



NYU

STEINHARDT

**COUNCIL FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF EDUCATOR PREPARATION
ANNUAL REPORTING MEASURES (CAEP COMPONENT 5.4 | A.5.4)**

Prepared by:

New York University, Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development

John Lyons

Jhanidya Bermeo

Amanda Dudley

Jessica Sears

Cesar Benjumea

April 2018

Table of Contents

<i>Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)</i>	3
1. <i>Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)</i>	3
2. <i>Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)</i>	7
3. <i>Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 A.4.1)</i>	11
4. <i>Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 A.4.2)</i>	11
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	15
5. <i>Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)</i>	15
6. <i>Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)</i>	15
7. <i>Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)</i>	20
8. <i>Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)</i>	23
<i>References</i>	24

Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)

1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)

As New York State does not share Value Added Measure (VAM) data with schools of education, NYU Steinhardt is unable to report on VAM data for its CAEP Program graduates. Nonetheless, we regularly request data on our program graduates but do not receive data that can be identified as individual graduates, programs, or graduating year cohorts. Instead, faculty and staff at NYU Steinhardt use multiple measures to give us a full picture of the quality and skills of our program graduates. Two that specifically address CAEP Component 4.1 are the Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Scale and Graduates' Grade Point Averages across specifically identified courses that align with core knowledge and skill areas. Both measures are described in detail below.

Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Scale (EBMAS)

The Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Survey (EBMAS) is an NYU Steinhardt developed measure of teacher candidates' developing dispositions toward teaching. EBMAS consists of 25 items developed to measure preservice teachers' beliefs about education in multicultural settings, some of which were initially drawn from the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) (Gibson and Dembo, 1984) and the Teacher Multicultural Attitudes Survey (TMAS) (Ponterotto, et al., 1998). All items were developed or selected based on clarity and alignment with the goals of NYU's teacher education program.

The EBMAS is administered with candidates at two points during their enrollment in teacher education programs, once during their first semester and then again shortly before program completion. EBMAS yields the following five scales: one measure of General Teacher Efficacy, defined as the overall belief that teachers' work can promote the learning of all students regardless of home background or community; Two measures of Personal Teacher Efficacy (i.e., candidates' beliefs that they as individuals can effectively educate all children regardless of background or community), one which focuses on the ability to address challenges in classroom management and instruction, and the other related to personal responsibility for student success; and two scales designed to measure Multicultural Attitudes and Social Justice based on teachers' awareness of, comfort with, and sensitivity toward issues of cultural pluralism in the classroom and their belief in the moral and social responsibility of teachers to educate all children equitably. The items within every scale are statements of beliefs that candidates respond to using a six-point Likert scale of agreement (from 1=Strongly Disagree to 6=Strongly Agree) and are balanced across positive and negative statements.

Table 1 displays the comparison of mean EBMAS scale scores against the program standard of 4.5 for BS and MA program finishers in the class of academic year 2016-2017. For both BS and MA program completers, the observed mean scores exceeded the program standard of 4.50 on four of the five scales. Both groups fell short on the Personal Teacher Efficacy: Student Success scale, with mean scores ranging from 4.18 to 4.36. Consistent with previous graduating cohorts, the 2017 cohort's highest mean scores corresponded with Multicultural Awareness.

Table 1**Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Survey (EBMAS) Scores by Degree: Class of 2017**

Scale ¹	BS			MA		
	N	Mean ^{2,3}	Standard Deviation	N	Mean ^{2,3}	Standard Deviation
Personal Teacher Efficacy: Student Problem Solving	35	4.61	.64	88	4.64	.74
Personal Teacher Efficacy: Student Success	35	4.18 [†]	.80	88	4.36	.76
General Teacher Efficacy	35	5.23 [†]	.72	88	4.65	1.02
Multicultural Awareness	35	5.47 [†]	.56	88	5.45 [†]	.54
Social Justice	35	5.38 [†]	.63	88	5.27 [†]	.55

SOURCE: 2017 Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Survey (EBMAS), NYU-Steinhardt

¹ Scales were constructed from the multiyear EBMAS database using principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation. Internal consistency (alpha) for the scales were moderate to large, confirming reliability as follows: PTE (Student Problem Solving, 5-item scale) alpha = 0.729, PTE (Student Success, 4-item scale) alpha = 0.716, General Teacher Efficacy (5-item scale) alpha = 0.541, Multicultural Awareness (8-item scale) alpha = 0.760, Social Justice (6-item scale) alpha = 0.589.

² All responses are measured on a 6-point scale of agreement, where: 1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Moderately Disagree; 3=Slightly Disagree; 4=Slightly Agree; 5=Moderately Agree; and 6=Strongly Agree.

³ The program standard is to meet or exceed a mean score of 4.50.

[†] The Mean value is significantly different from the program standard of 4.50 (p<0.05).

Grade Point Averages

Contained in Table 2 are the Grade Point Averages (GPAs) of Teacher Education Graduates in the class of 2017. Four types of GPAs are presented based on the grades achieved in courses related to different program claim areas, including: Content Knowledge, Pedagogical Knowledge, Clinical Skill, as well as the Cross Cutting Theme of Learning to Learn. GPAs are reported separately for BS and MA graduates. As can be seen in the table, the program standard of 3.0 was exceeded by undergraduate and graduate-level program completers for all claim areas.

Grade Point Averages (GPA) are among the measures used to assess teacher education students' mastery of the content and skills required to be a competent and qualified teacher. Across the university, students are graded in each course from A to F with GPAs computed on a four-point scale, weighted for course hours. Grades are awarded for achievement of course objectives. The grading criteria are described in the syllabus for each course.

Teacher education students pursuing the BS or B Mus. degrees must have a program concentration in a subject that is related to their certification area. These courses are taken in the College of Arts and Science (CAS) and Steinhardt and are designed to build the deep content knowledge, understanding and skill required for graduates to teach their subjects effectively. The Content Knowledge GPA for undergraduates is computed as a weighted average of these courses. MA students take their post-graduate course in Steinhardt and their grades in these courses are used to compute their Content Knowledge GPA.

Students in both BS and MA teacher education programs take courses that comprise a common, required Pedagogical Core. Grades from these courses were used to calculate students' Pedagogical Knowledge GPA and include Inquiries into Teaching and Learning, Teaching Students with Disabilities, courses in pedagogical content knowledge, and courses in human development. Grades in student-teaching and practicum courses and seminars are used to compute a Clinical Skill GPA as a measure of clinical practice.

Undergraduate students also receive a broad and deep education in the liberal arts and sciences in large part by meeting the requirements of the College Core Curriculum (CCC), a common core of courses in Steinhardt and CAS. The College Core Curriculum and the other courses taken at NYU help undergraduates develop a set of intellectual skills, tools and ideas that enable them to learn on their own; knowledge of cultural perspectives, practices and traditions; and facility with the tools of modern technology - cross-cutting theme skills for which evidence must be provided in the accreditation process. Accordingly, the Cross-Cutting Themes (CCT) GPA is calculated from the aggregate CCC courses and other contributing courses for both CAS and Steinhardt. Students pursuing the MA degree took their liberal arts and science courses as undergraduates. Therefore, composite undergraduate GPAs are used as a proxy CCT measure for MA students.

Table 2**Mean Grade Point Averages (GPA) of NYU BS and MA Teacher Education Graduates by Claim area: Class of 2017**

GPA Category	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Content Knowledge			
BS	96	3.59† ¹	.35
MA	159	3.86†	.18
Pedagogical Knowledge			
BS	96	3.73†	.18
MA	217	3.83†	.24
Clinical Skill			
BS	96	3.87†	.30
MA	172	3.89†	.27
Cross Cutting: Learning to Learn			
BS	88	3.17†	.64
MA	173	3.42†	.36

¹ † The Mean value is significantly different from the program standard of 3.0 (p<.05)

2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)

Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale (DRSTOS-R)

The Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale – Revised (DRSTOS-R) is an observation protocol for rating the teaching performance of student teachers, based on the work of Charlotte Danielson as presented in her book, *Enhancing Professional Practices: A Framework for Teaching* (Danielson, 2007). The DRSTOS-R has been used to assess the pedagogical proficiency of NYU’s student teachers with few modifications from fall 2004 through the present. The items of the DRSTOS-R are aligned with national frameworks for teaching, including the widely used standards of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC).

Items on the DRSTOS-R also correspond with items on other measures of pedagogical skill proficiency including the edTPA certification rubrics and the Danielson rubric used by the New York City Department of Education to evaluate teacher quality. DRSTOS-R data are collected for multiple purposes and are used to facilitate discussion and comparison between program options.

The data in this report are intended to provide feedback that can be used to support programmatic planning in several ways. Administrative data identifying field supervisors who have submitted protocols provides accountability and speaks to internal consistency of program field supervision. Additionally, this information provides a context for understanding student performance data and the extent that the results may be generalized to the full population of students in the program. DRSTOS-R data on student performance, in conjunction with information from other sources, may be used to identify areas in need of additional program-wide attention and facilitate discussions concerning program improvement (e.g. increased emphasis in course curricula and field mentorship, etc.).

Table 3 below presents DRSTOS-R ratings for students in their student final teaching placement for the class of 2017, for a total of 79 BS students and 127 MA students. For both BS and MA cohorts, the program standard is for 80% or more of the students to achieve a mean of at least 3.0 for all four domains and the Total Scale. The 80% standard was exceeded across all four domains by BS and MA students. The ratings are an overall improvement for BS students in comparison to last year, with Professional Responsibilities and Classroom Environment showing particular strength. For MA students, the stand out is Professional Responsibilities.

Disaggregated results by program options are displayed in Table 4. For BS students, the program standard was met for two groups: Dual Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education and Dual Childhood/ Childhood Special Education. For MA students, the program standard was met for all programs, with the exception of Dance Education. It is important to note that the number of cases differs by program option and the percent meeting standards is influenced to a large extent based on only small changes in scores for program options containing few students.

It should be noted that the DRSTOS is not being used to assess teaching effectiveness in our new Embedded Master of Arts in Teaching (EMAT) program. While developing the program, faculty acknowledged that the DRSTOS-R had not been updated in several years and was due for a revamp or replacement. Faculty made the decision to pilot 12 components of the Danielson Framework, that which the original DRSTOS was based, as the EMAT Framework and use it to assess students at 3 formal teaching observations during their course of study. The pilot has gone so successfully that a decision has been made to phase out the DRSTOS–R and replace it with the piloted EMAT Framework. There is a plan to implement that transition in the coming 2018-2019 academic year.

Table 3**Mean Scores and Percentages Meeting Standards on the Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale-Revised (DRSTOS-R) for Steinhardt Teacher Education Students in their Final Student Teaching Placement: Class of 2017**

Scale Domain ¹	Number of Items	N	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	% Meeting Standards
BS Students					
Planning and Preparation	6	79	3.33	.45	86.08%†
Classroom Environment	7	79	3.53	.43	93.67%†
Instruction	7	79	3.43	.45	91.14%†
Professional Responsibilities	3	79	3.72	.44	94.94%†
Total Score	23	79	3.47	.42	89.87%†
MA Students					
Planning and Preparation	6	127	3.30	.44	82.68%†
Classroom Environment	7	127	3.42	.43	86.61%†
Instruction	7	127	3.37	.42	85.83%†
Professional Responsibilities	3	127	3.64	.45	95.28%†
Total Score	23	127	3.40	.40	85.83%†

SOURCE. 2017 Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale - Revised (DRSTOS-R) NYU-Steinhardt.

¹ Scale: 1=Not Yet Proficient; 2=Partially Proficient; 3=Entry Level Proficient; 4=Proficient.

† Values meeting the program standard that 80% of students at or above a Mean Score of 3.0. The standard for proficiency is 3.0.

Table 4**Summary of Performance on DRSTOS-R Total Scores for Student Teachers in their Final Placements by Program Certification Area: Class of 2017**

Program	N	Mean Score ¹	Standard Deviation	% Meeting Standards
BS Students				
The Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale – Revised	The Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale – Revised	The Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale – Revised	The Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale – Revised	The Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale – Revised
Dual Early Childhood/ Early Childhood Special Education	19	3.60	.26	100.00%†
Educational Theater	3	‡	‡	‡
English Education	2	‡	‡	‡
Math Education	6	3.07	.39	66.66 %
Science Education	3	‡	‡	‡
Social Studies Education	2	‡	‡	‡
Teachers of World Languages	1	‡	‡	‡
MA Students				
Arts Education	10	3.68	.21	100.00%†
Dance Education	8	3.14	.22	62.25%
Dual Childhood/ Childhood Special Education	16	3.35	.38	81.25%†
Dual Early Childhood/ Early Childhood Special Education	10	3.37	.40	80.00%†
Educational Theater	15	3.41	.41	86.67%†
English Education	11	3.51	.36	90.90%†
Math Education	4	‡	‡	‡
Social Studies Education	6	3.32	.23	100.00%†
Teachers of World Languages	47	3.39	.47	85.10%†

SOURCE. 2017 Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale Revised (DRSTOS-R) NYU-Steinhardt.

¹ Scale: 1=Not Yet Proficient; 2=Partially Proficient; 3=Entry Level Proficient; 4=Proficient.

† Values meeting the program standard that 80% of students at or above a Mean Score of 3.0. The standard for proficiency is 3.0.

‡ Reporting standards not met (fewer than five cases).

3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 | A.4.1)

Without access to individual graduate level data, the sort that might be provided with VAM data, we must be more creative in our approach to measuring the satisfaction of employers of NYU Steinhardt's graduates. In response to this standard, NYU Steinhardt has developed an annual survey of school building leaders that will be administered annually across all the schools that we know hire our graduates. The survey was developed jointly by NYU faculty and staff as well as school building leaders from our network of partnership schools over a series of focus group discussions in the 2017-2018 academic year and is being distributed digitally in the spring of 2018. We plan to share the results and more about the components of this survey in our 2019 annual CAEP report.

4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 | A.4.2)

Student Teacher End-of-Term Feedback Questionnaire (ETFQ)

Faculty and staff designed the Student Teacher End-of-Term Feedback Questionnaire (ETFQ) as an integral component of the evidence base for self-inquiry. Designed and administered as an online questionnaire, the ETFQ elicits feedback from teacher-education students concerning the extent to which they perceive that the semester's student-teaching experience has enhanced their professional knowledge and expertise. The ETFQ format includes a combination of forced-choice and open-ended items divided into three parts. The first part asks about the school environment, the second part focuses on the cooperating teacher, and the third part focuses on the contributions of the student-teacher supervisor.

In the context of the student teaching experience, the items ask students to evaluate how well their cooperating teachers and supervisors contribute to their growth as teachers using a five-point, Likert-type scale ranging from "Poor" to "Excellent." An open-ended prompt asks the students to describe the specific ways in which the cooperating teachers and supervisors helped their professional growth, as well as any specific experiences that were problematic. All student teachers in teacher education program are asked to complete the ETFQ at the end of each semester of student teaching.

Table 5 displays the results of three scales based on ETFQ data, each corresponding to one of the Teacher Education Program claims. These data reflect students who participated in student teaching at both the BS and MA program levels during the 2016-2017 year. The total mean scores for each of the three scales met or exceed the program standard criterion of 4.0 (nominally equivalent to a rating of "Good") for student teachers in all areas with the exception of graduate students' response on claim 1, Content Knowledge, with a mean score of 3.99 which it should be noted is not significantly different from the program standard of 4.0.

Table 5

Mean Scores on the End of Term Feedback Questionnaire Claim Scales for Teacher Education Students in Student Teaching Placements: Class of 2017

Scale	N	Mean ^{1,2}	Standard Deviation
Content Knowledge ³ : Claim Scale 1			
BS	188	4.03	.89
MA	249	3.99	.97
Pedagogical Knowledge ⁴ : Claim Scale 2			
BS	188	4.15	.83
MA	249	4.14	.92
Clinical Knowledge ⁵ : Claim Scale 3			
BS	188	4.19	.79
MA	249	4.14	.88

Source: End of Term Feedback Questionnaire.

¹ Items are measured on a 5-point Likert scale with values: 1= Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Average, 4=Good and 5= Excellent.

² The program criterion for each claim is a mean score of at least 4.0 for all program completers.

³ Scale consists of mean scores on two items measuring how students rate their cooperating teachers and supervisors in terms of their contribution towards developing content knowledge specific to students' field and age group.

⁴ Scale consists of mean scores on two items measuring how students rate their cooperating teachers and supervisors in terms of their assistance in furthering organizational teaching skills in areas such as planning, structuring lessons and assessment methods.

⁵ Scale consists of mean scores on four items measuring how students rate their cooperating teachers and supervisors in terms of their contribution towards (1) enhancing teaching practices, such as instructional philosophies, and methods used in the classroom, and (2) developing classroom management skills such as establishing routines and approaches to discipline.

Program Exit Survey

The Program Exit survey evaluates Steinhardt's teacher education students shortly before their graduation for the purpose of evaluating the quality of the teacher education program, to obtain data to inform Steinhardt's efforts toward continuous program improvement, and to assess the readiness of program completers to begin teaching. The survey consists of both Likert type and free-response questions organized into the following sections: (i) Candidate Background, including degree, certification, and program areas; (ii) Candidate Perceptions on how well their teacher education program prepared them for teaching; (iii) Feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of their program options; and (iv) Professional Plans for the future. Data from the section measuring perceptions of preparation for teaching are used to assess the programs' influence on the teaching skills and knowledge of the students. Program completers are asked to use a four-point scale ranging from "Very well prepared" to "Not well at all" to report their perceptions of preparation in 15 areas of essential teaching skill and knowledge. Eleven of these items were drawn from Arthur Levine's national study of the effectiveness of schools of education (Levine, 2006). The other four items refer to skills that faculty identified as key goals of the NYU program that extended beyond the Levine study.

Program standards were established using data from the Levine study as a set of norms. For the Levine sample, the percentages responding that they were "Very well" or "Moderately well" prepared by their programs to teach ranged from 27% for Address the needs of students with disabilities to 81% for Understand how students learn. For the 11 items drawn from the Levine survey, the percentages reporting "Very well" or "Moderately well" were less than 60% for five items, ranged between 60 and 69% for three items, in the 70% range for two items, and exceeded 80% for one item. Using these data as references to set a high, uniform program standard, Steinhardt faculty established 80% as the program standard for all 15 items.

Table 6 below presents the results from the Program Exit surveys for the class of 2017. Percentages of respondents who reported feeling "Very well" or "Moderately well" prepared are shown across a parallel set of items related to Content Knowledge, Pedagogical Knowledge, Clinical Skill, Caring Professionals, and two Cross-Cutting Themes (Integration of Technology and Teaching Diverse Learners).

The results suggest the need for continued focus on improving curriculum and instruction to support candidates' development for work with parents, English language learners and the items contained in the Caring Professionals domain. It should also be noted that these are self-perceptions predominantly given by preservice teachers who most likely have the tendency to underrate their own abilities.

Table 6**Percentage of Steinhardt Teacher-Education Program Completers who reported their Programs Prepared them “Very Well” or “Moderately Well” to Begin Teaching: Class of 2017**

	Undergraduates (N=46)			Graduates (N=97)		
	Modrtly Well	Very Well	Total	Modrtly Well	Very Well	Total
Content Knowledge¹						
Have a mastery of your subject area	41.03%	30.8%	71.8%	47.1%	34.5%	81.6%†
Implement state/district curriculum & performance standards	43.6%	41.0%	84.6%†	41.4%	31.0%	72.4%
Pedagogical Knowledge¹						
Understand how students learn	43.6%	33.3%	76.9%	46.0%	37.9%	83.9%†
Use different pedagogical approaches	59.0%	15.4%	74.4%	51.7%	36.8%	88.5%†
Use student performance assessment techniques	46.2%	23.1%	69.2%	35.6%	36.8%	72.4%
Address needs of students with disabilities	35.9%	28.2%	64.1%	33.3%	27.6%	60.9%
Address needs of students with limited English proficiency	15.4%	7.7%	23.1%	33.7%	26.7%	60.5%
Work with parents	30.8%	10.3%	41.0%	29.9%	12.7%	42.5%
Clinical Skill¹						
Maintain order & discipline in the classroom	46.2%	30.8%	76.9%	41.4%	41.4%	82.8%†
Impact my students' ability to learn	46.2%	38.5%	84.6%†	46.0%	34.5%	80.5%†
Caring Professionals¹						
Work collaboratively with teachers, administrators and other school personnel	41.0%	7.7%	48.7%	50.6%	17.2%	67.8%
Identify & use resources within the neighborhood/community where you teach	48.7%	15.4%	64.1%	31.0%	29.9%	60.9%
Engage as an active participant (i.e., stakeholder) in the community where you teach	43.6%	12.8%	56.4%	33.3%	27.6%	60.9%
Cross-Cutting Theme: Teaching Diverse Learners¹						
Address needs of students from diverse cultures	41.0%	33.3%	74.4%	42.5%	40.2%	82.8%†
Cross-Cutting Theme: Integration of Technology¹						
Integrate technology into teaching	35.9%	25.6%	61.5%	36.8%	33.3%	70.1%

¹ **Note:** All responses recorded on a four-point scale as follows: 4=Very Well, 3=Moderately Well, 2=Somewhat Well, 1=Not Well at All. Most items were taken from Arthur Levine's survey of teacher education graduates (2006).

† Total percentage meeting or exceeding the program criterion of 80%.

Outcome Measures

5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)

The table below represents an unduplicated count of CAEP program graduates by initial (first teaching licensure) and advanced (licensure beyond the initial level) program option types.

Table 7

Program graduates for Academic Year 2016-2017 by CAEP Initial & Advanced Programs

CAEP Program Graduates Academic Year 2016-2017	
Initial Program Graduates	283
Advanced Program Graduates	40
Total	323

Source: Institutional Data

6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)

New York State Teacher Certification Exams (NYSTCE) and edTPA

In order to receive New York State certification as a teacher, a candidate must pass examinations in his or her certification area administered through the New York State Teacher Certification Exam (NYSTCE) program.

Graduates applying for first initial teaching certification are required to pass: the Educating All Students (EAS) exam which replaced the elementary and secondary Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W); the Multi-Subject Content Specialty Test (CST); and the edTPA performance measure for their area of specialization. The ALST exam is no longer required for New York State certification.

The NYSTCE program continues to undergo a period of transition, providing safety nets for all required exams. Revised CSTs will be rolled out for each of the subject areas through 2019, rescaled from a range of 100-300 to 400-600, with the exception of ‘Multi-Subject: Secondary Teachers (Grade 7–Grade 12) Part Two: Mathematics’ exam. In lieu of a safety net for this exam, “candidates must complete a mathematics tutorial and complete and submit an attestation stating that they have demonstrated comparable mathematics skills consistent with what would be assessed by the Part Two: Mathematics of the CST through course completion, and that they received a 3.0 grade point average or higher in such coursework.”

http://www.nystce.nesinc.com/PageView.aspx?f=HTML_FRAG/GENRB_SafetyNet.html

Further refinements will be made in the procedures for administering, scoring, and reporting the edTPA performance measure through 2022. Test taken between September 2013 and December 2017 require passing scores of 49 for Elementary Education, 35 for Classical and World

Language, and 41 for all other subjects. Beginning January 1, 2018, these passing scores will be lowered with a phase in period over four years.

<http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/certificate/nysedtpapassscore.html>

Candidates who apply for and meet all certification requirements for an initial certificate on or before June 30, 2018 but who do not receive a passing score on the edTPA can use two methods as a safety net:

“use a passing score on an ATS–W taken on, or before, April 30, 2014 (before the new certification examination requirements became effective), or use a passing score on an ATS–W taken on, or before, June 30, 2018 and after receipt of a failing numeric score on the edTPA or an "Incomplete" (I) with a numeric score on one or more task totals.”

<http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/certificate/nysedtpapassscore.html>

In addition, the New York State Multiple Measures Review Process (MMRP) offers teacher candidates who do not pass the edTPA but score within two points of the passing score to demonstrate that they are prepared to teach by presenting their case to a panel. In order to be eligible for a waiver of the edTPA requirement through the MMRP, teacher candidates must:

“have an edTPA total score that is one or two points below the passing score effective January 1, 2018 and the status of the exam is "failing" in TEACH; have a cumulative grade point average of a 3.0 in their program area or its equivalent, as determined by the Commissioner; and have already received satisfactory passing scores on all other certification examinations (or available safety nets) required for the teaching certificate sought and, for those not enrolled or formerly enrolled in a New York State teacher preparation program, also have met all other requirements for certification (e.g., coursework, workshops).”

<http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/certificate/nysedtpapassscore.html>

The EAS, on a scale of 400-600, also has a safety net in place which lowers its passing score by 20 points, from the original 520 to 500. As per the NYSTCE website:

The Board of Regents directed the Department to establish a "safety net passing score," which has been set to 500. The original passing score was 520.

All previous EAS submissions have been reviewed to determine if those who failed the EAS would have passed the assessment under the safety net passing score. Candidates who previously failed the EAS, but scored at or above the safety net passing score, have been notified that they have now been deemed to have passed the assessment. No action is required on the part of any candidate whose passing status has changed. The updated passing status has been reported directly to NYSED and any reporting institutions that candidates indicated when registering.

Candidates currently taking the EAS through June 30, 2017, need not take any action; their submission will be evaluated under the safety net passing score automatically. After

June 30, 2017, the original EAS passing score (non-safety net) will be used to determine if a candidate has passed the assessment.

(http://www.nystce.nesinc.com/PageView.aspx?f=HTML_FRAG/GENRB_SafetyNet.html)

Tables 8 and 9 display the results of the performance of the class of 2017 graduates on the NYSTCE exams. Test score data are matched with individual program graduates. As shown in Table 8, graduates showed strong performance on the ALST, EAS, and CST set of exams, exceeding the dual program standards of 90% passing with an effect size of at least 0.80, indicating that the mean scale score exceeded passing to a large and educationally meaningful extent. The edTPA shows lower passing rates across exam groups, particularly with Elementary Education. It should be noted that the pass rates on the edTPA have been very low across the state due to its initial high passing score, subsequently the NYS Board of Regents has decided to lower the passing score and phase in new requirements through 2019. Based on our graduates' current mean scores, we expect to see much higher pass rates for the 2017-2018 graduates. Also, the testing score databases contain data on whether a student opted to use a safety net through a passing score on the ATS-W or through the New York State Multiple Measures Review Process (MMRP).

Table 8**Mean Scaled Scores, Effect Sizes, and Passing Rates for Teacher-Education Graduates on the NYSTCE Exams: Class of 2017**

	N ¹	Mean Scaled Score (MSS)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Effect Size (ES) ²	% Passing ³	Passing Score
Knowledge of Pedagogy - ATS-W (Elementary & Secondary)						
BS	7	272.14	4.34	12.0	100.0%	220
MA	14	260.79	14.75	2.77	100.0%	
Total	21	264.57	13.31	3.35	100.0%	
Knowledge of Pedagogy - EAS						
BS	58	537.93	16.68	2.27	100%	500
MA	127	528.48	19.00	1.50	96.9%	
Total	185	531.44	18.78	1.67	97.8%	
Content Knowledge (Old)						
BS	14	256.14	12.94	2.79	100.0%	220
MA	88	256.43	26.03	1.40	95.5%	
Total	102	256.39	24.60	1.48	96.1%	
Content Knowledge (New)						
BS	45	556.90	17.14	2.15	97.8%	520
MA	83	557.89	21.66	1.75	97.6%	
Total	128	557.54	20.12	1.87	97.7%	

SOURCE: 2017 New York State Teacher Certification Exams

¹ **Note:** If a student has multiple tests, data are based on the most recent exam.² ES = (MSS-Passing Score)/SD; the program standard is an ES >= 0.80, large and meaningful.³ The Program Standard is 90% passing.

Table 9**Mean Scaled Scores, Effect Sizes, and Passing Rates for Teacher-Education Graduates on the EdTPA Exam: Class of 2017**

	N ¹	Mean Scaled Score (MSS)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Effect Size (ES) ²	% Passing ³	Passing Score
Elementary Education						
BS	9	50.67	9.42	0.18	55.6%	49
MA	6	54.17	7.83	0.66	66.7%	
Total	15	52.07	8.71	0.35	60.0%	
World Languages/Classical Languages						
BS	--	--	--	--	--	35
MA	22	40.23	5.17	1.01	86.4%	
Total	22	40.23	5.17	1.01	86.4%	
All Other						
BS	20	45.80	5.81	0.83	80.0%	41
MA	71	46.92	6.50	0.91	87.3%	
Total	91	46.67	6.34	0.89	85.7%	

SOURCE: 2017 New York State Teacher Certification Exams

¹ **Note:** If a student has multiple tests, data are based on the most recent exam.² $ES = (MSS - \text{Passing Score}) / SD$; the program standard is an $ES \geq 0.80$, large and meaningful.³ The Program Standard is 90% passing.

7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)

Similar to the Program Exit survey (pp. 12-13, Table 6), a One-Year Follow-Up and a Five-Year Follow-Up survey are administered annually to assess the perceptions of graduates concerning the extent to which the program had prepared them to teach and the quality of their educational experience. This survey provides information about program completers' early professional experiences and the degree to which their programs prepared them for teaching. Since many of the questions are identical to the Program Exit survey, the results from the three surveys can be compared to assess changes in perceptions of preparation and perceived program quality during the first year of teaching. The survey also asks about the employment of graduates, including their teaching assignments and the locations and types of schools in which they teach. The employment data are used to supplement those collected through employment records. Tables 10 and 11 below present the results from the One-Year Follow-Up and Five-Year Follow-Up surveys for the respective classes of 2016 and 2011. Percentages of respondents who reported feeling "Very well" or "Moderately well" prepared are shown across a parallel set of items related to Content Knowledge, Pedagogical Knowledge, Clinical Skill, Caring Professionals, and two Cross-Cutting Themes (Integration of Technology and Teaching Diverse Learners).

The results suggest the need for continued focus on improving curriculum and instruction to support candidates' development for work with parents, English language learners and the items contained in the Caring Professionals domain.

Table 10**Percentage of Steinhardt Teacher-Education Program Completers who reported their Programs Prepared them “Very Well” or “Moderately Well” to Begin Teaching: Class of 2016**

	Undergraduates (N=24)			Graduates (N=36)		
	Moderately Well	Very Well	Total	Moderately Well	Very Well	Total
Content Knowledge¹						
Have a mastery of your subject area	19.1%	47.6%	66.7%	45.5%	27.3%	72.7%
Implement state/district curriculum & performance standards	38.1%	42.9%	81.0% †	46.9%	34.4%	81.3%
Pedagogical Knowledge¹						
Understand how students learn	23.8%	61.9%	85.7% †	36.4%	42.4%	78.8%
Use different pedagogical approaches	38.1%	42.9%	81.0%	42.4%	36.4%	78.8%
Use student performance assessment techniques	23.8%	47.6%	71.4%	33.3%	39.4%	72.7%
Address needs of students with disabilities	33.3%	47.6%	81.0%	36.4%	30.3%	66.7%
Address needs of students with limited English proficiency	28.6%	33.3%	61.9%	33.3%	24.2%	57.6%
Work with parents	28.6%	14.3%	42.9%	24.2%	21.2%	45.5%
Clinical Skill¹						
Maintain order & discipline in the classroom	14.3%	66.7%	81.0%	36.4%	33.3%	69.7%
Impact my students' ability to learn	28.6%	57.1%	85.7% †	39.4%	27.3%	66.7%
Caring Professionals¹						
Work collaboratively with teachers, administrators and other school personnel	14.3%	71.4%	71.4%	39.4%	27.3%	66.7%
Identify & use resources within the neighborhood/community where you teach	9.5%	47.6%	57.1%	33.3%	30.3%	63.6%
Engage as an active participant (i.e., stakeholder) in the community where you teach	19.1%	47.6%	66.7%	36.4%	18.2%	54.5%
Cross-Cutting Theme: Teaching Diverse Learners¹						
Address needs of students from diverse cultures	33.3%	52.4%	85.7%	36.4%	39.4%	75.8%
Cross-Cutting Theme: Integration of Technology¹						
Integrate technology into teaching	14.3%	52.4%	66.7%	36.4%	27.3%	63.6%

¹ **Note:** All responses recorded on a four-point scale as follows: 4=Very Well, 3=Moderately Well, 2=Somewhat Well, 1=Not Well at All. Most items were taken from Arthur Levine's survey of teacher education graduates (2006).

† Total percentage meeting or exceeding the program criterion of 80%.

Table 11**Percentage of Steinhardt Teacher-Education Program Completers who reported their Programs Prepared them “Very Well” or “Moderately Well” to Begin Teaching: Class of 2011**

	Undergraduates (N=29)			Graduates (N=53)		
	Moderately Well	Very Well	Total	Moderately Well	Very Well	Total
Content Knowledge¹						
Have a mastery of your subject area	33.3%	29.6%	63.0%	45.8%	20.8%	66.7%
Implement state/district curriculum & performance standards	33.3%	18.5%	51.9%	46.8%	19.2%	66.0%
Pedagogical Knowledge¹						
Understand how students learn	29.6%	59.3%	88.9%	52.1%	31.3%	83.3%
Use different pedagogical approaches	44.4%	22.2%	66.7%	47.9%	25.0%	72.9%
Use student performance assessment techniques	51.9%	29.6%	81.5%	48.9%	19.2%	68.1%
Address needs of students with disabilities	29.6%	37.0%	66.7%	34.0%	29.8%	63.8%
Address needs of students with limited English proficiency	29.6%	7.4%	37.0%	19.2%	21.3%	40.4%
Work with parents	22.2%	11.1%	33.3%	29.2%	8.3%	37.5%
Clinical Skill¹						
Maintain order & discipline in the classroom	33.3%	33.3%	66.7%	37.5%	31.3%	68.8%
Impact my students' ability to learn	55.6%	25.9%	81.5% †	45.8%	27.1%	72.9%
Caring Professionals¹						
Work collaboratively with teachers, administrators and other school personnel	40.7%	29.6%	70.4%	38.3%	23.4%	61.7%
Identify & use resources within the neighborhood/community where you teach	40.7%	11.1%	51.9%	21.3%	17.0%	38.3%
Engage as an active participant (i.e., stakeholder) in the community where you teach	11.1%	33.3%	44.4%	25.5%	14.9%	40.4%
Cross-Cutting Theme: Teaching Diverse Learners¹						
Address needs of students from diverse cultures	29.6%	33.3%	63.0%	36.2%	27.7%	63.8%
Cross-Cutting Theme: Integration of Technology¹						
Integrate technology into teaching	33.3%	29.6%	63.0%	27.1%	18.8%	45.8%

¹ **Note:** All responses recorded on a four-point scale as follows: 4=Very Well, 3=Moderately Well, 2=Somewhat Well, 1=Not Well at All. Most items were taken from Arthur Levine's survey of teacher education graduates (2006).

† Total percentage meeting or exceeding the program criterion of 80%.

8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

New York University is committed to offering students degrees that give them the ability to be competitive in the job market, irrespective of their program of study. We are unable to share program level rates as the federal data available to us combines defaults of many different types and levels.

For default rate requests, we can provide historic 3-year default rates for the university as a whole. The past 3-year default rates are as follows:

FY 2014 is 2.0%

FY 2013 is 1.9%

FY 2012 is 2.0%

Reflective of NYU's commitment to offering quality programs, these rates are considerably lower than national averages.

References

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: a framework for teaching* (2nd ed). Alexandria, Va: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). *Teacher efficacy: A construct validation*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 569-582.

Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers*. Washington, D.C.: The Evaluation Schools Project.

Ponterotto, J.G., Baluch, S., Greig, T., and Rivera, L. (1998). *Development and initial score validation of the teacher multicultural attitude survey*. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 58, 1002-1016.