NY

Adelphi University
Traditional Report AY 2019-20
New York

REPORT COMPLETE
STATUS: CERTIFIED

Institution Information

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Academic year
- IPEDS ID

IPEDS ID

188429

☐ **THIS INSTITUTION HAS NO IPEDS ID**

IF NO IPEDS ID, PLEASE PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION

ADDRESS

1 South Ave

Harvey Hall

CITY

Garden City

STATE

New York

ZIP

11530-4213

SALUTATION

Ms.

FIRST NAME

Patricia

LAST NAME

Esposito

PHONE

(516) 877-4075

EMAIL

esposito2@adelphi.edu

SECTION I: PROGRAM INFORMATION

List of Programs

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

List each program for an initial teaching credential below and indicate whether it is offered at the Undergraduate level (UG), Institution Information Postgraduate level (PG), or both. **(§205(a)(C))**

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Teacher Preparation Program

List of Programs

CIP Code	Teacher Preparation Programs	UG, PG, or Both	Update
13.1202	Elementary Education	PG	
13.1	Special Education	PG	
13.1302	Teacher Education - Art	Both	
13.14	Teacher Education - English as a Second Language	PG	
13.1316	Teacher Education - General Science	PG	
13.1307	Teacher Education - Health	PG	
13.1311	Teacher Education - Mathematics	PG	
13.1312	Teacher Education - Music	UG	
13.99	Teacher Education - Other	PG	
13.1314	Teacher Education - Physical Education and Coaching	Both	
13.1315	Teacher Education - Reading	PG	
13.1318	Teacher Education - Social Studies	PG	

Total number of teacher preparation programs:

24

SECTION I: PROGRAM INFORMATION

Program Requirements

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

Check the elements required for admission (entry) into and completion (exit) from the program. If programs are offered at the undergraduate level and postgraduate level, complete the table for both types of programs. **(§205(a)(1)(C)(i))**

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Full-time equivalent faculty supervising clinical experience
- Adjunct faculty supervising clinical experience
- Cooperating Teachers/PreK-12 Staff Supervising Clinical Experience
- Supervised clinical experience

Undergraduate Requirements

1. Are there initial teacher certification programs at the undergraduate level?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

If yes, for each element listed below, indicate if it is required for admission into or exit from any of your teacher preparation program(s) at the undergraduate level. If no, leave the table below blank (or **clear responses already entered**) then click save at the bottom of the page.

Element	Admission	Completion
Transcript	(●) Yes ( ) No	( ) Yes (●) No
Fingerprint check	( ) Yes (●) No	( ) Yes (●) No
Background check	( ) Yes (●) No	( ) Yes (●) No
Minimum number of courses/credits/semester hours completed	( ) Yes (●) No	(●) Yes ( ) No
Minimum GPA	(●) Yes ( ) No	(●) Yes ( ) No
Minimum GPA in content area coursework	( ) Yes (●) No	(●) Yes ( ) No
Minimum GPA in professional education coursework	( ) Yes (●) No	(●) Yes ( ) No
Minimum ACT score	(●) Yes ( ) No	( ) Yes (●) No
Minimum SAT score	(●) Yes ( ) No	( ) Yes (●) No
Minimum basic skills test score	( ) Yes (●) No	( ) Yes (●) No
Subject area/academic content test or other subject matter verification	( ) Yes (●) No	(●) Yes ( ) No
Recommendation(s)	(●) Yes ( ) No	( ) Yes (●) No
Essay or personal statement	(●) Yes ( ) No	( ) Yes (●) No

Element	Admission	Completion
Interview	Yes / No	Yes / No
Other Specify:	Yes / No	Yes / No

2. What is the minimum GPA required for admission into the program? (Leave blank if you indicated that a minimum GPA is not required in the table above.)

3

3. What is the minimum GPA required for completing the program? (Leave blank if you indicated that a minimum GPA is not required in the table above.)

3

4. Please provide any additional information about the information provided above:

Postgraduate Requirements

1. Are there initial teacher certification programs at the postgraduate level?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

If yes, for each element listed below, indicate if it is required for admission into or exit from any of your teacher preparation program(s) at the postgraduate level. If no, leave the table below blank (or **clear responses already entered**) then click save at the bottom of the page.

Element	Admission	Completion
Transcript	Yes / No	Yes / No
Fingerprint check	Yes / No	Yes / No
Background check	Yes / No	Yes / No
Minimum number of courses/credits/semester hours completed	Yes / No	Yes / No
Minimum GPA	Yes / No	Yes / No
Minimum GPA in content area coursework	Yes / No	Yes / No
Minimum GPA in professional education coursework	Yes / No	Yes / No
Minimum ACT score	Yes / No	Yes / No
Minimum SAT score	Yes / No	Yes / No
Minimum basic skills test score	Yes / No	Yes / No
Subject area/academic content test or other subject matter verification	Yes / No	Yes / No
Recommendation(s)	Yes / No	Yes / No
Essay or personal statement	Yes / No	Yes / No

Element	Admission	Completion
Interview	○ Yes ● No	○ Yes ● No
Other Specify: Graduate Record Exam (GRE) or equivalent. No suggested score set.	● Yes ○ No	○ Yes ● No

2. What is the minimum GPA required for admission into the program? (Leave blank if you indicated that a minimum GPA is not required in the table above.)

3

3. What is the minimum GPA required for completing the program? (Leave blank if you indicated that a minimum GPA is not required in the table above.)

3

4. Please provide any additional information about the information provided above:

Supervised Clinical Experience

Provide the following information about supervised clinical experience in 2019-20. (§205(a)(1)(C)(iii), §205(a)(1)(C)(iv))

Are there programs with student teaching models?

- ● Yes
- ○ No

If yes, provide the next two responses. If no, leave them blank.

Programs with student teaching models (most traditional programs)	
Number of clock hours of supervised clinical experience required prior to student teaching	100
Number of clock hours required for student teaching	480

Are there programs in which candidates are the teacher of record?

- ○ Yes
- ● No

If yes, provide the next two responses. If no, leave them blank.

Programs in which candidates are the teacher of record in a classroom during the program (many alternative programs)	
Number of clock hours of supervised clinical experience required prior to teaching as the teacher of record in a classroom	
Number of years required for teaching as the teacher of record in a classroom	

All Programs	
Number of full-time equivalent faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year (IHE staff) Optional tool for automatically calculating full-time equivalent faculty in the system	29.5
Number of adjunct faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year (IHE staff)	322
Number of cooperating teachers/K-12 staff supervising clinical experience during this academic year	293
Number of students in supervised clinical experience during this academic year	702

Please provide any additional information about or descriptions of the supervised clinical experiences:

SECTION I: PROGRAM INFORMATION

Enrollment and Program Completers

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

In each of the following categories, provide the total number of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs for an initial teaching credential and the subset of individuals enrolled who also completed the program during the academic year. **(§205(a)(1)(C)(ii))**

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Enrolled Student
- Program Completer

Enrollment and Program Completers

2019-20 Total	
Total Number of Individuals Enrolled	687
Subset of Program Completers	232

Gender	Total Enrolled	Subset of Program Completers
Male	198	51
Female	489	181
Non-Binary/Other	0	0
No Gender Reported	0	0
Race/Ethnicity	Total Enrolled	Subset of Program Completers
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0
Asian	22	10
Black or African American	31	13
Hispanic/Latino of any race	116	39
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	2
White	447	145

Race/Ethnicity	Total Enrolled	Subset of Program Completers
Two or more races	15	5
No Race/Ethnicity Reported	54	18

SECTION I: PROGRAM INFORMATION

Teachers Prepared

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

On this page, enter the number of program completers by the subject area in which they were prepared to teach, and by their academic majors. Note that an individual can be counted in more than one academic major and subject area. For example, if an individual is prepared to teach Elementary Education and Mathematics, that individual should be counted in both subject areas. If no individuals were prepared in a particular academic major or subject area, you may leave the cell blank. Please use the "Other" category sparingly, if there is no similar subject area or academic major listed. In these cases, you should use the text box to describe the subject area(s) and/or the academic major(s) counted in the "Other" category.

If your IHE offers both traditional and alternative programs, be sure to enter the program completers in the appropriate reports. For the traditional report, provide only the program completers in traditional programs within the IHE. For the alternative report, provide only the program completers for the alternative programs within the IHE.

After entering the teachers prepared data, save the page using the floating save box at the bottom of the page.

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Academic Major

Teachers Prepared by Subject Area

Please provide the number of teachers prepared by subject area for academic year 2019-20.

For the purposes of this section, number prepared means the number of program completers. "Subject area" refers to the subject area(s) an individual has been prepared to teach. An individual can be counted in more than one subject area. If no individuals were prepared in a particular subject area, please leave that cell blank. **(§205(b)(1)(H))**

What are CIP Codes?

☐ **No teachers prepared in academic year 2019-20**

If your program has no teachers prepared, check the box above and leave the table below blank (or **clear responses already entered**).

What are CIP codes? The Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) provides a taxonomic scheme that supports the accurate tracking and reporting of fields of study and program completions activity. CIP was originally developed by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in 1980, with revisions occurring in 1985, 1990, and 2000 (https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55).

CIP Code	Subject Area	Number Prepared
13.10	Teacher Education - Special Education	25
13.1202	Teacher Education - Elementary Education	58

CIP Code	Subject Area	Number Prepared
13.1203	Teacher Education - Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Education	
13.1210	Teacher Education - Early Childhood Education	16
13.1301	Teacher Education - Agriculture	
13.1302	Teacher Education - Art	17
13.1303	Teacher Education - Business	
13.1305	Teacher Education - English/Language Arts	1
13.1306	Teacher Education - Foreign Language	1
13.1307	Teacher Education - Health	1
13.1308	Teacher Education - Family and Consumer Sciences/Home Economics	
13.1309	Teacher Education - Technology Teacher Education/Industrial Arts	6
13.1311	Teacher Education - Mathematics	8
13.1312	Teacher Education - Music	8
13.1314	Teacher Education - Physical Education and Coaching	58
13.1315	Teacher Education - Reading	
13.1316	Teacher Education - Science Teacher Education/General Science	1
13.1317	Teacher Education - Social Science	
13.1318	Teacher Education - Social Studies	
13.1320	Teacher Education - Trade and Industrial	
13.1321	Teacher Education - Computer Science	
13.1322	Teacher Education - Biology	3
13.1323	Teacher Education - Chemistry	
13.1324	Teacher Education - Drama and Dance	
13.1328	Teacher Education - History	
13.1329	Teacher Education - Physics	
13.1331	Teacher Education - Speech	87

CIP Code	Subject Area	Number Prepared
13.1337	Teacher Education - Earth Science	1
13.14	Teacher Education - English as a Second Language	26
13.99	Education - Other Specify: Secondary Education	40

Teachers Prepared by Academic Major

Please provide the number of teachers prepared by academic major for academic year 2019-20. For the purposes of this section, number prepared means the number of program completers. "Academic major" refers to the actual major(s) declared by the program completer. An individual can be counted in more than one academic major. If no individuals were prepared in a particular academic major, please leave that cell blank. (§205(b)(1)(H))

Please note that the list of majors includes several "Teacher Education" majors, as well as several noneducation majors. Please use care in entering your majors to ensure education-specific majors and non-education majors are counted correctly. For example, if an individual majored in Chemistry, that individual should be counted in the "Chemistry" academic major category rather than the "Teacher Education–Chemistry" category.

What are CIP Codes?

Do participants earn a degree upon completion of the program?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

☐ No teachers prepared in academic year 2019-20

If your program does not grant participants a degree upon completion, or has no teachers prepared, leave the table below blank (or clear responses already entered).

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
13.10	Teacher Education - Special Education	
13.1202	Teacher Education - Elementary Education	
13.1203	Teacher Education - Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Education	
13.1210	Teacher Education - Early Childhood Education	
13.1301	Teacher Education - Agriculture	
13.1302	Teacher Education - Art	16
13.1303	Teacher Education - Business	
13.1305	Teacher Education - English/Language Arts	
13.1306	Teacher Education - Foreign Language	
13.1307	Teacher Education - Health	

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
13.1308	Teacher Education - Family and Consumer Sciences/Home Economics	
13.1309	Teacher Education - Technology Teacher Education/Industrial Arts	
13.1311	Teacher Education - Mathematics	
13.1312	Teacher Education - Music	8
13.1314	Teacher Education - Physical Education and Coaching	23
13.1315	Teacher Education - Reading	
13.1316	Teacher Education - General Science	
13.1317	Teacher Education - Social Science	
13.1318	Teacher Education - Social Studies	
13.1320	Teacher Education - Trade and Industrial	
13.1321	Teacher Education - Computer Science	
13.1322	Teacher Education - Biology	
13.1323	Teacher Education - Chemistry	
13.1324	Teacher Education - Drama and Dance	
13.1328	Teacher Education - History	
13.1329	Teacher Education - Physics	
13.1331	Teacher Education - Speech	
13.1337	Teacher Education - Earth Science	
13.14	Teacher Education - English as a Second Language	
13.99	Education - Other Specify:	
01	Agriculture	
03	Natural Resources and Conservation	
05	Area, Ethnic, Cultural, and Gender Studies	
09	Communication or Journalism	2

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
11	Computer and Information Sciences	3
12	Personal and Culinary Services	
14	Engineering	
16	Foreign Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics	5
19	Family and Consumer Sciences/Human Sciences	
21	Technology Education/Industrial Arts	
22	Legal Professions and Studies	2
23	English Language/Literature	28
24	Liberal Arts/Humanities	3
25	Library Science	
26	Biological and Biomedical Sciences	5
27	Mathematics and Statistics	7
30	Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies	
38	Philosophy and Religious Studies	1
40	Physical Sciences	
41	Science Technologies/Technicians	
42	Psychology	21
44	Public Administration and Social Service Professions	1
45	Social Sciences	12
46	Construction	
47	Mechanic and Repair Technologies	
50	Visual and Performing Arts	
51	Health Professions and Related Clinical Sciences	76
52	Business/Management/Marketing	14
54	History	10

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
99	Other Specify: sport management, movement & sport studies, exercise science, health sciences, athletic, kinesi…	15

SECTION I: PROGRAM INFORMATION

Program Assurances

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

Respond to the following assurances. Note: Teacher preparation programs should be prepared to provide documentation and evidence, when requested, to support the following assurances. **(§205(a)(1)(A)(iii); §206(b))**

Program Assurances

1. Program preparation responds to the identified needs of the local educational agencies or States where the program completers are likely to teach, based on past hiring and recruitment trends.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

2. Preparation is closely linked with the needs of schools and the instructional decisions new teachers face in the classroom.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

3. Prospective special education teachers are prepared in core academic subjects and to instruct in core academic subjects.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) Program does not prepare special education teachers

4. Prospective general education teachers are prepared to provide instruction to students with disabilities.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

5. Prospective general education teachers are prepared to provide instruction to limited English proficient students.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

6. Prospective general education teachers are prepared to provide instruction to students from low-income families.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

7. Prospective teachers are prepared to effectively teach in urban and rural schools, as applicable.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

8. Describe your institution's most successful strategies in meeting the assurances listed above:

1. Strategies for Preparing Adelphi University Teacher Candidates to Teach Children with Disabilities All Teacher candidates in the Childhood education programs are required to take one special education course, Introduction to Special Education (600), or for the Undergraduates, The Child with Special Needs (305). Teacher candidates in the secondary education programs are required to take Managing Inclusive Environments (560). All students in the Physical Education program are required to take Adapted Physical Education (852-469), which provides a knowledge base and skills necessary to teach students with disabilities. Field experiences are required, and each course meets the New York State mandate on training in the needs of children with autism. 2. Preparing Teacher Candidates to Respond to the identified needs of the local educational agencies The Office of School and Community Partnerships is committed to supporting students throughout their fieldwork and clinical experiences. We seek school placements that will better position them to secure employment. School sites are considered based on their commitment to provide a rich student teaching experience through the collaborative work between mentor teachers and university field supervisors. Sites are also selected to match certification area(s) sought and the school

environment that can support university expectations and NYSED standards. Sites include public, private, center-based schools. The various student teaching models provide students with an opportunity to consider their academic, financial, and personal commitments. Our goal is to keep in mind the needs of our students and to offer an experience that facilitates their transition from student to professional. In compliance with NYSED mandates, all teacher candidates must have at least one diverse and/or high-needs placement in their fieldwork and student teaching. This is arranged through the Office of School and Community Partnership. Year-Long Student Teaching Experiences University Model Program Adelphi University continues to offer a Model Program, which is a collaborative effort between our university and school district personnel to best prepare teacher candidates for professional practice. Our emphasis is on shared responsibility for teacher preparation, collaboration, and cooperation between the university and the school community. This program was created in 2004 with 5 districts in Nassau County, and has now expanded to 17 districts across Nassau, Suffolk, and Queens counties. Of special note for this program, 75% of the districts in the program are diverse sites, which are defined by NY State by the percentage of non-white students, free/reduced lunch, and ENL (English as a New Language) students. The teacher candidates in this program work in one district over the course of an entire school year, rather than merely one semester. They first work as participant observers in the fall semester of the school year, and then as student teachers in the spring semester of the school year. As participant observers from September through December, they work for one day each week with individual students, groups of students and progress to teaching whole class lessons. They follow the school calendar of their school district and are assigned two mentor teachers, each for an eight week period. During the second semester, the teacher candidates continue their student teaching experience with “Mentor Teacher B” for an additional eight weeks and then return to “Mentor Teacher A” for the last eight week experience. In the spring, they are expected to be at the school each school day and complete a total of 480 hours, 240 hours at each placement. Their field supervisor from Adelphi University meets with them once a week for the entire two semester experience. Residency Program The residency program was developed in 2014 to provide teacher candidates with an opportunity to student teach for a full academic year (2 semesters). The fall semester consists of a 4-day week experience and 5-day week for the spring semester. The opportunity was to better position teacher candidates to fulfill their student teaching experience with schools that provide rich and real-life experiences with faculty, students, and the community. School partners that have committed to working with our teacher candidates have also shared their intention to hire residents upon graduation. Our goal is to continue working with our school partners in a co-constructive manner in the areas of curriculum, assessment review, and professional development. In addition to submitting the student teaching application, there is an additional screening process and district interview for teacher candidates to be accepted into this competitive program. The residency program was restructured in 2019 to reflect a sustainable funding model through which partner schools provide financial support to teacher candidates throughout their clinical experience.

SECTION II: ANNUAL GOALS

Annual Goals: Mathematics

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

Each institution of higher education (IHE) that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program (including programs that offer any ongoing professional development programs) or alternative route teacher preparation program, and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, shall set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the state educational agency, including mathematics, science, special education, and instruction of limited English proficient students.
(§205(a)(1) (A)(i), §205(a)(1)(A)(ii), §206(a))

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Quantifiable Goals

Report Progress on Last Year's Goal (2019-20)

1. Did your program prepare teachers in mathematics in 2019-20?

If no, leave remaining questions for 2019-20 blank (or clear responses already entered).

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

2. Describe your goal.

One of our current goals is to develop our teachers' capacity to engage in rich non-routine problem solving, with particular focus on perseverance and modeling, and the capacity to communicate their reasoning in a multi-modal manner using technology. We feel that such a goal is relevant to current concerns about online learning experiences, as it emphasizes communication skills using technology, with particular attention to problematizing and problem-posing. This goal is about developing teachers' comfort with the uncertainty of problem solving. It is also a goal that stays close to our continued focus to increase teacher candidate understanding of the NCTM mathematical practices. A second goal is to link our curriculum with current interest in the power of mathematics in climate science and epidemiology, and the turn to modeling more generally, as these are not fully understood by the public, introducing new concerns about mathematical literacy. In other words, our goal is to revisit a previous goal from years past, and renew it, that being an emphasis on critical mathematics education, and the need to help teachers prepare to teach in classrooms where science and mathematics are seen as elitist and not to be trusted. The goal is to revise reading lists in our courses, and to alter assignments slightly, so that lesson planning in particular is more focused on links between mathematics and social and scientific modeling. This is meant to be a goal that is responsive to changes in our communities, where students' digital lives are increasingly shaped by online media and virtual participation.

3. Did your program meet the goal?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

4. Description of strategies used to achieve goal, if applicable:

We have met the goal to some extent, in that we have emphasized with teacher candidates the mathematical habits of perseverance and determination in problem solving. This has been emphasized in their lesson planning, directing them to avoid banal classical textbook problems when trying to stimulate problem solving habits like that of mathematicians. We introduced new resources from NCTM that included non-routine problems, and we've changed the weekly assignments so that teacher candidates must present a video online of themselves exploring and explaining a rich non-routine problem from these new resources. This accountability has meant that each candidate is digging into challenging non-routine problems, and the

individual nature of that engagement is important, in helping them appreciate the kinds of habits they should be trying to cultivate in their own students. But the goal of increasing their comfort level with uncertainty in mathematical problem solving remains unreached. This is not something we can achieve in one or two years. Our new video assignments are addressing the goal in the context of online learning and exploring ways to better prepare our candidates when they are enrolled in online courses and may also be teaching online in K-12 schools. Moreover, the goal to increase their multimodal capacity to use different kinds of communicative tools (gesture, diagram, dynamic manipulative) has been taken online, and they are showing enhanced skill at using the online environment (and screen tools) in innovative ways. Our second goal has also been partially met, as we changed one of our core mandatory courses for candidates, 0809-594 Critical Literacy in Mathematics and Science Education. This course is populated by both science and math future teachers, and offered us an opportunity to address the goal of helping candidates increase their understanding of the use of mathematics in various kinds of environment modeling, including climate change. The course has always targeted social justice issues associated with STEM literacy, but we redesigned the readings and assignments in order to respond to current concerns, as discussed above. We modified the assignments, as discussed in our goal, and candidates now must read various STS texts (science and technology studies), such as N. Oreskes, book Why trust science? (2020), as a way of helping them grasp the philosophical and historical nature of mathematics and science. In addition, we have implemented the mandatory course for all math education candidates, History of Mathematics 0148-656, in which they must write a short paper on controversies in the history of mathematics.

5. Description of steps to improve performance in meeting goal or lessons learned in meeting goal, if applicable:

6. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Review Current Year's Goal (2020-21)

7. Is your program preparing teachers in mathematics in 2020-21? If no, leave the next question blank.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

8. Describe your goal.

We are actively developing a STEM institute at our Manhattan campus, where we can serve urban populations with limited educational resources. This institute will offer workshops for teachers in integrated curriculum projects, where math and science and art will be woven together. We are targeting communities in NYC with highly diverse populations, and aim to work with teacher-candidates and develop their distinctive skills and perspectives around STEAM pedagogy, developing an appreciation for the plurality of mathematical practices, and an awareness of the diverse material practices where mathematical thinking is at work. The STEAM institute is being designed with faculty development and program development goals, and will therefore have impact across our STEM programs. We continue the goals from the previous year, restated here: One of our current goals remains developing our teachers' capacity to engage in rich non-routine problem solving, with particular focus on perseverance and modeling, and the capacity to communicate their reasoning in a multi-modal manner using technology. We feel that such a goal is relevant to current concerns about online learning experiences, as it emphasizes communication skills using technology, with particular attention to problematizing and problem-posing. This goal is about developing teachers' comfort with the uncertainty of problem solving. It is also a goal that stays close to our continued focus to increase teacher candidate understanding of the NCTM mathematical practices. A second goal is to link our curriculum with current interest in the power of mathematics in climate science and epidemiology, and the turn to modeling more generally, as these are not fully understood by the public, introducing new concerns about mathematical literacy. In other words, our goal is to revisit a previous goal from years past, and renew it, that being an emphasis on critical mathematics education, and the need to help teachers prepare to teach in classrooms where science and mathematics are seen as elitist and not to be trusted. The goal is to revise reading lists in our courses, and to alter assignments slightly, so that lesson planning in particular is more focused on links between mathematics and social and scientific modeling. This is meant to be a goal that is responsive to changes in our communities, where students' digital lives are increasingly shaped by online media and virtual participation.

Set Next Year's Goal (2021-22)

9. Will your program prepare teachers in mathematics in 2021-22? If no, leave the next question blank.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

10. Describe your goal.

Our main goal is to continue to develop the STEAM institute at our Manhattan campus, where we can serve urban populations with limited educational resources. This institute will function in various ways, and will support various STEM education efforts. We have already established support from our administration, and are in the process of sorting out ways to jumpstart the institute. Our NOYCE science teacher candidates will be part of the institute, and we are intending to cultivate a math teacher cohort as well. As a STEAM focused institute, we prize math and science and art woven together. We are targeting communities in NYC with highly diverse populations. In Spring 2021 we forged new partnerships with the NYC Department of Education, and in particular District 13, along with partnering with Bank Street's project Prepared to Teach, which focuses on teacher residencies. . We are aiming to bring qualified Adelphi teacher candidates on board, and support them through new residency programs at middle and high schools in NYC. We are meeting with representatives from the districts. These residency programs will commence in 2022. These programs will fold into other programs we are designing at the Manhattan campus, and hope to see launched next year, as part of our new initiative and new institute – in particular, we are designing an interdisciplinary MA in STEAM education, with tracks in math, science and computer science. The program is under review by the university Academic Affairs committee. The STEAM institute is being designed with both faculty development and program development goals, and will therefore have impact at different levels and in different ways, building research capacity in faculty, increasing our partnerships in the city, and building Adelphi networks. As part of this larger goal of establishing a new institute, we continue to be altering our math education curriculum to address the partially met goals of the previous two years, especially the need to develop teacher candidate skills in multimodal teaching (online and in person) and teacher candidate knowledge of the role of mathematics in environment and climate modeling. This goal remains linked to our new curriculum in the literacy course (see above) and our increased focus on current controversies regarding the authority of science and math in contemporary cultures.

SECTION II: ANNUAL GOALS

Annual Goals: Science

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

Each institution of higher education (IHE) that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program (including programs that offer any ongoing professional development programs) or alternative route teacher preparation program, and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, shall set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the state educational agency, including mathematics, science, special education, and instruction of limited English proficient students.
(§205(a)(1) (A)(i), §205(a)(1)(A)(ii), §206(a))

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Quantifiable Goals

Report Progress on Last Year's Goal (2019-20)

1. Did your program prepare teachers in science in 2019-20?

If no, leave remaining questions for 2019-20 blank (or clear responses already entered).

- (●) **Yes**
- ( ) **No**

2. Describe your goal.

To recruit and support a cohort of graduate students seeking an MA in Education and New York State Teacher Certification (grades 7-12) in a science discipline.

3. Did your program meet the goal?

- (●) **Yes**
- ( ) **No**

4. Description of strategies used to achieve goal, if applicable:

In 2019, faculty submitted a National Science Foundation/Noyce Scholarship Program proposal entitled, "The New York Noyce STEAM Pipeline: Preparing Next Generation Science Teachers: Phase II" which is currently pending but with indication as selected for funding and will support 24 science teachers over 4 years.

5. Description of steps to improve performance in meeting goal or lessons learned in meeting goal, if applicable:

6. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Furthermore, faculty have submitted three program proposals to support the New York City Department of Education Teaching Fellows program with the goal of increasing enrollment in science education including; 1) Alternative Certification Program; Master of Arts (M.A.): Science Education Immersion Program; Transitional B Certificate: 7-12 Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science or Physics; 2) Traditional Pipeline, Master of Arts (M.A.): Science Education Immersion Program, 7-12 Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science or Physics and Master of Arts (M.A.); and 3) Bilingual Science, 7-12 Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science or Physics with a Bilingual Extension.

Review Current Year's Goal (2020-21)

7. Is your program preparing teachers in science in 2020-21? If no, leave the next question blank.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

8. Describe your goal.

. Our grant submission to the National Science Foundation was selected for funding: 1.2 million dollars over five years to support and prepare 26 science teachers across the four disciplines to teach grades 7-12 in under resourced school districts. Our program description can be found HERE. Our program will be housed at our Manhattan Center within The Institute for STEM and the Imagination. Through multiple recruitment strategies, our first cohort of eight science candidates will begin May, 2020. Recruitment included efforts from a broad range of stakeholders from offices including admissions, financial aid, marketing, communications and faculty from Arts and Sciences and the College of Education and Health Sciences. Currently, we are awaiting notification of funding specific to last year's submission of science programs to the New York City Teaching Fellows program. If funded, this will increase our program numbers to over 20 additional science teachers each over four years.

Set Next Year's Goal (2021-22)

9. Will your program prepare teachers in science in 2021-22? If no, leave the next question blank.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

10. Describe your goal.

We will continue to recruit and prepare science teachers for all three of our science education pathways: the Noyce Fellowship, Adelphi Accelerated Program in Adolescent Science Education and our traditional two-year MA program in science education. Through recruitment efforts and scholarship support, we look to prepare a cohort of five candidates at the minimum.

SECTION II: ANNUAL GOALS

Annual Goals: Special Education

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

Each institution of higher education (IHE) that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program (including programs that offer any ongoing professional development programs) or alternative route teacher preparation program, and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, shall set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the state educational agency, including mathematics, science, special education, and instruction of limited English proficient students.
(§205(a)(1) (A)(i), §205(a)(1)(A)(ii), §206(a))

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Quantifiable Goals

Report Progress on Last Year's Goal (2019-20)

1. Did your program prepare teachers in special education in 2019-20?

If no, leave remaining questions for 2019-20 blank (or clear responses already entered).

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

2. Describe your goal.

Special Education faculty will start revising curricula and re-write/develop new courses to address the reduction of credits while maintaining NYS program requirements and program integrity (e.g., foundations, pedagogy, management, etc.). Faculty will address fieldwork placements and assignments to align with the curriculum. Faculty will work on a marketing brochure with Adelphi Communications. Faculty will develop Special Topics courses that may eventually run as electives. To address enrollment, Special Education faculty will review our current course offerings to determine the semesters in which courses are offered and by which mode (e.g., blended, hybrid, etc.).

3. Did your program meet the goal?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

4. Description of strategies used to achieve goal, if applicable:

Our goal was partially met as we have started to rewrite curricula for our methods and assessment courses. We have mapped out a new program which will reduce the program credits by six. Due to the pandemic, the brochure work has been temporarily put on hiatus. We have addressed enrollment concerns by limiting course offerings and section availability. Collaborative meetings online and independent work by faculty members to address curriculum changes and course offerings.

5. Description of steps to improve performance in meeting goal or lessons learned in meeting goal, if applicable:

Unfortunately, due to the pandemic and the necessity for faculty to convert to fully online instruction, faculty have not been able to meet as often as prior to the pandemic. As we continue to pursue our current goals and work within Covid-19 protocols we will set up dedicated additional meeting times to work

collaboratively to move forward with curricular design.

6. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

The Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study (CAGs) program in Adolescent Special Education in Hauppauge and CAGs in Childhood Special Education in the Hauppauge Center in 2019, but discontinued in 2020 due to enrollment concerns. Few students enrolled in the Hauppauge Center and trying to hold in person courses in 3 campus sites (Garden City main campus and Manhattan and Hauppauge Centers) became impractical. Program proposals submitted to support the New York City Department of Education Teaching Fellows program (Certificates of Advanced Graduate Study (CAGs) program in Childhood, Adolescent, and Autism; and 1 Dual Adolescent Special Education Master's Program) have been tentatively approved and we are awaiting official documentation and recognition of the award by the NYCDOE.

Review Current Year's Goal (2020-21)

7. Is your program preparing teachers in special education in 2020-21? If no, leave the next question blank.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

8. Describe your goal.

We want to continue to redesign the curriculum and add tracks in order to fit in electives. We would like to have limited offerings of courses (e.g., not offer each course each semester). We want to expand fieldwork assignments to include CSD (e.g., speech pathologists, ot/pt, etc.) placements. Part of our redesign will include more blended and fully online courses (which will also assist with enrollment and offerings for our Manhattan students). We want to have marketed a completed special education programs brochure. We would like to offer the Autism Certificate as part of a "track" which may attract additional students. We would like to have our additional Childhood SPED CAGS sent to NYS for approval. We would like to develop more elective courses (which have been our traditional Special Topics courses).

Set Next Year's Goal (2021-22)

9. Will your program prepare teachers in special education in 2021-22? If no, leave the next question blank.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

10. Describe your goal.

Our goal with the waning of the pandemic will be to offer more in-person instruction. While we will reduce the number of remote classes and incorporate more hybrid and blended instruction into our curriculum. Our faculty will review the many effective aspects of distance learning to design and create new courses and assignments as part of the overall curricular changes. We will continue to work with UCOMM to market our program as we have already started to design a program brochure. We will finalize program changes and seek Adelphi Academic Affairs approval and NYS registration. We will continue to address fieldwork placements and fieldwork assignments for our pre-student teaching/practicum courses.

SECTION II: ANNUAL GOALS

Annual Goals: Instruction of Limited English Proficient Students

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

Each institution of higher education (IHE) that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program (including programs that offer any ongoing professional development programs) or alternative route teacher preparation program, and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, shall set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the state educational agency, including mathematics, science, special education, and instruction of limited English proficient students.
(§205(a)(1) (A)(i), §205(a)(1)(A)(ii), §206(a))

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Quantifiable Goals

Report Progress on Last Year's Goal (2019-20)

1. Did your program prepare teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2019-20?

If no, leave remaining questions for 2019-20 blank (or clear responses already entered).

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

2. Describe your goal.

NYSED funded proposals for Clinically Rich ITI-BE (ESOL) and ITI-BE (Bilingual Education) in both Long Island (20 students per year for 5 years) and Manhattan (20 students per year for 5 years) were submitted in December 2018 and renewed in 2019. Cohorts began in Manhattan and Long Island in January 2020. Faculty have submitted two program proposals to support the New York City Department of Education Teaching Fellows program with the goal of increasing enrollment in teachers for ENLs, including 1) M.A. TESOL and 2) Bilingual Science, 7-12 Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science or Physics with a Bilingual Extension.

3. Did your program meet the goal?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

4. Description of strategies used to achieve goal, if applicable:

Our program met our goals for the NYSED funded Clinically Rich ITI-CR (Clinically Rich program to provide advanced certificate programs in TESOL and Bilingual Education) for current teachers. We had 22 teachers enrolled in the program in 2019-20 in New York City (Manhattan Cohort) and 19 teachers enrolled from the rest of New York State (Long Island based cohort). This met our goal of registering 40 teachers in total. We did extensive recruitment throughout our region. We were also able to enroll 8 students who had been recruited by The College of New Rochelle who entered our program when the College of New Rochelle closed due to financial difficulties.

5. Description of steps to improve performance in meeting goal or lessons learned in meeting goal, if applicable:

We provided classes at times and locations that served our students best, including increasing the number of courses which were fully online due to COVID.

6. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Due to delays caused by the COVID closures of schools, the New York City Department of Education has delayed the awarding of Teaching Fellows programs to universities. We have been notified that we are likely to receive a contact in May 2021 for this program, and we will set a more specific goal for TESOL and Bilingual Extension enrollment when our contract has been received.

Review Current Year's Goal (2020-21)

7. Is your program preparing teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2020-21? If no, leave the next question blank.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

8. Describe your goal.

We will continue the NYSED funded proposals for Clinically Rich ITI-BE (ESOL) and ITI-BE (Bilingual Education) in both New York City (20 students per year for 5 years) and the rest of NY State outside of New York City (20 students per year for 5 years) in 2020-21. We are planning to have cohorts beginning in September 2020 and January 2021. This program will be conducted fully online. Despite the challenges posed by COVID, we are on track to meet our program goals for 2020-21 for the NYSED funded Clinically Rich ITI-CR (Clinically Rich program to provide advanced certificate programs in TESOL and Bilingual Education) for current teachers. We have 13 teachers enrolled in the program in 2020-21 in New York City (Manhattan Cohort) and 24 teachers enrolled from the rest of New York State (Long Island based cohort). We hope to enroll at least 3 students this summer in order to meet our goal of registering 40 teachers in total. Due to delays as a result of Covid, we are still waiting to hear about our submitted program proposal to support the New York City Department of Education Teaching Fellows program with the goal of increasing enrollment in teachers for ENLs, including 1) M.A. TESOL and 2) Bilingual Science, 7-12 Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science or Physics with a Bilingual Extension. We hope to have this proposal awarded in 2020-2021.

Set Next Year's Goal (2021-22)

9. Will your program prepare teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2021-22? If no, leave the next question blank.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

10. Describe your goal.

We will continue the NYSED funded proposals for Clinically Rich ITI-BE (ESOL) and ITI-BE (Bilingual Education) in both New York City (20 students per year for 5 years) and the rest of NY State outside of New York City (20 students per year for 5 years) in 2021-22. We are planning to have cohorts beginning in September 2021 and January 2022. This program will be conducted fully online. Faculty have submitted two program proposals to support the New York City Department of Education Teaching Fellows program with the goal of increasing enrollment in teachers for ENLs, including 1) M.A. TESOL and 2) Bilingual Science, 7-12 Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science or Physics with a Bilingual Extension. We expect to receive a contract in May of 2021.

SECTION III: PROGRAM PASS RATES

Assessment Pass Rates

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

The pass rates table is populated from files provided by the testing company or state. The table provides information on the performance of the students in your teacher preparation program on each teacher credential assessment used by your state. In cases where a student has taken a given assessment more than once, the highest score on that test is used. In the case of a teacher preparation program with fewer than 10 scores reported on any single initial teacher credential assessment during an academic year, the program shall collect and publish information with respect to an average pass rate and scaled score on each state credential assessment taken over a three-year period. **(§205(a)(1)(B))**

Please note that this page does not have an edit feature as the pass rates have already been through several rounds of verification. If you identify an error, please contact Westat's Title II Support Center and your testing company representative.

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Pass rate
- Scaled score
- Teacher credential assessment

Assessment Pass Rates

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
006 -BIOLOGY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	3			
006 -BIOLOGY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	2			
006 -BIOLOGY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	3			
006 -BIOLOGY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	3			
161 -CHEMISTRY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
007 -CHEMISTRY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	1			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
007 -CHEMISTRY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	2			
TP014 -EARLY CHILDHOOD Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	7			
TP014 -EARLY CHILDHOOD Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	9			
TP014 -EARLY CHILDHOOD Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	7			
008 -EARTH SCIENCE CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	1			
008 -EARTH SCIENCE CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	2			
201 -EDUCATING ALL STUDENTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	6			
201 -EDUCATING ALL STUDENTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	76	523	69	91
201 -EDUCATING ALL STUDENTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	214	524	203	95
201 -EDUCATING ALL STUDENTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	227	526	225	99
201 -EDUCATING ALL STUDENTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	224	526	218	97
090 -ELEMENTARY ATS-W Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	3			
090 -ELEMENTARY ATS-W Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	22	263	22	100
090 -ELEMENTARY ATS-W Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	9			
TP110 -ELEMENTARY EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
TP110 -ELEMENTARY EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	26	54	25	96
TP110 -ELEMENTARY EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	36	55	35	97
TP110 -ELEMENTARY EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	43	57	42	98
TP115 -ENGLISH AS AN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	6			
TP115 -ENGLISH AS AN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	3			
TP115 -ENGLISH AS AN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	4			
003.1 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	2			
003.1 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	10	542	10	100
003.1 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	12	543	12	100
003.1 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	11	536	10	91
116 -ESOL CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
022 -ESOL CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	1			
116 -ESOL CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	7			
116 -ESOL CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	4			
022 -ESOL CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	1			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
022 -ESOL CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	4			
TP119 -HEALTH EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	1			
TP119 -HEALTH EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	1			
073.1 -HEALTH EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
073.1 -HEALTH EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	1			
073.1 -HEALTH EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	8			
073.1 -HEALTH EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	3			
TP021 -K-12 PERFORMING ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	1			
TP021 -K-12 PERFORMING ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	2			
TP021 -K-12 PERFORMING ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	5			
TP011 -K-12 PHYSICAL EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
TP011 -K-12 PHYSICAL EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	31	42	27	87
TP011 -K-12 PHYSICAL EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	31	41	29	94
TP011 -K-12 PHYSICAL EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	21	44	20	95
004.1 -MATHEMATICS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	3			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
004.1 -MATHEMATICS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	6			
004.1 -MATHEMATICS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	16	541	16	100
004.1 -MATHEMATICS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	6			
1211 -MULTI-SUBJECT BIRTH TO GRADE 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	2			
1211 -MULTI-SUBJECT BIRTH TO GRADE 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	7			
1211 -MULTI-SUBJECT BIRTH TO GRADE 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	8			
1211 -MULTI-SUBJECT BIRTH TO GRADE 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	8			
002 -MULTI-SUBJECT CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	1			
002 -MULTI-SUBJECT CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	1			
1221 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 1 - 6 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	2			
1221 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 1 - 6 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	5			
1221 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 1 - 6 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	26	1650	22	85
1221 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 1 - 6 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	41	1648	39	95
1221 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 1 - 6 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	40	1636	38	95
1241 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 7 - 12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
1241 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 7 - 12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	5			
1241 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 7 - 12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	12	1659	11	92
1241 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 7 - 12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	1			
075 -MUSIC CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	3			
075 -MUSIC CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	1			
075 -MUSIC CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	4			
076 -PHYSICAL EDUCATION CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	1			
076.1 -PHYSICAL EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	14	533	10	71
076.1 -PHYSICAL EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	55	545	52	95
076.1 -PHYSICAL EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	31	548	31	100
076.1 -PHYSICAL EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	27	546	25	93
009 -PHYSICS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
009 -PHYSICS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	1			
902 -SAFETY NET MULTI-SUBJECT Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	5			
976 -SAFETY NET PHYSICAL ED Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	2			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
960 -SAFETY NET STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	1			
091 -SECONDARY ATS-W Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	4			
091 -SECONDARY ATS-W Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	12	262	12	100
TP003 -SECONDARY ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	7			
TP003 -SECONDARY ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	13	49	13	100
TP003 -SECONDARY ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	12	48	12	100
TP004 -SECONDARY HISTORY/SOCIAL STUDIES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	4			
TP004 -SECONDARY HISTORY/SOCIAL STUDIES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	10	45	10	100
TP004 -SECONDARY HISTORY/SOCIAL STUDIES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	7			
TP005 -SECONDARY MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	6			
TP005 -SECONDARY MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	15	43	15	100
TP005 -SECONDARY MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	6			
TP006 -SECONDARY SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	1			
TP006 -SECONDARY SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	4			
TP006 -SECONDARY SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	8			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
005 -SOCIAL STUDIES CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
115 -SOCIAL STUDIES CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
005 -SOCIAL STUDIES CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	1			
115 -SOCIAL STUDIES CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	4			
005 -SOCIAL STUDIES CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	3			
115 -SOCIAL STUDIES CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	9			
115 -SOCIAL STUDIES CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	7			
005 -SOCIAL STUDIES CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	1			
129 -SPANISH CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	1			
020 -SPANISH CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	1			
TP012 -SPECIAL EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	1			
060.1 -STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
060.1 -STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	3			
060.1 -STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	24	546	23	96
060.1 -STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	46	546	45	98

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
060.1 -STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	37	538	36	97
078 -THEATRE CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
078 -THEATRE CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	1			
078 -THEATRE CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	2			
TP015 -VISUAL ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	7			
TP015 -VISUAL ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	4			
TP015 -VISUAL ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	8			
079 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	5			
079 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	12	238	11	92
079 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	4			
079 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	12	230	11	92
TP020 -WORLD LANGUAGE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	1			
TP020 -WORLD LANGUAGE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	1			

SECTION III: PROGRAM PASS RATES

Summary Pass Rates

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

The pass rates table is populated from files provided by the testing company or state. The table provides information on the performance of the students in your teacher preparation program on each teacher credential assessment used by your state. In cases where a student has taken a given assessment more than once, the highest score on that test is used. In the case of a teacher preparation program with fewer than 10 scores reported on any single initial teacher credential assessment during an academic year, the program shall collect and publish information with respect to an average pass rate and scaled score on each state credential assessment taken over a three-year period. **(§205(a)(1)(B))**

Please note that this page does not have an edit feature as the pass rates have already been through several rounds of verification. If you identify an error, please contact Westat's Title II Support Center and your testing company representative.

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Pass rate
- Scaled score
- Teacher credential assessment

Summary Pass Rates

Group	Number taking tests	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
All program completers, 2019-20	232	208	90
All program completers, 2018-19	228	221	97
All program completers, 2017-18	229	213	93

SECTION IV: LOW-PERFORMING

Low-Performing

Provide the following information about the approval or accreditation of your teacher preparation program. **(§205(a)(1)(D), §205(a)(1)(E))**

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

Low-Performing

1. Is your teacher preparation program currently approved or accredited?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

If yes, please specify the organization(s) that approved or accredited your program:

- [x] State
- [x] CAEP
- [ ] AAQEP
- [x] Other specify:

ASHA

2. Is your teacher preparation program currently under a designation as "low-performing" by the state?

- ( ) Yes
- (●) No

SECTION V: USE OF TECHNOLOGY

Use of Technology

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

On this page, review the questions regarding your program's use of technology. If you submitted an IPRC last year, this section is pre-loaded from your prior year's report; please review and update as necessary.

After reviewing and updating as necessary, save the page using the floating save box at the bottom of the page.

Use of Technology

1. **Provide the following information about the use of technology in your teacher preparation program. Please note that choosing 'yes' indicates that your teacher preparation program would be able to provide evidence upon request. (§205(a)(1)(F))**

   Does your program prepare teachers to:

   a. **integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction**

   - (●) Yes
   - ( ) No

   b. **use technology effectively to collect data to improve teaching and learning**

   - (●) Yes
   - ( ) No

   c. **use technology effectively to manage data to improve teaching and learning**

   - (●) Yes
   - ( ) No

   d. **use technology effectively to analyze data to improve teaching and learning**

   - (●) Yes
   - ( ) No

2. **Provide a description of the evidence that your program uses to show that it prepares teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction, and to use technology effectively to collect, manage, and analyze data in order to improve teaching and learning for the purpose of increasing student academic achievement. Include a description of the evidence your program uses to show that it prepares teachers to use the principles of universal design for learning, as applicable. Include planning activities and a timeline if any of the four elements listed above are not currently in place.**

   Adelphi University prepares teacher candidates to integrate technology in their teaching and to use technology in data collection, management and analysis for institutional improvement purposes as described below. Technology Integration in Curricula and Instruction Adelphi College of Education and Health Sciences provides technology rich teacher preparation through courses and clinical partnerships. Technology is integrally infused within our approach to teacher preparation, and cannot be separated from other aspects of our education. Teacher candidates are exposed to the latest and most important technologies for teaching in their fields through both core and elective courses. All programs model how digital technologies are used to acquire new skills and knowledge that is crucial to educators, how to collaborate with peers and mentors to design learning experiences, and how to produce materials for use in their classrooms. All programs integrate these technologies "across the curriculum", others offer elective and required courses that focus on the specific technologies for their domains. The process of establishing technology integration in the EPP was represented in 2011 with the Technology Committee's decision to use the Hunter Competencies. However, the initiatives involving technology integration began before that date, both in terms of course and field- based learning for teacher candidates (Smartboard Training in 2007) and field-based projects with P-12 students (the iPad Initiative in Mineola School District in 2010-11). The Hunter framework provided a way to establish a common language and basis for collecting meaningful evidence of progress with learning and technology. Faculty have progressed dramatically in the use of technology instruction, especially in AY 2020-2021 when the pandemic forced the university to provide 85% of its courses in a fully online environment through synchronous or

asynchronous instruction. The Faculty Center for Professional Education (FCPE) has been instrumental in providing support for faculty to further develop their skills in instructional technology and communication with students in an online environment. The FCPE has provided a series of workshops on online and blended course development, which include the following topics: Online and Blended Course Design Moodle Basics The Art of Online Discussion Forums Moodle Gradebook Preparing Online Quizzes in Moodle EPP faculty use the following types of technology in teacher education courses: SmartBoard, Moodle (a Google-based system), discussion boards, Google Suite (Drive, Classroom, Docs, Slides, Hangouts), educational apps such as Kahoot, StarTracker, NearPod, Virtual Reality, and Plickers, Excel Spreadsheets to collect and analyze student data, and online science simulations such as Phet, and National Science Teachers Association Learning Center Class Hub. Example technology identified in the advanced programs included Canva, Voicethread, Twitter, Prezi, PPT, Moodle, email, Google (Sites, Classroom), Wakelet, Turnitin (persuasive writing assignment), and online tools. Chart 1.5.1 Technology Integration provides a detailed list of technology within specific courses, based on a 2019 survey of teacher education faculty (available upon request). In addition, all initial teacher candidates are required to take the edTPA for NYS certification.Technical support and equipment is provided continually for student teachers' video recording for edTPA. A moodle support site provides students with technology resources, instruction and support. Evidence of Teacher Candidate Use of Technology Adelphi evaluates candidate use of technology through three surveys: the exit survey completed by teacher candidates in their last semester, the alumni survey completed by teacher alumni 1-5 years post graduation, and the employer survey, completed by principals or assistant principals who supervise Adelphi teacher alumni. Exit Survey Data In 2018, the exit survey was revised to include questions about the completers' perceptions of preparation in instructional technology. Questions inquired about candidates' ability to 1) use of technology to aid in differentiating instruction to meet individual needs; 2) use technology to track, share, and evaluate student learning; 3) access databases, digital media, and tools to improve P-12 learning; and 4) ability to design and facilitate digital learning, mentoring, and collaboration including social media. These four questions were added in 2018 so only two years of data is available from responses. Candidates were asked to rate their preparation in each area on a likert scale (1 = unprepared; 5= well prepared). The average mean of the four responses for initial candidates were 3.27 (AY17-18, n=49) and 3.63 (AY 18-19, n=88). There is a wide range of scores by program, with highest means in Early Childhood Special Education at 4.38 (AY 18-19, n=8) and Physical Education at 4.19 (AY 18-19, n=6) and the lowest in Adolescent English and Adolescent Social Studies at 3.38 (AY 18-19, n=8 for both programs). One must be cautious about drawing too firm conclusions, as the n is below 10 for most programs. However, the range indicates that the EPP should continue to include technology as part of faculty meetings and encourage sharing across programs of instructional technology. The exit survey was conducted with candidates in advanced programs, but they are not reported due to a low n (AY 17-18, n=1, AY 18-19, n=2). Alumni Survey Data Alumni teachers were asked to use a likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree) the following question: "Adelphi prepared me well to use technology to facilitate learning." The mean response was a 4.0 with a 1.0 standard deviation, indicating that most alumni teachers agreed with this statement, with wide variability between individual responses. Employer Survey Data An employer survey was administered by the Office of Accreditation and Assessment in 2018, with a response rate of 24%. Employers of Adelphi teacher alumni were asked to evaluate teacher preparation on a likert scale (1=unsatisfactory; 4 = distinguished) with the following question: "Utilizes various instructional technology resources to engage student learning." The mean response was 3.25 with a standard deviation of .5 points, indicating that most employers rate alumni teachers between proficient and distinguished in their use of instructional technology. Technology in Data Collection, Management and Analysis for Student Success The following electronic platforms are used regularly to monitor teacher candidate progress throughout the program: 1) candidate admissions through the SLATE enrollment Management platform, 2) Course listing, Advising, and Student Services (CLASS, an online platform for student registration, submission of grades and electronic transcript, 3) Degree Audit, an online platform for students and advisors to monitor degree progress and 4) EAB Navigate, an online tool for communicating with advisees and scheduling advising appointments Data360, an integrated platform for exploring and analyzing University data, continues to help us monitor student data for enrollment, course planning, graduation clearance, and other academic related data to help with institutional improvement. The Assessment Office collects, analyzes and reports data from Data 360 at the school and program level. Moodle is used as a portal for data collection of program key assessment data and school wide surveys (exit survey, diversity and technology surveys). All school wide surveys are now electronic. The Assessment Office collects, analyzes and reports data to programs for review and continuous improvement action plans.

SECTION VI: TEACHER TRAINING

Teacher Training

Provide the following information about your teacher preparation program.
(§205(a)(1)(G))

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

Teacher Training

1. **Provide a description of the activities that prepare general education teachers to:**

   a. **Teach students with disabilities effectively**

   NYSED requires that all teacher candidates take a course on teaching students with disabilities effectively. Adelphi teacher education programs prepare teacher candidates to teach students in diverse and inclusive settings through foundations instruction, enriching and educative coursework/assignments, and practical field experiences in high needs and diverse settings. Teacher candidates are given opportunities to interact and engage with students who are struggling, at-risk, or classified in public and private school settings. Evidence of teacher candidates' meeting this requirement include; fieldwork assignments, coursework, and the clinical setting capstone during student teaching and practica. All teacher candidates are required to take at least on 3 credit special education course. Teacher candidates in the Childhood education programs are required to take one special education course from the following options: Introduction to Special Education (600) for graduates and Child with Special Needs (305) for undergraduates. Teacher candidates in the secondary education programs are required to take Managing Inclusive Environments (560). All students in the Physical Education program are required to take Adapted Physical Education (852-469), which provides a knowledge base and skills necessary to teach students with disabilities. Field experiences are required, and courses meet New York State mandate on training the needs of children with autism. Below are the course descriptions for each of these courses: 600 - Introduction to Special Education This course is designed to introduce regular education and prospective special education teachers to students with special needs. Topics include the legal/historical foundation of special education, referral and identification processes, family involvement, and descriptions of students with the various classifications as well as students with special health care needs. The course will focus on the Individual Education Plan (IEP) and research-based teaching strategies. Field (practicum) experiences constitute part of the course requirements, including the child study and observation in settings that include special education students. 560 – Managing Inclusive Environments This course is designed to introduce educators to the legal and structural changes in the current educational landscape that permit the accommodation of students with special needs in general education classrooms; to explore professional obligations that attach to these changes for example, and to study classroom management options that maximize learning and minimize distractions in inclusive secondary classrooms. 305 - The Child with Special Needs Introduction to students with special needs and a historical perspective on special education. Topics include teaching resources, family involvement, referral and identification processes and Individual Education Plans. Twenty-five hours of fieldwork is required. 469 - Adapted Physical Education Introductory knowledge base and skills necessary to teach students with disabilities. Field experiences required. Meets New York State mandate on training the needs of children with autism.

   b. **Participate as a member of individualized education program teams, as defined in section 614(d)(1)(B) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.***

   NYSED requires that all teacher candidates take a course on teaching students with disabilities effectively. Each of the courses listed above, which meet this NYSED requirement, includes a section on diagnosing a learning disability and on working within an IEP Team. In addition, teacher candidates review student's IEP's during their clinical practice and design appropriate lessons. Teacher candidates complete an IEP collaboratively in the Methods of Instruction class. Concurrently, teacher candidates assess and diagnose students who are struggling academically, behaviorally, emotionally, or socially as case studies during fieldwork in the Formal and Informal Methods of Assessment course. Teacher candidates form a Committee on Special Education Team (CSE) during these two specific courses, but are introduced to the IEP and diagnostics during the Foundation courses.

   c. **Effectively teach students who are limited English proficient.**

   NYSED requires that all teacher candidates must take six credit hours of instruction with the following content: (iv) language acquisition and literacy development by native English speakers and students who are English language learners—and skill in developing the listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills of all students, including at least six semester hours of such study for teachers of early childhood education, childhood education, middle childhood education, and adolescence education; teachers of students with disabilities, students who are deaf or hard-of-hearing, students who are blind or visually impaired, and students with speech and language disabilities; teachers of English to speakers of other languages; and library

media specialists. (8 CRR-NY 52.21 Registration of Curricula in Teacher Education, NYSED). The majority of our Childhood and Adolescent teacher candidates, who have enrolled in the STEP 4 +1 program, are required to take a 3 credit literacy course and a 3 credit course entitled Sociolinguistics, which includes information and teaching methodology for ENLs. This course is tailored for the grade level which teacher candidates are preparing to teach. The two courses focus on second language acquisition, theories on how students can achieve full biliteracy, and content-based instruction for ENL students with a variety of cultural backgrounds and English proficiency levels. 310 - Sociolinguistic Perspectives in Childhood Education Introduces the sociolinguistic perspectives on language use and language learning. Concepts of language contact, language variation and language acquisition in childhood education are explored, particularly as related to English language learners. 311 - Sociolinguistic Perspectives in Adolescence Education Introduces the sociolinguistic perspectives on language use and language learning. Concepts of language contact, language variation and language acquisition in adolescent education are explored, particularly as related to English language learners. For teacher candidates who enter an Adelphi Master's degree program, content on ENL language and literacy acquisition is embedded within the required 6 credits of literacy instruction. In addition, dual certifications are encouraged and many teacher candidates opt to add on a TESOL Advanced Certificate while completing their initial certification. Finally, Adelphi University offers a state-funded program for inservice teachers who wish to improve their skills in effectively teaching ENL students in their content area classrooms. The ITI-BE/BSE program prepares classroom teachers for an advanced certificate in P-12 TESOL and provides state funds toward candidate tuition.

2. Does your program prepare special education teachers?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

If yes, provide a description of the activities that prepare *special education teachers* to:

a. Teach students with disabilities effectively

The Adolescent and Childhood Special Education programs as well as the tri-cert in Bilingual special education prepares teacher candidates to teach students in diverse and inclusive settings through foundations tutelage, enriching and educative coursework/assignments, and practical field experiences in high needs and diverse settings. Teacher candidates are given opportunities to interact and engage with students who are struggling, at-risk, or classified in public and private school settings. Evidence includes fieldwork assignments, coursework, and the clinical setting capstone during student teaching and practica.

b. Participate as a member of individualized education program teams, as defined in section 614(d)(1)(B) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.*

Teacher candidates complete an IEP collaboratively in the Methods of Instruction class. Concurrently, teacher candidates assess and diagnose students who are struggling academically, behaviorally, emotionally, or socially as case studies during fieldwork in the Formal and Informal Methods of Assessment course. Teacher candidates form a Committee on Special Education Team (CSE) during these two specific courses, but are introduced to the IEP and diagnostics during the Foundation courses. In addition, teacher candidates review student's IEP's during their clinical practice and design appropriate lessons.

c. Effectively teach students who are limited English proficient.

Teacher candidates are able to teach ELL/ENL students during their fieldwork experiences and during their student teaching/practica. Methods coursework prepares our teacher candidates to provide instruction to students who have limited English proficiency.

Contextual Information

On this page, review the contextual information about your program. If you submitted an IPRC last year, this section is pre-loaded from your prior year's report; please review and update as necessary.

After reviewing and updating as necessary, save the page using the floating save box at the bottom of the page.

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

Contextual Information

Please use this space to provide any additional information that describes your teacher preparation program(s). You may also attach information to this report card (see below). The U.S. Department of Education is especially interested in any evaluation plans or interim or final reports that may be available.

1. Impact on P-12 Student Learning The New York State Education Department (NYSED) provided data on Student Achievement Growth ratings for teachers who received their teaching degree through Adelphi between 2012 and 2016. Student Achievement Growth Rating (AY 14-15 and 15-16) from Adelphi Master's program completers (n=146) were compared to the state average (n=8,605). ELA and Math scores are used for student achievement data, so only teachers of Math or ELA were included in this data set. Data indicate that the scores are comparable: 84% of Adelphi teachers were rated highly effective or effective, based on Student Achievement Growth Rating data, compared to 86% state-wide. NYSED has not provided this type of data, disaggregated by EPP, since this date, so this is the most current data available. The EPP is planning to collect more current data through one of the following approaches: 1) inquire when NYSED will provide more current disaggregated statewide data; 2) request data from the NYC DOE for recent alumni teaching in NYC public schools; and/or 3) request data from small local school district partners. 2. Teacher Effectiveness The New York State Education Department provided data on overall Teacher Effectiveness. Ratings (AY 14-15 and 15-16) of Adelphi Master's program completers (n=720) were compared to the state average (n=38,004). Scores are equivalent: 93% of Adelphi teachers were rated highly effective or effective compared to 94% state-wide. NYSED has not provided this type of data, disaggregated by EPP, since this date, so this is the most current data available. The EPP is planning to collect more current data through one of the following approaches: 1) inquire when NYSED will provide more current disaggregated statewide data; 2) request data from the NYC DOE for recent alumni teaching in NYC public schools; and/or 3) request data from small local school district partners. 3. Employer Satisfaction A pilot Employer survey was administered in Summer 2018 to 55 employers, with a 24% return rate. All 14 items on the survey were rated above an average of 3.0 (proficient). When asked whether Adelphi alumni teachers were well-prepared to teach, 92% of the employers rated the alumni teachers as proficient or distinguished. Three comments from school administrators detail the strengths of our alumni teachers: "They have a good understanding of the need to differentiate instruction and adjust instruction to meet student needs. Very student centered." "Teachers are better prepared to take over a classroom with authority. Teachers are more aware of pedagogical practices and curriculum." The one item with lower ratings involved understanding how to interpret data to identify gaps in student learning, where 23% of the alumni were rated at the "basic" level ("2"). A comment from a school or district administrator on the survey corroborated this and is an area for us to address in our coursework. This is the most current data available at this time. The Assessment, Fieldwork, and Alumni faculty committees have reviewed the pilot Employer surveys, including alignment to CAEP and InTASC. Revisions were made and the employer survey will be disseminated on or before June 30th. Data from this more recent survey administration will be provided in the next report. 4. Completer Satisfaction In Spring 2018 survey of recent graduates asked them to report, using a Likert scale (5 = Strongly Agree; 1 = Strongly Disagree) whether their Adelphi experience prepared them well in a number of areas related to effective teaching. When asked whether student teaching prepared them well for their first year of student teaching, the mean response was 4.3. Alumni report being well-prepared (4.0 mean or higher) in the following areas based on their experience at Adelphi: reflective practice, teaching in the content area, using a variety of instructional methods, planning and preparing lessons, collaborating with colleagues, working with a diverse population, working with students with special needs, and using technology to support instruction. The lowest ranked items (less than 4.0 mean) included working with English Language Learners, collaborating with students' families, and two markers of classroom management (adjusting to unplanned circumstances in the classroom and managing classroom dynamics). This is the most current data available at this time. The Assessment, Fieldwork, and Alumni faculty committees have reviewed the pilot Employer surveys, including alignment to CAEP and InTASC. Revisions were made to the survey. The alumni survey will be distributed through Survey Monkey on May 3. After a two week period, data will be analyzed, and employer information will be gleaned from the alumni surveys. Data from this more recent survey administration will be provided in the next report. Outcome Measures (Intial and Advanced Levels) 5. Graduation Rates The 5 year graduation rate for initial licensure programs are between 97% and 99% during the 17-18, 18-19, and 19-20 academic years. The 5 year graduation rate for advanced certificate programs is between 96% and 100% during the 17-18, 18-19, and 19-20 academic years. 6. Ability of Completers to meet certification requirements Teacher candidates seeking initial licensure in New York State are required to take three certification exams: Educating All Students (EAS), Content Specialty Test (CST), and the Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA). Comparison data is available for the edTPA. Teacher candidates seeking advanced certification are required to take the CST in the additional certification area. The EAS pass rate for Adelphi candidates seeking initial certification during the 17-18, and 18-19 and 19-20 academic years were 98%, 98% and 92% respectively. Reviewing the program data, 4 programs demonstrated lower pass rates. This data is shared regularly with faculty members and teacher education retreats are held each semester, so that faculty can review data and discuss potential factors which contributed to this change. The CST pass rate for Adelphi candidates seeking initial certification was 94% in AY 17-18, and 88% in AY18-19, and 93% in AY 19-20. These scores reflect a time period during which NYS was

revising each of the CST exams, which required faculty and students to adapt to the new formats; this may account for some of the variability in pass rates. Scores for the edTPA are reported for the calendar, rather than the academic year. The edTPA mean score for Adelphi students seeking initial teaching certification in 2020 was within 1.5 point of both the state and national averages, as reported by SCALE and Pearson. For 15-rubric exams, the mean Adelphi score was 42.93 (42.75 – state average; 44.59 – national average). For 18-rubric exams, the mean Adelphi score was 52.24 (51.51 state average; 51.25 national average). In addition to these scores, an additional 28 teacher candidates passed this certification requirement through a safety net provided by NYSED for candidates graduating in Spring or Summer 2020 as detailed in this NYSED announcement - http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/certificate/certexamsafetynetedtpa-2020.html Adelphi edTPA scores have traditionally been higher than both state and national scores. This is the first time in many years that Adelphi's scores dipped below state and national scores. Scores may have been negatively impacted by the pandemic, which created difficulties in student teachers being placed in P-12 schools in which they complete the edTPA. Adelphi's location in Nassau County, bordering on Queens in New York City (NYC), may have affected teacher candidate scores on the edTPA more severely than in other areas. The NYC metropolitan area was an early epicenter of the pandemic from late February to June 2020 (CDC 2020, https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6946a2.htm). NYC and many suburban schools were closed, which disrupted in-person student teaching and completion of the edTPA. The CST pass rate for Adelphi candidates seeking advanced certification was 93% in AY 17-18, 98% during AY18-19, and 92% in AY19-20. 7. Ability of completers to be hired in educational positions A follow-up survey was electronically distributed to the 165 graduates in October-November 2020 to track employment status 6 months post-graduation. 44 of the 165 graduates completed the Employment Follow-up Survey for a response rate of 27%. 95% of graduates responded that they were employed in the education field. 91% of this group were employed full-time. Details about alumni employment are posted on the Annual Reporting Measures page of the Adelphi website. 8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information Adelphi University provides this information through a link to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) College Navigator. This data is reported for all Adelphi students and is not disaggregated for teacher candidates. The most recent available data through NCES is for 2017. Adelphi's cohort default rate in 2017 was 3.7% compared to a nationwide default rate of 9.7%

Supporting Files

No files have been provided.

You may upload files to be included with your report card. You should only upload PDF or Microsoft Word or Excel files. These files will be listed as links in your report card. Upload files in the order that you'd like them to appear.

Report Card Certification

Please make sure your entire report card is complete and accurate before completing this section. Once your report card is certified you will not be able to edit your data.

Certification of submission

☑ **I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the information in this report is accurate and complete and conforms to the definitions and instructions used in the *Higher Education Opportunity Act, Title II: Reporting Reference and User Manual*.**

NAME OF RESPONSIBLE REPRESENTATIVE FOR TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM:

Dr. Daryl Gordon

TITLE:

Associate Dean

Certification of review of submission

☑ **I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the information in this report is accurate and complete and conforms to the definitions and instructions used in the *Higher Education Opportunity Act, Title II: Reporting Reference and User Manual*.**

NAME OF REVIEWER:

Patricia Esposito

TITLE:

Director of Assessment