



1. AAQEP Annual Report for 2025

Provider/Program Name:	Manhattan University Teacher Education Programs
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or "n/a" if not yet accredited):	July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025

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>

2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows current enrollment and recent completion data, disaggregated by program and license/certificate, for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2024-2025

Degree or Program offered by the institution/organization	Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential granted by the state	Number of Candidates Enrolled in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 06/25)	Number of Completers in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 06/25)
<i>Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials</i>			
Bachelor of Arts in Adolescent English (ADED)	Initial Certification: English Grades 7-12	9	3
Bachelor of Arts in Adolescent Social Studies (ADED)	Initial Certification: Social Studies Grades 7-12	3	0
Bachelor of Arts in Adolescent Spanish (ADED)	Initial Certification: Spanish Grades 7-12	1	1
Bachelor of Arts in Adolescent Mathematics (ADED)	Initial Certification: Mathematics Grades 7-12	5	1
Bachelor of Arts in Adolescent Biology (ADED)	Initial Certification: Biology Grades 7-12	2	0

Bachelor of Arts in Adolescent Physics (ADED)	Initial Certification: Physics Grades 7-12	3	1
Bachelor of Arts in Dual Adolescence/Students with Disabilities Math (SPSE)	Dual Initial Certification: Adolescence Math and Students with Disabilities 7-12	3	0
Bachelor of Science in Physical Education (PHED)	Initial Certification in Physical Education K-12	32	6
Bachelor of Science in Childhood Education (CHED)	Initial Certification Grades 1-6	46	8
Bachelor of Science in Dual Childhood/Students with Disabilities (SPCE)	Dual Initial Certification in Childhood and Students with Disabilities 1-6	15	1
Bachelor of Science/Master of Science in Education Childhood/Students with Disabilities 5 Year (CHSP)	Dual Initial Certification in Childhood and Students with Disabilities 1-6	(BA) 8	(BA) 6
		(MSED) 12	(MSED) 10
Bachelor of Science/Master of Science in Education Adolescence/Students with Disabilities Generalist 7-12 Ext. English or Social Studies or Math 5 Year Program (ASDG)	Initial Certification Students with Disabilities Generalist with Ext. English or Math or Social Students 7-12	(BA) 6	(BA) 6
		(MSED) 2	(MSED) 1
Master of Science in Dual Childhood/Students with Disabilities (CESP)	Dual Initial Certifications in Childhood and Students with Disabilities Grades 1-6	2	2
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		150	46
<i>Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators</i>			
MS Education Students with Disabilities (CESP, CHSP, ADG, SPED)	Professional Certification in Students with Disabilities	14	11

Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		14	11
<i>Programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials</i>			
x	x	x	x
Total for programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials		0	0
<i>Programs that lead to credentials for specialized professionals or to no specific credential</i>			
Total for programs that lead to specialized professional or no specific credentials		n/a	n/a
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs			
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers		150	46

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.)

Manhattan University no longer offers a School Building Leadership certificate program. That program has been closed as of 2024.

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.
150

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.				
46				
C. Number of recommendations for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.				
33				
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	44	40	90.1%
003	CST English	6	3	50% *
004	CST Math	5	3	60%
221	CST Multi Subject Childhood 1-6 Part 1	21	19	90.5%
222	CST Multi Subject Childhood 1-6 Part 2	21	19	90.5%
245	CST Multi Subject Childhood 1-6 Part 3	15	15	100%
241	CST Multi Subject Secondary 7-12 Part 1	1	1	100%
244	CST Multi Subject Secondary 7-12 Part 2	2	2	100%
076	Physical Education	4	4	100%
115	CST Social Studies	2	2	100%
129	CST Spanish	1	1	100%
060	CST Students with Disabilities	17	16	94.1%
192	CST Phys Ed	1	1	100%

*1 test was taken by a 2014 graduate, 1 by a 2020 graduate, and 1 graduate failed during this time period but subsequently passed in September 2025.

F. 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 46 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 is distributed every other year, which means that this year we are still working through the information which we gleaned from the 2024 survey. Key insights from that 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	Preparation
		Mean (% High, N)	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)
Average	-0.160	6.24	6.07

G. Explanation of **evidence available from employers of program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

Due to budget constriction, we were unable to survey employers of program completers during the 2024-2025 academic year. However, we have received approval to send out the employer survey in the spring of 2026 and will have data from that survey available for our review during summer 2026.

The Kakos School of Arts and Sciences recently revamped its Board of Consultors consisting of professionals in the field poised to give feedback about University 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 offers feedback to relevant stakeholders. However, as K-12 schooling is a particularly singular professional field, the department of Education intends to develop our own consultors group from among school leaders and teachers in the local context to solicit qualitative feedback for the continuous improvement of our programs to be examined alongside the quantitative feedback obtained from surveys.

H. 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. For the 2024 graduating class, data from completers of our programs showed the following outcomes:

- **Adolescent Education:** 77% employed, 8% graduate school (n=13)
- **Childhood Education:** 60% employed, 20% graduate school (n=5)
- **Childhood & Special Education:** 18% employed, 82% graduate school (n=11)
- **Physical Education:** 33% employed, 58% graduate school (n=12)

I. Explanation of how the **staffing capacity** for program delivery and administration and quality assurance system monitoring have changed during the reporting year, if at all, and how capacity matches the current size of the program.

The department of Education has been operating at reduced faculty capacity since 2023, necessitating thoughtful adjustments to course offerings, including combining some courses, where prudent, to allow adolescent and childhood teacher candidates to take classes together under one instructor.

The creation of the role of Director, of Clinical Placements, staffed by a full time faculty member, has created a foundation of consistency, clarity, and centralized record keeping for all field placement requirements, centralizing communication with and feedback from partner schools and providing timely reminders and updates for students regarding their required hours and progress towards them.

Having hired a new Chair of the Education department for the fall 2025 semester, the department is in position to pivot from maintaining equilibrium into expanding capacity in the academic year to come.

A tenure track line for a faculty member specializing in Special Education has been approved for 2026-2027 and the search will take place in early 2026.

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

Tables 3 and 4 report on select measures (3 to 5 measures for each standard) of candidate/completer performance related to AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, including the program's expectations for performance (criteria for success) and indicators of the degree to which those expectations are met.

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

Provider-selected measures (name and description)	Criteria for success	Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation				
		Test Num ber	Test Name	Total Attemp ts	Total Passe d	Pass Rate
Educating All Students (EAS) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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:					

	<p>Aspect C</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Diverse student population 2. English language learners 3. Students with disabilities <p>Aspect E</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Teacher responsibilities <p>Aspect F</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. School-home relationships 	201	Educating all Students	44	40	90.1%																				
Content Specialty Test (CST) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADED • CHED • PHED • SPED 	<p>The Content Specialty tests examine complete 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:</p> <p>Aspect A</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Professional Knowledge 7. Content Knowledge 8. Pedagogical Knowledge <p>Aspect B</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Application of Learning Theory <p>Aspect D</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Use of Data 	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Test #</th> <th>Name</th> <th>Attempts</th> <th>Passed</th> <th>Pass Rate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>003</td> <td>CST English</td> <td>6</td> <td>3</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>044</td> <td>CST Math</td> <td>5</td> <td>3</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>216</td> <td>CST Multi-Subject Childhood 1-6 Part 1</td> <td>21</td> <td>19</td> <td>90.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Test #	Name	Attempts	Passed	Pass Rate	003	CST English	6	3	50%	044	CST Math	5	3	60%	216	CST Multi-Subject Childhood 1-6 Part 1	21	19	90.5%				
Test #	Name	Attempts	Passed	Pass Rate																						
003	CST English	6	3	50%																						
044	CST Math	5	3	60%																						
216	CST Multi-Subject Childhood 1-6 Part 1	21	19	90.5%																						

		2 CST 2 Multi 2 Subje ct Childh ood 1- 6 Part 2	21	19	90.5%	
		2 CST 4 Multi 5 Subje ct Childh ood 1- 6 Part 3	15	15	100%	
		2 CST 4 Multi 1 Subje ct Secon dary 7-12 Part 1	1	1	100%	
		2 CST 4 Multi 4 Subje ct Secon dary 7-12 Part 2	2	2	100%	
		0 CST	4	4	100%	

		7 6 Physical Educa tion				
	1 1 5 CST Social Studie s	2		2	100%	
	1 2 9 CST Spani sh	1		1	100%	
	0 6 0 CST Stude nts with Disabi lities	17		16	94.1%	
	1 9 2 CST Phys Ed	1		1	100%	
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	<p>Standard 1 Aspect a Content, pedagogical, and/or Professional Knowledge Relevant to the Credential or Degree for Which They Are Prepared</p> <p>Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2024-2025 Subject Matter Question 1 Presented content using research-based pedagogy and demonstrated depth and breadth</p>				

		<p>of subject matter Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.60</p> <p>Subject Matter Question 2 Integrated subject matter knowledge in lesson plans and curriculum development</p> <p>Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.50</p> <p>Subject Matter Question 3</p> <p>Demonstrated knowledge of content and the structure of the discipline</p> <p>Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.44</p> <p>Standard 1 Aspect b</p> <p>Learners, learning theory including social, emotional, and academic dimensions, and application of learning theory</p> <p>Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2024-2025</p> <p>Pedagogy Question 1</p> <p>Used knowledge of child and/or adolescent development to create appropriate differentiated instruction.</p> <p>Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.72</p> <p>Teaching Skills Question 1</p> <p>Planned and implemented learning activities based on learners' individual cognitive, language, social, emotional and physical developmental levels. Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.77</p> <p>Standard 1 Aspect 1c</p>
--	--	---

		<p>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</p> <p>Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2024-2025</p> <p>Caring Question 2 Differentiated instruction based on diverse backgrounds Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.77</p> <p>Caring Question 3 Created an inclusive and mutually respectful, safe, and supportive learning environment Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.83</p> <p>Pedagogy Question 2 Use a variety of strategies designed to differentiate instruction Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.61</p> <p>Pedagogy Question 3 Managed and adapted the learning environment to meet the needs of diverse students Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.66</p> <p>Standard 1 Aspect 1d Assessment of/for learning; assessment and data literacy; use of data to inform practice; formative assessment</p> <p>Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2024-2025</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Teaching Skills Question 3 Analyzed and utilized formative and summative assessment data to monitor instructional effectiveness and student learning. Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.44</p> <p>Teaching Skills Question 6 Used discussion and questioning techniques to provide timely feedback. Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.61</p> <p>Standard 1 Aspect 1e Creation and development of positive learning and work environments</p> <p>Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2024-2025</p> <p>Teaching Skills Question 4 Created an intellectually challenging and stimulating learning environment that resulted in student participation, cooperation, and learning. Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.66</p> <p>Caring Question 3 Created an inclusive, mutually respectful, safe, and supportive learning environment. Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.83</p> <p>Caring Question 5 Fostered student interactions among all students. Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.88</p> <p>Standard 1 Aspect 1f</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Dispositions and behaviors required for successful professional practice</p> <p>Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2024-2025</p> <p>Professionalism Question 1 Was responsible (attendance, punctuality, preparation, and professional dress). Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.66</p> <p>Professionalism Question 2 Used appropriate language (vocabulary, inflection, and intonation). Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.88</p> <p>Professionalism Question 3 Followed policies and ethical and legal procedures of the placement. Physical Education (n = 18) M=4.00</p> <p>Professionalism Question 5 Reflected on and acted on constructive feedback from others. Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.61</p> <p>Professionalism Question 6 Expanded knowledge of current research as it applies to curriculum, instruction, and assessment methods Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.72</p> <p>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.</p>
--	--	--

<p>Candidate Preservice Assessment of Teaching (CPAST)</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>	<p>Because this measure was not described in the QAR, further description of items relevant to AAQEP Standard 1 are described below.</p> <p>Standard 1 Aspect a</p> <p>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 1.74 and the final domain mean was 2.27.</p> <p>Standard 1 Aspect b</p> <p>Item M, “Connections to Research and Theory” captures part of Aspect 2b. The final average across both terms was 2.09. Means, comparison scores, and score distributions for Item M can be viewed here in the Assessment and Analysis of Teaching table and chart.</p> <p>Standard 1 Aspect c</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Item C, “Assessment of Learning” which requires candidates to plan assessments that “<i>are culturally relevant and draw from learners’ funds of knowledge</i>” captures part of Aspect 1c. The final average across both terms was 2.12. Item D, “Differentiated Methods” requires candidates to “<i>make culturally relevant connections</i>.” The final average across both terms was 2.15. Means, comparison scores, and score distributions for Items C and D can be viewed here in the Planning for Instruction Assessment table and chart.</p> <p>Standard 1 Aspect d</p> <p>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 2.00. The end of term average for Item K was 2.24 and for Item L was 2.09. Means, comparison scores, and score distributions for these items can be viewed here in the Assessment and Analysis of Teaching table and chart.</p> <p>Standard 1 Aspect e</p> <p>Item I, “Safe & Respectful Learning Environment” captures Aspect 1e. The average across both terms was 2.61. Means, comparison scores, and score distributions for Item I can be viewed here within the Instructional Delivery table and chart.</p> <p>Standard 1 Aspect f</p>
--	---

		<p>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 2.30 and the final domain mean was 2.54.</p>										
Teacher Performance Assessment- (PHED)	<p>During the 2024-2025 academic year, the Physical Education Teacher Program continued to have each student during their student teaching experience complete a Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA). Six students completed the TPA.</p> <p>The TPA consists of three core tasks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Task 1 evaluates candidates' planning skills 3. Task 2 measures instructional skills. 4. Task 3 assesses student learning and candidates' ability to use assessment effectively in the classroom 	<p>Six out of six teacher candidates achieved the expected passing score of 36 out of 40 (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.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1309 864 1890 1060"> <thead> <tr> <th>Can dida tes</th><th>Task 1 Plann ing</th><th>Task 2 Instru ction</th><th>Task 3 Assess ment</th><th>Overall average score</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>N=6</td><td>2.8</td><td>2.9</td><td>2.8</td><td>2.8</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Overall average point score: 42 points (93%)</p>	Can dida tes	Task 1 Plann ing	Task 2 Instru ction	Task 3 Assess ment	Overall average score	N=6	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.8
Can dida tes	Task 1 Plann ing	Task 2 Instru ction	Task 3 Assess ment	Overall average score								
N=6	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.8								

	<p>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.</p>	
<p>Bradley-Isaac Assessment of Pre-Service Teacher Dispositions</p>	<p>As noted in our 2024 annual report, the Education and Physical Education Departments began implementing a disposition assessment not included in our original Quality Assurance Report. The Bradley-Isaac Assessment of Pre-Service Teacher Dispositions is designed to provide a comprehensive evaluation of pre-service professionals, focusing on their preparedness, skill development, and alignment with organizational standards. Faculty rate students across 25 items measuring students' Responsibility, Integrity, Enthusiasm, Communication, and Reflection using a 4-point scale (1 = <i>strongly disagree</i>, 2 = <i>disagree</i>, 3 = <i>agree</i>, 4 = <i>strongly agree</i>).</p> <p>Our expectation for performance on the disposition assessment is different based on class year. It is expected students may present with more dispositional challenges during the introductory courses in their first three</p>	<p>Standard 1 Aspect f</p> <p>Freshmen through Junior classes ($n = 187$ ratings)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1: 57.22% teacher ratings indicated no dispositional issues (all 3s and 4s) • Tier 2: 22.46% of teacher ratings indicated some minor dispositional issues (a score of 2 for 5 or fewer dispositions with no scores of 1) • Tier 3: 20.32% of teacher ratings indicated dispositional issues (score of 2 for more than 5 dispositions and/or a score of 1 for 1 or more dispositions) <p>Senior Year classes ($n = 60$ ratings)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1: 85% of teacher ratings indicated no dispositional issues (all 3s and 4s) • Tier 2: 11.67% of teacher ratings indicated some minor dispositional issues (a score of 2 for 5 or fewer dispositions with no scores of 1) • Tier 3: 3.33% of teacher ratings indicated dispositional issues (score

	<p>years than those who are enrolled in upper division courses in their senior year.</p> <p>Freshmen through Junior expectation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1: At least 80% of teacher ratings indicate no dispositional issues (students receive scores of 3 or above for all items) • Tier 2: No more than 15% of teacher ratings indicate some minor dispositional issues (students are flagged with a score of 2 for 5 or fewer dispositions) • Tier 3: No more than 5% of teacher ratings indicate dispositional issues (students are flagged with a score of 2 for more than 5 dispositions and/or a score of 1 for 1 or more dispositions) <p>Senior expectation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1: At least 90% of teacher ratings indicate no dispositional issues (students receive scores of 3 or above for all disposition items) • Tier 2: No more than 10% of teacher ratings indicate some minor dispositional issues 	<p>of 2 for more than 5 dispositions and/or a score of 1 for 1 or more dispositions)</p>
--	---	--

	<p>(students are flagged with a score of 2 for 5 or fewer dispositions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 3: No teacher ratings indicate dispositional issues (students are flagged with a score of 2 for more than 5 dispositions and/or a score of 1 for 1 or more dispositions) 	
CPAST Aligned Portfolio Analysis	<p>The CPAST-aligned scoring system was used for both the digital portfolio and fieldwork evaluations to ensure consistency across measures of candidate performance. Each component is scored on a four-point scale, where 3 = exceeds expectations, 2 = meets expectations, 1 = emerging, and 0 = missing. Final scores are interpreted using CPAST performance bands: 13–15 indicates exceeds, 8–12 indicates meets, and 0–7 indicates does not meet. This shared structure provides a clear, aligned framework for evaluating candidates' readiness across multiple dimensions of their preparation.</p>	<p>The CPAST-Aligned Digital Portfolio results for this pilot cohort of 31 students show a final average score of 11.65 out of 15, placing the group well within the “meets expectations” range (8–12). This indicates that, overall, candidates are demonstrating the essential competencies outlined by the CPAST rubric, while also illuminating clear strengths and areas for program growth.</p> <p>Task 1: Planning for Instruction and Assessment — Average: 2.07</p> <p>Task 1 received the lowest average score, which signals an important area for program development. This outcome aligns with recent departmental changes: the implementation of a new lesson plan template occurred shortly before or during this cohort’s preparation period. As a result, candidates did not receive as much structured practice or direct instruction in applying the new template. Their performance</p>

		<p>reflects this gap in preparation rather than a lack of planning ability. Moving forward, integrating explicit instruction, modeling, and guided practice with the lesson plan template earlier in coursework and field experiences will help strengthen this domain.</p> <p>Task 2: Instructional Delivery — Average: 2.21</p> <p>The score for Task 2 indicates that candidates are meeting expectations in delivering instruction. This suggests that coursework, supervision, and fieldwork are supporting candidates in developing foundational teaching practices such as clarity, pacing, and student engagement. Continued emphasis on practice-based instruction, targeted coaching, and high-quality clinical placements will help maintain and potentially elevate this area toward “exceeds.”</p> <p>Task 3: Assessment — Average: 2.31</p> <p>Task 3 shows relative strength in candidates’ ability to use assessment to inform instruction, reflecting “solid meets” performance. This likely stems from the program’s ongoing focus on formative assessment strategies and data-informed decision-making. The results suggest that candidates understand how to gather evidence of student learning and use it meaningfully. Additional opportunities to analyze student work samples and connect assessment</p>
--	--	---

		<p>outcomes to instructional adjustments could help move more candidates into the “exceeds” range.</p> <p>Task 4: Analysis of Teaching — Average: 2.69</p> <p>Task 4 demonstrates the highest performance across all domains, approaching the “exceeds” level. Candidates appear well-prepared to analyze their instructional decision-making, interpret classroom evidence, and articulate the rationale behind their practice. This strength suggests that reflective practice is well-integrated into coursework and supervision. Maintaining strong feedback cycles, peer collaboration, and reflective assignments will continue to support high performance in this area.</p>
--	--	--

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

Provider-selected measures (name and description)	Criteria for success	Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation
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.	<p>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</p> <p>Standard 2 Aspect f Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning</p>

		<p>Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2024-2025</p> <p>Professionalism Question 4 Took initiative and developed collaborative relationships with all school personnel. Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.66</p> <p>Standard 2 Aspect b</p> <p>Engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners and do so in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts.</p> <p>Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2024-2025</p> <p>Caring Question 2 Differentiated instruction based on diverse backgrounds. Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.77</p> <p>Pedagogy Question 3 Managed and adapted the learning environment to meet the needs of diverse students. Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.66</p> <p>Standard 2 Aspect c</p> <p>Create productive learning environments and use strategies to develop productive learning environments in a variety of school contexts.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2024-2025</p> <p>Teaching Skills Question 4 Created an intellectually challenging and stimulating learning environment that resulted in student participation, cooperation, and learning.</p> <p>Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.66</p> <p>Caring Question 3 Created an inclusive, mutually respectful, safe, and supportive learning environment.</p> <p>Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.83</p> <p>Caring Question 5 Fostered student interactions among all students.</p> <p>Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.88</p> <p>Technology Question 1</p> <p>Used technology to enhance teaching and learning.</p> <p>Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.44</p> <p>Standard 2 Aspect e</p> <p>Establish goals for their own professional growth and engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection</p> <p>Mean from Student Teaching Survey AY 2024-2025</p> <p>Professionalism Question 2</p> <p>Reflected on and acted on constructive feedback from others.</p> <p>Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.61</p> <p>Professionalism Question 6</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Expanded knowledge of current research as it applies to curriculum, instruction, and assessment methods.</p> <p>Physical Education (n = 18) M=3.72</p> <p>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.</p>
Candidate Preservice Assessment of Teaching (CPAST)	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Our expectation is that the average consensus score at the end of student teaching is at least a 2 on every item (0 = <i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i>, 1 = <i>Emerging</i>, 2 = <i>Meets Expectations</i>, 3 = <i>Exceeds Expectations</i>).</p>	<p>Because this measure was not described in the QAR, further description of items relevant to AAQEP Standard 2 are described below.</p> <p>Standard 2 Aspect a</p> <p>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 1.85, up from 1.83 the previous year. Means, comparison scores, and score distributions for Item O can be viewed here in the Professional Commitment & Behaviors table and chart.</p> <p>Standard 2 Aspect b</p> <p>Items C, "Assessment of P-12 Learning" and D "Differentiated Methods" require culturally relevant practices to meet expectations,</p>

		<p>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 2.12 for Item C and 2.15 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 2.27. 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.</p> <p>Standard 2 Aspect c</p> <p>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 2.27. 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 2.61. The Pedagogy Domain mean can be viewed here with national and state comparisons. Means, comparison scores, and score</p>
--	--	---

		<p>distributions for Item I can be viewed here within the Instructional Delivery table and chart.</p> <p>Standard 2 Aspect e</p> <p>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 2.39 for Item N and 2.82 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.</p> <p>Standard 2 Aspect f</p> <p>Item S, “Collaboration” directly captures Aspect 2f, “collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning.” The average across both terms was 2.61. 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.</p>
Bradley-Isaac Assessment of Pre-Service Teacher Dispositions	As noted in our 2024 annual report, the Education and Physical Education Departments began implementing a	Standard 2 Aspect e

	<p>disposition assessment not included in our original Quality Assurance Report. The Bradley-Isaac Assessment of Pre-Service Teacher Dispositions is designed to provide a comprehensive evaluation of pre-service professionals, focusing on their preparedness, skill development, and alignment with organizational standards. Faculty rate students across 25 items measuring students' Responsibility, Integrity, Enthusiasm, Communication, and Reflection using a 4-point scale (1 = <i>strongly disagree</i>, 2 = <i>disagree</i>, 3 = <i>agree</i>, 4 = <i>strongly agree</i>).</p> <p>Our expectation for performance on the Reflection section of the disposition assessment is different based on class year. It is expected students may present with more dispositional challenges during the introductory courses in their first three years than those who are enrolled in upper division courses in their senior year.</p> <p>Freshmen through Junior expectation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1: At least 80% of teacher ratings indicate no Reflection dispositional issues (students receive scores of 3 or above for all Reflection items) 	<p>The Reflection section of the Bradley-Isaac Assessment of Pre-Service Teacher Dispositions consists of 3 items.</p> <p>Freshmen through Junior classes ($n = 187$ ratings)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1: 84.49% teacher ratings indicated no Reflection issues (all 3s and 4s) • Tier 2: 8.02% teacher ratings indicated some minor Reflection issues (a score of 2 for 1 Reflection item) • Tier 3: 7.49% teacher ratings indicated Reflection issues (a score of 2 for more than 1 Reflection item and/or a score of 1 for 1 or more Reflection items) <p>Senior Year classes ($n = 60$ ratings)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1: 95% teacher ratings indicated no Reflection issues (all 3s and 4s) • Tier 2: 3.33% teacher ratings indicated some minor Reflection issues (a score of 2 for 1 Reflection item) • Tier 3: 1.67% teacher ratings indicated Reflection issues (a score of 2 for more than 1 Reflection item and/or a score of 1 for 1 or more Reflection items)
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 2: No more than 15% of teacher ratings indicate some minor Reflection dispositional issues (students are flagged with a score of 2 for 1 Reflection item) • Tier 3: No more than 5% of teacher ratings indicate Reflection dispositional issues (students are flagged with a score of 2 for more than 1 Reflection item and/or a score of 1 for 1 or more Reflection items) <p>Senior expectation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1: At least 90% of teacher ratings indicate no Reflection dispositional issues (students receive scores of 3 or above for all Reflection items) • Tier 2: No more than 10% of teacher ratings indicate some minor Reflection dispositional issues (students are flagged with a score of 2 for 1 Reflection item) • Tier 3: No teacher ratings indicate Reflection dispositional issues (students are flagged with a score of 2 for more than 1 Reflection item dispositions and/or a 	
--	--	--

	score of 1 for 1 or more Reflection items)	
CPAST Aligned Portfolio Analysis	<p>The CPAST-aligned scoring system was used for both the digital portfolio and fieldwork evaluations to ensure consistency across measures of candidate performance. Each component is scored on a four-point scale, where 3 = exceeds expectations, 2 = meets expectations, 1 = emerging, and 0 = missing. Final scores are interpreted using CPAST performance bands: 13–15 indicates exceeds, 8–12 indicates meets, and 0–7 indicates does not meet. This shared structure provides a clear, aligned framework for evaluating candidates' readiness across multiple dimensions of their preparation.</p>	<p>Task 5: Professional Commitment and Behaviors — Average: 2.34</p> <p>While Task 5 shows a generally positive average, this score should be interpreted cautiously. This component relied on candidate self-reflection, which is inherently subjective and does not always produce reliable or accurate measures of professional commitment. The variability and potential inflation/deflation in self-assessment made this task more difficult to score consistently.</p> <p>In response to this challenge, the portfolio has been revised to include a new action research assignment, which will provide supervisors with more authentic, evidence-based artifacts of candidates' professional behaviors, decision-making, and growth over time. This change is expected to strengthen both the validity and reliability of Task 5 moving forward.</p> <p>Document Links</p> <p>Rubric Preparation and Review: Reflective Document</p>

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.

Ensuring timely inception of and tracking of field placements for students of all levels across our degree programs had become burdensome for a faculty member to manage while teaching a full academic load. In response to this difficulty, the role of Director of Clinical Placements was created and has allowed students to complete their required hours during the expected semesters, with high quality and consistent placements made possible through centralized communication and organization.

New York City Public Schools, our primary partner for fieldwork and student teaching placements, requires all students to pass a background check conducted by a third party vendor. The cost for fingerprinting is \$103 per student. The Education department in 2024-2025 began using a fund earmarked for student teacher transit costs to reimburse students for their fingerprinting fee, a more equitable use of funds since this ensured all students could benefit rather than only those traveling a greater distance to their placement sites. Additionally, this alleviated a meaningful burden on students who have lesser financial means.

The Kakos School of Arts and Sciences curriculum committee approved curricular changes incepted to meet the needs of our evolving major population amid reduced total faculty. These adjustments include the combination of Adolescent and Childhood Planning courses as well as the merging of our Psychology of Education courses into one combined Adolescent/Childhood course. These proposed changes will go before the University curriculum committee in spring 26 and with approval, will be rolled out to students in fall 27.

A successful search was held by the department of Education to bring on board a new department chair which will help with shoring up staffing concerns and providing thought partnership across Education faculty with regard to the evolving vision of teacher preparation at Manhattan and the practical steps that will see that vision brought to fruition.

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 and recent activities related to investigating data quality. Table 5 may focus 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 2025-26 year	Continue to partner with experts in the field to provide cocurricular learning experiences for preservice teachers that support and amplify evolving course content aligned to needs of the field
Actions	Monthly workshop series for all undergraduate students focused on areas of need such as classroom management, family communication strategies, best practices for working
Expected outcomes	Program completers will have access to up to date training on topics relevant to changing educational landscape.
Reflections or comments	Workshop content and presenters should be updated annually to meet changing needs in the educational landscape. Topics will be brainstormed and curated by the proposed consultors' group from item G as well as district stakeholders in concert with education faculty.
Standard 2	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	Update fieldwork allocations per course and identify a fieldwork tracking software program that allows programmatic tracking of student fieldwork placements and hour accumulation.
Actions	Analysis of fieldwork placements to ensure students are gaining experience in a wide variety of placements, serving a cross section of local K-12 students. Concurrently, faculty will also examine course assignments for fieldwork to ensure intentional learning activities are connected to classroom placements.
Expected outcomes	Program completers will have requisite knowledge of the varied settings and pedagogical models in the field to allow informed decision making when accepting employment.
Reflections or comments	Minimal solutions have been identified to date regarding fieldwork tracking programs on the market.
Standard 3	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	Increase alumni participation in completer survey in order to ensure greater accuracy in identifying and addressing gaps/needs.

Actions	Faculty outreach in advance of institutional outreach to alert alumni of the importance of their participation. Also, a pivot to offering QR code links via text as well as email correspondence of survey.
Expected outcomes	Increased number of participants will provide greater sample size and more reliable data on needs.
Reflections or comments	Students are more likely to respond to outreach from faculty they know as opposed to outreach from the institution at large; therefore, we can leverage relationships to prime the pump for participation.
Standard 4	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	Formalize partnership with NYCPS District 10 through written agreement.
Actions	Outreach to the district superintendent and staff to foster discussion of best practices for and documentation of curated student teacher placements.
Expected outcomes	Increased efficacy of the student teaching experience via the mentorship of willing, highly qualified cooperating mentor teachers.
Reflections or comments	Administrative changes at the NYCPS may make progress challenging.

Update on Activities to Investigate Data Quality

Data quality investigations are essential to work across the standards. This section documents activities in the 2024-25 reporting year related to ensuring data quality.

To ensure higher quality, more reliable data on teacher readiness, the Education department in 2024-2025 moved to an internally created portfolio system that allows holistic evaluation of student teacher growth and proficiency rather than a singular snapshot.

Cooperating teachers were provided with remote training on the effective and faithful use of the CPAST instrument to increase understanding of expectations and to norm scoring ideology.

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). If 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 has posted a position for a full time faculty member in Special Education who will also serve as Graduate Program Director, spearheading oversight and adaptation of our Master of Science in Special Education degree program.

In response to alumni feedback regarding perceived weaknesses in classroom management preparation, the department responded by updating the course content for “Classroom & Instructional Management for Diverse Learners”, which is taken by childhood, adolescent, and physical education majors. The new course design, consulted on by a NYCPS Behavior Systems Change Specialist and a professor from the University of Oregon Center on PBIS, was rolled out in the fall 2025 semester. Additionally, a monthly workshop series featuring specialists from the field has been incepted, with sessions one and two (delivered in fall 2025) featuring a Behavior Systems Change Specialist from the New York City Public Schools working with Manhattan University students on behavioral expectation setting and appropriate remediation of concerns.

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).

Due to NYSED phasing out current certifications for Special Education in favor of new, all-grade certifications, we are in the process of rewriting our 5 year graduate program to meet the needs of the new certification. Drafts have been created and will be submitted to both curriculum committees at the University and eventually to New York State Education Department for approval in the spring of 2026.

10. Sign Off

Provider's Primary Contact for AAQEP (Name, Title)	Dean/Lead Administrator (Name, Title)
Dr. Kerri Mulqueen Chairperson for Education	Dr. Marcy Kelly Dean of Arts and Sciences

Date sent to AAQEP:	
---------------------	--