



Adelphi University  
Traditional Report AY 2024-25  
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

THIS INSTITUTION HAS NO IPEDS ID

IF NO IPEDS ID, PLEASE PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP

SALUTATION

FIRST NAME

LAST NAME

Esposito

**PHONE**

(516) 877-4075

**EMAIL**

esposito2@adelphi.edu

# List of Programs

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [List of Programs](#)

List each program for an initial teaching credential below and indicate whether it is offered at the Undergraduate level (UG), 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

**Note:** This section is preloaded with the list of programs reported in the prior year's IPRC.

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:**

28

# Program Requirements

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

- >> [Undergraduate Requirements](#)
- >> [Postgraduate Requirements](#)
- >> [Supervised Clinical Experience](#)

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

**Note:** This section is preloaded from the prior year's IPRC.

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	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Fingerprint check	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Background check	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum number of courses/credits/semester hours completed	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum GPA	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum GPA in content area coursework	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum GPA in professional education coursework	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum ACT score	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Minimum SAT score	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Minimum basic skills test score	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Subject area/academic content test or other subject matter verification	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Recommendation(s)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No

Element	Admission	Completion
Essay or personal statement	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Interview	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Other Specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> 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:

2.75 overall, 3.0 in STEP Program

## Postgraduate Requirements

**Note:** This section is preloaded from the prior year's IPRC.

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

- Yes  
 No

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

Element	Admission	Completion
Transcript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Fingerprint check	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Background check	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Minimum number of courses/credits/semester hours completed	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum GPA	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum GPA in content area coursework	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum GPA in professional education coursework	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum ACT score	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Minimum SAT score	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Minimum basic skills test score	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No

Element	Admission	Completion
Subject area/academic content test or other subject matter verification	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Recommendation(s)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Essay or personal statement	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Interview	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Other Specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> 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:

#2 question: up to 50% may be below 3.0 per state law.

## Supervised Clinical Experience

**Note:** The clinical experience requirements in this section are preloaded from the prior year's IPRC. Teacher preparation providers will enter the number of participants each year.

Provide the following information about supervised clinical experience in 2024-25. ([§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

560

You have programs with the teacher of record model, but "years required for teaching as the teacher of record" is 0. Please correct the data, or confirm.

I confirm that there are 0 hours required

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

- Yes

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

100

Years required of teaching as the teacher of record in a classroom

0

### All Programs

Number of full-time equivalent faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year (IHE staff)

10

[Optional tool](#) for automatically calculating full-time equivalent faculty in the system

Number of adjunct faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year (IHE staff)

43

Number of cooperating teachers/K-12 staff supervising clinical experience during this academic year

292

Number of students in supervised clinical experience during this academic year

512

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

Teaching Fellows Program - This program prepares those who do not have a degree in teaching. Rather than completing a traditional teacher education program prior to entering the classroom, teaching fellows pursue a master's degree in education while teaching full time in a New York City public school. All Teaching Fellows are employed as a classroom teacher as holders of the NYS Transitional B certificate. During our SBS Fellows course in the summer, they will have completed approximately 90 hours of supervised clinical experience. Teaching Fellows are supervised 4 times in their first year and 2 times in their second year.

# Enrollment and Program Completers

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [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

2024-25 Total	
Total Number of Individuals Enrolled	606
Subset of Program Completers	285

Gender	Total Enrolled	Subset of Program Completers
Male	363	77
Female	243	208
No Gender Reported	0	0
Race/Ethnicity	Total Enrolled	Subset of Program Completers
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0
Asian	32	13
Black or African American	88	17
Hispanic/Latino of any race	21	13
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0
White	334	176
Two or more races	90	46

**Race/Ethnicity**

**Total Enrolled**

**Subset of Program Completers**

**No Race/Ethnicity Reported**

41

20

# Teachers Prepared

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](#)

## THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

- >> [Teachers Prepared by Subject Area](#)
- >> [Teachers Prepared by Academic Major](#)

## Teachers Prepared by Subject Area

Please provide the number of teachers prepared by subject area for academic year 2024-25.

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 2024-25

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	<input type="text" value="18"/>
13.1202	Teacher Education - Elementary Education	<input type="text" value="46"/>

CIP Code	Subject Area	Number Prepared
13.1203	Teacher Education - Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Education	
13.1210	Teacher Education - Early Childhood Education	4
13.1301	Teacher Education - Agriculture	
13.1302	Teacher Education - Art	47
13.1303	Teacher Education - Business	
13.1305	Teacher Education - English/Language Arts	7
13.1306	Teacher Education - Foreign Language	1
13.1307	Teacher Education - Health	1
13.1308	Teacher Education - Family and Consumer Sciences/Home Economics	
13.1309	Teacher Education - Technology Teacher Education/Industrial Arts	
13.1311	Teacher Education - Mathematics	10
13.1312	Teacher Education - Music	6
13.1314	Teacher Education - Physical Education and Coaching	75
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	14
13.1320	Teacher Education - Trade and Industrial	
13.1321	Teacher Education - Computer Science	2
13.1322	Teacher Education - Biology	15
13.1323	Teacher Education - Chemistry	5
13.1324	Teacher Education - Drama and Dance	9
13.1328	Teacher Education - History	
13.1329	Teacher Education - Physics	1
13.1331	Teacher Education - Speech	48

CIP Code	Subject Area	Number Prepared
13.1337	Teacher Education - Earth Science	4
13.14	Teacher Education - English as a Second Language	4
13.99	Education - Other Specify: teacher ed - secondary	73

## Teachers Prepared by Academic Major

Please provide the number of teachers prepared by academic major for academic year 2024-25. 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?](#)

Does this teacher preparation provider grant degrees upon completion of its programs?

- Yes  
 No

No teachers prepared in academic year 2024-25

If this provider 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	1
13.1202	Teacher Education - Elementary Education	
13.1203	Teacher Education - Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Education	
13.1210	Teacher Education - Early Childhood Education	
13.1301	Teacher Education - Agriculture	
13.1302	Teacher Education - Art	42
13.1303	Teacher Education - Business	
13.1305	Teacher Education - English/Language Arts	
13.1306	Teacher Education - Foreign Language	
13.1307	Teacher Education - Health	

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
13.1308	Teacher Education - Family and Consumer Sciences/Home Economics	<input type="text"/>
13.1309	Teacher Education - Technology Teacher Education/Industrial Arts	<input type="text"/>
13.1311	Teacher Education - Mathematics	<input type="text"/>
13.1312	Teacher Education - Music	<input type="text"/>
13.1314	Teacher Education - Physical Education and Coaching	49
13.1315	Teacher Education - Reading	<input type="text"/>
13.1316	Teacher Education - General Science	<input type="text"/>
13.1317	Teacher Education - Social Science	<input type="text"/>
13.1318	Teacher Education - Social Studies	<input type="text"/>
13.1320	Teacher Education - Trade and Industrial	<input type="text"/>
13.1321	Teacher Education - Computer Science	<input type="text"/>
13.1322	Teacher Education - Biology	<input type="text"/>
13.1323	Teacher Education - Chemistry	<input type="text"/>
13.1324	Teacher Education - Drama and Dance	<input type="text"/>
13.1328	Teacher Education - History	<input type="text"/>
13.1329	Teacher Education - Physics	<input type="text"/>
13.1331	Teacher Education - Speech	<input type="text"/>
13.1337	Teacher Education - Earth Science	<input type="text"/>
13.14	Teacher Education - English as a Second Language	<input type="text"/>
13.99	Education - Other Specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
01	Agriculture	<input type="text"/>
03	Natural Resources and Conservation	<input type="text"/>
05	Area, Ethnic, Cultural, and Gender Studies	<input type="text"/>
09	Communication or Journalism	3

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
11	Computer and Information Sciences	2
12	Personal and Culinary Services	
14	Engineering	
16	Foreign Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics	2
19	Family and Consumer Sciences/Human Sciences	
21	Technology Education/Industrial Arts	
22	Legal Professions and Studies	2
23	English Language/Literature	14
24	Liberal Arts/Humanities	7
25	Library Science	
26	Biological and Biomedical Sciences	16
27	Mathematics and Statistics	14
30	Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies	1
38	Philosophy and Religious Studies	
40	Physical Sciences	7
41	Science Technologies/Technicians	
42	Psychology	9
44	Public Administration and Social Service Professions	
45	Social Sciences	11
46	Construction	
47	Mechanic and Repair Technologies	
50	Visual and Performing Arts	15
51	Health Professions and Related Clinical Sciences	37
52	Business/Management/Marketing	11
54	History	18

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
99	<b>Other Specify:</b> <input data-bbox="285 117 1260 163" type="text" value="athletic training, exercise science, sports management, food studies"/>	<input data-bbox="1292 90 1572 136" type="text" value="14"/>

# Program Assurances

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [Program Assurances](#)

Respond to the following assurances. 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

**Note:** This section is preloaded from the prior year's IPRC.

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, and 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 teacher candidate 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/or student teaching. Placements are 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. The teacher candidates in the Model program are placed in one district over the course of an entire school year, rather than 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. 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.

**West Hempstead Grant Funded Residency** As part of New York's Empire State Department of Labor (NYSDOL) Teacher Residency Program grant, the West Hempstead Union Free School District, in partnership with Adelphi University, was awarded \$300,000. The grant covers \$30,000 per resident towards tuition, books, and a \$2000/month stipend for 10 months. Residents who pursue certification in Special Education, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Adolescent Social Studies, or Adolescent English. Special consideration will be given to diverse residents, including but not limited to, individuals currently underrepresented in the teaching profession. This residency is a year long clinical experience.

**Bellmore-Merrick Internship** The Bellmore-Merrick Internship is open to teacher candidates who are seeking certification in Adolescent Education. Teacher candidates in the Bellmore-Merrick School District internship are required to student teach in the fall term of their fifth year and then serve as paid interns from January through June in the spring semester. Teacher candidates must have an overall GPA of 3.0 to be eligible for the program, and must present a writing sample and engage in interviews as part of the acceptance process.

# 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\(a\)\)](#)

**Note:** Last year's goal and the current year's goal are preloaded from the prior year's IPRC.

## THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

- >> [Report Progress on Last Year's Goal \(2024-25\)](#)
- >> [Review Current Year's Goal \(2025-26\)](#)
- >> [Set Next Year's Goal \(2026-27\)](#)

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 (2024-25)

### 1. Did your program prepare teachers in mathematics in 2024-25?

If no, leave remaining questions for 2024-25 blank (or [clear responses already entered](#)).

- Yes  
 No

### 2. Describe your goal.

Our primary objective is to build on the previous years' progress and advance the STEAM institute at our New York city campus, which was relocated to Brooklyn in Fall 2023. The program oversees significant cohorts of Teaching Fellows and Teaching Collaboratives, funded by the Department of Education, and blending these groups with our NOYCE fellows who will also support urban communities with limited access to educational resources in our overarching goals to prepare candidates to teach in this shortage area. Our candidates are placed in diverse schools in New York City to refine their competencies. The Adelphi University Manhattan Institute for Studies of STEM and the Imagination (known as "MIXI") is designed to be interdisciplinary, mirroring the STEAM approach. We organized a well-received conference from April 18-20, 2023, attracting both MA and PhD students, along with esteemed speakers (e.g., Mia Shaw, New York University, presented at our MIXI lab in November 2023, and so did Alexander Galloway (NYU, media studies) and Luciana Parisi (Duke University, media studies) and Ezekiel Dixon-Román (Teachers College, Education)) who hold distinguished research positions in STEM and STS, all aligned with the objectives of the institute. Our NOYCE teacher candidates and Teaching Fellow candidates will be integrated into the institute, along with a small cohort of math teachers. The program focuses on interdisciplinary integration of math, science, and art. Our STEAM- focused institute illuminates the interconnectedness of these areas. We also project that select Math MA students in our existing program will enter our proposed PhD in the Learning Sciences, which is scheduled to begin in Fall 2024. MIXI now features a website and was awarded a prestigious national grant from the Spencer Foundation of nearly \$250,000. This grant bolsters our interdisciplinary approach to math and science education, with its focus on technology in schools. Program objectives include assessing how recent changes to mathematics curriculum assessments, implemented in the summer of 2022, will benefit our math students in these programs.

### 3. Did your program meet the goal?

- Yes  
 No

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

To build the math program in our MIXI location in NYC, and attract additional students into math education committed to working in challenging schools, we advertised widely and reached out to local NYC schools, focusing on vocational schools in under-resourced districts. We worked hard at rewriting our website information, so that candidates would get a more accurate understanding of the career and the program at Adelphi. We placed our teacher candidates in these schools, and two of these have been hired for full time positions. Strategies to reach the objective of enhancing interdisciplinary skills in our teacher candidates were revisions of curriculum to remain responsive to the changing technologies available. We also developed the new PhD in the Learning Sciences (launched in 2025 Fall) and recruited seven students who had been involved in various MIXI events and projects. This is part of our goal to enhance the professional training of all kinds of related stakeholders.

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

Frequent meetings with university communications office.

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

## Review Current Year's Goal (2025-26)

**7. Is your program preparing teachers in mathematics in 2025-26? If no, leave the next question blank.**

- Yes  
 No

**8. Describe your goal.**

Our goals pertain to aligning program courses with shared objectives for the STEAM program, and ensuring that instructors in our programs are following through with shared objectives, through regular catch-up meetings, and observations, where faculty and staff can discuss both student progress but also program issues and ways of changing course assignments to make them more responsive to year-by-year changes in district needs. In other words, our goal concerns better communication across the faculty team, to make sure that all staff are collaborating and that the courses are synchronized well to complement each other. This is a curriculum planning goal for the staff and faculty of the program. As we launch our new PhD in the Learning Sciences, and see some of our MA courses transformed into PhD courses, and as we take in new kinds of students, changing the culture and the expectations, we want to reflect on how our curriculum development is progressing, and how it comes together cohesively, across the various degrees and credentials which our students obtain upon graduation.

## Set Next Year's Goal (2026-27)

**9. Will your program prepare teachers in mathematics in 2026-27? If no, leave the next question blank.**

- Yes  
 No

**10. Describe your goal.**

We have new goals that respond to current changes in society and education, taking cue from three concerns: (1) the growing concern in the US about the impact of climate crises and ways of empowering students to take action using STEAM and in particular mathematical knowledges, skills, and dispositions, and (2) the growing concern in the US with algorithmic governance and the access to AI tools across various sectors of society, including the changing landscape of mathematics as a discipline, where computational mathematics begins to dominate the field, and (3) the ongoing concern

around racist/gendered/classed practices in education that do not serve equity and democracy. These are massive concerns that cannot be adequately addressed by any one effort, but we believe it's important to further develop our already well-established "critical" approach to math and science literacy, by shifting our curriculum to be responsive to these concerns. This year our goal is to better integrate these concerns into the program, within three courses that candidates take: (a) the history of mathematics course, (b) the critical literacy in math and science education, and (c) Teaching math in the secondary mathematics classroom. These two courses already target student learning about mathematics as a grounded and historically situated material practice, and so they are appropriate courses for such work. There has been international research recently on how mathematics curriculum and instruction might be developed to help build an ecological sensibility in students (see the 2025 International Commission on Mathematical Instruction). This research is pragmatic and focused on problem-based design and an emphasis on mathematical modeling, with a new appreciation for Indigenous modes of engaging the earth, and can be integrated into the curriculum. The goal is to help prepare our teacher candidates for future teaching by giving them opportunities in our courses where they can develop skills and knowledge about (i) mathematical modeling that avoids dangerous solutionism and seeks a multi-species flourishing and (ii) mathematical concepts and practices that are embedded in current computational AI methods, so that candidates are not mystified by tools such as large language models, and understand their techniques and their limits.

# Annual Goals: Science

## THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

- >> [Report Progress on Last Year's Goal \(2024-25\)](#)
- >> [Review Current Year's Goal \(2025-26\)](#)
- >> [Set Next Year's Goal \(2026-27\)](#)

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\(a\)\)](#)

**Note:** Last year's goal and the current year's goal are preloaded from the prior year's IPRC.

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 (2024-25)

### 1. Did your program prepare teachers in science in 2024-25?

If no, leave remaining questions for 2024-25 blank (or [clear responses already entered](#)).

- Yes  
 No

### 2. Describe your goal.

Main Campus/Long Island: Participation of science student teachers in a NYS DOL school year residency program in a partner district that previously participated in a local district-funded academic year residency program. In both programs, student teachers are compensated for substituting one day per week in the fall term and two days per week in the spring term. In the school year program, however, as full-time employees who are paid tuition remission and a monthly stipend, participants are also required to substitute at all other times during the school year (which is optional in the locally-funded program) and meet other responsibilities not expected of student teachers. NYC Campus: This coming year we will be working closely with NYC DOE as they are recruiting our first Teaching Fellows cohort funded through our recently awarded NYS Workforce Grant. Our grant supports 15 candidates per cohort. We also will be submitting a NSF/Robert Noyce proposal for a third round of funding as we have found much success in our prior two awards and believe that our good work will be highlighted in the proposal for funding. Lastly, we will work closely with our outreach coordinator that was recently hired with the goal of building partnerships with different school networks in NYC where we can provide programming for uncertified teachers through different tuition models.

### 3. Did your program meet the goal?

- Yes  
 No

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

Main Campus/Long Island: No NYC Campus: Yes Main Campus/Long Island: Recruitment announcements for the NYS DOL school year residency program via email and text including invitation to a meeting with district personnel. NYC Campus: We worked closely with our NYCPS partners to support our first cohort of 25 science educators.

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

Main Campus/Long Island: For the NYS DOL school year residency program, earlier and more frequent recruitment announcements and more targeted one-to-one recruitment of potential science candidates before they apply for student teaching, i.e., in the fall in the academic year before student teaching. For the local district-funded academic year residency program, outreach to several other districts that have participated and/or still participate for science positions, e.g., identification of appropriate cooperating teachers.

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

## Review Current Year's Goal (2025-26)

**7. Is your program preparing teachers in science in 2025-26? If no, leave the next question blank.**

- Yes  
 No

**8. Describe your goal.**

Main Campus/Long Island: Three science student teachers are expected to participate in either the same local district-funded academic year residency program that ran in 2023-24 and/or in the NYS DOL school year residency program that ran in 2024-25 with elementary level student teachers. If the latter grant is populated with any secondary science student teachers, the team, particularly university supervisors, will be consulted about their experiences to help guide the plan for the new cohort. NYC Campus: We will continue to prepare science teacher candidates across the four disciplines (Grades 7-12) through our Trans-B/ NYC Teaching Fellows STEAM MA program and our twelve month traditional STEAM MA pathway.

## Set Next Year's Goal (2026-27)

**9. Will your program prepare teachers in science in 2026-27? If no, leave the next question blank.**

- Yes  
 No

**10. Describe your goal.**

Main Campus/Long Island: Participation of science student teachers in a renewed NYS DOL school year residency program in the same partner district and/or in at least one local district-funded academic year residency program. NYC Campus: We will continue to prepare science teacher candidates across the four disciplines (Grades 7-12) through our Trans-B/ NYC Teaching Fellows STEAM MA program and our twelve month traditional STEAM MA pathway. We recently received a 2.5M grant from SUNY Early Workforce Initiative which will provide full tuition support and a small stipend to 35 NYCPS Teaching Fellows seeking STEM teacher certification. Additionally, we have candidates beginning the STEAM MA program this coming summer (2026) following our traditional, initial certification pathway. We look forward to continuing our programs in our new Adelphi University Manhattan Center Campus and utilizing our state-of-the-art Makerspace.

## 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\(a\)\)](#)

**Note:** Last year's goal and the current year's goal are preloaded from the prior year's IPRC.

### THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

- >> [Report Progress on Last Year's Goal \(2024-25\)](#)
- >> [Review Current Year's Goal \(2025-26\)](#)
- >> [Set Next Year's Goal \(2026-27\)](#)

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 (2024-25)

### 1. Did your program prepare teachers in special education in 2024-25?

If no, leave remaining questions for 2024-25 blank (or [clear responses already entered](#)).

- Yes  
 No

### 2. Describe your goal.

Our program will continue accepting applicants for our Transitional B Adolescence Students with Disabilities Generalist Grades 7-12 Master's program for pre-service teachers employed by the NYCDOE. This program has been expanded to include additional cohorts for the Summer and Fall. We will work toward creating more dual modality sections of existing courses (in-person and online) as well as further develop our asynchronous distance learning courses. We plan to create a more permanent presence at our New York Center in Brooklyn. We will also register students who need to transfer credits and complete their special education degree from the College of St. Rose in our Teach-Out agreement. Special education faculty will continue to meet regularly to discuss curriculum and fieldwork and to collaborate with colleagues within our College of Education and Health Sciences. We will continue to revise and implement diverse and experiential clinical assignments in the field. Our program faculty will also continue to review current key assessments throughout our curriculum and make any necessary revisions based on student data and feedback. We will continue to implement, analyze and interpret our CEHS Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) during the student teaching and practica experiences, particularly in the areas of culturally responsive-sustaining teaching (CR-S) and diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging (DEIB); and technology. Special education faculty will continue to explore our process of progress monitoring of teacher candidates which will expand to dispositions at admissions in our CEHS Fall pilot. We will also re-examine our advisement policies and documents to remain current. We will ensure that our syllabi and assignments align with the most recent 2020 Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) and CAEP standards. Our special education faculty is in the process of re-registering and developing programs which will align with the new NYS certification requirements for special education (Students with Disabilities - SWD All Grades). The new SWD All Grades certification has been broadened to include a Prek-12 single license, sunsetting the two existing Grades 1-6 and 7-12 certifications. Our newly aligned SWD All Grades programs are currently under review in the RSASOE Academic Affairs and we hope to be able to receive full Senate approval in the Fall, followed by NYSED approval, and implement the new programs in Fall 2025. Our existing programs will continue until we receive NYSED approval for the new SWD ALL Grades programs, at which time we will sunset our current programs in Childhood Special Education Grades 1-6 and Adolescence Special Education Grades 7-12.

### 3. Did your program meet the goal?

- Yes  
 No

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

Special Education faculty as well as interdisciplinary collaborative partners have been meeting regularly to discuss ways to improve our curriculum and manage our incoming cohorts. Our new programs have been approved at both the University and State levels - and as such, our syllabi have been redesigned to focus on the new SWD PreK-12 certification. The main strategy has been to collaborate with integral partners in the new SWD certification as well as our curriculum advisors to manage existing and future Transitional B cohorts. We have also met as faculty to redesign courses for multiple modalities, including in-person, online synchronous and asynchronous courses.

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

In meeting our current goals, the most effective strategies involve developing deeper partner relationships through meaningful collaborations. In addition, it is in our faculty, and our students best interest to continue to adapt the curriculum to meet the specific needs of students and faculty in learning modality and curriculum - and to continue to assess how students are performing in our courses.

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

## Review Current Year's Goal (2025-26)

### 7. Is your program preparing teachers in special education in 2025-26? If no, leave the next question blank.

- Yes  
 No

### 8. Describe your goal.

Our Transitional B Alternative Certification program is expanding with additional New York City Teaching Fellows (NYCTF) and we will continue accepting applicants for our recent NYS approved Transitional B SWD All Grades Master's program for preservice teachers employed by the New York City Public Schools (NYCPS). This program will include additional cohorts starting this summer as well as current NYCTF continuing in the program during the Summer and Fall. Program faculty will continue to work toward creating dual modality sections of existing courses (in-person and online) as well as create asynchronous courses for our fully online programs. Special education faculty will continue to meet regularly to discuss curriculum and fieldwork and to collaborate with colleagues within our College of Education and Health Sciences. As our fieldwork has expanded to PreK-12 to align with our new Students with Disabilities (SWD) All Grades certification, we will align our clinical placements in collaboration with our School of Education's student teaching and fieldwork placement office - and as such will revise and implement age appropriate clinical assignments in our fieldwork courses. We will continue to implement, analyze and interpret our CEHS Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) during the student teaching and practica experiences. Special education faculty will continue to explore our process of progress monitoring of teacher candidates which has expanded to the collection of dispositions at admissions in our CEHS pilot. Lastly, all of our special education programs have been re-registered with NYS and align with the new NYS certification requirements for special education (Students with Disabilities - SWD All Grades). Priority goals include creating new advisement sheets, updating the Adelphi Bulletin, website and subsequent webpages, and updating or transferring current student programs to the new certification - as well as market and promote all of our new programs.

## Set Next Year's Goal (2026-27)

9. Will your program prepare teachers in special education in 2026-27? If no, leave the next question blank.

Yes

No

**10. Describe your goal.**

As we continue to expand our Transitional B Alternative Certification program with additional New York City Teaching Fellows (NYCTF) cohorts, we will continue to revise curriculum to meet the needs of the New York City Public School (NYCPS) teachers and the goals of our recently NYS approved Transitional B SWD All Grades Master's program for preservice teachers employed by the NYCPS. This program under the new SWD PreK-12 cert will include additional cohorts starting this summer as well as continuing NYC Teaching Fellows in the Summer and Fall. Program administrators and faculty will collaborate with field coordinators who observe the NYCTF's in their own classrooms to incorporate field visit feedback and Teaching Fellow self-reflection into our four reflective practice courses. Our faculty will also continue to work toward creating additional online sections of existing courses to include more hybrid courses which mix synchronous with asynchronous learning environments to better serve our off-campus students who reside within and outside of the tri-state area. Special education faculty will continue to meet regularly within the program and meet outside of the program to collaborate with interdisciplinary faculty. Discussions will include long-term advisement planning, curriculum updates, and fieldwork placements and experiences. As our fieldwork has expanded to PreK-12, our goal is to align our courses and fieldwork with the new Students with Disabilities (SWD) All Grades certification in coordination with our School of Education's student teaching and fieldwork placement office. Another goal is to advise, manage, and collaborate on our new interdisciplinary 4+1 Art Design and SWD Education program which was recently approved by the university and is now accepting students for the Fall 2026 semester. As a result of a two-year collaboration with the College of Arts and Sciences, an articulation agreement was finalized to accept undergraduates who will be studying to become art educators to receive both an Art Education teaching license and in their 5th year complete SWD graduate courses to earn a Master's Degree in SWD All Grades. This semester, we have also started developing curricula for a new Teacher Educator, Assessment and Management (TEAM) cohort composed of orthodox women seeking to become certified in Early Childhood and Special Education. The TEAM cohort who have been accepted and started classes this Spring will have the opportunity to apply for a Transitional B license starting in the Fall semester allowing them to teach in SWD PreK programs while working toward their degree and initial licensure. Lastly, we will continue to implement, analyze and interpret our CEHS Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) during the student teaching and practica experiences as well as exploring our process of progress monitoring of teacher candidates through the collection of SEL and dispositions during their tenure at Adelphi. Priority goals include advisement using the new e-planner Stellic system, intra-and interdisciplinary collaboration, curriculum development, promotion of new programs, and the creation of new program of study (advisement) sheets for our incoming cohorts.

# Annual Goals: Instruction of Limited English Proficient Students

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

- >> [Report Progress on Last Year's Goal \(2024-25\)](#)
- >> [Review Current Year's Goal \(2025-26\)](#)
- >> [Set Next Year's Goal \(2026-27\)](#)

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\(a\)\)](#)

**Note:** Last year's goal and the current year's goal are preloaded from the prior year's IPRC.

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 (2024-25)

1. Did your program prepare teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2024-25?

If no, leave remaining questions for 2024-25 blank (or [clear responses already entered](#)).

- Yes  
 No

2. Describe your goal.

Currently we are not offering the CR-ITI programs because we did not receive the notification from the NYSED to continue the programs. However, we will continue to prepare teachers who work with diverse learners at the College of Education and Health Sciences in Adelphi through our regular teacher education programs. Our goal is to continue to prepare more teachers with the capacity to better serve the bilingual/multilingual student populations in New York. While we are not granted the CR-ITI grants to continue the programs in 2024-2025 year, we still offer regular ESL advanced certification and bilingual education programs. We are currently working on a National Professional Development Grant Program application to fund bilingual candidates in the teacher education pipeline. As Adelphi is currently working toward becoming a Hispanic serving institution and has longstanding partnerships with various school districts serving diverse populations, it is our hope that with the grant funding, we are able to prepare more teachers to offer high quality education to our bilingual/multilingual students in New York State.

3. Did your program meet the goal?

- Yes  
 No

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

Our faculty completed a grant proposal for National Professional Development Grant Program in coordination with Associate Dean Emily Kang and Dawn Grzan, director of the Office of Sponsored Projects. The proposal was submitted in May 2024. A number of area school districts with large ELL populations contributed letters of support. Our proposal was ranked highly at 93.5, but was not funded. Only 13 proposals of 137 submitted were funded.

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

As of this writing in April 2026, our program continues to prepare teachers in TESOL. While the loss of the state grant for CR-ITI has resulted in fewer students for our program, our faculty continue to educate future ESL and bilingual teachers. Last year we reported that our program has gone fully online, which is attractive to graduate students. In November 2025, program faculty met with Priscilla Zarate, of the Education Impact Foundation, Inc. to discuss the potential for Adelphi to be involved in TESOL initiatives. Ms. Zarate noted the strong alignment between Adelphi's mission and the Foundation's commitment to strengthening pathways for aspiring multilingual educators. We will continue to work with her team to pursue opportunities for improving educational opportunities for ESL teachers.

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

## Review Current Year's Goal (2025-26)

**7. Is your program preparing teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2025-26? If no, leave the next question blank.**

- Yes  
 No

**8. Describe your goal.**

Our goal is to continue to prepare more teachers to better serve the bilingual/multilingual student populations in New York in the upcoming academic year. Faculty members will continue to hold information sessions about advanced certificates for Adelphi students in other certification areas. The Bilingual/TESOL faculty made a decision to offer courses in a fully online format, which will dramatically increase the potential student pool of our program. Because the tuition cost is a barrier for many students, the faculty will work closely with our department chair and dean to obtain a reduced tuition rate for our courses.

## Set Next Year's Goal (2026-27)

**9. Will your program prepare teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2026-27? If no, leave the next question blank.**

- Yes  
 No

**10. Describe your goal.**

Our program will continue to prepare ESL and bilingual teachers in 2026-2027. Our chairperson and dean have worked with the university to offer discounted tuition for our online students. We are meeting with school districts interested in discounted tuition for their teachers to obtain a TESOL advanced certificate. Our program is working closely with the Associate Dean to complete the materials required for CAEP re-accreditation. Our CAEP site visit is scheduled for November 2026. The program is revising their websites to ensure that they are up to date and attractive to potential applicants.

## Assessment Pass Rates

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [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 (%)
160 -BIOLOGY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	27	538	21	78
160 -BIOLOGY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	15	548	14	93
160 -BIOLOGY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	16	551	16	100
006 -BIOLOGY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	1			
160 -BIOLOGY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	7			
161 -CHEMISTRY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
161 -CHEMISTRY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	5			
161 -CHEMISTRY CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	4			
162 -EARTH SCI CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	4			
162 -EARTH SCI CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	4			
162 -EARTH SCI CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	6			
162 -EARTH SCI CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	2			
201 -EDUCATING ALL STUDENTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	23	520	20	87
201 -EDUCATING ALL STUDENTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	242	526	225	93
201 -EDUCATING ALL STUDENTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	287	530	281	98
201 -EDUCATING ALL STUDENTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	290	531	286	99
201 -EDUCATING ALL STUDENTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	226	529	225	100
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, 2024-25	5			
003.1 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	3			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
003.1 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	9			
116 -ESOL CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	4			
116 -ESOL CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	3			
116 -ESOL CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	3			
073.1 -HEALTH EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	1			
073.1 -HEALTH EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	2			
004.1 -MATHEMATICS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	3			
004.1 -MATHEMATICS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	9			
004.1 -MATHEMATICS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	9			
004.1 -MATHEMATICS CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	12	535	12	100
1211 -MULTI-SUBJECT BIRTH TO GRADE 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	1			
1211 -MULTI-SUBJECT BIRTH TO GRADE 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	5			
1211 -MULTI-SUBJECT BIRTH TO GRADE 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	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	9			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
1221 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 1 - 6 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	38	1645	34	89
1221 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 1 - 6 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	46	1650	45	98
1221 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 1 - 6 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	51	1651	51	100
1241 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 7 - 12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	4			
1241 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 7 - 12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	110	1620	65	59
1241 -MULTI-SUBJECT GRADES 7 - 12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	13	1651	13	100
165 -MUSIC CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	2			
165 -MUSIC CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	5			
165 -MUSIC CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	7			
165 -MUSIC CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	1			
076.1 -PHYSICAL EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
076.1 -PHYSICAL EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	29	538	25	86
076.1 -PHYSICAL EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	59	540	54	92
076.1 -PHYSICAL EDUCATION CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	30	545	29	97
163 -PHYSICS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
163 -PHYSICS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	1			
163 -PHYSICS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	8			
163 -PHYSICS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	1			
115 -SOCIAL STUDIES CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
115 -SOCIAL STUDIES CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	3			
115 -SOCIAL STUDIES CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	12	537	11	92
115 -SOCIAL STUDIES CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	15	551	15	100
115 -SOCIAL STUDIES CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	12	539	12	100
129 -SPANISH CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	1			
129 -SPANISH CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	1			
060.1 -STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
060.1 -STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	6			
060.1 -STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	11	546	11	100
060.1 -STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	6			
060.1 -STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES CST.1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	4			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
166 -THEATER CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	2			
166 -THEATER CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	6			
166 -THEATER CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	3			
166 -THEATER CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	8			
167 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	7			
167 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	17	555	16	94
079 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	1			
167 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2024-25	43	555	43	100
079 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	2			
167 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2023-24	42	555	42	100
167 -VISUAL ARTS CST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2022-23	24	550	23	96

## 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](#)

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [Summary Pass Rates](#)

## Summary Pass Rates

Group	Number taking tests	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
All program completers, 2024-25	289	272	94
All program completers, 2023-24	291	281	97
All program completers, 2022-23	226	222	98

# Low-Performing

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [Low-Performing](#)

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

**Note:** This section is preloaded from the prior year's IPRC.

## 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

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [Use of Technology](#)

On this page, review the questions regarding your program's use of technology, and update as needed.

**Note:** This section is preloaded from the prior year's IPRC.

## 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 EPP has aligned all curriculum and instruction to the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) Standards. The ISTE standards provide 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, since the pandemic. 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 and the use of Artificial Intelligence. A recent retreat focused on equipping EPP faculty with knowledge of current K-12 classroom technologies and the preparedness expectations for teacher candidates entering the profession. The session was facilitated by an adjunct faculty member who also serves as the Director of Technology for a local partner school district. EPP faculty use the following types of technology in teacher education courses: Moodle (a Google-based system), ChatGPT, Magic School AI,

discussion boards, Google Suite (Drive, Classroom, Docs, Slides, Hangouts), educational apps such as Kahoot, StarTracker, Padlet, NearPod, Virtual Reality, and Plickers, Menti, 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. With recent advancements in artificial intelligence technology (such as ChatGPT and Gemini), efforts are underway to train EPP faculty on navigating students' use of these tools in course assignments. The university has also established a ChatGPT Task Force to help faculty understand the implications of ChatGPT to teaching and learning, education policies, and academic honesty. Evidence of Teacher Candidate Use of Technology Adelphi evaluates candidates' use of technology through three instruments: the Teacher Performance Assessment completed by the teacher candidate during student teaching, the Exit Survey completed by teacher candidates in their last semester, and the Alumni Survey completed by alumni working in the field. Teacher Performance Assessment In 2022, the teacher performance assessment was revised to include three questions about completers' perceptions of preparation in the effective use of technology in schools worldwide. Candidates were asked to reflect on: 1) how the technology used aligned with ISTE standards and the learning goals of their unit; 2) how they used particular technology tools to support their specific learners; and 3) how they would change which technologies they used and/or how they used those technologies if they taught the unit again. Candidates were asked to rate their preparation in each area on a Likert scale (1 = Indicator not met; 2 = Indicator partially met; 3 = Indicator met or exceeded). The means for initial candidates for the 2024-2025 academic year are as follows: How did the technology used align with ISTE standards and the learning goals of your unit? (N=205, M=2.81) How did you use these particular technology tools to support your specific learners? (N=205, M=2.79) How would you change which technologies you used and/or how you used those technologies if you taught the unit again? (N=205, M=2.75) One must be cautious about drawing firm conclusions, as the n is below 10 for most programs. However, the overall means suggest that initial candidates are meeting or approaching the expected benchmark in technology integration. Scores varied by program, with the highest means recorded in Childhood Special Education, Adolescent Math, and Educational Theatre (M=3.00). The EPP should continue to support candidates in aligning technology use with ISTE standards and encourage reflective practice around instructional technology across all programs. Exit Survey Data In 2018, the exit survey was revised to include four questions about completers' perceptions of preparation in instructional technology. Questions inquired about candidates' ability to: 1) access databases, digital media, and tools to improve P-12 learning; 2) know why and how to help P-12 students access and assess quality digital content; 3) design and facilitate digital learning, mentoring, and collaboration, including the use of social networks; and 4) use technology to track, share, and evaluate student learning. Candidates were asked to rate their preparation in each area on a Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). The means for initial candidates for the 2024-2025 academic year are as follows: Accessing databases, digital media, and tools to improve P-12 learning (N=130, M=3.94). Knowing why and how to help P-12 students access and assess quality digital content (N=130, M=3.81). Designing and facilitating digital learning, mentoring, and collaboration, including the use of social networks (N=130, M=3.91). Using technology to track, share, and evaluate student learning (N=130, M=4.02). The average mean across the four responses for initial candidates was 3.92 (24-25 AY, n=130). Scores varied widely by program, with the highest means recorded in Childhood Education at 5.00 (24-25 AY, n=2), Physical Education Undergrad at 4.31 (24-25 AY, n=25), and Art Undergrad at 4.25 (24-25 AY, n=5). One must be cautious about drawing firm conclusions, as several programs have small sample sizes (n<5). However, the overall mean of 3.92 suggests that initial candidates across programs are generally proficient in accessing databases, digital media, and tools to improve P-12 learning. The variation in scores across programs indicates that the EPP should continue to prioritize technology integration in faculty meetings and encourage cross-program sharing of instructional technology practices, particularly to support programs with lower means. Alumni Survey Data An Alumni survey was administered by the Office of Assessment and Accreditation in Spring 2025. Technology for the enhancement of P-12 learning was the sole technology-related question included. Alumni teachers were asked to rate their agreement with this statement on a Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). Results were generally positive, with 81% of respondents indicating agreement. However, some variability was noted, as only 19% selected "Strongly Agree," suggesting that while candidates feel prepared, there is room for deeper confidence in technology integration across programs. The alumni survey was also conducted with candidates in advanced programs, but results are not reported due to small sample sizes. 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, and 3) Stellar ePlanner, an online platform for students and advisors to monitor degree progress, and 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

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [Teacher Training](#)

Provide the following information about your teacher preparation program.

**(§205(a)(1)(G))**

**Note:** This section is preloaded from the prior year's IPRC.

## 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 general education teacher candidates take at least one 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 general education teacher candidates are required to take at least one 3-credit special education course. Teacher candidates in the Childhood Education and STEP Childhood programs are required to take the special education course, Introduction to Special Education (810-600) for graduates, and Child with Special Needs (0836-305) for undergraduates. Teacher candidates in the secondary education programs are required to take Managing Inclusive Environments (0810-560). 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 all courses meet New York State mandates 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 meet this NYSED requirement, and include a section on diagnosing a learning disability and on working within an IEP Team. In addition, teacher candidates review student's IEP's during their clinical practice and design appropriate lessons. Teacher candidates complete an IEP collaboratively in the Methods of Instruction (0810-750) 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 (0810-720) 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 earlier 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 Students with Disabilities (SWD) All Grades PreK-12 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 Students with Disabilities (SWD) All Grades PreK-12 programs as well as the tri-cert in Bilingual Special Education prepares teacher candidates to teach students in diverse and inclusive settings through tutelage in special education foundations, 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 (0810-750) 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 (0810-720) 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

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [Contextual Information](#)

On this page, review the contextual information about your program, and update as needed.

**Note:** This section is preloaded from the prior year's IPRC.

## 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.

The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) has granted Adelphi University's Ruth S. Ammon College of Education and Health Sciences (CEHS) with accreditation for teacher and teacher leader programs at the initial and advanced levels. This accreditation status is effective from spring 2020 to spring 2027. Adelphi University is proud to publicly share impact and outcome measures identified by CAEP which demonstrate that our graduates are effective teachers and teacher leaders who contribute to student learning. Measure 1: Completer Impact and Effectiveness Initial Programs: Impact on P-12 Student Learning Growth The New York State Education Department (NYSED) no longer provides up-to-date data on Student Achievement Growth ratings for teachers. We reached out multiple times to the state education department for data on recent graduates as well as to the NYC Public Schools; however, neither organization has indicated that they will provide any updated findings. Alternatively, the EPP conducted case studies with recent graduates to examine their impact on P-12 students. For Academic Year 2024–2025, we completed five case study observations across the Art Education (Graduate), STEP Childhood, Physical Education (Undergraduate), STEP Adolescent Social Studies, and TESOL programs. All five completers performed at the Distinguished level on the Danielson Framework for Teaching, with an aggregate mean score of 3.8 out of 4.0. 1. Documented Academic Progress: The STEP Childhood completer moved ELL students from Reading Recovery level (RR — no independent reading ability) to early independent reading levels by year's end. The TESOL completer's students saw English Regents pass rates rise from approximately 20% in January to 92% by year's end. The STEP Adolescent Social Studies completer teaches at a school that achieved 96% proficiency on the Global History Regents and 92% on the U.S. History Regents (2024–25 NYS Report Card). The Physical Education completer achieved a 75% success rate on his hockey unit assessment and transformed a previously non-competitive athletics program over four years. 2. Differentiated and Culturally Responsive Instruction: Completers adapted instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners — including ELLs, students with IEPs, and students from varied cultural backgrounds — through center rotations, scaffolded supports, and identity-affirming projects. Students across all five classrooms demonstrated engagement, persistence, and willingness to take academic risks. 3. NYCPS New Teacher Survey: In the 2025–2026 hiring season, 110 Adelphi graduates were hired by NYC Public Schools — a 28% increase from the prior year. Of those hired, 83% were placed in priority districts and 25% in shortage subject areas. Initial Programs: Teacher Effectiveness The New York State Education Department has not provided data on overall Teacher Effectiveness since 2016. For Academic Year 2024–2025, the EPP collected evidence from five case study observations using the Danielson Framework for Teaching and the NYCPS New Teacher Survey. Additional evidence is drawn from Employer Survey data collected across three cycles (Spring 2023–Spring 2025). Findings demonstrate program completers' effectiveness through: 1. Danielson Framework Assessment: All five completers scored at the Distinguished level (aggregate mean 3.8/4.0) and earned perfect Distinguished ratings (4.0) in Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities. Completers demonstrated particular strength in Instruction (mean 3.92) and Professional Responsibilities (mean 4.0). All five earned Distinguished ratings in Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport, reflecting highly effective application of professional knowledge and skills. 2. Classroom Environment and Instructional Flexibility: Completers created supportive environments where students felt safe to take risks, and adapted instruction in real time based on student needs across all five classrooms. 3. Professional Growth: Completers credited Adelphi preparation as foundational to their effectiveness. The STEP Childhood completer cited the Residency experience as giving her "the courage to think outside the box." The Physical Education completer credited Adelphi mentorship as "formative" to his teaching philosophy. The TESOL completer credited coursework in cultural responsiveness and second language acquisition as critical to her practice. 4. NYCPS New Teacher Survey: The NYCPS New Teacher Survey indicates that 68% of NYCPS first-year teachers rated Adelphi's preparation "Effective" or "Very Effective." 93% agreed student teaching prepared them for their first year, and 79% agreed coursework prepared them for the classroom. Graduates reported strong preparation in building relationships with students (98.1%), creating inclusive classroom structures (96.2%), giving meaningful feedback (96.2%), reflecting on their practice (94.3%), identifying appropriate instructional strategies (94.3%), and designing standards-aligned lessons (92.5%). 5. Employer Survey (Spring 2023–2025): In Spring 2023, 100% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that Adelphi alumni compare favorably to other first hires across all four Danielson domains. In Spring 2024, 100% agreed on Planning and Preparation and Professional Responsibility, and 86% agreed on Classroom Environment and Instruction. In Spring 2025, 75% of respondents agreed across all four CAEP standards (R1.1–R1.4), with no disagreement recorded on any item. Administrator comments across cycles consistently highlighted alumni strengths in differentiated instruction, technology integration, classroom community-building, and professional collaboration. The consistent pattern of positive ratings across all three cycles and all four domains reinforces findings from case studies, principal evaluations, and student work analysis that Adelphi completers are well-prepared and effective in the classroom. The report also identifies areas for program improvement — lesson planning, assessment design, family engagement with ELL households, and Regents preparation for secondary candidates — which are informing targeted updates to coursework and clinical experiences. Measure 2: Satisfaction of Employers and Stakeholder Involvement Initial Programs: Employer Survey The EPP has established multiple cycles of employer feedback data collection, utilizing both formal surveys and structured feedback from clinical

partnerships: Cycle 1 - Spring 2023 Formal Survey: A survey was administered to 10 employers, with a 20% response rate (2 responses): one from early childhood special education and one from childhood education. When asked whether Adelphi alumni teachers compare favorably to other first hires and/or recently tenured faculty, 100% strongly agreed or agreed with planning and preparation, classroom management, instruction, and professional responsibility. Three comments from school administrators detail our alumni's strengths, drawn from the survey results: "AU students demonstrate strong, differentiated planning skills and proficiency with technology in both classroom and virtual settings. They excel at building student connections, maintaining engaging learning communities, and collaborating with colleagues. They align instruction with standards and are recognized as teacher-leaders." Cycle 2 - Spring 2024 Formal Survey: A revised survey incorporating the Danielson Framework for Teaching domains, which explicitly addresses preparation for working with diverse P-12 students and their families through Domain 4 (Professional Responsibilities), including indicators for communicating with families and demonstrating knowledge of students' backgrounds, was administered to 29 employers, with a 24% return rate (7 responses): 3 from early childhood special education, 1 from childhood education, 1 from STEP childhood, 1 from physical education, and 1 from combined science and math. When asked whether Adelphi alumni teachers compare favorably to other first hires and/or recently tenured faculty, 100% strongly agreed or agreed with planning and preparation, and professional responsibility. 86% strongly agreed or agreed with classroom management, and instruction. Three comments from school administrators detail our alumni's strengths, drawn from the survey results: "AU students have strong foundational knowledge of best practices," "AU students understand the importance of creating safe and supportive classroom environments," and "Students have strong knowledge of differentiated instruction." Cycle 3 - Spring 2025 Formal Survey: The Assessment Committee developed a revised employer survey in March 2025, aligned with CAEP Standard R1 and organized into four sections corresponding directly to R1.1–R1.4 indicators. The EPP administered this final survey in Spring 2025. Each section addresses specific knowledge domains and includes diversity, equity, and inclusion indicators. The survey was administered to 10 employers, with a 40% return rate (4 responses): 1 from art education, 1 from STEP childhood education, 1 from physical education undergraduate, and 1 from physical education graduate. When asked whether Adelphi alumni teachers compare favorably to other first hires and/or recently tenured faculty, 75% agreed with all statements across all four areas: The Learner and Learning, Content, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibility. Overall, results indicate that employers view Adelphi teacher education alumni positively, suggesting graduates are well-prepared for the profession. Data collection of this survey is currently in progress; complete response rate data and findings from this cycle will be publicly available by Fall 2026.

Initial Programs: New York City Public School Opening Hiring Report NYCPSS Hiring Data: The sustained and increasing demand for Adelphi graduates by New York City Public Schools—the largest school district in the nation—provides additional behavioral evidence of employer satisfaction. In the 2025-2026 hiring season, NYCPSS hired 110 Adelphi graduates through traditional pathways, representing a 28% increase from the prior year (86 hires in 2024-2025). This growth in hiring suggests that school administrators and hiring officials value the preparation Adelphi completers receive. Additionally, 83% of Adelphi new hires were placed in NYCPSS priority districts, demonstrating that completers are meeting critical staffing needs in high-demand schools serving diverse student populations. The NYCPSS New Teacher Survey further validates preparation quality: 68% of Adelphi completers rated their overall preparation as "Effective" or "Very Effective," with 93% agreeing that their student teaching experience prepared them for their first year of teaching. Completers reported particularly strong preparation in building meaningful relationships with students (98%), creating inclusive classroom environments (96%), and identifying appropriate instructional strategies (94%)—competencies directly aligned with InTASC Standards addressing diverse learners and instructional practice. The Advisory Board and faculty review and analyze data during regular meetings, identify patterns and trends across programs, recommend program modifications based on employer feedback, and monitor implementation of data-driven changes. Initial Programs: Advisory Board Updates District representative feedback across five advisory board meetings from 2023 to 2025 reflects an evolving picture of candidate preparation. Early feedback highlighted both strengths — particularly in math and science at the secondary level — and gaps in elementary literacy preparation. By late 2023, representatives noted that graduates were strong in content knowledge but inconsistent in applying equity-based practices with diverse learners. In 2024, the consensus shifted more positively, with stakeholders observing that graduates show greater grit and openness to feedback, and are generally well-prepared for student teaching and employment. Feedback in 2025 focused on programmatic improvements: representatives recommended using an SEL rubric to identify struggling candidates early, renaming social-emotional learning to "habits of mind," and teaching SEL explicitly. The most recent meeting emphasized future readiness, calling for candidates who are adaptable, tech-savvy, knowledgeable of district strategic plans, and skilled at integrating content with classroom management across diverse student populations. Advanced Programs: Employer Survey The EPP has established multiple cycles of employer feedback data collection, utilizing both formal surveys and structured feedback from advisory board members from districts who have hired program completers: Cycle 1 - Spring 2023 Survey: In Spring 2023, a survey was administered to 7 employers, with 1 response from early childhood special education. The respondent demonstrated 100% agreement (agreed or strongly agreed) across all four survey criteria: licensure preparation, employment milestone eligibility, coursework relevance to job responsibilities, and overall program effectiveness. Cycle 2 - Spring 2024 Survey: A survey was administered to 6 employers of advanced program graduates, achieving a 33% response rate (N=2 complete responses). Results indicated strong employer satisfaction, with 100% of respondents either strongly agreeing or agreeing that AU alumni teachers were well prepared for their professional responsibilities. Cycle 3 - Spring 2025 Survey: The EPP administered the revised employer survey aligned with CAEP Standard RA1.1 in Spring 2025. This survey incorporates explicit RA1.1 indicators and was developed by the Assessment Committee in March 2025. To date, there have been no responses. Data collection of this survey is currently in progress; complete response rate data and findings from this cycle will be publicly available by Fall 2026. Advanced Programs: New York City Public School Opening Hiring Report and Analysis External Validation – NYC Public Schools Hiring Report: The NYC Public Schools 2025 Hiring Report provides third-party validation of employer satisfaction with advanced program completers. Of the 110 Adelphi graduates hired in 2025-2026 (a 28% increase from prior year), 65 were in advanced program areas including Early Childhood (24), Physical Education (23), and Special Education (18). The New Teacher Survey (N=53) found 68% rated their preparation as "Effective" or "Very Effective," with 88.7% reporting sufficient preparation to engage students with disabilities and multi-language learners, and 79.2% prepared to communicate effectively with families of diverse backgrounds—directly addressing CAEP's requirement for evidence of preparation to work with diverse P-12 students and families Note: NYC did not provide disaggregated data by initial vs. advanced for two program sets: Childhood (initial)/Early Childhood (advanced) and Physical Education (initial and advanced).

Measure 3: Candidate Competency at Program Completion Initial Programs: State Licensure Exams Teacher candidates seeking initial licensure in New York State are required to take two certification exams: Educating All Students (EAS) and Content Specialty Test (CST). In addition, New York State-registered teacher preparation programs are required to integrate a teacher performance assessment (TPA) into the candidates' student teaching, practicum, or similar clinical experience (e.g., residency, mentored in-service component). The EPP chose to create a TPA by using the Renaissance Group's Teacher Work Sample as the base and creating an Addendum to assess candidates' ability to plan and enact culturally responsive and sustaining practices as well as technology into their planning, teaching and assessment. The EAS pass rate for Adelphi candidates seeking initial certification during the 2022-2023, 2023-2024, and 2024-2025 academic years was 99%, 96%, and 98%, respectively. The pass rate was higher than the minimum threshold of 80% across all programs. The percentage of white test takers decreased from 79% (2022-2023) to

71% (2024-2025), while people of color increased from 14% to 23% over the same period, indicating growing diversity among candidates. The "not reported" category remained stable at approximately 6-8% across all years. The CST pass rate for Adelphi candidates seeking initial certification during the 2022-2023, 2023-2024, and 2024-2025 academic years was 95%, 97%, and 94%, respectively. Most subject areas maintained pass rates well above the 80% minimum across all years. However, four instances fell below the 80% threshold: Multi-Subject B-2 Part 2 (2022-2023), Multi-Subject 7-12 Part 1 and Multi-Subject B-2 Part 1 (2023-2024), and Health Education (2022-2023). These lower pass rates occurred in small testing groups of just one to two candidates, where a single result can dramatically affect the overall percentage. White test takers decreased from 81% (2022-2023) to 71% (2024-2025), while people of color more than doubled from 11% to 25%. This indicates growing diversity among candidates over the three-year period. The "not reported" category remained stable at approximately 5-8% across all years. The EPP collected TPA data on 205 candidates across three locations during the 2024-2025 academic year. Garden City campus: 153 students (72% white, 26% people of color, 2% not reported) New York City - Brooklyn Center: 7 students (43% white, 29% people of color, 29% not reported) Online: 45 students (71% white, 9% people of color, 20% not reported) At the Garden City Campus (153 students), Sound professional practice scored highest (2.97), showing these teachers excel at connecting their instruction directly to their objectives. At the Brooklyn campus (7 students), multiple criteria received perfect scores of 3.00, including Welcoming & affirming environment, High expectations and rigorous instruction, Inclusive curriculum and assessment, Ongoing professional learning. The small sample size may contribute to these perfect scores. In the Online program (45 students), four areas stood out with perfect scores (3.00): Knowledge of Community, Alignment w/National, State or Local Standards, Welcoming & affirming environment, and Why would you change which technologies you used and/or how you used those technologies if you taught the unit again? This highlights the program's strengths in cultural responsiveness and technology integration. In the 2023-2024 AY, the EPP collected TPA data on 211 candidates across three locations: 1. Garden City campus: 163 students (74% white, 23% people of color, 3% not reported) 2. New York City - Brooklyn Center: 8 students (62% white, 25% people of color, 13% not reported) 3. Online: 40 students (78% white, 12% people of color, 10% not reported) At the Garden City Campus (163 students), Alignment with Learning Goals scored highest (2.97), showing these teachers excel at connecting their instruction directly to their objectives. At the Brooklyn campus (8 students), multiple criteria received perfect scores of 3.00, including Knowledge of Context, Learning Goals, Assessment Planning, and Instructional Design. The small sample size may contribute to these perfect scores. In the Online program (40 students), three areas stood out with perfect scores (3.00): Welcoming & Affirming Environment, Inclusive Curriculum and Assessment, and Technology Alignment with Standards. This highlights the program's strengths in cultural responsiveness and technology integration. In the 2022-2023 AY, the EPP collected TPA data on 124 candidates (78% white, 12% people of color, 10% not reported). Overall, candidates scored above a 2.6 in all items, with the highest scores (2.98) in Alignment w/National, State or Local Standards, (2.94) Lesson and Unit Structure, and (2.93) Appropriateness for Students. This data is shared regularly with faculty at teacher education retreats and during individual program meetings, so that faculty can review data and discuss potential factors which contributed to this change. Initial Programs: Danielson Framework for Teaching 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. In the 2024-2025 AY, the EPP collected Danielson data on 205 candidates across three locations: 1. Garden City campus: 153 students (72% white, 26% people of color, 2% not reported) 2. New York City - Brooklyn Center: 7 students (43% white, 29% people of color, 29% not reported) 3. Online: 45 students (71% white, 9% people of color, 20% not reported) In the 2023-2024 AY, the EPP collected Danielson data on 220 candidates across three locations: 1. Garden City campus: 171 students (75% white, 22% people of color, 3% not reported) 2. New York City - Brooklyn Center: 9 students (56% white, 22% people of color, 22% not reported) 3. Online: 40 students (78% white, 10% people of color, 12% not reported) Overall, candidates scored above a 3.00 at all locations and maintained average scores above the 3.0 threshold. On the Garden City campus, Creating an environment of respect and rapport scored highest (3.51). In the Brooklyn Center, multiple domains tied 3.78 (Communicating with students, Reflecting on teaching, Growing and developing professionally, and Showing Professionalism). In the Online program, Demonstrating knowledge of resources scored the highest (3.48). Across all locations, creating respectful environments and professionalism consistently score high, while assessment techniques and questioning/discussion strategies typically score lower. In the 2022-2023 AY, the EPP collected Danielson data on 169 candidates (79% white; 12% people of color; 9% not reported). Overall, candidates scored above a 3.0 in all four domains, with the highest score (M=3.5) in Creating an environment of respect and rapport. The lowest scores (M=3.1) were in Using questioning and discussion techniques, and Using assessment in instruction. Advanced Programs: State Licensure Exams 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 during the 2022-2023, 2023-2024, and 2024-2025 academic years was 93%, 100%, and 94%, respectively. The pass rate was higher than the minimum threshold of 80% across all programs. Educational Leadership is the only advanced program required to take the Educating All Students (EAS). The pass rate for Adelphi candidates seeking advanced certification was 100% across all three academic years (2022-2025). Educational Leadership candidates also take the School Leadership Assessments (SLA). The pass rate for these exams was 100% for the 2022-2023, 2023-2024, and 2024-2025 academic years. This data is shared regularly with faculty at teacher education retreats and during individual program meetings so that faculty can review the data and discuss potential factors that may have contributed to these results. Advanced Programs: Academic Competency The Advanced Programs identified the courses where each of the 6 sub-components in RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions are addressed, and three of the six are assessed. 2024 - 2025 Academic Year Data Analysis Overall, candidates are generally meeting or exceeding expectations across the programs. Mean scores consistently fall in the upper portion of their respective rating scales (either 1-3 or 1-4). Most mean scores are at or above the midpoint of their respective rating scales (either 1-3 or 1-4 scales). Programs using a 1-3 scale show mean scores predominantly in the 2.5-3.0 range. Programs using a 1-4 scale show mean scores predominantly in the 3.0-3.5 range. Health Education continues to show strong performance with mean scores ranging from 2.31 to 3.31 on a 1-4 scale, with the highest score in the Rationale element (3.31). The Literacy program demonstrates strong performance with mean scores of 2.89-3.00 on a 1-3 scale, showing improvement from the prior year. Educational Leadership (SBL) shows consistent performance with mean scores ranging from 2.00 to 3.00 on a 1-3 scale. Several programs reported no data for 2024-2025, including Early Childhood Special Education, Childhood Special Education, Adolescent Special Education, and Educational Leadership (SDL), due to either no enrolled candidates or data collection limitations. Physical Education shows mean scores of 2.22 to 2.83 on a 1-3 scale, with a data gap noted in the Research Methods component due to an incorrect course number being provided. 2023 - 2024 Academic Year Data Analysis Overall, candidates are meeting and/or exceeding expectations across the programs. Mean scores consistently fall in the upper portion of their respective rating scales (either 1-3 or 1-4). Almost all mean scores are at or above the midpoint of their respective rating scales (either 1-3 or 1-4 scales). Programs using a 1-3 scale show mean scores predominantly in the 2.5-3.0 range. Programs using a 1-4 scale show mean scores predominantly in the 3.0-3.5 range. Health Education shows particularly strong performance with an average score of 3.40 across its assessed standards. The literacy program shows consistently strong performance with means of 2.93-2.96 on a 1-3 scale. The lowest-scoring

program (Early Childhood Special Education at 2.33 average) still shows performance well above the minimum expectations on its 1-3 scale. 2022 - 2023 Academic Year Data Analysis Overall, candidates are generally meeting or exceeding expectations across the programs. Mean scores predominantly fall in the upper portion of their respective rating scales (either 1-3 or 1-4). Almost all mean scores are at or above the midpoint of their respective rating scales (either 1-3 or 1-4 scales). Programs using a 1-3 scale show mean scores generally in the 2.0-3.0 range. Programs using a 1-4 scale show mean scores generally in the 3.0-3.5 range. Educational Leadership demonstrates strong performance with mean scores ranging from 3.11 to 3.56. Several programs demonstrate strong performance in specific areas, with Adolescent Special Education, Childhood Special Education, and Educational Leadership all achieving a mean of 3.0 or higher in Applications of Data Literacy. The Early Childhood Special Education program shows the lowest mean score in the area of "Employment of data analysis and evidence to develop supportive, diverse, equitable, and inclusive school environment" at 2.0; however, this is still above the minimum expectation on the 1-3 scale. Trend Analysis: CAEP Advanced Professional Skills Assessment (2022-2025) Across all three years, candidates generally meet or exceed expectations in programs with available data. Most mean scores are at or above the midpoint of their respective rating scales. Programs using a 1-3 rating scale typically show mean scores in the 2.5-3.0 range, while those using a 1-4 scale show scores predominantly in the 3.0-3.5 range. Overall performance remains stable with an average score of approximately 2.9 across all three years, indicating consistent program quality while assessment methods continue to develop. A recurring data limitation across all three years is the small sample sizes in several programs, which affects the reliability of mean scores and makes year-to-year comparisons difficult. Health Education consistently demonstrates the strongest performance across all three years, maintaining mean scores well above the midpoint on its 1-4 scale. Measure 4: Ability of Completers to be Hired in Education Positions for Which They Have Been Prepared Initial Programs: Employment Follow-Up Survey The Employment Follow-Up Survey provides an important source of data regarding employment in teaching positions. Employment follow-up data collected across three consecutive cycles (2022–2025) consistently demonstrate that Adelphi University EPP completers are successfully hired in positions aligned with their certification preparation. Across all three cycles, 100% of graduates who responded to the employment question confirmed current employment in the education field, with the majority employed full time in teaching roles. Placements span elementary, middle, and high school settings across New York, the broader region, and beyond. The majority of zero to two years of experience among respondents confirms that graduates are entering the workforce promptly following program completion. The diversity of placements — across subject areas, grade levels, school types, and geographic locations — reflects the breadth and quality of Adelphi's initial certification programs in preparing candidates for the full range of P–12 educational settings. The EPP is actively implementing strategies to improve survey participation in future cycles, including targeted outreach through alumni networks and partnerships with employing districts. Initial Programs: New York City Public School Opening Hiring Report The New York City Public Schools Department provided Adelphi University with the 2025 NYCPS School Opening Hiring Report in February 2026, following the 2024 report received in February 2025. Taken together, these two reports provide a two-year trend analysis demonstrating consistent and growing employer demand for Adelphi program completers in NYC Public Schools — the largest school district in the nation. Overall hiring trends show steady growth across three consecutive hiring seasons. Adelphi graduates hired through traditional pathways increased from 83 hires in 2023–2024, to 86 hires in 2024–2025 (a 4% increase), to 110 hires in 2025–2026 (a 28% increase). This upward trajectory — particularly the sharp 28% jump in 2025–2026 — reflects increasing and sustained employer confidence in Adelphi's preparation programs. The proportion of Adelphi graduates hired in shortage subject areas also grew year over year, rising from 16% of hires in 2024–2025 to 25% in 2025–2026. This growth indicates that Adelphi's programs are increasingly meeting NYCPS's most critical staffing needs in high-demand disciplines. Certification readiness among Adelphi graduates applying to NYCPS improved significantly as well. The eligibility rate rose from 77.4% of applicants in 2024–2025 (out of 137 applicants) to 81.9% in 2025–2026 (out of 149 applicants). Both the total applicant pool and the eligibility rate increased, suggesting that more graduates are pursuing NYCPS positions and that program completers are better at meeting certification requirements year over year. Placement in NYCPS priority districts — schools identified for prioritized support based on hiring needs and vacancy rates — remained consistently high, with 83% of Adelphi new hires placed in priority districts in 2025–2026. This sustained commitment to high-need schools demonstrates that Adelphi completers are not only being hired, but are being hired where they are needed most, serving diverse student populations in underserved communities. Across both report cycles, the trend data from NYCPS provides compelling third-party evidence that Adelphi University program completers are successfully and increasingly obtaining teaching positions aligned with their preparation, meeting employer demand, and contributing meaningfully to the NYC teacher pipeline. Advanced Programs: Employment Follow-Up Survey Employment follow-up data collected across three consecutive cycles (November 2023, 2024, and 2025) consistently demonstrate that Adelphi University advanced program completers are successfully hired in positions aligned with their certification preparation. Across all three cycles, 100% of graduates who responded to the employment question confirmed current employment in the education field, with all respondents employed full time in teaching or instructional roles. The majority of employed graduates report zero to two years of experience, confirming that completers are entering the workforce promptly following program completion. Placements span elementary, middle, and high school settings across Long Island and the broader region, reflecting the breadth of Adelphi's advanced certification programs in preparing candidates for diverse P–12 educational settings. The consistency of full-time, certification-aligned employment across all three cycles provides strong evidence of the advanced programs' effectiveness in preparing graduates who are sought after by employers and ready to contribute meaningfully to their school communities. Advanced Programs: New York City Public School Hiring Report Analysis The NYC Public Schools 2025 Hiring Report provides compelling third-party evidence that Adelphi University program completers are successfully hired in positions directly aligned with their certification preparation. As the largest school district in the nation, NYCPS represents a rigorous, external standard for evaluating graduate employability. The hiring data demonstrates clear and growing demand for Adelphi completers across certification areas. In the 2025–2026 hiring season, 110 Adelphi graduates were hired through traditional pathways — a 28% increase from the prior year — with 68 of those hires in advanced program certification areas including Early Childhood, Physical Education, Special Education, and ESL. Critically, 31% of advanced program hires were placed in shortage subject areas, confirming that Adelphi graduates are being hired in the most high-demand certification fields. Eligibility data further strengthens this evidence. Of the 149 Adelphi graduates who applied to NYCPS positions, 81.9% were deemed eligible for hire — up from 77.4% the prior year. This increasing eligibility rate directly demonstrates that a growing proportion of completers are meeting the certification requirements necessary to be hired in their prepared areas. Placement data reinforces that graduates are hired where they are most needed. 83% of Adelphi new hires were placed in priority districts — high-need schools serving diverse student populations — indicating that completers are not only employable but actively sought after for the most critical teaching positions in the city. Taken together, the growth in total hires, the rise in eligibility rates, the concentration in shortage subject areas, and the priority district placements collectively provide strong, quantifiable evidence that Adelphi program completers are consistently and increasingly able to be hired in positions for which they were prepared.

## 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

## 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