



AAQEP Annual Report for 2025

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 dedicated 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 aim to expose our candidates to a diverse range of theorists to strengthen and deepen their foundational understanding. 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 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 Summer Institute for Teachers, Teacher Opportunity Corp II (TOC II) grant, as well as our Literacy Learning Clinic which serves 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 several 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. Additionally, 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:

Degree	Certification Area
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
<p>Students with Disabilities (All Grades) (B.S)</p> <p>^^In the Students with Disabilities (All Grades) (B.S.) program, which was adapted in 2024-2025 from Special Education with Childhood Education- grades 1-6 (B.S) due to state regulatory changes, there are 11 options within the program for additional certifications and extensions. Below are the different options within the program.</p> <p>1. Students with Disabilities (All Grades) with Early Childhood Extension (Birth-2)</p>	<p>Initial Certification-Students with Disabilities (All Grades)</p> <p>^^In the Students with Disabilities (All Grades) (B.S.) program, which was adapted in 2024-2025 from Special Education with Childhood Education- grades 1-6 (B.S) due to state regulatory changes, there are 11 options within the program for additional certifications and extensions. Below are the accompanying certifications for each corresponding-numbered option within the program.</p>

	1) Initial Certification-Students with Disabilities (All Grades) with Early Childhood Extension (Birth-2)
2.Students with Disabilities (All Grades) with Students with Disabilities Early Childhood Education (Birth-2) Extension	2. Initial Certification -Students with Disabilities (All Grades) with Students with Disabilities Early Childhood (Birth-2) Extension
3. Students with Disabilities (All Grades) and Childhood Education (Grades 1-6)	3. Initial Certification- Students with Disabilities (All Grades) and Childhood Education
4. Students with Disabilities (All Grades) and Childhood Education (Grades 1-6) with Early Childhood Education (Birth-2) Extension	4. Initial Certification-Students with Disabilities (All Grades) and Childhood Education with Early Childhood Extension (Birth-2)
5. Students with Disabilities (All Grades) and Childhood Education (Grades 1-6) with Students with Disabilities Early Childhood (Birth-2) Extension	5. Initial Certification-Students with Disabilities (All Grades) and Childhood Education with Students with Disabilities Early Childhood Extension (Birth-2)
6. Students with Disabilities (All Grades) with Bilingual Extension	6. Initial Certification-Students with Disabilities (All Grades with Bilingual Extension
7. Students with Disabilities (All Grades) and Childhood Education (Grades 1-6) with Bilingual Extension	7. Initial Certification-Students with Disabilities (All Grades) and Childhood Education with Bilingual Extension
8. Students with Disabilities (All Grades) with Bilingual and Early Childhood Education (Birth-2) Extensions	8. Initial Certification- Students with Disabilities (All Grades) with Bilingual and Early Childhood (Birth-2) Extension
9. Students with Disabilities (All Grades) with Bilingual and Students with Disabilities Early Childhood Education (Birth-2) Extensions	9. Initial Certification-Students with Disabilities (All Grades) with Bilingual and Students with Disabilities Early Childhood (Birth-2) Extension
10. Students with Disabilities (All Grades) and Childhood Education (Grades 1-6) with	10. Students with Disabilities (All Grades) and Childhood Education (Grades 1-6) with

Bilingual and Early Childhood (Birth-2) Extensions	Bilingual and Early Childhood (Birth-2) Extensions	
11. Students with Disabilities (All Grades) and Childhood Education (Grades 1-6) with Bilingual and Students with Disabilities Early Childhood Education (Birth-2) Extensions	11. Initial Certification - Students with Disabilities (All Grades) and Childhood Education (Grades 1-6) with Bilingual and Students with Disabilities Early Childhood Education (Birth-2) Extensions	
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. Students with Disabilities (All Grades)	Initial/Professional Certification-Students with Disabilities
**M.S. Literacy (All Grades)	Initial/Professional Certification-Literacy Education

** The M.S. program in Students with Disabilities (All Grades) leads to initial certification. After a completer fulfills New York's classroom hours requirement, the completer may apply for a professional certification. As a result of regulatory state changes, in fall 2024, M.S. Childhood Special Education (Grades 1-6) became M.S. Students with Disabilities (All Grades). These substantive changes were accepted by AAQEP in a Substantive Change Response in December 2024.*

*** 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. As a result of regulatory state changes, in fall 2024, all previous tracks for the M.S. in Literacy were consolidated into M.S. Literacy (All Grades). These substantive changes were accepted by AAQEP in a Substantive Change Response in December 2024.*

****The Advanced Certificate and B.A./M.A.T. and B.S./M.A.T. programs are very low-enrollment programs. Additionally, the curricula are the same for the corresponding M.A.T. programs, except for 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.*

^^ In the substantive change form, it was stated that the state has required that all Special Education programs become Students with Disabilities (All Grades) programs. The School of Education did this, as shown above. However, we also now offer additional certification and extension options for candidates in the Students with Disabilities (All Grades) program. Below are those options.

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/school-education/about-us/see-how-were-doing>

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>			
Childhood Education-grades 1-6 (B.S.)	Initial Certification-Childhood Education	174	56
Childhood Education-grades 1-6 with Bilingual Extension (B.S.)	Initial Certification-Childhood Education with Bilingual Extension	27	12
Special Education with Childhood Education- grades 1-6 (B.S.) *In Spring 2025, this program became Students with Disabilities (All Grades) B.S. The Registrar is updating the classification but still lists candidates under the old program title. When the	Initial Certification-Students with Disabilities Grades 1-6 and Childhood Education Grades 1-6 **Students who entered the program in Spring 2025 and later will receive Initial Certification in Students with Disabilities. Students can attain	77	17

new classification is adopted, candidates will be reported as being in the Students with Disabilities (All Grades) B.S., as well as there being a specification of which track they are in. To review all of the tracks, please refer to the nested table inside Table 1 above.	additional certifications and extensions depending on their track, as outlined in Table 1 above. Each track's certification will be detailed in this table starting next year.		
<p>Special Education with Childhood Education and Bilingual Extension (B.S.)</p> <p>** Consistent to the changes described above for the newly-named Students with Disabilities (All Grades) B.S. program, starting next year, this degree will appear as the track, "Students with Disabilities (All Grades) and Bilingual Extension" withing the Students with Disabilities (All Grades) B.S. program.</p>	<p>Initial Certification-Students with Disabilities Grades 1-6 and Childhood Education Grades 1-6 and Bilingual Extension</p> <p>**Students who entered the program in Spring 2025 and later will receive Initial Certification in Students with Disabilities and a Bilingual Extension.</p>	8	2
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	26	6
Adolescence Education Chemistry-Grades 7-12 (B.A., B.S., and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-Chemistry Education- Grades 7-12	0	0
Adolescence Education English Language Arts-Grades 7-12 (M.A.T. and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-English Language Arts Education- Grades 7-12	54	17
Adolescence Education Mathematics-Grades 7-12 (B.S., M.A.T., and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-Mathematics Education- Grades 7-12	23	6

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	109	33
Adolescence Education Spanish-Grades 7-12 (M.A.T. and Advanced Certificate)	Initial Certification-Spanish Education- Grades 7-12	25	5
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		523	154
<i>Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators</i>			
M.S. Childhood Special Education- Grades 1-6 ****In Fall 2024, this program became M.S. Students with Disabilities (All Grades). The Registrar is updating the classification but still lists candidates under the old program title. When the new classification is adopted, candidates will be reported as being in the M.S. Students with Disabilities (All Grades).	Initial/Professional Certification- Childhood Special Education- Grades 1- 6 ** Students who entered the program in Fall 2024 and later will receive Initial Certification in Students with Disabilities.	92	31
M.S. Literacy Education Birth through Grade 6, Grades 7-12, or Birth-Grade 12	Initial/Professional Certification- Literacy Education	56	28
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		148	59
<i>Programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials</i>			
		0	0
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>			
		0	0
Total for programs that lead to specialized professional or no specific credentials		0	0

TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs	671	213
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers	671	213

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.)

Programs have not been added or discontinued. Rather, the Literacy and Students with Disabilities programs have been modified to adhere to new state regulations that require these programs to prepare candidates for all grades. These modifications are discussed in detail above in Section 1.

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.
671
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.
213
C. Number of recommendations for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.
306

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 2020, Spring 2021, Fall 2021, and Spring 2022 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 2020	48	43			90%		
Spring 2021	39	31			80%		
Fall 2021	46	41	2		89%	4%	
Spring 2022	31	25			81%		
Undergrad Childhood 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 2020	6	5			83%		
Spring 2021	2	1			50%		
Fall 2021	5	5			100%		
Spring 2022	2	2			100%		
Undergrad Special 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 2020	27	24			89%		
Spring 2021	17	12	1		71%	6%	
Fall 2021	27	26			96%		
Spring 2022	13	10			77%		
<u>Undergrad Special Education with Bilingual Extension</u> <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 2020	7	6			86%		
Spring 2021	1	1			100%		
Fall 2021	3	2			67%		
Spring 2022							
<u>Undergrad Adolescent Social Studies</u> <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 2020	7	4	1		57%	14%	
Spring 2021	3	3			100%		

Fall 2021	8	5			63%		
Spring 2022	6	2	2		33%	33%	

Undergrad Adolescent Biology
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 2020							
Spring 2021							
Fall 2021	3		1			33%	
Spring 2022							

Undergrad Adolescent Chemistry
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 2020							
Spring 2021							
Fall 2021							
Spring 2022							

Undergrad Adolescent Mathematics <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 2020	5	4	1		80%	20%	
Spring 2021	1	1			100%		
Fall 2021	6	2	2		33%	33%	
Spring 2022	2	1			50%		
MAT – English Language Arts <u>Expected Completion Timeframe for Fall Entrants = 4 Semesters</u> <u>Expected Completion Timeframe for Spring Entrants = 5 Semesters</u>							
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 2020	8	7	1		88%	12%	
Spring 2021	7	5			71%		
Fall 2021	7	4	2		57%	29%	
Spring 2022	2	1			50%		
MAT – Social Studies <u>Expected Completion Timeframe for Fall Entrants = 4 Semesters</u> <u>Expected Completion Timeframe for Spring Entrants = 5 Semesters</u>							
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 2020	12	11			92%		

Spring 2021	7	4			57%		
Fall 2021	8	2	4		25%	50%	
Spring 2022	7	6			86%		

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 2020	5	5			100%		
Spring 2021	2	1			50%		
Fall 2021	2	0	2		0%	100%	
Spring 2022	1	1			100%		

MAT – Spanish

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 2020	6	5			83%		
Spring 2021	1	1			100%		
Fall 2021	3	3			100%		
Spring 2022	2	1			50%		

MAT – Mathematics <u>Expected Completion Timeframe for Fall Entrants = 4 Semesters</u> <u>Expected Completion Timeframe for Spring Entrants = 5 Semesters</u>							
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 2020	2	2			100%		
Spring 2021	3	2	1		67%	33%	
Fall 2021	3	3			100%		
Spring 2022	1	1			100%		
MS Childhood Special Education <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 2020	16	6	6		38%	75%	
Spring 2021							
Fall 2021	12	7	5		58%	42%	
Spring 2022							
MS Literacy <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 2020	24	22			92%		
Spring 2021							

Fall 2021	20	18	1		90%	5%	
Spring 2022							

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%.

Summary for 2023-2024, the last year with official state data:

The two types of certification exams reported include the **Content Specialty Tests (CSTs)**, specific to each program area, and the **Educating All Students (EAS)** exam, which assesses pedagogical knowledge related to teaching diverse groups of learners. The overall pass rate for the EAS exam was **91%**, while the CST pass rates ranged from **83% to 100%**, with all exams exceeding an 80% pass rate.

For the **English Language Arts (ELA)** CST, the one-year pass rate was **67%** (2 out of 3 candidates passing). However, due to the program's low enrollment, the **three-year aggregate pass rate** provides a more reliable indicator of performance at **80%** (16 out of 20 candidates passing).

In the **Childhood Education and Special Education** programs, candidates take the **Multi-Subject CST**. Faculty in these programs have made concerted efforts to strengthen candidate preparation, following a pass rate of **73%** two years ago. Through targeted workshops and enhanced guidance, the pass rate improved to **84%**, demonstrating the positive impact of these initiatives. The goal is to continue building on this progress in future cycles.

More detailed reporting of each exam's pass rate is provided in **Section 4** below.

F. Explanation of evidence available from program completers, with a characterization of findings.

The primary sources of evidence from program completers are the Employment Update Survey and the Alumni Survey. The Employment Update Survey is discussed below in **Section H**. The Alumni Survey is discussed in **Section 4, Table 4**. The survey, under the newly adopted schedule, is administered every fall. Alumni from the most recent academic year who had been out of school for at least a year, are asked how they perceive the School of Education has prepared them for their current positions. Fourteen 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. Thirteen of the 14 items had mean scores above 3.0. The only item that

scored below 3.0 related to understanding of institutional policy. When the members of the Assessment Committee were presented with this data, they produced multiple recommendations to address this issue. These include having P-12 Administrators visit and hold forums on navigating school and institutional policies for new teachers, including such topic in our Professional Development Day, and incorporating such topic in the curriculum. These adaptations will be made in collaboration with faculty.

G. 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 October 2025. We identified the employers through the responses in the Employment Update Survey sent out to alumni who graduated within the past three years as well as through internet searches to identify alumni positions and places of employment. 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 fourteen 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. The employers rated the alumni higher than the alumni rated themselves. On 12 of the 14 items, the employer scores were higher than those of the alumni scores, and on average, the mean item score was 0.36 points higher on the employer survey than on the alumni survey. SOE faculty use this data to communicate with our P-12 partners and among themselves to address the results and plan programmatic operations moving forward.

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.

Currently, the SOE receives no data from the state on completers, so we must generate the data we need. Every semester, the SOE emails all alumni who graduated within the past three years for an update on their employment status. The Employment Update Survey, which is an Outlook Forms survey that asks them to indicate their semester of graduation, their major, their current position, their current district (if working in public school), their current school, and what year they began working at their current employer.

Based on response rates in past years using varied survey schedules, we returned this year to the practice of surveying the past three years’ graduates each year for the Employment Update Survey. Our most recent Employment Update Survey was

conducted in May 2025. With the larger sample, we were able to obtain responses from 92 completers, albeit with a lower response rate of 15%.

Out of the total respondents, 86% reported being employed in a P-12 school. Of those employed, the breakdown of their job titles is as follows: Teacher of Record =32%, Substitute = 48%, Leave Replacement = 4%, Teacher's Assistant =15%, Literacy Specialist =1%.

Last year's survey was of only the 2023-2024 completers, before the SOE decided to go back to three-year cohorts of respondents. Therefore, for a more accurate comparison between last year's results and this year's results, we examined how the 2023-2024 completers responded immediately after graduation with this year's respondents immediately after graduation. We examined the percentage of each cohort occupying different roles in their current employment.

Comparison of 2023-2024 Completers Immediately After Graduation and 2024-2025 Completers Immediately After Graduation		
	2023-2024 Completers	2024-2025 Completers
Teacher of Record	20%	32%
Substitute	59%	48%
Leave Replacement	0%	4%
Teacher's Assistant	20%	15%
Literacy Specialist	0%	1%

* All percentage values have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

With the small sample sizes involved, there are no significant differences between the percentages of 2023-2024 completers and 2024-2025 completers who immediately became teachers of record, and we will continue to monitor that to examine if it is significant over time.

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.

During the reporting year, staffing capacity for program delivery, administration, and quality assurance has remained stable and continues to align with the size and scope of the program. Faculty workloads and administrative roles have been adjusted as needed to ensure adequate coverage of courses, field supervision, and assessment responsibilities. To further strengthen capacity and address areas of concern, we have submitted hiring needs requests to the provost to support

program delivery and maintain the effectiveness of our quality assurance systems. The current structure, along with the proposed hires, will ensure continued alignment between staffing capacity and program demands.

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																	
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. Successful performance on the 8-item assessment is considered an average score of 3 out of 4, or a total score of 24.	The average scores on the assessment for each Student Teaching course: When Scored by Cooperating Teacher (CT): Average score of 27.00. 82% of assessments averaged 3.0 per item or higher. When Scored by Faculty Supervisor (FS): Average score of 25.96. 73% of assessments averaged 3.0 per item or higher.																	
	The Candidate Proficiency Evaluation Form is used for Adolescence Biology. The assessment is scored on a scale of 1 - 3. Successful performance on the 23-item assessment is considered an average score of 2 out of 3, or a total score of 46.																		
		<table><tr><th>Course</th><th>FS Average Score</th><th>CT Average Score</th></tr><tr><td>ED5900</td><td>26.09</td><td>26.66</td></tr><tr><td>ED5940</td><td>24.03</td><td>26.29</td></tr><tr><td>ED5960</td><td>26.26</td><td>28.88</td></tr><tr><td>ED6901</td><td>28.26</td><td>29.65</td></tr><tr><td>ED6902</td><td>27.56</td><td>28.80</td></tr></table>	Course	FS Average Score	CT Average Score	ED5900	26.09	26.66	ED5940	24.03	26.29	ED5960	26.26	28.88	ED6901	28.26	29.65	ED6902	27.56
Course	FS Average Score	CT Average Score																	
ED5900	26.09	26.66																	
ED5940	24.03	26.29																	
ED5960	26.26	28.88																	
ED6901	28.26	29.65																	
ED6902	27.56	28.80																	

		<table><tr><td>ED6903</td><td>27.72</td><td>25.35</td></tr><tr><td>ED6904</td><td>28.00</td><td>26.17</td></tr><tr><td>ED7026</td><td>27.85</td><td>28.30</td></tr></table> <p>The average scores on the CPEF were:</p> <p>When Scored by Cooperating Teacher (CT): Average score of 48.50. 100% of assessments averaged 2.0 per item or higher.</p> <p>When Scored by Faculty Supervisor (FS): Average score of 63.60. 100% of assessments averaged 2.0 per item or higher.</p> <table><tr><td>Course</td><td>FS Average Score</td><td>CT Average Score</td></tr><tr><td>ED5900</td><td>N/A</td><td>48.50</td></tr><tr><td>ED6900</td><td>63.60</td><td>N/A</td></tr></table>	ED6903	27.72	25.35	ED6904	28.00	26.17	ED7026	27.85	28.30	Course	FS Average Score	CT Average Score	ED5900	N/A	48.50	ED6900	63.60	N/A
ED6903	27.72	25.35																		
ED6904	28.00	26.17																		
ED7026	27.85	28.30																		
Course	FS Average Score	CT Average Score																		
ED5900	N/A	48.50																		
ED6900	63.60	N/A																		
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. Successful performance on the 10-item assessment is considered an average item score of 3 out of 4 on rubric, or a 30 overall.	<p>The average scores on the assessment for each Student Teaching course.</p> <p>When Scored by Cooperating Teacher: Average score of 35.36. 81% of assessments averaged 3.0 per item or higher.</p> <p>When Scored by Faculty Supervisor: Average item score of 35.27.</p>																		

		88% of assessments averaged 3.0 per item or higher. <table><tr><th>Course</th><th>FS Average Score</th><th>CT Average Score</th></tr><tr><td>ED5900</td><td>31.43</td><td>33.86</td></tr><tr><td>ED5940</td><td>35.59</td><td>35.52</td></tr><tr><td>ED5960</td><td>34.93</td><td>35.72</td></tr><tr><td>ED6900</td><td>36.75</td><td>37.50</td></tr><tr><td>ED6901</td><td>38.00</td><td>36.41</td></tr><tr><td>ED6902</td><td>32.60</td><td>34.17</td></tr><tr><td>ED6903</td><td>35.46</td><td>34.74</td></tr><tr><td>ED6904</td><td>36.33</td><td>35.00</td></tr><tr><td>ED7026</td><td>40.00</td><td>37.13</td></tr></table>	Course	FS Average Score	CT Average Score	ED5900	31.43	33.86	ED5940	35.59	35.52	ED5960	34.93	35.72	ED6900	36.75	37.50	ED6901	38.00	36.41	ED6902	32.60	34.17	ED6903	35.46	34.74	ED6904	36.33	35.00	ED7026	40.00	37.13
Course	FS Average Score	CT Average Score																														
ED5900	31.43	33.86																														
ED5940	35.59	35.52																														
ED5960	34.93	35.72																														
ED6900	36.75	37.50																														
ED6901	38.00	36.41																														
ED6902	32.60	34.17																														
ED6903	35.46	34.74																														
ED6904	36.33	35.00																														
ED7026	40.00	37.13																														
Lesson Planning Assessment	<p>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 average item scores 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 ED4085, ED6092, and ED6082, the Methods courses for Science. That rubric uses a 3-point scale. For those courses, success is defined as an average item score of 2.5 out of 3.</p>	Lesson Plan Assessment Average Item Scores: <table><tr><th>Course</th><th>Average Item Score</th></tr><tr><td>ED4082</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>ED4085</td><td>2.30</td></tr><tr><td>ED4086</td><td>3.47</td></tr><tr><td>ED6082</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>ED4121</td><td>3.65</td></tr><tr><td>ED6083</td><td>3.58</td></tr><tr><td>ED6085</td><td>3.46</td></tr><tr><td>ED6086</td><td>3.09</td></tr><tr><td>ED6092</td><td>2.66</td></tr><tr><td>ED6093</td><td>3.89</td></tr><tr><td>ED6095</td><td>3.74</td></tr></table>	Course	Average Item Score	ED4082	N/A	ED4085	2.30	ED4086	3.47	ED6082	N/A	ED4121	3.65	ED6083	3.58	ED6085	3.46	ED6086	3.09	ED6092	2.66	ED6093	3.89	ED6095	3.74						
Course	Average Item Score																															
ED4082	N/A																															
ED4085	2.30																															
ED4086	3.47																															
ED6082	N/A																															
ED4121	3.65																															
ED6083	3.58																															
ED6085	3.46																															
ED6086	3.09																															
ED6092	2.66																															
ED6093	3.89																															
ED6095	3.74																															

Literacy Practicum	Average score of 12.0 out of 16.0 on rubric.	Course	Average Rubric Score	
		ED7323	15.52	
Certification Exam: CST	Passing score: Score of 520 or above	Pass Rates for Each CST 2023-2024		
		Exam	Pass Rate	N
		Biology	83	12
		Chemistry	N/A	0
		English	67*	3
		Mathematics	91	11
		Multi-Subject	84	70
		Social Studies	86	22
		Spanish	100	5
		Students with Disabilities	100	21
		*There were only 3 test takers for English and only 5 test takers for Spanish in 2023-2024. The three-year combined pass rate for English is 80% and for Spanish, it is 100%.		
Certification Exam: EAS	Passing score: Score of 500 or above	Pass Rate for EAS 2023-2024		
		Pass Rate	N	
		91	150	

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
Alumni Survey	The Alumni Survey is now administered in 1-year intervals. Each fall, the alumni who had completed a full year earlier are	Below is a table with the data of all participants (n=25) who responded to the survey. Response rate was 12%. The

	<p>surveyed. Therefore, the alumni who graduated in 2023-2024 were surveyed in Fall 2025. Presented here is the data for the survey that was completed in Fall 2025.</p> <p>An Alumni Survey was conducted in Fall 2025 of alumni who graduated in the 2023-2024 academic year.</p> <p>In previous administrations of the survey, the surveyed population was three years of completers. However, we initially launched a survey for three years of completers and received fewer than 10 responses. Such a response rate, especially for a population of over 500 alumni, could not provide us with sufficient data to inform our practices.</p> <p>The Assistant Dean for Data Management, in collaboration with faculty, examined factors influencing the response rate and explored strategies to enhance participation. One reason for the low response rate was that spam filters had become more aggressive, and the email address sending the emails was likely filtered into spam folders. Furthermore, response rates for online surveys continues to fall, as potential respondents do not trust emails from people they do not know, especially when</p>	<p>numbers in the right column are the mean scores for the respective item.</p> <p>Each item demonstrated a mean of above 3, indicating <i>met performance expectations</i> for all items.</p>	
	My SUNY Old Westbury SOE education has provided me with:		
	In depth knowledge and content in my field.	3.12	
	In-depth knowledge and understanding of instructional theory and strategies for planning instruction that supports all students in meeting learning goals.	3.24	
	The ability to create learning experiences that are accessible and meaningful for all students.	3.40	
	The ability to effectively integrate technology and digital media into my practice strategically.	3.00	

	the email requires them to click on a link.	The understanding, respect for, and ability to foster relationships with diverse students, families, and communities.	3.48
	<p>The solution was to have professors personally email the alumni, asking them to fill out the survey and providing them with the link. The professors were given the list of alumni and told to select candidates who they knew. Because of the time-intensive nature of this approach and the time burden on faculty members, the decision was made to target only candidates from the most recent academic year who had been out of school for at least a year. In other words, in Fall 2025, alumni who had graduated in 2023-2024 were surveyed. The survey will be repeated each fall.</p> <p>Alumni were asked to rate how well the SOE prepared them for the various aspects of their current positions with a 14-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>	Understanding the importance of analyzing and using educational research in my field.	3.08
		The ability to assess student learning, use assessments to inform practice and improve student learning.	3.32
		The ability to create positive environments that supports learning and development for all students.	3.40
		The ability to demonstrate behavior that supports equality and the belief that all students can learn.	3.48
		The ability to understand and apply educational and institutional policies that relate to my work.	2.92

	A response of “3” is “Agree,” so an average of 3 for each item is the performance expectation.	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.	3.32
		The knowledge and skills necessary to support students’ growth in international and global perspectives.	3.24
		The knowledge and skills necessary to establish goals for my professional growth, including goal setting, self-assessment, and reflection in my own practice.	3.24
		The ability to collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning.	3.16
Employer Survey	An Employer Survey was conducted in October 2025 of employers of alumni who graduated from Fall 2021 through Spring 2024. The employers were identified through the Employment Update Survey that the SOE sends recent	Below is a table with the data of all participants (n=15) who responded to the survey. Response rate was 33%. The numbers in the right column are the mean scores for the respective item.	

	<p>graduates each semester. Additionally, internet searches were conducted on all alumni from this time period to ascertain their current place of employment.</p> <p>In the survey, the employers were asked to rate how skillful the SOE alumna(us) were in various aspects of current positions with a 14-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>A response of “3” is “Agree,” so an average of 3 for each item is the performance expectation.</p>	<p>Each item demonstrated a mean of above 3, indicating <i>met performance expectations</i> for all items.</p>	
	Recent SUNY Old Westbury graduates have demonstrated:		
	In depth knowledge and content in his/her field.	3.53	
	In-depth knowledge and understanding of instructional theory and strategies for planning instruction that supports all students in meeting learning goals.	3.47	
	The ability to create learning experiences that are accessible and meaningful for all students.	3.80	
	The ability to effectively integrate technology and digital media into practice strategically.	3.47	
	The understanding, respect for, and ability to foster relationships with diverse students, families, and communities.	3.93	

		Understanding the importance of analyzing and using educational research in field.	3.50
		The ability to assess student learning, use assessments to inform practice and improve student learning.	3.60
		The ability to create positive environments that supports learning and development for all students.	3.93
		The ability to demonstrate behavior that supports equality and the belief that all students can learn.	3.80
		The ability to understand and apply educational and institutional policies that relate to his/her work.	3.53
		The knowledge and skills to engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners including students with disabilities and	3.60

		students who are learning English as a new language.	
		The knowledge and skills necessary to support students' growth in international and global perspectives.	3.29
		The knowledge and skills necessary to establish goals for professional growth, including goal setting, self-assessment, and reflection in their own practice.	3.67
		The ability to collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning.	3.87

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 AND LITERACY

Within the Childhood Education and Literacy Department, faculty achieved several notable accomplishments and implemented innovative initiatives (listed below) to enhance teaching, learning, and program effectiveness.

- Stemn, B. *Promoting Equitable and Inclusive Education for Sustainable National Development in Liberia* at Liberia Studies conference in Maryland.
- DeGregory, C., LaCelle-Peterson, M., Lowenstein, K., Schneider, S. (2025). *Locating Quality in the Dynamic Educator Preparation Landscape: Creating Quality in Context*. Myers Education Press.
- Lynch, A. "Building a pathway to success: Lessons from implementation of an afterschool program for newcomers," has been accepted for the 2025 NYSABE Annual Conference.
- Schneider, S. (2024). Dialogue and Learning: The impact of Martin Buber on modern education. *Research Features*.
- Stephanie Schneider (2025), "*The role of dialogue in teaching and learning*", Open Access Government April 2025, pp.244-245. Available at <https://www.openaccessgovernment.org/article/the-role-of-dialogue-in-teaching-and-learning/189133/>
- Hsu, A. (2024). Take a stand: Engaging teacher education students in the physicality of learning. In L. Baecher and L. Portnoy (Eds.) *Playful pedagogy in higher education: Research and Cases from across the disciplines*. Knowledge Studies in Higher Education, vol 14. Springer

For the Literacy Graduate Program, we moved to the new certification (B-12) that was mandated by the state. This has enabled candidates to be trained to work with students at the early childhood, childhood, middle, and high school levels which has benefited their understanding of teaching literacy to a range of learners.

The Literacy Program and the Childhood Program have restructured the literacy courses to include the Science of Reading into the coursework. Candidates learn about the Science of Reading and how to implement explicit and systematic literacy instruction into their teaching.

We reinstated the observation and practicum course (ED 5930) which offers teacher candidates under close supervision several key benefits in multiple domains including but not limited to: *Real-World Teaching Experience; Classroom Management Skills; Mentorship and Feedback; Lesson Planning and Instructional Practice; Student Engagement Techniques; Professional Identity Development; Assessment and Evaluation Skills; Reflection and Self-Assessment; GoReact Technology; Networking and Career Preparation*. The department regularly reviews and updates the curriculum based on feedback from

school districts, the School of Education Advisory Board, and emerging national and state trends in teacher preparation. For instance, our two literacy courses have been revised, and continue to be refined, in response to the Science of Reading initiative, the emphasis on systematic phonics instruction, and the integration of evidence-based practices.

To support teacher candidates in successfully passing the NYSTCE, the department has embedded state certification test preparation into TPA seminars and methods courses. This integration has contributed to an improvement in candidates' pass rates on the certification exam. For example, in 2022-23, **73%** of the candidates passed the multisubject content specialty test. After the intervention during the 2023-24 academic year, **84%** of the candidates who took the test passed.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

- **Faculty Excellence and Scholarship**

Faculty continue to publish in respected journals and present at conferences globally, enhancing the program's academic reputation and relevance. Faculty publish widely in peer-reviewed journals and present at international, national, and regional conferences.

- **Flexible Learning and Access**

Online, hybrid, and weekend courses were added to meet candidate needs and expand access for working professionals. Aligned with NYSED certification changes, we launched two new programs that broaden certification from Grades 1–6 to Pre-K–12, covering ages 3–21.

- **AI and Trauma-Informed Practice Integration**

The program is integrating training in AI tools and trauma-informed care to prepare candidates for contemporary classroom challenges.

- **Curricular Redesign**

Aligned with NYSED certification changes, we launched two new programs that broaden certification from Grades 1–6 to Pre-K–12, covering ages 3–21.

- **District and Grant Partnerships**

Collaborations with local school districts and participation in state and federal grants are providing practical training opportunities and growing community impact.

ADOLESCENCE

American Museum of Natural History (AMNH) Partnership - courses are offered through the museum as part of graduate program requirements.

This partnership has provided an effective solution to the long-standing challenge of scheduling graduate science content courses, especially since the Biology Department has not had sufficient faculty to offer all the courses required for the M.A.T. Biology program. Without this partnership, candidates could face delays in program completion, an outcome that is unacceptable if we wish to remain competitive, particularly given that our lower tuition is a major attraction for prospective candidates.

In December of 2024 we had 4 program completers, and in May 2025, we had 11 program completers- all from the M.A.T. in English Language Arts 7-12th grade program, 2 Advanced Certificate in English. (These numbers indicate successful completion of a goal we set in the 2024 AAQEP Annual Report to “Graduate more program completers in the upcoming academic year(s).”)

The English education programs continued to see exponential growth in enrollment/qualified applicants admitted who chose to attend Old Westbury for their graduate programs in English education this year, notably we had 10 newly accepted and enrolled candidates in the spring 2025 semester, which is a new trend given that we typically have only had about 3-5 new candidates starting in the spring semester.

The Graduate English Ed cohort of graduating candidates completed the process of researching and writing for a professional manuscript for which they identified peer-reviewed journals in the field that they will submit to.

EFFORTS/ INNOVATIONS:

This year the faculty continued to work with candidates to develop their professional presence in the field. They worked on research and writing for publication and presentation, and two graduate candidates in 2 different cohorts of the program created writing that resulted in publication acceptances in a newly published peer-reviewed book, an edited collection, *Teaching Writing Hope in Uncertain Times*, edited by the professor, which details the ways in which these graduate candidates, in-service teachers integrated hope goals into their teaching of ELA during uncertain times.

Last year, the CST data showed that an overwhelming majority of our candidates are passing the English CST, but the two areas they showed the lowest mean scores were in the following subsections: Reading Literature and Reading Informational Texts. As such, we intentionally chose to integrate this content more explicitly into the content and methods courses, with particular attention paid to close reading of informational texts, which are an important part of the state ELA standards. Subsequently, scores increase on the CST this year.

Given the high number of candidates enrolled for the spring semester, the SOE provided additional flexibility in course sequencing this academic year. When appropriate and on a case-by-case basis, we adjusted the order of certain courses to support timely degree completion and to help maintain our goal of a two-year completion timeline for the M.A.T. programs. This continued new effort and shift was successful this year as there were 4 candidates who took the first methods courses alongside the other education pre-requisite course as a co-requisite and did exceptionally well.

CHALLENGES:

Challenges this year included fewer course offerings in the content area courses with two full-time faculty members on sabbatical who typically teach 2 English courses in the graduate English education programs. With both faculty members returning this fall, we believe this challenge will be rectified in the upcoming academic year.

Some continued challenges are, though less so this year with our awareness of these issues, is in the realm of quality control of adjuncts teaching some pivotal courses in the programs, including foundations and student teaching. Most adjuncts followed all key assessment protocol and checked in with the Program Coordinator/Department Chair periodically. The improvement plan we put in place to have more “checks” along the way for our adjunct faculty maximized the learning gains of our candidates this year in those courses.

Because there were discrepancies between Student Teaching Assessment scores from undergraduates and graduate candidates in the Social Studies programs, since Spring 2024, the method courses (ED6085/ED4086) that used to be taught together were split between undergraduate (ED4086) and graduate candidates (ED6085). It allowed the faculty coordinator to answer the specific needs of two different groups of candidates and help them to perform better.