



AAQEP Annual Report for 2021

Provider/Program Name: **New York University**

End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or “n/a” if not yet accredited): **June 2027**

PART I: Publicly Available Program Performance and Candidate Achievement Data

1. Overview and Context

This overview describes the mission and context of the educator preparation provider and the programs encompassed in its AAQEP review.

The Teacher Education Program overall is housed within NYU Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development, where it is overseen by a School-wide Teacher Education Council (TEC). The Teacher Education program offers curricula leading to New York State’s initial and professional teacher certification. These curricula are housed in specialty areas within three of our eleven departments: Teaching and Learning, Music and Performing Arts Professions, and Art and Art Professions.

Program's Mission

The NYU Steinhardt Teacher Education program inspires an emphasis on quality education that supports learners to be knowledgeable in pedagogy and content knowledge. It also requires an understanding that such knowledge and practice are in the making and there is a place for learners in this process. Research continues to show how equity gaps persist within Pre-K-16 education while learners are also denied opportunities to see a place for their educational goals in formal education contexts. Teacher Education is focused on understanding equity and inequity; developing and evaluating strategies that seek to ameliorate inequities; and developing educational contexts that foster student agency and goal setting. Thus, education for equity also implies education for leadership. A drive to emancipatory education becomes a limitless source of innovation and creativity in educational practice, research, and curriculum development, and necessitates a recognition that transformation must be an element of the quality control measures. Our focus is on developing and using new knowledge in ways that build our disciplines and support our students to be nuanced practitioners.

Program Details

- Degree level: Undergraduate (BS, BMus) and Graduate (MA, MAT) degrees
- Mode of delivery: On-Campus and Online (the Teacher Residency program)

Specialty areas: Art Education, Childhood Education, Dance Education, Early Childhood Education, Educational Theater, English Education, Literacy Education, Mathematics Education, Music Education, Science Education, Social Studies Education, Special Education, and World Language Education.

Public Posting URL

We are converting the document into an accessible PDF in alignment with NYU policies. We will provide the link before the January 15th deadline.

Part I of this report is posted at the following web address (accredited members of AAQEP must post at least Part I):

1. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows enrollment and completion data from the most recently completed academic year for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2020-2021

* Some groups do not offer a bachelor's degree program. They are shown as "not applicable" below.

** Due to the complexity of our program, we made a slight adjustment to your table 1.

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution/organization	State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential	Number of Candidates currently enrolled	Number of Completers in 2020-21	
AAQEP Group	Degree	Number of Enrollments 2020-21	Number of Completers 2020-21	Number of Students Eligible for Endorsement
Arts Education	Bachelor's	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Arts Education	Master's	11	8	8
Dance Education	Bachelor's	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Dance Education	Master's	16	8	8
Dual Childhood/Childhood Special Education	Bachelor's	130	25	25

Dual Childhood/Childhood Special Education	Master's	115	47	47
Dual Early Childhood/Early Childhood Education	Bachelor's	123	23	23
Dual Early Childhood/Early Childhood Education	Master's	17	4	4
Educational Theatre	Bachelor's	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Educational Theatre	Master's	25	9	9
English Education	Bachelor's	32	7	7
English Education	Master's	64	25	25
Literacy	Bachelor's	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Literacy	Master's	9	8	8
Math Education	Bachelor's	40	5	5
Math Education	Master's	26	13	13
Music Education	Bachelor's	59	7	7
Music Education	Master's	18	8	8
Science Education	Bachelor's	18	1	1
Science Education	Master's	37	19	19
Social Studies Education	Bachelor's	33	2	2
Social Studies Education	Master's	45	19	19
Teachers of World Languages	Bachelor's	11	3	3
Teachers of World Languages	Master's	35	11	11

Added or Discontinued Programs

Any programs within the AAQEP review that have been added or discontinued within the past year are listed below. (This list is required only from providers with accredited programs.)

Our graduate programs in secondary education are offered through two MAT programs. One is the MAT in Secondary Education (which we call the Teacher Residency program and is not new) and the other is the MAT in Transformational Teaching Middle and High School. The second program replaces the standalone MA programs in English, Social Studies, Math, and Science. Both programs offer concentrations in Teaching English, Math, Social Studies, Science, and Students with Disabilities.

As a result of this change, we have also created three BA/MAT dual degree programs that enable NYU College of Arts and Sciences undergraduates to complete the MAT in Transformational Teaching Middle and High School in only 5 years of study. As of 2020, NY State no longer requires institutions to register dual degree programs with the Department of Education.

These dual degree programs are:

BA English/MAT Teaching English concentration

BA Mathematics/MAT Teaching Mathematics concentration

BA History/MAT Teaching Social Studies concentration

Plan Code: GETTMDMAT MAT Transformational Teaching Middle and High School

HEGIS Code: 0803

Subplan: GEMTC003 - Mathematics

Subplan: GESST003 - Social Studies

Subplan: GEENG003 - English

The old plans that they replace are:

BA Math/MA Teaching Math 7-12: GEMTEDMA

HEGIS Code: 1701, 1701.01

NYSED Program Code: 35090

BA English/MA Teaching English 7-12: GEENGDMA

HEGIS Code: 1502.00, 1501.01

NYSED Program Code: 35087

BA History/MA Teaching Social Studies 7-12: GESSTDMA

HEGIS Code: 2205, 2201.01

NYU Program Code: 35086

These programs have been placed on admissions moratorium while any current students complete their degrees. The faculty expect to formally terminate these old dual degree programs at some point in the future.

2. Program Performance Indicators

The program performance information in Table 2 applies to the academic year indicated in Table 1.

Table 2. Program Performance Indicators

<p>1. Total enrollment in the educator preparation programs shown in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals earning more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.</p>
<p>811 students</p>
<p>2. Total number of unique completers (across all programs) included in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals who earned more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.</p>
<p>249 students</p>
<p>3. Number of recommendations for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.</p>
<p>249 eligible for endorsement</p>
<p>4. Cohort completion rates for candidates who completed the various programs within their respective program's expected timeframe and in 1.5 times the expected timeframe.</p>
<p>For the most recent cohorts to qualify for this metric, 81.28% of graduate students completed their program within 1.5 times the estimated time to completion. 81.03% of undergraduate students completed their program within 6 years (1.5 times the estimated time to completion).</p>
<p>5. Summary of state license examination results, including teacher performance assessments, and specification of any examinations on which the pass rate (cumulative at time of reporting) was below 80%.</p>
<p>Due to COVID 19, not all exams have been completed. According to the NYSED website:</p>

If you are graduating and are missing any **EXAM** requirement (CST, EAS, edTPA*) but have completed all other requirements (degree, fingerprinting, recommendation), you also may apply for an [Emergency COVID-19 Certificate](#), **valid for two years**. (This includes past graduates.)

- a. Candidates must apply for their regular Initial Certificate(s) by September 1, 2022 if they haven't already. Regular fee applies, \$50 each certificate.
- b. **Candidates must also concurrently apply for the Emergency COVID-19 Certificate(s) by September 1, 2022. There is no fee.**

Individual Evaluation is the correct and only pathway available for the COVID-19 Certificate(s).

During the two-year validity period of the Emergency COVID-19 Certificate(s), candidates must complete all missing exam requirements.

When exam requirements have been satisfied, the regular Initial Certificates should issue automatically.

With this in mind, 196 students took the EAS test, of whom 96.92% passed. 83 graduates from the 2021 academic year took the EAS test, of whom 98.80% passed.

161 students took CST tests, of whom 90.68% passed. 71 graduates from the 2021 academic year took the CST tests, of whom 85.92% passed.

It should be noted that we are aware that a large proportion of our graduates have not taken the exams for licensure. Though a portion of this is due to graduates applying for two-year Emergency COVID-19 Certificates, a much larger portion of our students never take the licensing exams because they are from other countries and not eligible to teach in the US due to their visa statuses. Many of these graduates might be happy to stay and teach if they were granted residency or a work visa.

6. Narrative explanation of **evidence available from program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

One year after graduation, when asked about the extent to which NYU prepared them to be teachers, graduate school alums' most highly rated standards were "understand how students learn," "impact their students' ability to learn," and "address the needs of students from various backgrounds." More specifically, 82.11% of graduate students reported that NYU prepared them either "moderately well" or "very well" to understand how students learn. This figure was 79.47 percent for "impact your students' ability to learn" and 78.31 percent for "address needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds." Graduate students felt less well prepared to "work with parents," as 49.21 percent of students reported that NYU prepared them either "moderately well" or "very well" to do so. The next two standards with the lowest self reported ratings of program preparation among graduate students were "identify and utilize the resources within the neighborhood/community where you teach" with 57.89% reporting that NYU prepared them moderately or very well, followed by "Engage as an active participant (i.e. stakeholder) in the community where you teach" at 58.64%.

The highest self-reported feelings of preparation for undergraduate alumni one year after graduation were "impact their students' ability to learn," with 82.76% reporting that NYU prepared them "moderately well" or "very well". Undergraduate students also felt moderately or very well prepared to "utilize different pedagogical approaches," "have mastery of your subject area," and "implement state or district curriculum and program standards" at 81.18%, 79.07%, and 79.07% respectively. The standards with the lowest ratings of program preparation among undergraduate students were "work with parents," with 40.70% reporting that NYU prepared them moderately or very well, followed by "address needs of students with limited English proficiency" at 42.53%, and "identify and utilize the resources within the neighborhood/community where you teach" at 58.14%.

Results from the 5 year survey generally mirrored results from the 1 year survey for both undergraduate and graduate students. Taken together with the graduate student results, these surveys suggest that NYU has done a strong job of preparing educators in certain areas of pedagogical knowledge and clinical skill, while further work is needed to prepare students to interact with parents and utilize the resources in the community where they teach.

7. Narrative explanation of **evidence available from employers of program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

Due to COVID-19 this survey was not distributed.

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

NYU Teacher Education programs conduct an annual survey of principals, superintendents, and other school leadership to elicit feedback on our program graduates employment. In light of Covid-19, the survey was not administered in AY2020-2021, to be respectful of the stress being placed on school leadership in New York City at this time.

3. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

Tables 3 and 4 report on select measures of candidate/completer performance related to AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, including the program's expectations for successful performance and indicators of the degree to which those expectations are met.

The data discussed in Tables 3 and 4 are displayed in charts in [the attached appendix](#).

Table 3. Expectations and Performance on Standard 1: Candidate and Completer Performance

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
<p>Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale (DRSTOS-R)</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>It should be noted that the DRSTOS-R is not being used to assess teaching effectiveness in our new Teacher Residency program (TR). While developing the TR 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</p>	<p>For the AY 2020-2021 the DRSTOS-R was not administered to the on campus programs due to COVID-19. This decision was approved by a unanimous vote in the Teacher Education Council. Faculty and advisors conducted informal check-ins throughout the academic year.</p> <p>The TR began administering the Framework during the 2020-2021 AY as a pilot, so we have gathered no data for official reporting. We will report data from the Framework in the 2022-2023 academic year annual report. DRSTOS will no longer be used.</p>

	<p>of the Danielson Framework, on which the original DRSTOS was based, as the TR Framework and use it to assess students at 3 formal teaching observations during their course of study. The pilot has been so successful that the teacher education faculty decided to phase out the DRSTOS–R and replace it with the piloted TR Framework. The on campus teacher education will be using the Framework in full beginning Spring 2022.</p>	
<p>Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Scale (EBMAS)</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Table 5 in the appendix displays the comparison of mean EBMAS scale scores against the program standard of 4.5 for Bachelors and Masters students who completed their studies in academic year 2020-2021. For both Bachelors and Masters program completers, the observed mean scores exceeded the program standard of 4.50 on three of the five scales. Both groups fell short on the Personal Teacher Efficacy: Student Success scale, with mean scores ranging from 4.12 to 4.33. Undergraduate students also fell just short on Personal Teacher Efficacy:</p>

	<p>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</p>	<p>Student Problem Solving with a mean score of 4.49, while graduate students exceeded the program standard with a mean score of 4.84. Consistent with previous graduating cohorts, the 2020-21 cohort's highest mean scores corresponded with Multicultural Awareness.</p> <p>Evaluation of program standards are currently in process.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>agreement (from 1=Strongly Disagree to 6=Strongly Agree) and are balanced across positive and negative statements.</p>	
<p>GPA Data</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>The average GPA for graduate students upon graduation in AAQEP groups was 3.902 on a 4.0 scale. The standard deviation was .170, meaning that assuming a normal distribution, 68 percent of graduate students in AAQEP programs would be expected to have a GPA within .170 points of 3.902, and 95% of graduate students would be expected to have a GPA within .340 points of 3.902. In other words, the vast majority of students are graduating with at least a 3.56 GPA or higher. The average GPA for undergraduate students in AAQEP groups was 3.635 on a 4.0 scale. The standard deviation was .231. As stated above, assuming a normal distribution, 68 percent of undergraduate students in AAQEP groups would be expected to have a GPA within .231 points of 3.635, and 95% of students would be expected to have a GPA within .462 points of 3.635. The larger standard deviation for undergraduate students is more spread out than for graduate students. This is not necessarily surprising however, as undergraduate students may take more</p>

		<p>courses outside of their major, more time to explore, and more time to get acclimated to college than graduate students. These figures suggest that the vast majority of undergraduate students are expected to graduate with at least a B average or higher.</p>
--	--	--

Table 4. Expectations and Performance on Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
Employer Survey	<p>Without access to individual graduate level 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.</p>	<p>This survey was not sent due to the COVID shutdown of in-school instruction. Administrators were in no position to respond to this survey as their capacity was over extended.</p>
Exit Survey	<p>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</p>	<p>Shortly before graduation, when asked about the extent to which NYU prepared them to be teachers, teacher education students’ most highly rated standards were “understand how students learn,”</p>

	<p>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.</p>	<p>“impact their students’ ability to learn,” and “address the needs of students from various backgrounds.” More specifically, 88.46 percent of graduate respondents reported that NYU prepared them either “moderately well” or “very well” across these standards. Graduate students felt less well prepared to “identify and utilize the resources within the neighborhood/community where [they] teach,” as 38.46 percent of students reported that NYU prepared them either “moderately well” or “very well” to do so. The next two standards with the lowest self reported ratings of program preparation among graduate students were “work with parents” with 42.41% reporting that NYU prepared them moderately or very well, followed by “engage as an active participant (i.e. stakeholder) in the community where you teach” at 53.85%.</p> <p>The standards with the highest rates of self-reported feelings of preparation for undergraduate students shortly before graduation were “impact their students’ ability to learn,” “create a caring community that sets the framework for discipline and a smoothly functioning setting/classroom”, and “understand how</p>
--	---	--

		<p>students learn.” Among undergraduate respondents, 93.33% reported that NYU prepared them “moderately well” or “very well” across these three standards. The standards with the lowest ratings of program preparation among undergraduate students were “work with parents,” with 50.00% reporting that NYU prepared them moderately or very well, followed by “address needs of students with limited English proficiency” at 53.33%, and “identify and utilize the resources within the neighborhood/ community where you teach” at 63.33%.</p> <p>Similarly to the alumni surveys, the exit survey results suggest that NYU has done a strong job of preparing educators in certain areas of pedagogical knowledge and clinical skill, while further work is needed to prepare students to interact with parents and utilize the resources in the community where they teach.</p>
Alumni Surveys (1 and 5 yr follow up)	Similar to the Program Exit survey, a One-Year Follow-Up survey 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	One year after graduation, when asked about the extent to which NYU prepared them to be teachers, graduate school alums’ most highly rated standards were “understand how students learn,” “impact their students’ ability to learn,” and “address the needs of students from

	<p>experience. These surveys 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 surveys also ask 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. Program graduates reported levels of preparedness as 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).</p>	<p>various backgrounds." More specifically, 82.11 percent of graduate students reported that NYU prepared them either "moderately well" or "very well" to understand how students learn. This figure was 79.47 percent for "impact your students' ability to learn" and 78.31 percent for "address needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds." Graduate students felt less well prepared to "work with parents," as 49.21 percent of students reported that NYU prepared them either "moderately well" or "very well" to do so. The next two standards with the lowest self reported ratings of program preparation among graduate students were "identify and utilize the resources within the neighborhood/ community where you teach" with 57.89% reporting that NYU prepared them moderately or very well, followed by "Engage as an active participant (i.e. stakeholder) in the community where you teach" at 58.64%.</p> <p>The highest self-reported feelings of preparation for undergraduate alumni one year after graduation were "impact their students' ability to learn," with 82.76% reporting that NYU prepared them "moderately well" or "very well".</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Undergraduate students also felt moderately or very well prepared to “utilize different pedagogical approaches,” “have mastery of your subject area,” and “implement state or district curriculum and program standards” at 81.18%, 79.07%, and 79.07% respectively. The standards with the lowest ratings of program preparation among undergraduate students were “work with parents,” with 40.70% reporting that NYU prepared them moderately or very well, followed by “address needs of students with limited English proficiency” at 42.53%, and “identify and utilize the resources within the neighborhood/community where you teach” at 58.14%.</p> <p>Results from the 5 year survey generally mirrored results from the 1 year survey for both undergraduate and graduate students. Taken together with the graduate student results, these surveys suggest that NYU has done a strong job of preparing educators in certain areas of pedagogical knowledge and clinical skill, while further work is needed to prepare students to interact with parents and utilize the resources in the community where they teach.</p>
--	--	--

5. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

This section describes recent program accomplishments, efforts to address challenges, current priorities, and innovations that are in plan or process.

We responded to the AAQEP site visit feedback and built several committees and developed new instruments which are being rolled out in the 2021-2022 academic year.

We (Susan Koff, John Lyons, Jessica Sears) presented at the 2021 AAQEP conference in two separate presentations. The first presentation was about the steps needed to complete a successful transition from CAEP to AAQEP. The second presentation was Strategically Aligning Surveys with Accreditation Standards (presented by John Lyons and Jessica Sears).

Susan Koff & Catherine Milne presented on a panel at the 2021 AERA conference titled National Educator Preparation Program Accreditation: Understanding the CAEP and AAQEP Accreditation Review Processes.