AAQEP Annual Report for 2025

Provider/Program Name:	St. John's University – Educator Preparation
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or "n/a" if not yet accredited):	12/31/2030

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 Educator Preparation Program (EPP) in the School of Education (SOE) at St. John's University (SJU) is shared by two departments: Curriculum & Instruction and Education Specialties. The SOE has four major goals consistent with the mission and distinctive purposes of SJU: To foster a culture of academic excellence and commitment to moral values; to provide for the professional development of faculty and students; to support and encourage excellence in teaching and scholarly research; and to serve as a partner and resource to the larger educational community. In line with these goals, the SOE also embraces culturally responsive, evidence-based practices that challenge students to be vanguards of powerful and positive changes in the world. These goals help guide our professors and students and underpin our programs and course syllabi. Additionally, the ethos of the Vincentian mission, a central, animating force for the entire university that arose from a Catholic order of brothers and priests

dedicated to serving "the poor, the lonely, and the forgotten," (The Vincentian Mission) helps also to guide and inform our program development, delivery, and ongoing commitment to a culture of assessment.

Overview of Programs

The Departments of Curriculum & Instruction and Educational Specialties support both undergraduate and graduate students as they engage in their teacher preparation coursework. The departments work together to:

- Create an academic community that supports student success through engagement in an innovative educational setting that strives for equity and access for all students;
- Provide a rigorous, standards-aligned curriculum in classes that engage students in understanding and furthering inventive research and theory;
- Establish a network of partnerships including researchers and practitioners that investigates and produces social change within educational contexts;
- Incorporate innovative research and practices to reinforce service-oriented teaching and leadership practices;
- Recruit, retain, and guide engaged educational practitioners who advocate for inclusivity and excellence within the learning environment.

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.stjohns.edu/academics/schools/school-education/about/accreditation-information

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 05/25)	**Number of Completers** in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 06/25)
Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials			
Bachelor of Science in Education BSED and BSED/MSED	Adolescent Education, 7-12 (Initial)	138	37
	Childhood, 1-6 (Initial)	256	74
Master of Science in Education MSED	Adolescent Education, 7-12 (Initial)	21	9
	Childhood Education, 1-6 (Initial)	34	4
	Early Childhood, B-2 (Initial)	8	2
	English to Speakers of Other Languages, PK-12 (Initial)	18	1
	Literacy, all programs and grade bands (Initial)	20	10
	Students with Disabilities, all programs and grade bands (Initial)	57	30
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		552	167
Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators			
Master of Science in Education MSED	English to Speakers of Other Languages, PK-12 (Initial/Prof)	13	9

	Literacy, all programs and grade bands (Initial/Prof)	10	14
	Students with Disabilities, all programs and grade bands (Initial/Prof)	4	6
Advanced Certificates ADVCRT	Bilingual (Initial/Prof)	3	1
	English to Speakers of Other Languages, PK-12 (Initial/Prof)	37	18
	Middle School Extension (Initial/Prof)	2	1
	Students with Disabilities, all programs and grade bands (Initial/Prof)	2	0
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		71	49
Programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials			
Total for programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials		0	0
Programs that lead to credentials for specialized professionals or to no specific credential			
Total for programs that lead to specialized professional or no specific credentials		0	0
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs		623	216
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers		580	212

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.)

NYS required higher education institutions to revise their literacy programs to meet new grade band requirements. Previous programs in literacy that were delineated by grade bands (i.e., B-6 or 5-12) had to be revised to include all grades (i.e. PK-12).

Due to this change required by the state, 15 separate major codes/programs in literacy collapsed into 5. A substantive change form was submitted and approved by AAQEP for these collective changes.

NYS is requiring higher education institutions to revise their students with disabilities programs to meet new grade band requirements. Previous programs in special education that were delineated by grade bands (i.e., 1-6 or 7-12) are being revised to include all grades (i.e. PK-12). Due to this change required by the state, 9 separate students with disabilities major codes/programs are being collapsed into 7. A substantive change form will be submitted to AAQEP once all approvals from NYS are received.

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.
580
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.
212
C. **Number of recommendations** for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.
233
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.
For the fall 2018 first-time, first-year students entering the School of Education 63% graduated within 4 years with a BSED degree from the School of Education. There were no additional graduates beyond 4 years from the 2018 cohort.

For the fall 2022 first-time graduate students entering the School of Education pursuing a MSED, 94% of students in initial certification programs graduated with a MSED within 2 years, 98% graduated with a MSED within 3 years.

For the fall 2022 first-time graduate students entering the School of Education pursuing a MSED, 63% of students in additional/advanced certification programs graduated with a MSED within 2 years, 88% graduated with a MSED within 3 years.

For the fall 2022 first-time graduate students entering the School of Education pursuing an advanced certificate, 93% of students in additional/advanced certification programs graduated with an advanced certificate within 2 years, 100% graduated with an advanced certificate within 3 years.

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%.

Title II data for reporting year 2024 shows the cumulative pass rate for CST and EAS exams for St. John's University was 86%. This data includes test takers from traditional programs on the main campus, alternative programs on the main campus, and our former Staten Island campus.

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

Evidence from program completers was gathered through focus groups. The data from the completer focus groups provided valuable insights into the strengths of our EPP, as well as areas for continued improvement. Completers emphasized the value of the support they received from knowledgeable faculty and highlighted the well-structured coursework that prepared them to work with diverse learners through approaches such as UDL, multimodal tools, and inclusive assessment practices. Completers described their learning as "transformative," noting that the combination of CRP, fieldwork, and coursework broadened their understanding of second language acquisition, CR teaching, and giftedness, shaping their current educational practice and contributing to its effectiveness. Completers also identified opportunities for program improvement, including strengthening online pedagogy, expanding support for certification exam preparation, and offering deeper engagement with CR practices across diverse instructional settings. Several participants also recommended increasing the number of workshops focused on research and technology and emphasized the need for stronger integration between academic programs and career services.

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

We were unable to obtain employer data in this cycle through focus groups. Invitations to participate in employer focus groups were sent to 18 employers of recent completers, but no responses were received. We also reached out to cooperating teachers (n=92) and received a single response. The cooperating teacher reported that the candidate was ready to enter the profession, demonstrating strong CRP, effective collaboration, and active engagement with diverse learners and families. This is a well-documented challenge in our data collection process for accreditation, and we are continuing to determine methods to improve the ways in which we gather information from employers on program completers. New York State is working on a comprehensive data share that provides information on job placement and outcomes. St. John's received the first data share in fall 2025. Relevant information will be utilized to improve outreach to employers. The department will continue working with the Associate Dean of Innovation and Partnerships, Director of the Institute of Catholic Schools, and Director of Public-School Partnerships to identify employer connection opportunities.

H. Explanation of how the program investigates **employment rates for program completers**, with a characterization of findings. This section may also indicate rates of completers' ongoing education, e.g., graduate study.

The University Career Services unit at St. John's University manages the graduate placement outcomes data collection process. A uniform survey is utilized by Career Services to obtain employment and further education data from September, January and May graduates. The distribution of the survey begins with a link shared with graduates in the summer following their graduation. A calling campaign by Career Services advisors begins in September. The advisors call graduates who have yet to respond to the survey, those who indicated they obtained part-time employment, and those who were seeking employment. The calling campaign continues until December. The data is then analyzed and shared with schools and colleges early in the spring semester.

The data collection process for academic year 2024-2025 is still in process. Data from the most recently completed data cycle (2023-2024) is provided.

Academic Year 2023-2024:
The total population of graduates for Educator Prep Program graduates was 143. Of those 143, 113 graduates were reachable and 72 provided a response (63.7% response rate). The outcome rate (respondents were employed and/or pursuing further education) for each major/program was above the 85% target set by the departments.

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.

Our Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) are embedded within two departments, the Department of Curriculum & Instruction (C&I) and the Department of Education Specialties (DES).

We currently have 12 full-time faculty members in DES and 13 full-time faculty members in C&I. This total is inclusive of personnel changes related to new hires, retirements, and administrative promotions. In the past year, three full-time tenured faculty have departed the institution, and two full-time faculty members from C&I assumed administrative roles in the Dean's Office as associate deans. Across both departments, four new full-time, assistant-level professors have been hired in the past year: two assistant professors for C&I (Spring 2025 & Fall 2025 start) and two assistant professors for DES (Fall 2024 & Spring 2025 start). All new hires possess a doctorate degree in their applicable field. Both departments continue to have a strong staffing capacity for program delivery, administration, and quality assurance.

The Department of Education Specialties had three promotions starting fall 2025 from assistant-level faculty to tenured associate-level. The Department of Curriculum & Instruction had one promotion starting fall 2025 from associate-level faculty to full professor. These promotions highlight the work of faculty members engaged in research, teaching excellence, service to the profession, and sustained contributions to advancing educational practices in curriculum and instruction, literacy, special education, and teaching speakers of other languages (TESOL).

In addition to full-time faculty, we also have highly qualified adjunct faculty. All adjuncts possess the appropriate degree for their teaching level in an applicable field. Our adjunct faculty members are current or retired educators and administrators in schools across New York City Public Schools, Catholic Schools, and Long Island Public Schools, bringing their experience and expertise to our students through their close connection to current school-based practices.

Taking all this into consideration, our full-time and part-time faculty play a crucial role in implementing, overseeing, and evaluating the program effectively. Overall, our staffing structure is appropriately aligned with enrollment.

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
Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST) The Candidate Preservice Assessment for Student Teaching (CPAST) is a unit-wide measure of student performance on 21 rows including 13 pedagogical and 8 dispositional areas. Candidates, mentors, and university supervisors hold a three-way conference at the midpoint and end of student teaching to determine ratings. Candidates are scored on a 4-point scale (0-3) where a 2.0 average indicates the group meets expectations. CPAST was designed through a consortium of The Ohio State University's higher education institutions as a formative performance assessment, where proficiency indicates the readiness to take on the duties of a novice teacher. As students develop and apply their skills in the classroom, they demonstrate progress throughout the term with the goal for students to earn the Meets (2) or Exceeds (3) Expectations ratings by completion. Additionally, programs review and set annual targets for performance in prioritized areas.	**Aggregate:** Overall mean final scores for all student teachers must reach 2 or greater. As indicated by CPAST, a 2.0 average meets expectations.	**Expectations Met** **Fall 2024** For St. John's University student teachers (N=22), the midterm average for pedagogical standards was 1.67 and the midterm average for disposition standard was 1.98. For St. John's University student teachers, the final average for pedagogical standards was **2.23** and the midterm average for disposition standard was **2.43.** **Spring 2025** For St. John's University's student teachers (N=58), the midterm average for pedagogical standards was 2.08 and the midterm average for disposition standard was 2.37. The final average for pedagogical standards was **2.53** and the midterm average for disposition standard was **2.64.**

The Ohio State University oversees the use and data reporting for CPAST. Aspect: 1a & 1b		It is expected that midterm scores will reflect a student's early development of skills, and an increase in the final score is anticipated following mentoring from cooperating teachers and supervisors. We are encouraged to see the growth in scores from midterm to final checkpoints.
Student Teaching Evaluation on InTasc Standards Student teachers are evaluated at midterm and at the end of the semester by their University Supervisors and their Cooperating teachers on each of the ten InTASC standards on a scale from 1 (Weak) to 7 (Strong). For each semester (Fall 2024 and Spring 2025), we calculated the percentage of scores above 5 and calculated the mean score for each standard. Aspect: 1a & 1b	80% or more of student teachers receive a 5 or above on their final assessment scores from their clinical supervisors and cooperating teachers.	**Expectations Largely Met** Over 80% of student teachers received a 5 or better final score from their cooperating teachers (N=104) on all (1-10) InTASC standards (ranging from 89.4% - 94.9%). Over 80% of student teachers received a 5 or better final score from their university supervisor (N=77) on InTASC standards 1-9 (ranging from 86.6% - 95.9%). InTASC standard #10 scores from university supervisors were approaching expectations with 77.4% of students receiving a 5 or better final score. After further analysis, we realized these partially met scores may be a potential issue with training on the instrument scoring. We are addressing this discrepancy by reviewing our scoring guidelines with the university supervisors. We are developing an action plan with the Director of Clinical Experiences.

Coursework GPA The average GPA for coursework was calculated for education courses for all students and separately for graduate and undergraduate students in DES & C&I. Aspect: 1a	Students must maintain a 3.0 GPA or higher throughout their coursework.	**Expectation Met** The average GPA for all students (graduate and undergraduate) across all education coursework in DES and C&I is 3.88. The average GPA for education courses for graduate students was 3.92 and for undergraduate students it was 3.86. The average GPA for all undergraduate students across all coursework, including content area courses in other departments, is 3.69, meeting the 3.0 criteria.
Focus Groups (Candidates) The Department of Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) and the Department of Education Specialties (DES) conducted focus groups with candidates in Fall 2024 and Spring 2025. The candidate focus group protocol is divided into five sections: (1) Program Satisfaction, (2) Program Standards, (3) Support Services, (4) Professional Development, and (5) Sharing Feedback. The focus groups are intended to understand the experiences of our candidates and their perceptions of the program. Aspect: 1c	Candidates will recognize and interpret the diverse and intersecting aspects of learner identity and use this understanding to make reflective decisions that support engagement, inclusion, and developmental growth.	**Expectation met.** During focus groups, candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of how cultural, linguistic, and developmental identities shape learners' needs and inform instructional decision-making in CR classrooms. Students discussed how their awareness of students' background affects their teaching practices. One graduate student explained, "I learned a lot about culturally responsive teaching and how I can differentiate my instruction when teaching in the classroom." Candidates also recognized how identity-centered teaching has contributed to their professional growth. An undergraduate student noted, "Diverse classroom experiences opened my eyes to how

		students' backgrounds affect their participation. I need to learn new ways to support them." Similarly, candidates exhibited reflective growth in their understanding of intersectional identities of students, such as being a multilingual learner with a disability. As one undergraduate student shared, observing diverse classrooms helped them realize the importance of "adjusting lessons so everyone can succeed because not all students come with the same experiences."

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
Focus Group (Completers) The Department of Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) and the Department of Education Specialties (DES) conducted focus groups with completers in Spring 2025. The completer focus group protocol is divided into six sections: (1) Program Satisfaction, (2) Program Standards, (3) Support Services, (4) Professional Development, (5) Alumni Engagement, and (6) Sharing Feedback. The focus groups are intended to understand the	Completers will gather evidence and use differentiated assessment strategies to support equitable student outcomes and guide responsive, evidence-based instruction.	**Expectation met**. Completers demonstrate that they gather trustworthy evidence of student learning and design differentiated assessments to support diverse learners. Completers consistently described adapting assessment formats, designing multiple ways for students to demonstrate understanding, and adjusting linguistic demands. A novice teacher working in a special education setting explained that traditional assessments are not always appropriate: "We don't have assessments like an exit ticket because not all students would be

experiences of our completers and their perceptions of the program. Aspect: 2e		able to complete something like that… so we have IEP goals, stations… differentiated station work for every academic subject… and I've created my own assessments." Completers also reported using multimodal assessment options to provide multiple ways to demonstrate learning. One completer shared, "I prefer multimedia assessments… a lot of students don't do well with writing sentences or multiple choice, and projects, videos, or conversations help them show what they know." Several completers also described differentiating assessments for multimodal learners and/or students with reading disabilities by adjusting reading and vocabulary levels. One teacher described the process: "I take the text, adjust the lexicon, and now I have a modified version at the appropriate reading level for my ESL and dyslexic students." Completers also demonstrated that they use assessment results to reflect on their practices. One teacher recalled reviewing formative data and adapting teaching across class sections: "One class understood it, the other didn't… so I used the assessment data to change my teaching and reteach what they struggled with."

Global Experiences	Completers engage in global experiences and gain personal and professional insights to foster global awareness and intercultural competencies.	**Expectation Met.**
Global online learning exchange (GOLE) programs are collaborative projects where master's-level students engaged in virtual global experiences with international partner universities. A total of 93% (N=26) participants were completers of our undergraduate programs. In Fall 2024, 16 master's-level students participated in a GOLE project and in Spring 2025, 12 master's-level students participated in a GOLE project. Both projects partnered with graduate students and faculty from three different Brazilian universities. Participants reflected on their experiences, and their reflections were analyzed for emerging themes. Aspect: 2d		**Fall 2024 – Spring 2025 Global Online Learning Exchange (GOLE) Evidence of Personal & Professional Growth:** Emerging themes: - Students acknowledged that their global experiences during the project would be valuable for them in their current and future practice as educators - They acknowledged the important impact of this collaboration on building intercultural competencies to work with diverse school populations - An example of this theme is as follows: "This experience has also deepened my empathy and respect for the unique challenges faced by educators globally. This experience has inspired me to remain open-minded and adaptable in my approach to inclusive education, particularly for students with disabilities and behavioral concerns."
Employment Data	85% or more graduates are employed full-time or pursuing further education.	**Expectation met.**

The University Career Services unit at St. John's University manages the graduate placement outcomes data collection process. The data collection process for academic year 2024-2025 is still in process. Data from the most recently completed data cycle (2023-2024) is provided. Aspect: 2c		The data collection process for academic year 2024-2025 is still in process. The data is then analyzed and shared with schools and colleges early in the spring semester. Data from the most recently completed data cycle (2023-2024) is provided. Academic Year 2023-2024: The total population of graduates for Educator Prep Program graduates was 143. Of those 143, 113 graduates were reachable and 72 provided a response (63.7% response rate). The outcome rate for each major/program was above 85%. The outcome rate includes respondents who were employed and/or furthering their education.

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.

Global initiatives: One of the goals of St. John's University is to embed and provide more global opportunities for our students in undergraduate and graduate courses. While we have short-term and semester-long study abroad programs, such as our Rome campus program in the Spring semester, one popular global initiative to make global engagement more accessible is the [Global Online Learning Exchange (GOLE) program.](#) The GOLE program began at St. John's around 2018, and to date, faculty in our EPP programs have provided seven opportunities for online global exchanges in both departments to our students. Through the GOLE program, our students have engaged in global collaborations with students in universities in Brazil, Ukraine, China, and other countries. We have two new GOLE projects in 2024-2025 semester and one new GOLE project in Fall 2025 semester. We continue to encourage faculty to pursue global partnerships to embed global exchange opportunities in their coursework. To ensure we understand these initiatives and their outcomes, we will begin collecting student reflection data available from faculty as we collect reflections from our students who participate in study abroad programs (aspect 2d).

New Assessment Initiatives: In reflecting on our AAQEP-guided assessment and accreditation experiences, a key feature of pride for us was the construction of meaningful and ongoing communication across departments and programs. For example, while faculty were reviewing a signature assessment for our accreditation process, a faculty member said, "We were talking about how we teach in silos, like here is my culturally responsive class, here is my class on literacy, here is my class on differentiation and students with IEPs. How can we thread culturally responsive pedagogies in all of our classes?" The "sinking of silos" became a major theme for our collaborative work and inspired a new method of aligning our assessments: To examine ways that different measurements for student success can be woven together to produce agreed upon and aligned goals. For example, program coordinators submit annual program reports that include measurable goals for students that are then entered in the university's assessment management system (WEAVE). Collaboration with program coordinators meant that they embedded new measures into program evaluation. These include student teachers' scores on the Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teachers (CPAST). Student teachers write reflections that only their supervisor reads. The EPP leadership team has its own signature assessments and measures (such as the one described below). What we are starting to do is look across all assessments to agree on important measures and outcomes. This will create a more holistic approach to assessment—one that ultimately will help us further align our programs, measures, and courses in ways that facilitate our quest for continuous improvement.

Lesson Plan Framework: The lesson plan framework is aligned with all aspects of AAQEP's Standard 1; in this signature assessment, students are required to create relevant, meaningful and impactful learning experiences for their future students. To that end, the framework asks students to provide developmentally appropriate and engaging activities that facilitate language development and acquisition; provide support to students with exceptionalities; and use appropriate and effective technological tools to facilitate learning. The framework contains a rationale section wherein students are required to draw on their knowledge of learning science and theories to support their pedagogical decisions. Assessments, informal and formal, are threaded

throughout. After creating the lesson, students write a reflection about it. This reflection asks students to explain ways that their lesson plan was culturally responsive, differentiated, and rigorous. It is important to note that this lesson plan framework is revised every year in response to innovations, changing expectations, and student needs. These revisions take place during our Assessment Summit (see next section).

Assessment Summit: In our ongoing efforts to strengthen shared assessment practices, we successfully held the third annual Assessment Summit. Over the past three years, the Assessment Summit has become an integral component of our assessment culture, offering a collaborative space for data-informed reflection and planning. During the event, the EPP leadership team and the Director of Budget, Planning, and Assessment presented the analysis of evidence gathered throughout the academic year, including findings from focus groups, analyses of lesson plans, reviews of digital artifacts, summaries of Global Education initiatives, and data from clinical assessments. Following the data overview, faculty engaged in small-group work focused on actionable tasks, such as revising the lesson plan framework, generating ideas for deeper integration of CRP, and developing approaches to incentivize faculty participation in Global Education experiences. These annual meetings continue to reinforce our commitment to transparency and open communication among EPPs, fostering collaborative decision-making for ongoing program improvement.

Advisory Board: The EPP leadership team also held the third Advisory Board meeting this year, which has become an essential accomplishment in developing an assessment system that incorporates diverse perspectives from P–12 teachers, administrators, candidates, completers, and adjunct faculty. The growing number of Advisory Board members (i.e., from 11 members in September 2024 to 21 members in May 2025) reflects our commitment to creating safe and respectful spaces where the school community and partners can share insights on how our preparation programs can support the success of candidates and completers, aligned with the needs of local schools. During this year's meeting, the Advisory Board members reviewed evidence from focus groups, clinical experiences, and program assessments and provided reflections and suggestions for program improvement. As a collaborative space that supports shared assessment practices and open dialogue, the Advisory Board represents how we engage the school community and community partners to improve program quality and ensure that our preparation remains responsive to the needs of the schools our completers serve.

Part II: Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth

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

6. Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth and Improvement

This section charts ongoing improvement processes in relation to each AAQEP standard and recent activities related to investigating data quality. Table 5 may focus on an aspect of one or two standards each year, with only brief entries regarding ongoing efforts for those standards that are not the focus in the current year.

Table 5. Provider Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement

<table>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">The Educator Preparation Program will develop, maintain, and improve collaborative partnerships with PK–12 schools and districts to support high-quality clinical experiences, effective mentoring, and coherent alignment between coursework and professional practice.
Standard 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals for the 2025-26 year</td>
<td><i>Develop a completer performance assessment that captures major goals aligned with AAQEP, CPAST, and InTASC standards</i>. This assessment will be a reflection that students write before they begin student teaching. The reflection will ask students to respond to 10 domains drawn from the CPAST instrument and aligned with AAQEP. Near the end of student teaching, they will write responses to the same 10 prompts. Our goal is that 80% or more of students will demonstrate growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>

Create a structured reflection based on 10 domains
Design a process for collecting and analyzing pre-student teachers' responses
Pilot the assessment with a small group of students
Design a process for collecting and analyzing post-student teachers' responses.
Decide on outcome measures for the domains. What constitutes growth?

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected outcomes</td>
<td>We expect to have an instrument that generates important insights into the student teaching experience. These insights will help us improve our teacher preparation programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections or comments</td>
<td>We are at the beginning stages of a two-year initiative.</td>
</tr>
</table>

Standard 2	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	To increase the number of participating employers and completers in focus groups to obtain representative feedback on our EPP from different representatives of the wider school community. Our goal is to have at least six participants in each focus group for employers and completers.
Actions	• Recruit more participants through the Advisory Board • Expand outreach by accessing newly available employment data
Expected outcomes	We expect to achieve this goal based on preliminary results from reaching out to the Advisory Board members, where six employers and completers volunteered to participate in future focus groups.
Reflections or comments	Although recruitment of employers and completers has been a persistent challenge, we remain committed to exploring new recruitment strategies, recognizing that the perspectives of recent completers and community partners are an integral component in EPP evaluation and improvement.
Standard 3	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	To facilitate the use of actionable steps to improve program outcomes presented during the Assessment Summit and Advisory Board recommendations into program evaluation and planning to support candidate success.
Actions	• Collaborate with chairs and coordinators to design a process for collecting data on how Task Force findings and Advisory Board recommendations are used in program evaluation and planning.
Expected outcomes	We believe that designing a process to ensure assessment findings directly inform evaluation practices and goal setting for candidate success and program development will foster data-informed improvements.

Reflections or comments	As stated in Section 5, we consider the Assessment Summit and Advisory Board to be a meaningful accomplishment in developing a shared, inclusive assessment system within our EPP. Establishing a clearer connection between findings, action steps, and program changes will help ensure that the work generated in these collaborative spaces consistently informs program improvement efforts.
Standard 4	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	The EPPs will develop, maintain, and strengthen their collaborative partnerships with PK–12 schools and districts to support high-quality fieldwork, student teaching, practicum experiences, and alignment between coursework and professional practice.
Actions	Collect evidence from partner schools to assess the effectiveness of the partnerships and collaborations and identify and inform program strengths, needs, and improvements.
Expected outcomes	Through sustained PK–12 partnerships in both public and Catholic schools, we expect to increase the number of employers and partners who engage in collecting evidence for continuous improvement on candidate and completer performance. We expect partners to report better outcomes of a mutually beneficial collaborative partnership.
Reflections or comments	We plan to engage our Associate Dean of Innovation and Partnerships and the directors of public school and catholic school partnerships to support these goals.

Update on Activities to Investigate Data Quality

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

> We continue with largely the same activities to ensure data quality; however, we have had some minor adjustments to our data collection and analysis plan. For the lesson plan and digital artifacts analysis, we are analyzing only a representative sub-sample of the lesson plans and digital artifacts (selected across all courses and levels) in order to reduce faculty load in scoring lesson plans. We are exploring other options to improve lesson plan and digital artifact scoring and analysis.
>
> In addition, we are working on closely aligning annual program assessment collected and stored in WEAVE with our accreditation

assessment efforts.

7. Evidence Related to AAQEP-Identified Concerns or Conditions

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

N/A

8. Anticipated Growth and Development

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

To continue addressing innovation in educational technology, our Associate Dean for Innovation and Partnerships is collaborating with representative faculty to lead the development of a new Educational Technology Hub Center at The School of Education.

9. Regulatory Changes

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

PK-12 programs: As of 2022, NYSED has required both Literacy and Special Education programs to switch from separate grades to all-grades PK-12 programs by September 1, 2026. Thus, all Literacy and Special Education programs have switched to

PK-12 programs. The new literacy programs rolled out Fall 2024 and the new Special Education programs rolled out Fall 2025. The Special Education B-2 MSED programs in Early Childhood Special Education remain the same.

Certification Exam Waiver: NYSED has also allowed eligible students to apply for a certification exam waiver. Students whose scores fall within 0.5 standard error of measurement may apply for a waiver. This decision was made in February 2025. Please see following link for further information: https://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/certificate/certexamwaiver.html

10. Sign Off

Provider's Primary Contact for AAQEP (Name, Title)	Dean/Lead Administrator (Name, Title)
Brittany Dotson-Lazar, Director of Budget, Planning & Assessment	James Wolfinger, Dean of the School of Education

Date sent to AAQEP:	12/30/2025