New York State for

teacher certification. The programs are designed to be consistent with the Lasallian tradition of excellence in teaching, respect for individual dignity, and commitment to social justice principles, on which the college was founded.

Public Posting URL

Part I of this report is posted at the following web address (accredited members filing this report must post at least Part I):

https://manhattan.edu/academics/schools-and-departments/kakos/education/accreditation.php

2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows current enrollment and recent completion data for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2023-2024

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution or organization	**State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential**	**Number of Candidates** enrolled in most recently completed academic year (7/23-6/24)	**Number of Completers** in most recently completed academic year (7/23-6/24)
Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials			
BA/BS Adolescent Education (ADED, ASDG, SPSE)	Initial Certification (Grades 7-12)	53	14
BA/BS Childhood Education (CHED, CHSP, SPCE)	Initial Certification (Grades 1-6)	85	18
BS Physical Education (PHED)	Initial Certification in Physical Education (Grades K-12)	44	11
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		182	43
Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators			
MS Education Students with Disabilities (CESP, CHSP, ASDG, SPED)	Professional Certification in Students with Disabilities	23	19

Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		23	19
Programs that lead to credentials for other school professionals or to no specific credential			
Total for additional programs		NA	NA
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs			
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers			

Added or Discontinued Programs

Any programs within the AAQEP review that have been added or discontinued within the past year are listed below. (This list is required only from providers with accredited programs.)

Paused the following programs (not accepting new students temporarily) – CESP, SPED, SPAD, & SPBG.

3. Program Performance Indicators

The program performance information in Table 2 applies to the academic year indicated in Table 1.

Table 2. Program Performance Indicators

A. **Total enrollment** in the educator preparation programs shown in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals earning more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.
203
B. **Total number of unique completers** (across all programs) included in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals who earned more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.
62
C. **Number of recommendations** for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.
62

D. **Cohort completion rates** for candidates who completed the various programs within their respective program's expected timeframe **and** in 1.5 times the expected timeframe.

100%

E. **Summary of state license examination results**, including teacher performance assessments, and specification of any examinations on which the pass rate (cumulative at time of reporting) was below 80%.

Test Number	Test Name	Total Attempts	Total Passed	Pass Rate
201	EAS - Educating All Students	50	49	98.0%
161	CST Chemistry	0	0	
003	CST English	6	6	100.0%
004	CST Math*	3	1	33.3%
221	CST Multi-Subject Childhood 1-6 Part 1	23	22	95.6%
222	CST Multi-Subject Childhood 1-6 Part 2	29	26	89.6%
245	CST Multi-Subject Childhood 1-6 Part 3	29	27	93.1%
241	CST Multi-Subject Secondary 7-12 Part 1	4	4	100.0%
244	CST Multi-Subject Secondary 7-12 Part 2	3	3	100.0%
076	CST Physical Education	12	12	100.0%
115	CST Social Studies	5	5	100.0%
129	CST Spanish	1	1	100.0%
060	CST Students with Disabilities**	25	23	92.0%

*One student who failed was a Manhattan University student but not in the Teacher Preparation Program. The Education Department did not recommend the non-education student take the exam.
** One of the students who did not pass this test graduated in 2020 and was retaking the exam.

F. Narrative explanation of **evidence available from program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

Evidence available from program completers include the academic transcript that demonstrates completion of all credit

requirements for the state approved teacher education programs. Thus, a total of 62 students completed a teacher education program and were recommended for teacher certification.

The Benchworks by Elentra (formerly Skyfactor) Alumni survey was distributed to all graduates from 2019 to 2024. Due to cost the survey will be distributed every other year moving forward. Key insights from the survey include that the program appears to excel in academic rigor and providing challenging, motivating experiences for the students. On a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Not at all to 7 = Extremely, with intermediate values (2-6) representing increasingly positive or intense responses, 74.4% of respondents gave highly positive ratings of 6 or 7 for overall program satisfaction (M=6.03, n = 39). Category-Level and Gap Analysis identified multiple areas in need of improvement by comparing how important the respondents deem specific skills and how well they believe the program prepared them in the skills. The areas of Assessment and Lesson Planning were well aligned between importance and preparation. Classroom Management stood out as a critical area in need of improvement as there was a high consensus on importance and lower satisfaction with preparation. The area of Professional Relationships, which includes building relationships with families/guardians of students, stood out as a critical area in need of improvement.

The Competency Analysis results are summarized in the table below.

Competency Analysis Results

Competency	Gap	Importance Mean (% High, N)	Preparation Mean (% High, N)
Classroom Management	+0.968	6.76 (94.2%, n=39)	5.79 (70.5%, n=39)
Professional Relationships	+0.694	6.40 (87.2%, n=39)	5.71 (62.6%, n=38)
Diversity	+0.384	6.64 (94.9%, n=39)	6.26 (79.9%, n=39)
Instruction	+0.283	6.26 (80.5%, n=39)	5.98 (71.6%, n=39)
Lesson Planning	+0.133	6.43 (83.1%, n=39)	6.29 (83.1%, n=39)
Assessment	+0.090	6.22 (76.1%, n=39)	6.13 (78.7%, n=39)
Professional Development	-0.088	6.30 (80%, n=39)	6.39 (85.8%, n=37)
Technology	-0.426	5.45 (54.7%, n=39)	5.88 (69%, n=39)
Content	-0.525	5.67 (58.7%, n=39)	6.20 (79.5%, n=39)
Averages	**0.168**	**6.24**	**6.07**

Note: High scores represent the percentage of responses rated 6 or 7 on a 7-point scale.

G. Narrative explanation of **evidence available from employers of program completers**, with a characterization of findings.
The Benchworks by Elentra (formerly Skyfactor) Alumni survey was distributed and the plan is to survey employers of program completers during the 2024-2025 academic year. The new Kakos School of Arts and Sciences revamped our Board of Consultors consisting of professionals in the field to give us feedback about our programs, our graduates, and trends in the larger profession and society. The Board of Consultors meets with the Dean and faculty twice a year and we receive feedback but our intent is to formalize this feedback through a survey of employers of program completers.
H. Narrative explanation of how the program investigates **employment rates for program completers**, with a characterization of findings. This section may also indicate rates of completers' ongoing education, e.g., graduate study.
The Office of Institutional Research, Center for Graduate School and Fellowship Advisement, and the Center for Career Development work together each year to administer the Graduate Student Survey (GSS) which is given to graduating students as part of their graduation checklist. Nine months later, the graduates are sent a follow-up survey both electronically as well as by phone regarding their employment or graduate school status. The GSS collects information such as graduate school plans and employment status. Data showed that upon graduation of the May 2023 class within the education majors, 90% either had employment or were accepted in graduate school while 10% were still seeking opportunities. (https://manhattan.edu/about/career-outcomes.php)

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

Tables 3 and 4 report on select measures of candidate/completer performance related to AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, including the program's expectations for successful performance and indicators of the degree to which those expectations are met.

Table 3. Expectations and Performance on Standard 1: Candidate and Completer Performance

To meet their target goal of certification, completers must pass the required state examinations. Manhattan University Teacher Prep faculty have chosen the two required state exams as a measure of knowledge and the Evaluation of Student Teaching as direct observation of student teaching performance.

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
1. Educating All Students (EAS) ● ADED ● CHED ● PHED ● CHSP	The performance expectation of the EAS is a minimum score of 520. Candidates in Adolescence Education, Childhood Education, Physical Education, and Special Education take the EAS exam that includes measures of knowledge and competencies aligned with Standard One: Aspect C 1. Diverse student population 2. English language learners 3. Students with disabilities Aspect E 4. Teacher responsibilities Aspect F 5. School-home relationships	<table><tr><td>Test Number</td><td>Test Name</td><td>Total Attempts</td><td>Total Passed</td><td>Pass Rate</td></tr><tr><td>201</td><td>EAS – Educating All Students</td><td>50</td><td>49</td><td>98%</td></tr></table>
2. Content Specialty Test (CST) ● ADED ● CHED ● PHED ● SPED	The Content Specialty tests examine completer professional knowledge. The Performance Expectation on the Content Specialty Test is 520. The safety net during COVID was 500. Candidates in Adolescence Education, Childhood Education, Physical Education, and Special Education take the CSTs that include measures of competencies aligned with Standard One: Aspect A 6. Professional Knowledge 7. Content Knowledge 8. Pedagogical Knowledge	<table><tr><td>Test Number</td><td>Test Name</td><td>Total Attempts</td><td>Total Passed</td><td>Pass Rate</td></tr><tr><td>201</td><td>EAS - Educating All Students</td><td>50</td><td>49</td><td>98.0%</td></tr><tr><td>161</td><td>CST Chemistry</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>003</td><td>CST English</td><td>6</td><td>6</td><td>100.0%</td></tr><tr><td>004</td><td>CST Math</td><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>33.3%</td></tr><tr><td>221</td><td>CST Multi-Subject Childhood 1-6 Part 1</td><td>23</td><td>22</td><td>95.6%</td></tr></table>

Aspect B 9. Application of Learning Theory Aspect D 10. Use of Data	222	CST Multi-Subject Childhood 1-6 Part 2	29	26	89.6%
	245	CST Multi-Subject Childhood 1-6 Part 3	29	27	93.1%
	241	CST Multi-Subject Secondary 7-12 Part 1	4	4	100.0%
	244	CST Multi-Subject Secondary 7-12 Part 2	3	3	100.0%
	076	CST Physical Education	12	12	100.0%
	115	CST Social Studies	5	5	100.0%
	129	CST Spanish	1	1	100.0%
	060	CST Students with Disabilities * One student who failed was not in the Teacher Preparation Program; unclear why she took the exam.	25	23*	92.0%

| 3. Student Teaching Survey | The Physical Education Student Teaching Survey is completed at the end of each placement by the Student Teacher, Cooperating Teacher, and College Supervisor.

As stated in the QAR, it is our expectation that for the program, the mean scores will meet or surpass a 3.2 or 80% on each of the questions to evidence success with the corresponding aspects of this standard. | **Standard 1 Aspect a**
Content, pedagogical, and/or Professional Knowledge Relevant to the Credential or Degree for Which They Are Prepared

Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2023-2024
Subject Matter Question 1
Presented content using research-based pedagogy and demonstrated depth and breadth of subject matter
Physical Education (*n = 33*)   M=3.45
Subject Matter Question 2
Integrated subject matter knowledge in lesson plans and curriculum development |

		Physical Education ($n = 33$) M=3.54 Subject Matter Question 3 *Demonstrated knowledge of content and the structure of the discipline* Physical Education ($n = 33$) M=3.54 **Standard 1 Aspect b** *Learners, learning theory including social, emotional, and academic dimensions, and application of learning theory* **Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2023-2024** Pedagogy Question 1 *Used knowledge of child and/or adolescent development to create appropriate differentiated instruction.* Physical Education ($n = 33$) M=3.57 Teaching Skills Question 1 *Planned and implemented learning activities based on learners' individual cognitive, language, social, emotional and physical developmental levels.* Physical Education ($n = 33$) M=3.51 **Standard 1 Aspect 1c** *Culturally responsive practice, including intersectionality of race, ethnicity, class, gender identity and expression, sexual identity, and the impact of language acquisition and literacy development on learning* **Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2023-2024** Caring Question 2 *Differentiated instruction based on diverse backgrounds* Physical Education ($n = 33$) M=3.72 Caring Question 3

		Created an inclusive and mutually respectful, safe, and supportive learning environment Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.90 Pedagogy Question 2 *Use a variety of strategies designed to differentiate instruction* Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.57 Pedagogy Question 3 *Managed and adapted the learning environment to meet the needs of diverse students* Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.48 **Standard 1 Aspect 1d** *Assessment of/for learning; assessment and data literacy; use of data to inform practice; formative assessment* **Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2023-2024** Teaching Skills Question 3 *Analyzed and utilized formative and summative assessment data to monitor instructional effectiveness and student learning.* Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.54 Teaching Skills Question 6 *Used discussion and questioning techniques to provide timely feedback.* Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.45 **Standard 1 Aspect 1e** *Creation and development of positive learning and work environments* **Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2023-2024** Teaching Skills Question 4

		Created an intellectually challenging and stimulating learning environment that resulted in student participation, cooperation, and learning. Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.45 Caring Question 3 *Created an inclusive, mutually respectful, safe, and supportive learning environment.* Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.90 Caring Question 5 *Fostered student interactions among all students.* Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.78 **Standard 1 Aspect 1f** *Dispositions and behaviors required for successful professional practice* **Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2023-2024** Professionalism Question 1 *Was responsible (attendance, punctuality, preparation, and professional dress).* Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.87 Professionalism Question 2 *Used appropriate language (vocabulary, inflection, and intonation).* Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.87 Professionalism Question 3 *Followed policies and ethical and legal procedures of the placement.* Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.96 Professionalism Question 5 *Reflected on and acted on constructive feedback from others.* Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.81 Professionalism Question 6 *Expanded knowledge of current research as it applies to curriculum, instruction, and assessment methods.*

		Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.63
		Note: The Student Teacher Survey uses a 0 to 4 point scale where 0 = Not Evident and 4 = Distinguished. Respondents include the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and college supervisor.
Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST)	Although we did not report these data in our Quality Assurance Report, we have data from the CPAST for the undergraduate Childhood and Adolescent preservice teachers. The CPAST was developed and validated through the Valid and Reliable Instruments for Educator Preparation Programs (VARI-EPP) Collaboration (Kaplan et al., 2017). College supervisors are required to complete training on the evaluation protocol and the instrument's use to ensure reliability. Our expectation is that the average consensus score at the end of student teaching is at least a 2 on every item (*0 = Does Not Meet Expectations, 1 = Emerging, 2 = Meets Expectations, 3 = Exceeds Expectations*).	**Standard 1 Aspect a** The Pedagogy Domain of the CPAST is made up of 13 items measuring Planning for Instruction and Assessment, Instructional Delivery, Assessment, and Analysis of Teaching. The Pedagogy domain means from midterm and end of placement CPAST 3-way evaluation meetings are reported in this table along with state and national comparisons. The midterm domain mean was 1.92 and the final domain mean was 2.35. **Standard 1 Aspect b** Item M, "Connections to Research and Theory" captures part of Aspect 2b. The final average across both terms was 2.17. Means, comparison scores, and score distributions for Item M can be viewed here in the Assessment and Analysis of Teaching table and chart. **Standard 1 Aspect c** Item C, "Assessment of Learning" which requires candidates to plan assessments that "*are culturally relevant and draw from learners' funds of knowledge*" captures part of Aspect 1c. The final average across both terms was 2.10. Item D, "Differentiated Methods" requires candidates to "*make culturally relevant connections.*" The final average across both terms was 2.17. Means, comparison scores, and score distributions for Items C and D can be viewed here in the Planning for Instruction and Assessment table and chart. **Standard 1 Aspect d** Item J, "Data-Guided Instruction," Item K, "Feedback to Learners," and Item L, "Assessment Techniques" capture Aspect 1d. The end of term average for Item J across both terms was 1.97. Though this did not reach 2, the midterm average had been 1.57 showing growth. The end of term average for Item K was 2.37 and for Item L was 2.20. Means,

		comparison scores, and score distributions for these Items can be viewed here in the Assessment and Analysis of Teaching table and chart. **Standard 1 Aspect e** Item I, "Safe & Respectful Learning Environment" captures Aspect 1e. The average across both terms was 2.83. Means, comparison scores, and score distributions for Item I can be viewed here within the Instructional Delivery table and chart. **Standard 1 Aspect f** The Dispositions Domain of the CPAST is made up of 8 items measuring Professional Commitment and Behaviors, Professional Relationships, and Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice. The Disposition domain means from midterm and end of placement CPAST 3-way evaluation meetings are reported in this table along with state and national comparisons. The midterm domain mean was 2.18 and the final domain mean was 2.63.

Table 4. Expectations and Performance on Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
EAS	A passing score on the Educating All Students exam is 520, and teacher candidates must pass this exam to become certified in New York State. The EAS scores ranging from July 1, 2023- June 30, 2024 are presented in this table. Because of the topics presented on this certification exam, the pass rate benchmark of 80% serves as one indication that program completers in Childhood Education, Adolescence Education, Childhood Special Education (Five-year),Adolescent Education (Five-year), Physical	<table><tr><td>Test Number</td><td>Test Name</td><td>Total Attempts</td><td>Total Passed</td><td>Pass Rate</td></tr><tr><td>201</td><td>EAS – Educating All Students</td><td>50</td><td>49</td><td>98%</td></tr></table>

	Education, and Graduate Special Education are prepared to support the learning and language needs of diverse student populations, demonstrating that they have the knowledge to "understand and engage local school and cultural communities, and communicate and foster relationships with families/guardians/caregivers in a variety of communities" upon entering the profession.	
Student Teaching Survey (PHED)	The Physical Education Student Teaching Survey is completed at the end of each placement by the Student Teacher, Cooperating Teacher, and College Supervisor. As stated in the QAR, it is our expectation that for the program, the mean scores will meet or surpass a 3.2 or 80% on each of the questions to evidence success with the corresponding aspects of this standard.	**Standard 2 Aspect a** *Understand and engage local school and cultural communities, and communicate and foster relationships with families/guardians/caregivers in a variety of communities* **Standard 2 Aspect f** *Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning* **Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2023-2024** Professionalism Question 4 *Took initiative and developed collaborative relationships with all school personnel.* Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.60 **Standard 2 Aspect b** *Engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners and do so in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts.* **Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2023-2024** Caring Question 2 *Differentiated instruction based on diverse backgrounds.* Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.72 Pedagogy Question 3 *Managed and adapted the learning environment to meet the needs of diverse students.* Physical Education (*n = 33*) M=3.48

		Standard 2 Aspect c *Create productive learning environments and use strategies to develop productive learning environments in a variety of school contexts.* **Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2023-2024** Teaching Skills Question 4 *Created an intellectually challenging and stimulating learning environment that resulted in student participation, cooperation, and learning.* Physical Education (*n = 33*)　　M=3.45 Caring Question 3 *Created an inclusive, mutually respectful, safe, and supportive learning environment.* Physical Education (*n = 33*)　　M=3.90 Caring Question 5 *Fostered student interactions among all students.* Physical Education (*n = 33*)　　M=3.78 Technology Question 1 *Used technology to enhance teaching and learning.* Physical Education (*n = 33*)　　M=3.27 **Standard 2 Aspect e** *Establish goals for their own professional growth and engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection* **Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2023-2024** Professionalism Question 2 *Reflected on and acted on constructive feedback from others.* Physical Education (*n = 33*)　　M=3.81 Professionalism Question 6 *Expanded knowledge of current research as it applies to curriculum, instruction, and assessment methods.* Physical Education (*n = 33*)　　M=3.63

		Note: The Student Teacher Survey uses a 0 to 4-point scale where 0 = Not Evident and 4 = Distinguished. Respondents include the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and college supervisor.
Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST)	Although we did not report these data in our Quality Assurance Report, we have data from the CPAST for the undergraduate Childhood and Adolescent preservice teachers. The CPAST was developed and validated through the Valid and Reliable Instruments for Educator Preparation Programs (VARI-EPP) Collaboration (Kaplan et al., 2017). College supervisors are required to complete training on the evaluation protocol and the instrument's use to ensure reliability. Our expectation is that the average consensus score at the end of student teaching is at least a 2 on every item (*0 = Does Not Meet Expectations, 1 = Emerging, 2 = Meets Expectations, 3 = Exceeds Expectations*).	Domain means from midterm and end of placement CPAST 3-way evaluation meetings are reported in this table along with state and national comparisons. Because this measure was not described in the QAR, further description of items relevant to AAQEP Standard 2 are described below. **Standard 2 Aspect a** Item O, "Demonstrates Effective Communication with Parents or Legal Guardians" captures part of Aspect 2a, "engage local school and cultural communities, and communicate and foster relationships with families/ guardians/ caregivers in a variety of communities." The average across both terms was 1.83. Means, comparison scores, and score distributions for Item O can be viewed here in the Professional Commitment & Behaviors table and chart. **Standard 2 Aspect b** Items C, "Assessment of P-12 Learning" and D "Differentiated Methods" require culturally relevant practices to meet expectations, shedding light on Aspect 2b, engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners and do so in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts." The average across both terms was 2.10 for Item C and 2.17 for Item D. Additionally, Item T includes advocacy for equitable opportunities, adequate resources, and the cultural needs of learners in the item description. The average across both terms was 2.23. Means, comparison scores, and score distributions for Items C and D can be viewed here in the Planning for Instruction and Assessment table and chart, and for Item T here in the Professional Relationships, Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice table and chart. **Standard 2 Aspect c**

		Items A-M in the Pedagogy Domain capture Aspect 2c, "create productive learning environments and use strategies to develop productive learning environments in a variety of school contexts." The average score for the Pedagogy Domain across both terms was 2.36..Of the 13 pedagogy items, Item I, "Safe & Respectful Learning Environment" is the most proximal measure of Aspect 2c. The average across both terms was 2.83. The Pedagogy Domain mean can be viewed here with national and state comparisons. Means, comparison scores, and score distributions for Item I can be viewed here within the Instructional Delivery table and chart. **Standard 2 Aspect e** Items N, "Participates in Professional Development" and U, "Responds Positively to Constructive Criticism" shed light on Aspect 2e, "establish goals for their own professional growth and engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection." The average across both terms was 2.47 for Item N and 2.93 for Item U. Means, comparison scores, and score distributions for Item N can be viewed here within the Professional Commitment and Behaviors table and chart and for Item U here in the Professional Relationships, Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice table and chart. **Standard 2 Aspect f** Item S, "Collaboration" directly captures Aspect 2f, "collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning." The average across both terms was 2.77. Means, comparison scores, and score distributions for Item S can be viewed here in the Professional Relationships, Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice table and chart.
Teacher Performance Assessment-TPA (PHED)	During the 2022–2023 academic year, the Physical Education Teacher Program piloted the internal Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA), which the New York State Education Department officially approved in May 2023. Twelve students completed the TPA as part of their student teaching experience, with a	Ten out of twelve teacher candidates achieved the expected passing score of 36 out of 45 points (80%) or a 2.4 or higher on a 3-point rubric in the planning, instruction, and assessment tasks of the TPA performance-based assessment.

department faculty member scoring their performance using a modified rubric adapted from the national edTPA. The TPA consists of three core tasks: • Task 1 evaluates candidates' planning skills. • Task 2 measures instructional skills. • Task 3 assesses student learning and candidates' ability to use assessment effectively in the classroom. To meet program expectations, candidates are required to achieve a passing score of **36 out of 45 points (80%)**, or an average of **2.4 or higher** on a 3-point rubric across the planning, instruction, and assessment components of the TPA.		

2.4 or better using a 3 point rubric

Candidates	Task 1 Planning	Task 2 Instruction	Task 3 Assessment	Overall average score
N = 12	2.78	2.63	2.42	2.63

Overall average point score: 40 points (88%)

Teacher Performance Assessment-TPA (CHED & ADOL)

During AY 2023-2024, the education department piloted the new internal Teacher Performance Assessment which was approved by NY State Education Department as a replacement for the edTPA. Of the 31 candidates completing the TPA during their student teaching placement, 30 candidates received passing scores across the Planning, Teaching, and Assessment tasks. The final candidate repeated his student teaching

		placement Fall 2024. See commentary in section 5 below regarding the revision of the TPA for CHED and ADOL.

5. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

This section describes program accomplishments, efforts, and innovations (strengths and outcomes) to address challenges and priorities over the past year.

Along with the restructuring of the college's six schools into three, President Riverso paused or closed multiple programs across the college. The pause of the School Building Leadership program impacted the initial plan to utilize graduate students in the program as objective scorers for the internal TPA in the Childhood and Adolescence Education programs. The number of full time faculty was also reduced making scoring the TPAs and achieving inter-rater reliability a challenge. In June 2024, AAQEP held a conversation webinar for teacher preparation programs across New York to discuss their success and challenges with their new Teacher Performance Assessments. During this discussion, we heard from other programs who moved away from a "snapshot" TPA to a more holistic portfolio. In response, the Education Department developed a new online portfolio with multiple assignments aligned with the CPAST rubric as it is already used as part of the evaluation cycle during student teaching. The portfolio houses evidence for each of the 21 indicators across the Pedagogy and Disposition Domains. The CPAST aligned Student Teaching Portfolio is awaiting approval as the replacement for the edTPA.

The Education department is redesigning the secondary education program to more effectively recruit students. The major innovation consists of enrolling first-year students as majors in a content area, and then having them choose a "teacher track" by the end of their sophomore year. For Biology, Chemistry, and Physics, students will switch their major to Adolescence Education- with the subject area concentration. For English, History, Spanish, and Mathematics, students will declare a double major in Adolescence Education and the subject area major. The Education department has worked with the chairs of the other departments to create new 4-yr plans for the various programs of study. We hope this redesign will recruit more students into secondary education who enter college with an interest in a subject area but who were not previously planning to study education. The new programs of study are currently undergoing review by school and university curriculum committees prior to registering the changes with NYSED.

To address the weakness in classroom management preparation indicated in the survey of alumni, education faculty met with a Behavior (Systems Change) Specialist from the NYC DOE Special Education Office's Division of Specialized Instruction

and Student Support to rework the syllabus and assignments in the course, "Classroom & Instructional Management for Diverse Learners" taken by all ADOL, CHED, and PHED students.

Part II: Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth

AAQEP does not require public posting of the information in Part II, but programs **may** post it at their discretion.

6. Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth and Improvement

This section charts ongoing improvement processes in relation to each AAQEP standard. Note that providers may focus their work on an aspect of one or two standards each year, with only brief entries regarding ongoing efforts for those standards that are not the focus in the current year.

Table 5. Provider Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement

	Standard 1
Goals for the 2024-25 year	1. Review TPA and portfolio procedures 2. Replace Educator Disposition Assessment (EDA) 3. Replace PHED student teacher evaluation tool
Actions	Develop sustainable processes given current resources. Use data from new EDA assessment to drive intervention planning and delivery for students Identify an appropriate PHED student teacher evaluation tool that is more helpful for student candidate assessment
Expected outcomes	Streamlined TPA and portfolio process that demonstrates student performance at least 80% meeting expectations Identify students earlier in program that need additional support
Reflections or comments	
	Standard 2
Goals for the 2024-25 year	Review curriculum in all teacher preparation programs and identify DEI elements Identify socioeconomic/diversity variables within the schools that students are completing their 100 hours of observation pre-student teaching

Actions	Solidifying that students are gaining the content knowledge to be successful on the EAS but more importantly in the classrooms they will teach. Data analysis to assure our students are gaining experience with diverse students and schools
Expected outcomes	Students with these experiences and content knowledge will be better prepared as will be demonstrated on student teacher evaluations
Reflections or comments	
	Standard 3
Goals for the 2024-25 year	Reflect on program completer survey and address areas for improvement Establish data repository from Google to Microsoft as University is making a change
Actions	Faculty review and take action to address areas identified by program completers Work with institutional research and technology support to realize this goal
Expected outcomes	Continual program improvement through addressing areas Streamline process to deposit, analyze, and reflect on data from teacher education programs
Reflections or comments	
	Standard 4
Goals for the 2024-25 year	1.Partner with District 10 for recruitment efforts
Actions	Host NYC District 10 principals on campus for a professional development day
Expected outcomes	Intentional efforts to recruit a diverse education majors student body at the university.
Reflections or comments	

7. Evidence Related to AAQEP-Identified Concerns or Conditions

This section documents how concerns or conditions that were noted in an accreditation decision are being addressed (indicate "n/a" if no concerns or conditions were noted). Note that where a condition has been noted, a more detailed focused report will be needed in addition to the description included here. Please contact staff with any questions regarding this section.

n/a

8. Anticipated Growth and Development

This section summarizes planned improvements, innovations, or anticipated new program developments, including description of any identified potential challenges or barriers.

The Education Department is currently conducting a search for a new faculty member and department chair.

As previously described in section 5, the Education department is redesigning the secondary education program to more effectively recruit students.

A new 5-yr accelerated masters in special education and literacy for students majoring in Childhood Education was developed and will undergo curriculum review at the college and state level. A separate masters in special education and literacy for students majoring in Adolescence Education was developed and undergo curriculum review at the college and state level. Both masters programs will align with the NYS PK-12 certifications for Teaching Students with Disabilities and Literacy.

Revisions to the Early Childhood and Middle School certification extensions were drafted in response to university restrictions on low-enrolled courses.

This academic year (2024-2025), the Education and Physical Education Departments started the implementation of the Bradley-Isaac Assessment of Pre-Service (BIAPS) into our education and physical education courses. This assessment is designed to provide a comprehensive evaluation of pre-service professionals, focusing on their preparedness, skill development, and alignment with organizational standards. In the next annual report, we expect to share initial findings and insights derived from the BIAPS.

9. Regulatory Changes

This section notes new or anticipated regulatory requirements and the provider's response to those changes (indicate "n/a" if no changes have been made or are anticipated).

NYSED is phasing out current certifications for new all-grade certifications in Literacy (2026) and Special Education (2029). A new 5-yr accelerated masters in special education and literacy for students majoring in Childhood Education was developed and will undergo curriculum review at the college and state level. A separate masters in special education and literacy for students majoring in Adolescence Education was developed and undergo curriculum review at the college and state level. Both masters programs will align with the NYS PK-12 certifications for Teaching Students with Disabilities and Literacy.

10. Sign Off

Provider's Primary Contact for AAQEP (Name, Title)	Dean/Lead Administrator (Name, Title)
Shawn Ladda, Professor & Chair of the Dept of Kinesiology	Marcy Kelly, Dean, Kakos School of Arts & Science

Date sent to AAQEP:	12/19/2024