



## AAQEP Annual Report for 2023

Provider/Program Name:	SUNY Old Westbury
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or "n/a" if not yet accredited):	2028

### 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.

The mission of the SOE is to prepare teacher candidates with the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to educate learners in diverse and socially just classrooms by empowering them to use their training to build equitable and inclusive learning communities in and outside of the classroom. Our mission and vision are guided by the three tenants of the conceptual framework:

1. A commitment to preparing teachers as professionals,
2. A commitment to foster an active engagement in promoting a just world,
3. A commitment to instill in candidates a belief in the interdisciplinary nature of knowledge and practice

Overall, the SOE is committed to providing teacher candidates with the specialized knowledge, skills, and professional attributes essential to meeting the education needs of students in today's schools. We foster an environment for teacher education candidates to develop educational philosophies within the context of a dynamic socio-cultural and political environment. The overarching goal of the SOE is to cultivate the understanding of the interrelationship among academic content, pedagogical application, and continued learning as essential to excellence in teaching. The faculty aim to prepare future teachers who are competent, confident, and excited to be an integral part of the educational process that leads to a just society.

At SUNY Old Westbury, we strive to include coverage of an array of theorists in our programs to ground our candidates' understandings. Thus, we introduce them to constructivists, behaviorists, social justice scholars, along with classic educational pioneers. Candidates' course of study provides for in-depth knowledge of theories to guide them in developing their own philosophies of teaching. For example, to explore behaviorism in education, our practice is grounded in works by Lev Vygotsky, B.F. Skinner, and Albert Bandura's social learning theory. In studying the theory of constructivism, we include the work of Bruner and Piaget as well as Richard Skemp which addresses instrumental and relational learning among others. The main thrust of constructivist theory is that learners construct schemata to link what they already know with new learning and enable context- and content- dependent knowledge construction. Additionally, research on cultural competence and culturally responsive pedagogy by Gloria Ladson Billings, Paulo Freire, and Mariana Souto-Manning among others underpin our curriculum and instructional practices.

The teacher education degree programs share many commonalities. Aside from the study of our program theorists, within the SOE we share a vision and mission that are deeply rooted in social justice and diversity of thought. We are committed to the development of teacher leaders, agency, and advocacy. Hence, we provide services and supports to our students, families and the community through our New York State Education Department grant-funded Regional Center for Autism Spectrum Disorders which is housed on campus. We also provide supports through our Teacher Opportunity Corp II (TOC II) grant and Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) Teacher Diversity Pipeline Program (TDPP) grant, as well as our Literacy Learning Clinic which is free to the local communities. Additionally, our courses are interdisciplinary, and the general education curriculum is consistent with the mission of the College and School. All departments within the SOE have close working relationships with partnering school districts including a number of high needs school districts. These relationships afford our candidates the opportunity to student teach, observe, and engage in rich teaching models which eventually lead to work opportunities for many of our graduates who are later hired as educators within these districts. Likewise, teachers and administrators from these partnering districts serve as adjuncts, advisory board members, mentor teachers and/or employers of our alumni.

Below is the table of SOE programs accredited by AAQEP:

<b>Degree</b>	<b>Certification Area</b>
Childhood Education-grades 1-6 (B.S.)	Initial Certification-Childhood Education
Childhood Education-grades 1-6 with Bilingual Extension (B.S.)	Initial Certification-Childhood Education with Bilingual Extension
Special Education with Childhood Education-grades 1-6 (B.S.)	Initial Certification-Students with Disabilities Grades 1-6 and Childhood Education Grades 1-6
Special Education with Childhood Education and Bilingual Extension (B.S.)	Initial Certification-Students with Disabilities Grades 1-6 and Childhood Education Grades 1-6 and Bilingual Extension
Adolescence Education Biology-Grades 7-12 (B.A., B.S., M.A.T., ***B.S./M.A.T., and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-Biology Education- Grades 7-12
Adolescence Education Chemistry-Grades 7-12 (B.A., B.S., and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-Chemistry Education- Grades 7-12
Adolescence Education English Language Arts-Grades 7-12 (M.A.T. and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-English Language Arts Education- Grades 7-12
Adolescence Education Mathematics-Grades 7-12 (B.S., M.A.T., and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-Mathematics Education- Grades 7-12
Adolescence Education Social Studies-Grades 7-12 (B.A., M.A.T., ***B.A./M.A.T., and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-Social Studies Education- Grades 7-12
Adolescence Education Spanish-Grades 7-12 (M.A.T. and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-Spanish Education- Grades 7-12

*M.S. Childhood Special Education-Grades 1-6	Initial/Professional Certification-Childhood Special Education- Grades 1-6
**M.S. Literacy Education Birth through Grade 6, Grades 7-12, or Birth-Grade 12	Initial/Professional Certification-Literacy Education

*\* The M.S. program in Childhood Special Education leads to initial certification. After a completer fulfills New York's classroom hours requirement, the completer may apply for a professional certification.*

*\*\* The M.S. program in Literacy Education is an additional initial certification for teachers who already have a teaching certificate. After obtaining initial certification from the Literacy M.S. degree, a completer is eligible to apply for professional certification after fulfilling New York's classroom hours requirement.*

*\*\*\*The Advanced Certificate and B.A./M.A.T. and B.S./M.A.T. programs are very low-enrollment programs that, across 8 programs, had only 14 candidates in Spring 2020. Additionally, the curricula are the same for the corresponding M.A.T. programs, with the exception of the Advanced Certificate candidates who take only the pedagogy courses. After consulting with AAQEP, we have decided to aggregate all B.A./M.A.T., B.S./M.A.T., and Advanced Certificate data with the corresponding data for the M.A.T. programs. For instance, when the data for the Adolescence Social Studies M.A.T. is presented, it includes data from the B.A./M.A.T. and Advanced Certificate programs in Adolescence Social Studies.*

## 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://www.oldwestbury.edu/sites/default/files/2023-12/FINAL%20AAQEP%20Annual%20Report%2012-5-23jf%20-%20Part%20I.pdf>

## 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 2022-2023**

<b>Degree or Certificate</b> granted by the institution or organization	<b>State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential</b>	<b>Number of Candidates</b> enrolled in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/23)	<b>Number of Completers</b> in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/23)
<i><b>Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials</b></i>			
Childhood Education-grades 1-6 (B.S.)	Initial Certification-Childhood Education	215	64
Childhood Education-grades 1-6 with Bilingual Extension (B.S.)	Initial Certification-Childhood Education with Bilingual Extension	31	12
Special Education with Childhood Education- grades 1-6 (B.S.)	Initial Certification-Students with Disabilities Grades 1-6 and Childhood Education Grades 1-6	120	44
Special Education with Childhood Education and Bilingual Extension (B.S.)	Initial Certification-Students with Disabilities Grades 1-6 and Childhood Education Grades 1-6 and Bilingual Extension	12	7
Adolescence Education Biology-Grades 7-12 (B.A., B.S., M.A.T., B.S./M.A.T., and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-Biology Education-Grades 7-12	28	3
Adolescence Education Chemistry-Grades 7-12 (B.A., B.S., and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-Chemistry Education-Grades 7-12	1	0
Adolescence Education English Language Arts-Grades 7-12 (M.A.T. and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-English Language Arts Education- Grades 7-12	29	8

Adolescence Education Mathematics- Grades 7-12 (B.S., M.A.T., and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-Mathematics Education- Grades 7-12	42	8
Adolescence Education Social Studies- Grades 7-12 (B.A., M.A.T., B.A./M.A.T., and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-Social Studies Education- Grades 7-12	92	12
Adolescence Education Spanish-Grades 7- 12 (M.A.T. and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-Spanish Education- Grades 7-12	29	3
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		599	161
<b><i>Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators</i></b>			
M.S. Childhood Special Education-Grades 1- 6	Initial/Professional Certification- Childhood Special Education- Grades 1-6	76	14
M.S. Literacy Education Birth through Grade 6, Grades 7-12, or Birth-Grade 12	Initial/Professional Certification-Literacy Education	44	23
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		120	37
<b><i>Programs that lead to credentials for other school professionals or to no specific credential</i></b>			
Total for additional programs		0	0
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs		719	198
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers		719	198

### **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.)

N/A

### 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.

719

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.

198

C. **Number of recommendations** for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.

333

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.

There is a table below for each program's cohort completion rates, using the cohorts of candidates who entered in the Fall 2018, Spring 2019, Fall 2019, and Spring 2020 semesters. Some programs have different expected timeframes, and those timeframes are identified before each table.

Undergrad Childhood Education							
<u>Expected Completion Timeframe = 6 Semesters</u>							
Semester	Initial Cohort	Graduated in 100% Time (6 Semesters)	Graduated in 150% Time (9 Semesters)	Graduated in 200% Time (12 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (6 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (9 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (12 Semesters)

Fall 2018	19	18			95%		
Spring 2019	14	13			93%		
Fall 2019	33	29	2		88%	6%	
Spring 2020	23	19			83%		

**Undergrad Childhood Education with Bilingual Extension**  
**Expected Completion Timeframe = 8 Semesters**

Semester	Initial Cohort	Graduated in 100% Time (8 Semesters)	Graduated in 150% Time (12 Semesters)	Graduated in 200% Time (16 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (8 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (12 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (16 Semesters)
Fall 2018	9	8			89%		
Spring 2019	3	2			67%		
Fall 2019	8	8			100%		
Spring 2020							

**Undergrad Special Education**  
**Expected Completion Timeframe = 6 Semesters**

Semester	Initial Cohort	Graduated in 100% Time (6 Semesters)	Graduated in 150% Time (9 Semesters)	Graduated in 200% Time (12 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (6 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (9 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (12 Semesters)
Fall 2018	19	15	3		79%	16%	
Spring 2019	15	11			73%		
Fall 2019	18	17	1		94%	6%	
Spring 2020	14	11			79%		

Undergrad Special Education with Bilingual Extension <u>Expected Completion Timeframe = 8 Semesters</u>							
Semester	Initial Cohort	Graduated in 100% Time (8 Semesters)	Graduated in 150% Time (12 Semesters)	Graduated in 200% Time (16 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (8 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (12 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (16 Semesters)
Fall 2018							
Spring 2019	2	2			100%		
Fall 2019	2	2			100%		
Spring 2020							
Undergrad Adolescent Biology <u>Expected Completion Timeframe = 5 Semesters</u>							
Semester	Initial Cohort	Graduated in 100% Time (5 Semesters)	Graduated in 150% Time (7 Semesters)	Graduated in 200% Time (10 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (5 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (7 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (10 Semesters)
Fall 2018							
Spring 2019	1		1			100%	
Fall 2019							
Spring 2020							
Undergrad Adolescent Chemistry <u>Expected Completion Timeframe = 5 Semesters</u>							

Semester	Initial Cohort	Graduated in 100% Time (5 Semesters)	Graduated in 150% Time (7 Semesters)	Graduated in 200% Time (10 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (5 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (7 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (10 Semesters)
Fall 2018							
Spring 2019	1		1			100%	
Fall 2019							
Spring 2020							

**Undergrad Adolescent Mathematics**  
**Expected Completion Timeframe = 5 Semesters**

Semester	Initial Cohort	Graduated in 100% Time (5 Semesters)	Graduated in 150% Time (7 Semesters)	Graduated in 200% Time (10 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (5 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (7 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (10 Semesters)
Fall 2018	2		1			50%	
Spring 2019							
Fall 2019	5	3	1		60%	20%	
Spring 2020	2	1			50%		

**MAT – English Language Arts**  
**Expected Completion Timeframe for Fall Entrants = 4 Semesters**  
**Expected Completion Timeframe for Spring Entrants = 5 Semesters**

Semester	Initial Cohort	Graduated in 100% Time (4/5 Semesters)	Graduated in 150% Time (6/7 Semesters)	Graduated in 200% Time (8/10 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (4/5 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (6/7 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (8/10 Semesters)
Fall 2018	8	7			88%		
Spring 2019	5	5			100%		

Fall 2019	6	4	1		67%	17%	
Spring 2020	2	1			50%		

**MAT – Social Studies**

**Expected Completion Timeframe for Fall Entrants = 4 Semesters**

**Expected Completion Timeframe for Spring Entrants = 5 Semesters**

Semester	Initial Cohort	Graduated in 100% Time (4/5 Semesters)	Graduated in 150% Time (6/7 Semesters)	Graduated in 200% Time (8/10 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (4/5 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (6/7 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (8/10 Semesters)
Fall 2018	12	7	1		58%	8%	
Spring 2019	4	3			75%		
Fall 2019	12	8	1	2	67%	8%	17%
Spring 2020	4	3	1		75%	25%	

**MAT – Biology**

**Expected Completion Timeframe for Fall Entrants = 4 Semesters**

**Expected Completion Timeframe for Spring Entrants = 5 Semesters**

Semester	Initial Cohort	Graduated in 100% Time (4/5 Semesters)	Graduated in 150% Time (6/7 Semesters)	Graduated in 200% Time (8/10 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (4/5 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (6/7 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (8/10 Semesters)
Fall 2018	6	4			67%		
Spring 2019	1	1			100%		
Fall 2019	3	3			100%		
Spring 2020							

**MAT – Spanish**

**Expected Completion Timeframe for Fall Entrants = 4 Semesters**

<b><u>Expected Completion Timeframe for Spring Entrants = 5 Semesters</u></b>							
Semester	Initial Cohort	Graduated in 100% Time (4/5 Semesters)	Graduated in 150% Time (6/7 Semesters)	Graduated in 200% Time (8/10 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (4/5 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (6/7 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (8/10 Semesters)
Fall 2018	8	6			75%		
Spring 2019	3	2	1		67%	33%	
Fall 2019	3	2			67%		
Spring 2020	2	2			100%		
<b>MAT – Mathematics</b>							
<b><u>Expected Completion Timeframe for Fall Entrants = 4 Semesters</u></b>							
<b><u>Expected Completion Timeframe for Spring Entrants = 5 Semesters</u></b>							
Semester	Initial Cohort	Graduated in 100% Time (4/5 Semesters)	Graduated in 150% Time (6/7 Semesters)	Graduated in 200% Time (8/10 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (4/5 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (6/7 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (8/10 Semesters)
Fall 2018	2						
Spring 2019	3	2	1		67%	23%	
Fall 2019	3	3			100%		
Spring 2020	2	2			100%		
<b>MS Childhood Special Education</b>							
<b><u>Expected Completion Timeframe = 5 Semesters</u></b>							

Semester	Initial Cohort	Graduated in 100% Time (5 Semesters)	Graduated in 150% Time (7 Semesters)	Graduated in 200% Time (10 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (5 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (7 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (10 Semesters)
Fall 2018	19	12	5	1	63%	26%	5%
Spring 2019							
Fall 2019	18	16			89%		
Spring 2020	1	1			100%		
<b>MS Literacy</b> <b><u>Expected Completion Timeframe = 5 Semesters</u></b>							
Semester	Initial Cohort	Graduated in 100% Time (5 Semesters)	Graduated in 150% Time (7 Semesters)	Graduated in 200% Time (10 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (5 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (7 Semesters)	Graduation Rate % (10 Semesters)
Fall 2018	19	18			95%		
Spring 2019							
Fall 2019	15	14			93%		
Spring 2020							
<b>E. Summary of state license examination results</b> , including teacher performance assessments, and specification of any examinations on which the pass rate (cumulative at time of reporting) was below 80%.							
Summary for 2021-2022, the last year with official state data: There are two types of certification exams in New York presently. There are content exams (CST) for each program and a pedagogical exam about teaching diverse groups of students, called the Educating All Students (EAS) exam. The pass rate for the EAS was 97%. The pass rates for the CST's ranged from 81-100%. More detailed reporting of each exam's pass rate is included below in Section 4.							

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

The primary evidence sources of evidence from program completers are the Employment Update Survey and the Alumni Survey. The Employment Update Survey is discussed below in (H). The Alumni Survey is discussed in Section 4, Table 4. The survey is administered every 2-3 years and asks recent graduates, who have graduated in the previous three years, how they feel the School of Education has prepared them for their current positions. Fifteen different aspects of their position are covered, including content knowledge, relationships with families, creating positive learning environments, valuing diverse students, professional collaboration, and more. For each item, alumni are asked to answer whether they feel they were well prepared to handle the responsibilities of teaching. The scale ranges from Strongly Agree (4) to Strongly Disagree (1). “Agree” is scored a 3, so a mean score for an item of 3.0 or above is considered a successful performance. All items had mean scores above 3. Most items had mean scores of 3.5 or better, indicating sentiments closer to “Strongly Agree” than “Agree,” on average. Items that fell below that 3.5 mark, while still well above 3, related to content knowledge, understanding of school policy, assessment of learning, and research.

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

The primary evidence source from employers of program completers is the Employer Survey. It was last administered in July 2023. Before that, it was administered in July 2020. We identified the employers through the responses in the Employment Update Survey sent out to alumni who graduated within the past three years. The Employer Survey is nearly identical to the Alumni Survey. This allows the SOE to triangulate data and identify areas of agreement and disagreement between the two sets of raters. The fifteen items are the same as those given to the alumni, with the only differences being pronouns for clarity. For instance, “The ability to understand and apply educational and institutional policies that relate to my work” in the Alumni Survey became, “The ability to understand and apply educational and institutional policies that relate to his/her work” in the Employer Survey. The survey is scored the same way as the Alumni Survey, with 4 being “Strongly Agree” and 1 being “Strongly Disagree.” An item mean score of at least 3 is considered meeting expectations, as 3 is “Agree.” All items on the survey had mean scores over 3.0. On all but four items, the mean item scores from the employers and alumni were within 0.1 points of each other, demonstrating a high degree of agreement between employers and alumni on the strengths and weaknesses of our alumni. SOE faculty use this data and speak with or P-12 partners and New Teacher Network candidates to address the results.

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 SOE receives no data from the state on completers, so we must generate any data we need ourselves. Every semester, the SOE sends an email to all alumni who graduated within the past three years for an update on their employment status. This survey is called the Employment Update Survey. We ask them to fill out an Outlook Forms survey in which they indicate their semester of graduation, their major, their current position, their current district (if working in public school), and their current school. We also ask them to indicate what year they began working at their current employer. The last survey was sent in Spring 2023. Of the 437 recent alumni we reach out to, we received responses from 179 alumni, for a response rate of 41%. Out of the total respondents, 94% reported being employed in a P-12 school. Of those employed,

the breakdown of their job titles is as follows: Teacher of Record – 49%, Substitute – 33%, Leave Replacement – 11%, Teacher’s Assistant – 6%, Literacy Specialist – 1%. More than half the number of the substitute teachers graduated from the SOE within the past year.

#### 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**

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation																														
Student Teaching Assessment	The Student Teaching Assessment is completed in every clinical placement by both the Cooperating Teacher and the Faculty Supervisor. The assessment is scored on a scale of 1 - 4. <b>Successful performance on the 8-item assessment is considered an average score of 3 out of 4, or a total score of 24.</b>	The average scores on the assessment for each Student Teaching course:																														
		When Scored by Cooperating Teacher (CT): Average score of 27.04.																														
		When Scored by Faculty Supervisor (FS): Average score of 26.88.																														
		<table><tr><td>Course</td><td>FS Average Score</td><td>CT Average Score</td></tr><tr><td>ED5900</td><td>26.16</td><td>25.60</td></tr><tr><td>ED5940</td><td>26.24</td><td>26.72</td></tr><tr><td>ED5960</td><td>28.08</td><td>27.84</td></tr><tr><td>ED6900</td><td>28.80</td><td>25.60</td></tr><tr><td>ED6901</td><td>28.80</td><td>26.80</td></tr><tr><td>ED6902</td><td>26.72</td><td>28.72</td></tr><tr><td>ED6903</td><td>27.36</td><td>26.16</td></tr><tr><td>ED6904</td><td>24.32</td><td>28.56</td></tr><tr><td>ED7026</td><td>25.28</td><td>26.88</td></tr></table>	Course	FS Average Score	CT Average Score	ED5900	26.16	25.60	ED5940	26.24	26.72	ED5960	28.08	27.84	ED6900	28.80	25.60	ED6901	28.80	26.80	ED6902	26.72	28.72	ED6903	27.36	26.16	ED6904	24.32	28.56	ED7026	25.28	26.88
		Course	FS Average Score	CT Average Score																												
		ED5900	26.16	25.60																												
		ED5940	26.24	26.72																												
		ED5960	28.08	27.84																												
		ED6900	28.80	25.60																												
		ED6901	28.80	26.80																												
		ED6902	26.72	28.72																												
		ED6903	27.36	26.16																												
ED6904	24.32	28.56																														
ED7026	25.28	26.88																														

Professional Attributes	The Professional Attributes Assessment is completed in every clinical placement by both the Cooperating Teacher and the Faculty Supervisor. The assessment is scored on a scale of 1- 4. <b>Successful performance on the 10-item assessment is considered an average item score of 3 out of 4 on rubric, or a 30 overall.</b>	<p>When Scored by Cooperating Teacher: Average score of 35.80. 88% of assessments averaged 3.0 per item or higher.</p> <p>The average item scores on the assessment for each Student Teaching course.</p> <p>When Scored by Faculty Supervisor: Average item score of 3.66.</p> <p>94% of assessments averaged 3.0 per item or higher.</p> <table><tr><th>Course</th><th>FS Average Score</th><th>CT Average Score</th></tr><tr><td>ED5900</td><td>35.10</td><td>33.50</td></tr><tr><td>ED5940</td><td>36.10</td><td>35.60</td></tr><tr><td>ED5960</td><td>37.30</td><td>36.50</td></tr><tr><td>ED6900</td><td>35.60</td><td>34.30</td></tr><tr><td>ED6901</td><td>38.30</td><td>34.90</td></tr><tr><td>ED6902</td><td>39.00</td><td>37.80</td></tr><tr><td>ED6903</td><td>37.30</td><td>36.40</td></tr><tr><td>ED6904</td><td>31.70</td><td>35.50</td></tr><tr><td>ED7026</td><td>30.00</td><td>34.50</td></tr></table>	Course	FS Average Score	CT Average Score	ED5900	35.10	33.50	ED5940	36.10	35.60	ED5960	37.30	36.50	ED6900	35.60	34.30	ED6901	38.30	34.90	ED6902	39.00	37.80	ED6903	37.30	36.40	ED6904	31.70	35.50	ED7026	30.00	34.50
Course	FS Average Score	CT Average Score																														
ED5900	35.10	33.50																														
ED5940	36.10	35.60																														
ED5960	37.30	36.50																														
ED6900	35.60	34.30																														
ED6901	38.30	34.90																														
ED6902	39.00	37.80																														
ED6903	37.30	36.40																														
ED6904	31.70	35.50																														
ED7026	30.00	34.50																														
Lesson Planning Assessment	In each program’s Methods and Materials of Teaching course, a Lesson Plan Assessment is assigned. The rubrics differ between programs as do the number of items in the respective assessments, so the scores reported here will be the <b>average</b>	<p>Lesson Plan Assessment Average Item Scores:</p> <table><tr><th>Course</th><th>Average Item Score</th></tr><tr><td>ED4085</td><td>2.90</td></tr><tr><td>ED6082</td><td>2.91</td></tr><tr><td>ED6092</td><td>2.96</td></tr></table>	Course	Average Item Score	ED4085	2.90	ED6082	2.91	ED6092	2.96																						
Course	Average Item Score																															
ED4085	2.90																															
ED6082	2.91																															
ED6092	2.96																															

	<p><b>item scores</b> on the assessments.</p> <p>The assessments are scored on a scale of 1-4. An average item score of 3 out of 4 is considered successful. The only exceptions are <b>ED4085, ED6092, and ED6082</b>, the Methods courses for Science. That rubric uses a 3-point scale. For ED6082, success is defined as an average item score of 2.5 out of 3.</p>	<table><tr><td>ED4121</td><td>3.53</td></tr><tr><td>ED6083</td><td>3.69</td></tr><tr><td>ED6086</td><td>3.55</td></tr><tr><td>ED6093</td><td>4.00</td></tr><tr><td>ED6095</td><td>3.68</td></tr></table>	ED4121	3.53	ED6083	3.69	ED6086	3.55	ED6093	4.00	ED6095	3.68																	
ED4121	3.53																												
ED6083	3.69																												
ED6086	3.55																												
ED6093	4.00																												
ED6095	3.68																												
Literacy Practicum	Average score of 12.0 out of 16.0 on rubric.	<table><tr><td>Course</td><td>Average Rubric Score</td></tr><tr><td>ED7323</td><td>15.84</td></tr></table>	Course	Average Rubric Score	ED7323	15.84																							
Course	Average Rubric Score																												
ED7323	15.84																												
Certification Exam: CST	Passing score: Score of 520 or above	<p>Pass Rates for Each CST 2021-2022</p> <table><tr><td>Exam</td><td>Pass Rate</td><td>N</td></tr><tr><td>Biology</td><td>100</td><td>8</td></tr><tr><td>Chemistry</td><td>100</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>English</td><td>100</td><td>11</td></tr><tr><td>Mathematics</td><td>89</td><td>9</td></tr><tr><td>Multi-Subject</td><td>81</td><td>67</td></tr><tr><td>Social Studies</td><td>95</td><td>22</td></tr><tr><td>Spanish</td><td>100</td><td>7</td></tr><tr><td>Students with Disabilities</td><td>91</td><td>35</td></tr></table>	Exam	Pass Rate	N	Biology	100	8	Chemistry	100	1	English	100	11	Mathematics	89	9	Multi-Subject	81	67	Social Studies	95	22	Spanish	100	7	Students with Disabilities	91	35
Exam	Pass Rate	N																											
Biology	100	8																											
Chemistry	100	1																											
English	100	11																											
Mathematics	89	9																											
Multi-Subject	81	67																											
Social Studies	95	22																											
Spanish	100	7																											
Students with Disabilities	91	35																											
Certification Exam: EAS	Passing score: Score of 500 or above	<p>Pass Rate for EAS 2021-2022</p> <table><tr><td>Pass Rate</td><td>N</td></tr><tr><td>97</td><td>157</td></tr></table>	Pass Rate	N	97	157																							
Pass Rate	N																												
97	157																												

**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	
Alumni Survey	<p>An Alumni Survey was conducted in July 2023 of alumni who had graduated from Fall 2019 through Spring 2022. Alumni were asked to rate how well the SOE prepared them for the various aspects of their current positions with a 15-item questionnaire.</p> <p>Each item was scored from Strongly Agree (4) to Strongly Disagree (1). Strongly Agree was the most desirable response. A sample item is:</p> <p>“My SUNY Old Westbury SOE education has provided me with the ability to create learning experiences that are accessible and meaningful for all students.”</p> <p>A response of “3” is “Agree,” so an average of 3 for each item is the performance expectation.</p>	Below is a table with the data of all participants (n=46) who responded to the survey. Response rate was 12%. The numbers in the right column are the mean scores for the respective item.	
		Each item demonstrated a mean of above 3, indicated met performance expectations for all items.	
		My SUNY Old Westbury SOE education has provided me with:	
		In depth knowledge and content in my field.	3.49
		In-depth knowledge and understanding of instructional theory and strategies for planning instruction that supports all students in meeting learning goals.	3.53
The ability to create learning experiences that are accessible and meaningful for all students.	3.50		

		The ability to effectively integrate technology and digital media into my practice strategically.	3.58
		The understanding, respect for, and ability to foster relationships with diverse students, families, and communities.	3.69
		Understanding the importance of analyzing and using educational research in my field.	3.44
		The ability to assess student learning, use assessments to inform practice and improve student learning.	3.46
		The ability to create positive environments that supports learning and development for all students.	3.65
		The ability to demonstrate behavior that supports equality and the belief that all students can learn.	3.66

		The ability to understand and apply educational and institutional policies that relate to my work.	3.43
		The knowledge and skills to engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners including students with disabilities and students who are learning English as a new language.	3.58
		The knowledge and skills necessary to support students' growth in international and global perspectives.	3.58
		The knowledge and skills necessary to establish goals for my professional growth, including goal setting, self-assessment, and reflection in my own practice.	3.50
		The ability to collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning.	3.54

		<table><tr><td>The knowledge of a variety of teaching strategies to develop students critical thinking and problem- solving skills.</td><td>3.54</td></tr></table>	The knowledge of a variety of teaching strategies to develop students critical thinking and problem- solving skills.	3.54				
The knowledge of a variety of teaching strategies to develop students critical thinking and problem- solving skills.	3.54							
Employer Survey	<p>An Employer Survey was conducted in July 2023 of employers of alumni who had graduated from Fall 2019 through Spring 2022. The employers were identified through the Employment Update Survey that the SOE sends recent graduates each semester.</p> <p>In the survey, the employers were asked to rate how skillful the SOE alumna(us) were in various aspects of their current positions with a 15-item questionnaire. The aspects were the same as those of the Alumni Survey so that the results could be compared.</p> <p>Each item was scored from Strongly Agree (4) to Strongly Disagree (1). Strongly Agree was the most desirable response. A sample item is:</p> <p>“Recent SUNY Old Westbury graduates have demonstrated the ability to create learning experiences that are accessible and meaningful for all students.”</p>	<p>Below is a table with the data of all participants (n=21) who responded to the survey. Response rate was 15%. The numbers in the right column are the mean scores for the respective item.</p> <p>Each item demonstrated a mean of above 3, indicated met performance expectations for all items.</p> <table><tr><td colspan="2">Recent SUNY Old Westbury graduates have demonstrated:</td></tr><tr><td>In depth knowledge and content in his/her field.</td><td>3.35</td></tr><tr><td>In-depth knowledge and understanding of instructional theory and strategies for planning instruction that supports all students in meeting learning goals.</td><td>3.45</td></tr></table>	Recent SUNY Old Westbury graduates have demonstrated:		In depth knowledge and content in his/her field.	3.35	In-depth knowledge and understanding of instructional theory and strategies for planning instruction that supports all students in meeting learning goals.	3.45
Recent SUNY Old Westbury graduates have demonstrated:								
In depth knowledge and content in his/her field.	3.35							
In-depth knowledge and understanding of instructional theory and strategies for planning instruction that supports all students in meeting learning goals.	3.45							

	A response of “3” is “Agree,” so an average of 3 for each item is the performance expectation.	The ability to create learning experiences that are accessible and meaningful for all students.	3.42
		The ability to effectively integrate technology and digital media into practice strategically.	3.48
		The understanding, respect for, and ability to foster relationships with diverse students, families, and communities.	3.65
		Understanding the importance of analyzing and using educational research in my field.	3.28
		The ability to assess student learning, use assessments to inform practice and improve student learning.	3.52
		The ability to create positive environments that supports learning and development for all students.	3.63

		The ability to demonstrate behavior that supports equality and the belief that all students can learn.	3.57
		The ability to understand and apply educational and institutional policies that relate to his/her work.	3.40
		The knowledge of a variety of teaching strategies to develop students critical thinking and problem- solving skills.	3.28
		The knowledge and skills to engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners including students with disabilities and students who are learning English as a new language.	3.45
		The knowledge and skills necessary to support students' growth in international and global perspectives.	3.57

		The knowledge and skills necessary to establish goals for professional growth, including goal setting, self-assessment, and reflection in their own practice.	3.45
		The ability to collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning.	3.52

## 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.

### CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS

#### PROGRESS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND INNOVATIONS

The Childhood Department rewrote all course descriptions to reflect new areas of need such as linguistically and culturally diverse pedagogy and current development in teacher preparation programs in relation to state regulations.

Changes were also made after analysis of assessment data, including NYSTCE exam results and individual course assessments collected on LiveText. A rubric for the new TPA assessment was created and curriculum mapping was conducted to be sure all areas are covered in courses taken prior to student teaching.

We changed our admissions process based on the lack of predictive validity from our previous entrance exam by instituting an interview process to collect data from multiple raters to ensure the reliability of our new admissions measure. Reliability and predictive validity will be analyzed after enough data is available.

#### ADOLESCENCE PROGRAMS

##### ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF ALL ADOLESCENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS:

TPA assessments were submitted to the state and approved; these will be implemented in our programs in the 2023-2024 academic year.

Pass rates on the state teaching certification exams—EAS and CST are overwhelmingly high.

TPA seminars addressed content in Technology, Global Education, and Culturally Responsive Pedagogy.

This summer 2023, we offered more summer courses for the graduate adolescence education programs as per graduate student requests. In addition to ED6002 and ED6003, this summer ED6000 is running for the first time in the M.A.T. programs' histories, and we have a robust cohort of students taking the course.

##### Individual program Accomplishments English Education Graduate Programs:

The Graduate English Education cohort of graduating students completed a professional manuscript alongside program coordinator, Dr. Sieben, that they submitted to a peer-reviewed journal in the field of English education that was then accepted for publication (forthcoming).

This year we allowed more flexibility with sequencing of some of the courses when appropriate on a case-by-case basis to improve time to degree completion. This new effort and shift were successful this year.

##### CHALLENGES:

Challenges this year existed in the realm of quality control of adjuncts teaching some pivotal courses, including with student teaching. While one cohort of student teachers had a very responsive and collaborative field supervisor, one did not. We

have put an improvement plan in place to put more systems of “checks” in place along the way for our adjunct faculty to maximize the learning gains of our students.

#### Spanish Education Graduate Programs:

##### EFFORTS/ INNOVATIONS:

There has been a continued effort in the past two years to teach the upcoming and updated New York State World Language Standards in the ED6086 Methods & Materials for Teaching Spanish and ML7500 Assessment & Culture for Teachers courses. These new standards need to be implemented by public schools in NYS this upcoming academic year. The SOE have received positive feedback from cooperating teachers and world language chairs at the districts where our students did their student teaching experience, as well as by administrators at schools where they have interviewed for jobs. This means that these candidates will be able to help teachers in the districts where they will be employed to implement the new required standards and integrating them into their lesson planning.

#### Math Education Programs:

##### Efforts

Last year we received Content Specialty Test (CST) data that although students passed the CST, the data, broken down by competencies, show that our students were weak in Geometry and in Probability & Statistics. One of the courses required for our undergraduate Adolescence Education is MA3180 Foundations in Mathematics, taught by an SOE faculty member, was restructured to emphasize topics in high school geometry: geometric and analytic proofs/proving, measurement from an axiomatic perspective (i.e., where formulas come from and derivation).

#### Science Education Programs:

##### EFFORTS/ INNOVATIONS:

Increased discussion with faculty teaching the programs’ science content courses, particularly with the Biology courses as these represent the majority of the candidates’ preparation has been ongoing, to improve their content performance by aligning the instruction in those courses with the CST content categories.

#### SPECIAL ED PROGRAMS

Accomplishments:

Re-assessed admission procedure to increase diversity and allow for personal growth and improved potential absent of prior academic performance/achievement.

Removal of writing sample for program acceptance procedures because it was a barrier to our targeted population.

Changed on boarding procedures to provide increased consistency among adjunct faculty hires.

Efforts:

Supporting adjuncts to increase consistency in content and teaching to improve students' outcomes across classes.

Providing multi-disciplinary speakers for the CEC student group.

Working on the revision of course descriptions and objectives to reflect PreK-12 NYS certification changes and requirements.

Evaluate EAS and CST results connected to course objectives to address gaps.

Innovations:

Increase opportunities for student placement in elementary schools for class assignments as well as to increase networking opportunities with district partners.

Students are now taking the initiative to advocate for themselves as future leaders within varied roles in the schools they are placed.

Challenge:

1. Over reliance on many adjuncts within our graduate and undergraduate program
2. Large number of students and limited capacity
3. Budget constraints and the need to hire more full-time faculty.
4. Summer and winter class enrollment needs to be reviewed (as low enrolled classes risk class cancelations).