title II
higher education act

2022 TITLE II REPORTS
National Teacher Preparation Data

NY

Adelphi University
Traditional Report AY 2020-21
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

List of Programs

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	
13.1324	Teacher Education - Drama and Dance	PG	
13.14	Teacher Education - English as a Second Language	PG	
13.1305	Teacher Education - English/Language Arts	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:

25

Program Requirements

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	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Interview	○	●	○	●
Other Specify:	○	●	○	●

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

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:

Supervised Clinical Experience

Provide the following information about supervised clinical experience in 2020-21. (§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	46
Number of adjunct faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year (IHE staff)	927
Number of cooperating teachers/K-12 staff supervising clinical experience during this academic year	881
Number of students in supervised clinical experience during this academic year	450

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

Enrollment and Program Completers

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

2020-21 Total	
Total Number of Individuals Enrolled	703
Subset of Program Completers	264

Gender	Total Enrolled	Subset of Program Completers
Male	201	58
Female	502	206
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	18	6
Black or African American	27	8
Hispanic/Latino of any race	34	15
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	0
White	478	186

Race/Ethnicity	Total Enrolled	Subset of Program Completers
Two or more races	86	32
No Race/Ethnicity Reported	59	17

Race/Ethnicity	Total Enrolled	Subset of Program Completers
Two or more races	86	32
No Race/Ethnicity Reported	59	17

Teachers Prepared

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> Teachers Prepared by Subject Area

>> Teachers Prepared by Academic Major

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 2020-21.

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 2020-21**

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**	17

CIP Code	Subject Area	Number Prepared
13.1202	Teacher Education - Elementary Education	52
13.1203	Teacher Education - Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Education	
13.1210	Teacher Education - Early Childhood Education	12
13.1301	Teacher Education - Agriculture	
13.1302	Teacher Education - Art	29
13.1303	Teacher Education - Business	
13.1305	Teacher Education - English/Language Arts	11
13.1306	Teacher Education - Foreign Language	
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	
13.1311	Teacher Education - Mathematics	7
13.1312	Teacher Education - Music	3
13.1314	Teacher Education - Physical Education and Coaching	50
13.1315	Teacher Education - Reading	
13.1316	Teacher Education - Science Teacher Education/General Science	
13.1317	Teacher Education - Social Science	
13.1318	Teacher Education - Social Studies	18
13.1320	Teacher Education - Trade and Industrial	
13.1321	Teacher Education - Computer Science	
13.1322	Teacher Education - Biology	6
13.1323	Teacher Education - Chemistry	
13.1324	Teacher Education - Drama and Dance	4
13.1328	Teacher Education - History	
13.1329	Teacher Education - Physics	

CIP Code	Subject Area	Number Prepared
13.1331	Teacher Education - Speech	70
13.1337	Teacher Education - Earth Science	5
13.14	Teacher Education - English as a Second Language	3
13.99	Education - Other Specify: Teacher Education - Secondary Education	55

Teachers Prepared by Academic Major

Please provide the number of teachers prepared by academic major for academic year 2020-21. 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 2020-21**

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	2
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	11
13.1303	Teacher Education - Business	
13.1305	Teacher Education - English/Language Arts	
13.1306	Teacher Education - Foreign Language	

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
13.1307	Teacher Education - Health	
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	3
13.1314	Teacher Education - Physical Education and Coaching	16
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	

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
09	Communication or Journalism	8
11	Computer and Information Sciences	
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	3
23	English Language/Literature	1
24	Liberal Arts/Humanities	17
25	Library Science	
26	Biological and Biomedical Sciences	4
27	Mathematics and Statistics	9
30	Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies	2
38	Philosophy and Religious Studies	
40	Physical Sciences	4
41	Science Technologies/Technicians	
42	Psychology	28
44	Public Administration and Social Service Professions	
45	Social Sciences	8
46	Construction	
47	Mechanic and Repair Technologies	
50	Visual and Performing Arts	11
51	Health Professions and Related Clinical Sciences	43
52	Business/Management/Marketing	12

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
54	**History**	19
99	**Other Specify:** Sports management, Exercise science, Physical Ed. non cert, autism behavioral, counseling	14

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
54	**History**	19
99	**Other Specify:** Sports management, Exercise science, Physical Ed. non cert, autism behavioral, counseling	14

Program Assurances

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, Early Childhood Special Education, and TESOL 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 Student Success 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 Student Success. 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.

Annual Goals: Mathematics

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 (2020-21)

1. Did your program prepare teachers in mathematics in 2020-21?

If no, leave remaining questions for 2020-21 blank (or **clear responses already entered**).

- ● Yes
- ○ No

2. Describe your goal.

We are actively developing a STEAM 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 STEAM 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.

3. Did your program meet the goal?

- ● Yes
- ○ No

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

Our goal of introducing curriculum that better suits critical and creative approaches to math was partially met when the NYS department of education approved our proposal for a new STEAM MA degree (approved, Dec. 2021) that included teacher education programs in math, science and computer science education, centered at the Manhattan Campus, situated in our residency program initiatives in NYC, and linked to maker mathematics and interdisciplinary approaches to math and science teaching and learning. This new program is 30 credits of intensive focus and we are hopeful that candidates recruited through various paths can enroll in the program and serve under-resourced schools. The strategy is thus curriculum development. Within existing math education programs, we also modified our reading assignments in our classes, and modified our assignments to focus more on modeling skills. Strategies for supporting teacher comfort with the uncertainty of problem solving and creative math included sustained focus in our courses on teacher candidate understanding of the NCTM mathematical practices. Another strategy for building teacher capacity to work creatively with modeling tools is in directing student application assignments to focus on current concerns, such as climate science and epidemiology, and controversial areas of STEAM knowledge. This strategy, however, was modified to ensure that candidates were developing deep structural knowledge of mathematical systems and processes. This strategy is also limited to what we can do in pedagogical courses. In a collaborative effort with faculty in the math department, we are reviewing course requirements this coming year.

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

Steps to meet the goal included additional efforts that increase recruitment of quality math teachers for urban schools: we decided to petition NSF and ask for approval to modify our Noyce Pipeline scholarship program to include math teacher accreditation, as well as science. With the addition of math candidates, we are better situated to recruit and train good teachers across STEAM HS curriculum. Moreover, this increases our impact in high needs schools. We completed this change to the program in April, and quickly recruited 2-4 math candidates. We've also been recruiting math teachers for city schools through the Department of Education in NYC, linked to our organization of residency experiences for practicing teachers. We have built strong relationships with our first cohort of residents in D13 in NYC, where schools across the district have benefited. This involved designing a new residency in STEAM with the leaders in the district. Two of our three candidates in the pilot program are math. Thus our goal of building STEAM knowledge and interdisciplinary knowledge in our graduates has been met by all these efforts.

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

Our goals are linked to a university initiative to develop our programs in Manhattan and other NYC boroughs. We are finding that our Long Island campus administrative support is primarily targeting LI schools and students and other stakeholders, and that more effort is needed at our Manhattan campus, to make these efforts successful. Faculty are carrying a heavy workload to get new initiatives off the ground, in addition to their other responsibilities. We are confident that recent changes and hires will improve our ability to further meet our goals.

Review Current Year's Goal (2021-22)

7. Is your program preparing teachers in mathematics in 2021-22? If no, leave the next question blank.

- ● Yes
- ○ No

8. 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 STEAM 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.

Set Next Year's Goal (2022-23)

9. Will your program prepare teachers in mathematics in 2022-23? If no, leave the next question blank.

- ● Yes
- ○ No

10. Describe your goal.

Our goal for 2022-23 is to further develop our Noyce math pipeline and D13 residency in mathematics teaching in urban schools. This is a recruitment goal, but linked to our curriculum emphasis on critical and creative STEM learning, and our goal of preparing teachers to offer high quality math instruction in under-resourced schools. Our goal is to teach the first iteration of our STEAM courses at the Manhattan campus (30 credits, commencing summer 1, 2022), serving approximately 40 enrolled students, and assess the impact on math graduates during the first year of the program, based on student and staff experiences. A second goal is to review and revise our undergraduate math degree programs, to ensure that they are meeting the NCTM guidelines for math teacher education. In addition, we will be revising our math pedagogy assignments, to correlate them to the new 2020 CAEP standards in the field of math education.

Annual Goals: Science

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 (2020-21)

1. Did your program prepare teachers in science in 2020-21?

If no, leave remaining questions for 2020-21 blank (or **clear responses already entered**).

- ● Yes
- ○ No

2. 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 STEAM 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.

3. Did your program meet the goal?

- ● Yes
- ○ No

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

While our Noyce funding did not support any preservice candidates during the 2021-2022 academic year due to lack of recruitment, we have secured the Teaching Fellows Program supported with our NYC Department of Education partners. We will be welcoming over 35 fellows into our new STEAM MA program housed at our Manhattan Center this coming June. We also have a small cohort of Noyce scholars coming in this summer for the one-year accelerated science education program with added marketing support by our University Communications Team. We also will continue to partner with the New York City Urban Teacher Residency program where we are supporting five residents in addition to our Noyce scholars.

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 (2021-22)

7. Is your program preparing teachers in science in 2021-22? If no, leave the next question blank.

- ● Yes
- ○ No

8. 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.

Set Next Year's Goal (2022-23)

9. Will your program prepare teachers in science in 2022-23? If no, leave the next question blank.

- ● Yes
- ○ No

10. Describe your goal.

We will continue to work closely with our marketing and recruitment team at the University and with our partners in the NYC DOE to seek new students interested in the teaching profession. We have also launched the Teacher Interest Program (TIP) at Adelphi where we are supporting paid internships in STEAM after school programs for Adelphi junior and senior science and math students as a way to engage them in the profession of teaching with hopes that they will move into a teacher education program upon graduation. Finally, we are working closely with colleagues at Bank Street Prepared To Teach where we are submitting a US Department of Education SEED grant that will offer additional funding for science and math preservice candidates to join a residency program where they will be supported by the closely integrated ties of both clinical practice and coursework in STEAM teaching.

Annual Goals: Special Education

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 (2020-21)

1. Did your program prepare teachers in special education in 2020-21?

If no, leave remaining questions for 2020-21 blank (or **clear responses already entered**).

- ● Yes
- ○ No

2. 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 Communication Sciences & Disorders (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 Special Education Advanced Certificate sent to NYS for approval. We would like to develop more elective courses (which have been our traditional Special Topics courses).

3. Did your program meet the goal?

- ○ Yes
- ● No

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

The above goal was mostly met with the exception of an expansion of fieldwork in collaboration with Communication Sciences & Disorders and a marketed brochure. Special education faculty met during the academic year to discuss changes to our current program including successfully creating a revised Autism Certificate which has been approved by the Ruth S. Ammon College of Education and Health Sciences and the Adelphi Faculty Senate. We are currently in the process of seeking final NYS approval. We have also discussed the offering of both online and in-person courses for our Master's and Advanced Certificate programs. At the present time, we will continue to offer courses in both formats creating individual sections by format. We are still in the process of revising our Childhood Special Education Advanced Certificate which has been approved at the Department level, but will need to be submitted to our College (CEHS) Academic Affairs Committee and the Adelphi Faculty Senate. Elective courses have been developed and one temporary Special Topics course has been approved as a permanent course going forward in our curriculum.

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

Special education faculty will continue to meet on a regular basis to discuss the current curriculum for possible changes to enhance our program and to be competitive with neighboring institutions while maintaining the quality assurance and integrity of the program. We will also meet to discuss possible collaborations with existing programs within our college.

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

This past academic year, our program has written a new Transitional B Master's Degree program collaborating with New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) teachers and administrators to provide initial certification for NYC teachers in Adolescent Students with Disabilities Generalist Grades 7-12. In the past academic year, our program has hosted current NYC teachers who hold an initial certification in areas other than Special Education and have a Master's Degree seek additional certification in Adolescence Students with Disabilities Generalist Grades 7-12.

Review Current Year's Goal (2021-22)

7. Is your program preparing teachers in special education in 2021-22? If no, leave the next question blank.

- ● Yes
- ○ No

8. 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 the Office of University Communication and Marketing 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.

Set Next Year's Goal (2022-23)

9. Will your program prepare teachers in special education in 2022-23? If no, leave the next question blank.

- ● Yes
- ○ No

10. Describe your goal.

Our program will move forward the Transitional B Adolescence Students with Disabilities Generalist Grades 7-12 Master's program for final NYS approval and seek prospective applicants who are currently teaching in the NYCDOE. We will continue to offer the Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study for Adolescence Students with Disabilities Generalist Grades 7-12 for NYCDOE teachers who hold a Master's Degree in an area other than special education. We will apply for final NYS approval for our revised Autism Certificate and move forward our revised Advanced Certificate in Childhood Special Education Grades 1-6. We will continue to work with the Office of Communication and Marketing to market our programs, and especially to re-institute and re-engage our special education programs at the Manhattan Center which have been dormant since the start of the pandemic. We will work toward creating a more permanent host of formats (online and in-person) with NYS. Special education faculty will continue to meet regularly to discuss curriculum and fieldwork and to collaborate with related service providers and colleagues within our College (e.g., Communication Sciences & Disorders) for diverse and experiential clinical assignments in the field. Our program faculty will also review current key assessments throughout our curriculum and redesign specific assignments and rubrics. Special education faculty will continue to explore our process of progress monitoring of teacher candidates and re-examine our advisement policies and documents to remain current. We will also align our syllabi and

assignments with the most recent Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) and CAEP standards.

Annual Goals: Instruction of Limited English Proficient Students

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 (2020-21)

1. Did your program prepare teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2020-21?

If no, leave remaining questions for 2020-21 blank (or clear responses already entered).

- ● Yes
- ○ No

2. Describe your goal.

We will continue the New York State Education Department (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.

3. Did your program meet the goal?

- ● Yes
- ○ No

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

We enrolled the 40 teachers for the ITI-CR program. We improved recruitment by reaching out to Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) (Regional Educational Offices) and by improving our email list to principals asking them to nominate or share information with potential candidates.

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

Our biggest issue has been finding ways for teachers to take their in person certification tests during the COVID epidemic since testing centers often closed. We are continuing to follow up with the teacher candidates to ensure that they complete the requirements for their certifications.

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

Currently, the Teaching Fellows program does not have cohorts for TESOL teachers, so we will not receive a contract from them.

Review Current Year's Goal (2021-22)

7. Is your program preparing teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2021-22? 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 2021-22. We are planning to have cohorts beginning in September 2021 and January 2022. This program will be conducted fully online. We reached our goal of registering 40 CR-ITI teachers. The 2021-2022 CR-ITI-NYS program for the rest of New York State has registered 28 students in total. The 2021-2022 CR-ITI NYC program for New York City has registered 12 students in total. We used fully online classes and enhanced recruitment strategies to reach our goal. Next year is the last year of the CR-ITI grant program, and we are not sure if it will be renewed. We are starting to look for additional scholarship funds for our students.

Set Next Year's Goal (2022-23)

9. Will your program prepare teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2022-23? 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 2022-23. We are planning to have cohorts beginning in September 2022 and January 2023. This program will be conducted fully online.

Assessment Pass Rates

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 RTI'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 All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
006 -BIOLOGY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	4			
160 -BIOLOGY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	2			
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			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
161 -CHEMISTRY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
163 -CHEMISTRY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
161 -CHEMISTRY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	4			
007 -CHEMISTRY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	1			
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			
162 -EARTH SCI CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	4			
008 -EARTH SCIENCE CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	1			
008 -EARTH SCIENCE CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	1			
201 -EDUCATING ALL STUDENTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	15	525	14	93
201 -EDUCATING ALL STUDENTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	102	526	93	91
201 -EDUCATING ALL STUDENTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	248	531	244	98
201 -EDUCATING ALL STUDENTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	243	526	235	97
201 -EDUCATING ALL STUDENTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	227	526	226	100
090 -ELEMENTARY ATS-W Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	5			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
090 -ELEMENTARY ATS-W Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	5			
090 -ELEMENTARY ATS-W Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	104	264	104	100
090 -ELEMENTARY ATS-W Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	46	262	46	100
TP110 -ELEMENTARY EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	1			
TP110 -ELEMENTARY EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	28	54	27	96
TP110 -ELEMENTARY EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	38	55	36	95
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			
003.1 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
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, 2020-21	9			
003.1 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	11	539	10	91
003.1 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	12	543	12	100
116 -ESOL CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	5			
022 -ESOL CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	1			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
116 -ESOL CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	9			
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			
TP119 -HEALTH EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	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, 2020-21	2			
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			
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			
TP011 -K-12 PHYSICAL EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	31	42	28	90
TP011 -K-12 PHYSICAL EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	31	41	29	94
004.1 -MATHEMATICS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	4			
004.1 -MATHEMATICS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	7			
004.1 -MATHEMATICS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	6			

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, 2018-19	16	541	16	100
1211 -MULTI-SUBJECT BIRTH TO GRADE 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
1211 -MULTI-SUBJECT BIRTH TO GRADE 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	7			
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			
002 -MULTI-SUBJECT CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	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	6			
1221 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 1 - 6 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	40	1646	37	93
1221 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 1 - 6 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	40	1645	37	93
1221 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 1 - 6 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	41	1648	39	95
1241 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 7 - 12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
1241 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 7 - 12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	4			
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	13	1659	12	92

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
165 -MUSIC CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
165 -MUSIC CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	3			
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			
076.1 -PHYSICAL EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
076.1 -PHYSICAL EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	11	541	9	82
076.1 -PHYSICAL EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	42	544	42	100
076.1 -PHYSICAL EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	59	546	57	97
076.1 -PHYSICAL EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	31	548	31	100
091 -SECONDARY ATS-W Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	11	260	11	100
091 -SECONDARY ATS-W Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	77	267	75	97
091 -SECONDARY ATS-W Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	17	256	17	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
TP004 -SECONDARY HISTORY/SOCIAL STUDIES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	4			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
TP004 -SECONDARY HISTORY/SOCIAL STUDIES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	10	45	10	100
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
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			
115 -SOCIAL STUDIES CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	2			
115 -SOCIAL STUDIES CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	13	546	13	100
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			
129 -SPANISH CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	2			
129 -SPANISH CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	1			
060.1 -STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	2			
060.1 -STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	6			

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, 2020-21	27	546	27	100
060.1 -STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	35	548	34	97
060.1 -STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	47	546	46	98
166 -THEATER CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
166 -THEATER CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	2			
166 -THEATER CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	1			
078 -THEATRE CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	1			
078 -THEATRE CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	1			
TP015 -VISUAL ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	1			
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			
079 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
167 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	7			
079 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	4			
079 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	16	249	16	100

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
167 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2020-21	6			
079 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	12	240	12	100
079 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	4			
TP020 -WORLD LANGUAGE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2019-20	1			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)

Summary Pass Rates

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 RTI'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, 2020-21	253	242	96
All program completers, 2019-20	252	236	94
All program completers, 2018-19	229	223	97

Low-Performing

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

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:

- ☑ State
- ☑ CAEP
- ☐ AAQEP
- ☑ Other specify:

  ASHA

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

- ○ Yes
- ● No

Use of Technology

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 Ruth S. Ammon 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 Educator Preparation Program (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). 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 four 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. Candidates were asked to rate their preparation in each area on a likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5= strongly agree). The average mean of the four responses for initial candidates were 3.67 (AY19-20, n=83) and 3.91 (AY 20-21, n=56). There is a wide range of scores by program, with highest means in Physical Education UG at 4.33 (AY 19-20, n=9) and Art Education Grad at 4.40 (AY 20-21, n=5) and the lowest in Childhood Special Education 3.00 (AY 19-20, n=5) and Physical Education Graduate at 4.18 (AY20-21, n=10). 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. Alumni Survey Data An Alumni survey was administered by the Office of Assessment and Accreditation in Spring 2021, with a response rate of 17%. 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 (specific skill set) to facilitate learning." The mean response was a 3.61 with a .8 standard deviation, indicating that most alumni teachers agreed with this statement. Employer Survey Data An employer survey was administered by the Office of Assessment and Accreditation 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.

Teacher Training

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

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 Individualized Educational Plan (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.

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.

Measure 1 (Initial): Completer effectiveness 1. Impact on P-12 Student Learning Growth 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 Educator Preparation Provider (EPP), since this date, so this is the most current data available. The EPP has also obtained data from 12 program completers' administrators in 2017-2018. Administrators observed program completers and provided summative student teaching evaluation using the Danielson Framework for Teaching. Data indicated that all 12 program completers scored an average of 3.8 across the seven domains. Completers scored the highest in 2a. Creating an environment of respect and rapport (4.0) and the lowest in 3b. Questioning and discussion techniques (3.5). The mode was 3.8. 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 by the next annual report April 30, 2023. Due to the pandemic, not only is our physical contact with school partners limited, but so too is their time available for meeting with us to provide feedback. Additionally, customary evaluation measures for classroom teachers have been altered to account for blended and online teaching, adjustments to schedules and remediation necessary for pandemic-related learning losses, etc. We are not comfortable assessing impact during this unusual time. 2. Teacher Effectiveness The New York State Education Department data 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 three approaches discussed above in (1). Measure 2: Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement Initial Program: Employer survey A pilot Employer survey was administered in Summer 2018. A faculty-led committee reviewed and revised the pilot employer survey, which was disseminated in June 2021. Some of the main revisions included adjusting the rating scale so that it was consistent with other data collection measures for consistency in analysis and reporting. However, the EPP obtained a low response rate (N = 10 of which 7 were partially completed). In order to increase the number of completers, the EPP has since compiled a targeted list of employers as suggested by faculty who have maintained close contact with alumni. Additionally, the assessment committee is in the process of reviewing the questions to align it to the 2022 CAEP standards. The EPP plans to administer this survey by October 2022. Data for this measure are expected to be available to the public on or before December 2022. Advisory Board update A new dean has led the EPP since July 2019. She began assembling a new P-12 Advisory Board consisting of local superintendents, current students and alumni. However, due to the constraints of COVID-19, the EPP was unable to meet with its Advisory Board in the 2020-2021 academic year. The next meeting will be scheduled for Fall 2022. Data on these meetings will be posted in April 2023. Advanced Program: Employer survey In January 2022, the EPP's assessment committee created a new employer survey specific to its advanced programs and aligned to the CAEP revised advanced standards. The questions have been solidified and reviewed. The EPP plans to administer this survey by October 2022. Data for this measure are expected to be available to the public on or before December 2022. Measure 3: Candidate competency at completion. Initial Program: State required licensure exams: Content Specialty Test (CST), Educating All Students (EAS), and Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) 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). In 2020, due to COVID-19 and its associated limitations with in person student teaching, New York State authorized the use of the Assessment of Teaching Skills - Writing (ATS-W) exam as an alternative to the edTPA which has been extended to the 2021-2022 academic year. In 2020-2021, 177 out of 179 candidates took the ATS-W. The EAS pass rate for Adelphi candidates seeking initial certification during the 18-19, 19-20, and 20-21 academic years were 99%, 93%, and 99% respectively. The CST pass rate for Adelphi candidates seeking initial certification was 90% in AY 18-19, 93% in AY 19-20, and 97% in AY 20-21. This data is shared regularly with faculty at teacher education retreats which are held each semester, so that faculty can review data and discuss potential factors which contributed to this change. The EPP did not hold a retreat during the pandemic. However, we did hold a retreat on November 5, 2021 to review 2020-2021 data. Initial Program: Danielson Framework for Teaching Initial Candidate Data Spring 2021 The Danielson Framework for Teaching was developed by Charlotte Danielson as a tool to identify the aspects of a teacher's responsibilities that

have been documented through research as promoting improved student learning. Danielson divides the complex activity of teaching into twenty-two components clustered into four domains of teaching responsibility: (1) planning and preparation, (2) the classroom environment, (3) instruction, and (4) professional responsibilities. A joint meeting of assessment and fieldwork committees decided to adopt the 2013 Danielson Evaluation Framework in Fall 2020 as it is a validated instrument for evaluating teacher candidate's readiness to teach. We also realigned the instrument to new CAEP standards. Adoption was delayed because of the pandemic. EPP-wide data collection using this instrument began in earnest in Spring 2021. The EPP collected data around 112 candidates (87 white; 25 non-white). This data was shared with and reviewed by faculty members at the Fall 2021 teacher education retreat. Overall, candidates scored above a 3.0 in all four domains, with the highest scores (M=3.5) in 2a. Creating an environment of respect and rapport and 4e. Growing and developing professionally. The lowest scores (M=3.1) were in 1b. Demonstrating knowledge of students seems low in comparison to other items. The same for 3b. Using questioning and discussion techniques, 3c. Engaging students in learning, 4a. Reflecting on teaching, and 4c. Communicating Families. Advanced Program: State required licensure exams: CST and EAS Teacher candidates seeking advanced certification are required to take the Content Specialty Test (CST) in the additional certification area. The CST pass rate for Adelphi candidates seeking advanced certification was 96% in AY 18-19, 92% during AY 19-20, and 97% in AY 20-21. Ed leadership is the only advanced program required to take the EAS. The pass rate for Adelphi candidates seeking advanced certification was 100% for AY 18-19, AY 19-20, and AY 20-21. This data is shared regularly with faculty at teacher education retreats which are held each semester, so that faculty can review data and discuss potential factors which contributed to this change. Advanced Programs: Academic Competency The EPP plans to meet with faculty in the Advanced Programs and identify the courses where each of the 6 sub-components in RA1.1 are addressed. The EPP will collect this data in Fall 2022. Data for this measure will be available in April 2023. Measure 4: Ability of completers to be hired in positions for which they have prepared. Initial Program: Employment Follow-Up Survey 2020-2021 AY The Employment Follow-Up Survey provides an important source of data regarding employment in teaching positions. This survey was electronically distributed to 185 graduates six months post-graduation. Twenty-four out of 185 graduates completed this survey. 83% of graduates responded that they were employed in the field of education. 100% of this group were employed full-time. Employed graduates were more likely to be employed as a teacher on a regular contract (60%). Graduates were more likely to find employment in Elementary Schools (35%) and less likely to find employment in Nursery Schools (5%). The EPP will work with the newly formed Alumni Group to disseminate the survey during their annual event in April 2022. The previous alumni event was attended by 25 alumni, so it should be a good opportunity to increase our response rate to the Employment Follow-Up Survey. The University has a Center for Career and Professional Development which administers the Career Outcome Survey. The current report on our AU website is for 2020 program completers. However, this data is not disaggregated by initial and advance. The EPP will work with this office to request raw data and disaggregate by initial and advanced programs. Data will be available in April 2023. Advanced Programs: Employment Follow-Up Survey 2020-2021 AY The Employment Follow-Up Survey received 2 responses from advanced programs. This is not enough data to report outcomes. The EPP will work with the newly formed Alumni Group to disseminate the survey during their annual event in April 2022. The previous alumni event was attended by 25 alumni, so it should be a good opportunity to increase our response rate to the Employment Follow-Up Survey. The University has a Center for Career and Professional Development which administers the Career Outcome Survey. The current report on our AU website is for 2020 program completers. However, this data is not disaggregated by initial and advance. The EPP will work with this office to request raw data and disaggregate by initial and advanced programs. Data will be available in April 2023.

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:

Patricia Esposito

TITLE:

Director of Assessment and Accreditation

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:

Emily Kang

TITLE:

Associate Dean for Academic Affairs