



AAQEP Annual Report for 2022

Provider/Program Name:	New York University
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or “n/a” if not yet accredited):	6/30/2027

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 included 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: (1) Teaching and Learning, (2) Music and Performing Arts Professions, and (3) Art and Art Professions.

Program’s Mission

The NYU Teacher Education Program emphasizes quality education that develops learners who are knowledgeable in

pedagogy and content knowledge. It also requires an understanding that such knowledge and practice are in the making and that there is a place for learners in this process. Research continues to show how equity gaps persist within Pre-K-16 education while some 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 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 (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

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

<https://steinhardt.nyu.edu/about/teacher-education/accreditation#:~:text=The%20NYU%20Teacher%20Education%20Program,New%20York%20State%20Education%20Department>

2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows current enrollment and recent completion data for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2021-2022 (9/2021 - 8/2022)

Tables 1-3 shows enrollment and completion data from the most recently completed academic year for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Notes:

- Some groups do not offer a bachelor's degree program.
- Due to the complexity of our program, we made a slight adjustment to your table 1.
- Residency is not reported as a category. Students in the residency are assigned a subject area and are reported in their respective subject areas.
- All new programs presented in the 2021 report are accounted for, and are reported in their appropriate subject areas.
- For the dual programs with the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), the students are counted when they are in the MAT portion of their studies (so during that fifth year). We do not count them when they are still CAS undergrads.

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution or organization	Degree Level	State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential	Number of Candidates enrolled in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/22)	Number of Completers in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/22)
<i>Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials</i>				
Dance Education	Master's	Endorsement	22	7
Dual Childhood/Childhood Special Education	Bachelor's	Endorsement	130	19
Dual Childhood/Childhood Special Education	Master's	Endorsement	154	62
Dual Early Childhood/Early Childhood Education	Bachelor's	Endorsement	135	26
Dual Early Childhood/Early Childhood Education	Master's	Endorsement	23	14
Educational Theatre	Master's	Endorsement	34	10
English Education	Bachelor's	Endorsement	29	4
English Education	Master's	Endorsement	82	37

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution or organization	Degree Level	State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential	Number of Candidates enrolled in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/22)	Number of Completers in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/22)
Literacy	Master's	Endorsement	1	1
Math Education	Bachelor's	Endorsement	38	8
Math Education	Master's	Endorsement	31	11
Music Education	Bachelor's	Endorsement	61	10
Music Education	Master's	Endorsement	9	6
Science Education	Bachelor's	Endorsement	27	2
Science Education	Master's	Endorsement	38	16
Social Studies Education	Bachelor's	Endorsement	31	5
Social Studies Education	Master's	Endorsement	53	28
Teachers of World Languages	Bachelor's	Endorsement	15	2
Teachers of World Languages	Master's	Endorsement	55	19

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution or organization	Degree Level	State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential	Number of Candidates enrolled in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/22)	Number of Completers in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/22)
Visual Art Education	Master's	Endorsement	9	6
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials			921	290
<i>Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators</i>				
Dance Education	Master's	Endorsement	1	0
Math Education	Master's	Endorsement	1	0
Teachers of World Languages	Master's	Endorsement	2	0

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution or organization	Degree Level	State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential	Number of Candidates enrolled in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/22)	Number of Completers in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/22)
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials			4	0
<i>Programs that lead to credentials for other school professionals or to no specific credential</i>				
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total for additional programs			N/A	N/A
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs			986	290
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers			923	290

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.)

Added							
Academic Plan Title	Degree	Acad Plan	Acad Sub Plan	Hegis Code	Corresponding NY State Certificate	Sub-Plan Names	Modality
Inclusive Childhood Education	MA	GEYICEMAT		0802	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Transformational Teaching Students With Disabilities & Computer Science	MAT	GETTSCMAT		0803	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Transformational Teaching in Middle and High School	MAT	GETTMHMAT	GEENG002	0803	Initial	English Ed 7-12	On Campus
Transformational Teaching in Middle and High School	MAT	GETTMHMAT	GEMTC002	0803	Initial	Math Ed 7-12	On Campus
Transformational Teaching in Middle and High School	MAT	GETTMHMAT	GECHM001	0803	Initial	Chemistry 7-12	On Campus
Transformational Teaching in Middle and High School	MAT	GETTMHMAT	GEPSY001	0803	Initial	Physics 7-12	On Campus
Transformational Teaching in Middle and High School	MAT	GETTMHMAT	GEBIO002	0803	Initial	Biology 7-12	On Campus
Transformational Teaching in Middle and High School	MAT	GETTMHMAT	GEETS002	0803	Initial	Earth Science 7-12	On Campus
Transformational Teaching in Middle and High School	MAT	GETTMHMAT	GESST002	0803	Initial	Social Studies 7-12	On Campus
Transformational Teaching in Middle and High School	MAT	GETTMHMAT	GESGD001	0803	Initial	Students w/ Disabilities 7-12	On Campus

Active With Title Change (All program areas formerly listed as Foreign Language have been updated to World Language)							
Academic Plan Title	Degree	Acad Plan	Acad Sub Plan	Hegis Code	Corresponding NY State Certificate	Sub-Plan Names	Modality
Teaching World Languages 7-12/TESOL(All Grades)	MA	GEFLTSMA		1508	Dual Initial	N/A	On Campus
Teaching World Languages 7-12/TESOL(All Grades)	MA	GEFLTSMA	GECHFLT	1508	Dual Initial	TESOL Chinese	On Campus
Teaching World Languages 7-12/TESOL(All Grades)	MA	GEFLTSMA	GESPFLT	1508	Dual Initial	TESOL Spanish	On Campus
Teaching World Languages 7-12/TESOL(All Grades)	MA	GEFLTSMA	GEJPFLT	1508	Dual Initial	TESOL Japanese	On Campus
Teaching World Languages 7-12/TESOL(All Grades)	MA	GEFLTSMA	GEFRFLT	1508	Dual Initial	TESOL French	On Campus
Teaching a World Language 7-12: Chinese	MA	GEFLCEMA		1107	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Teaching a World Language 7-12: Chinese	MA	GEFLCEMA	GEMAN002	1107	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Teaching a World Language 7-12: French	MA	GEFLFHMA		1102	Initial	N/A	On Campus

Active With Title Change (All program areas formerly listed as Foreign Language have been updated to World Language)							
Academic Plan Title	Degree	Acad Plan	Acad Sub Plan	Hegis Code	Corresponding NY State Certificate	Sub-Plan Names	Modality
Teaching a World Language 7-12: Italian	MA	GEFLINMA		1104	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Teaching a World Language 7-12: Japanese	MA	GEFLJEMA		1108	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Teaching a World Language 7-12: Spanish	MA	GEFLSHMA		1105	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Teaching a World Language 7-12: Japanese	BS	UEFLJABS		1108	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Teaching a World Language 7-12: Chinese	BS	UEFLCHBS		1107	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Teaching a World Language 7-12: French	BS	UEFLFRBS		1102	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Teaching a World Language 7-12: Italian	BS	UEFLITBS		1104	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Teaching a World Language 7-12: Spanish	BS	UEFLSPBS		1105	Initial	N/A	On Campus

Discontinued (Terminated with NYSED)							
Academic Plan Title	Degree	Acad Plan	Acad Sub Plan	Hegis Code	Corresponding NY State Certificate	Sub-Plan Names	Modality
Clinically Based English Educ	ADCRT	GECBEEADCR		1501	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Clinically Based English Educ	MA	GECBEEMA		1501	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Teaching English 7 - 12	MA	GEENGDMA		1501	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Clinical Rich Integrated Scien	MA	GECRSPMA		0899	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Teachers of Biology 7-12	MA	GESBLPMA		0401	Professional	N/A	On Campus
Teaching Biology 7-12	MA	GESBLYMA		0401	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Teaching Chemistry 7-12	MA	GESCHYMA		1905	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Clinically Based Soc Stds 7-12	MA	GESOCMMA		2201	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Teachers of Social Studies 7-1	MA	GESSSPMA		2201	Professional	N/A	On Campus
Teaching Social Studies	MA	GESSTDMA		2201	Initial	N/A	On Campus
Teachers of Chinese 7-12	MA	GEFLCPMA		1107	Professional	N/A	On Campus
Teaching Foreign Languages 7-12:German	BS	UEFLGRBS		1103	Initial	N/A	On Campus

3. Program Performance Indicators

The program performance information in Table 2 applies to Academic Year 2021-2022 (9/2021 - 8/2022).

Table 2. Program Performance Indicators

A. 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.
923 Students
B. 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.
290 Completers
C. Number of recommendations for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.
290 eligible for endorsement
D. 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.
79% (N=77) completion rate for undergraduate programs
72% (N=92) completion rate for graduate programs
E. 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%.
123 unique students took the EAS exam and 122 students passed with a pass rate of 99.19%.
128 unique students took a CST exam and 126 students passed with a pass rate of 98.44%.
F. Narrative explanation of evidence available from program completers, with a characterization of findings.
Data from Graduating Students Regarding Overall Programmatic Quality Shortly before graduation, when asked about the extent to which the sequence of NYU coursework increased their knowledge and skills, 81.60% of students responded positively with either 'to an adequate extent' or 'to a great extent.' When asked about the extent to which there are connections between the courses in the program, 84.53% of students responded positively with either 'to an adequate extent' or 'to a great extent.'

When asked about the extent to which NYU coursework is relevant to placement experiences, 73.53% of students responded positively with either 'to an adequate extent' or 'to a great extent.'

The survey also sought to capture candidates' profession plans for the future. When asked about the extent in which the career support they received had positively impacted the ability to get employed upon completion of the degree, 65.45% of students responded positively with either 'to a great extent' or 'to an adequate extent.'

73.98% of students responded positively on how well the program informed them about the requirements for certification.

84.18% of students rated their access to the necessary resources to complete their program requirements positively.

When asked about the frequency to which they implement strategies they learn in their NYU coursework, 80.00% of students are able to implement strategies at their placement sites at least weekly.

Data from Graduating Students Regarding Clinical Placements

When asked to rate their confidence on how well their placement experience prepared them for teaching, students with residency placements (81.45%) self-reported their confidence higher than that of students with PK-12 placements. However, when asked if their placement was a good place to learn how to teach, students with PK-12 placements rated higher than that of students with residency placements, with an average score of 4.24 out of 5, where 1 is "strongly disagree" and 5 is "strongly agree."

Data from Graduating Students Relating to the Learning to Teach Framework

Data collected on students' perceptions of preparation for teaching are used to assess the programs' influence on the teaching skills and knowledge of the students. When asked how effectively they manage classroom procedures, 85.11% rated themselves positively as either 'highly effective' or 'effective.'

85.64% rated their effectiveness in using classroom management strategies as either 'highly effective' or 'effective.'

87.77% rated their effectiveness in establishing respectful and productive relationships with students and families as either 'highly effective' or 'effective.'

87.23% rated their effectiveness in designing measurable, challenging, and relevant lessons as either 'highly effective' or 'effective.'

92.02% rated their effectiveness in engaging students in learning as either 'highly effective' or 'effective.'

82.98% rated their effectiveness in making content and language comprehensible for all learners as either 'highly effective' or 'effective.'

72.19% rated their effectiveness in promoting rigorous academic talk as either 'highly effective' or 'effective.'

74.87% rated their effectiveness in using formal and informal assessment data to monitor student progress toward learning targets as either 'highly effective' or 'effective.'

77.01% rated their effectiveness in differentiating instruction to challenge students and meet diverse student needs as either 'highly effective' or 'effective.'

92.55% rated their effectiveness in reflecting on teaching as either 'highly effective' or 'effective.'

87.77% rated their effectiveness in growing and developing professionally as either 'highly effective' or 'effective.'

When asked to rate their confidence with having the content knowledge necessary to be an effective educator, 83.07% of students responded 'adequately confident' or 'very confident.'

When asked to rate their confidence with having the instructional skills necessary to be an effective educator, 79.89% of students responded 'adequately confident' or 'very confident.'

80.42% of students reported that their program had prepared them to meet the needs of diverse learners.

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

When asked about the extent to which NYU prepared [residents/student teachers] to be effective educators, employers responded positively. More specifically, 85.71% of employers reported that NYU prepared the teachers to either "an adequate extent" or "a great extent" in terms of content knowledge.

76.19% of employers reported that NYU prepared the teachers to be overall effective educators to either "an adequate extent" or "a great extent."

78.57% of employers reported that NYU prepared the teachers to either "an adequate extent" or "a great extent" in terms of instructional skills.

Employers were asked if they would hire [residents/student teachers] who completed the program and 85.71% would hire them in the absence of staffing or funding constraints. In fact, 85.37% of employers stated that they are more likely to hire an NYU graduate compared to graduates of other teacher preparation programs.

When NYU graduates were hired into their first teaching position, 93.94% employers rated their readiness to teach in the first weeks of school positively.

H. 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.

New York State does not release information on alumni employment. To collect this information, NYU Steinhardt distributes a 1- and 3-year alumni follow-up survey. In Spring 2022, this survey was sent to 500 alumni.

Of the 74 alumni who responded, 75.68% (N=56) are working in schools.

4. 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.

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
Learning to Teach Framework	The Learning to Teach Framework is an NYU Steinhardt-developed measure of teacher candidates' preparedness and readiness toward teaching. This is the first year that we are reporting on the framework, which is based both on Danielson's Framework for Teaching	For all the components, graduate students scored higher than undergraduate students on average. For the Managing Classroom Procedures component, undergraduates (N=108) scored an

	<p>and the Framework for Equitable and Effective Teaching (FEET). All items were developed or selected based on clarity and alignment with the goals of NYU's teacher education program. Candidates are measured on ten components: i) Manage Classroom Procedures; (ii) Use Equitable Classroom Management Strategies; (iii) Establish Respectful and Productive Relationships with Students and Families; (iv) Design Measurable, Challenging, and Relevant Lessons; (v) Engage Students in Learning; (vi) Make Content and Language Comprehensible for All Learners; (vii) Promote Rigorous Academic Talk; (viii) Use Formal and Informal Assessment Data to Monitor Student Progress Toward Learning Targets; (ix) Differentiate Instruction to Challenge Students and Meet Diverse Student Needs; (x) Reflect on Teaching; and (xi) Grow and Develop Professionally. Each component uses a 4-point scale (1=Basic, 2=Developing, 3=Effective & 4=Highly Effective) that allows for scoring to the ½ point, effectively creating a 7-point Likert scale with every half-point indicating qualities from two ratings.</p>	<p>average score of 2.88 out 4, while graduates (N=222) scored 3.12.</p> <p>For the Use Equitable Classroom Management Strategies component, undergraduates (N=107) scored an average score of 2.89 out 4, while graduates (N=220) scored 3.10.</p> <p>For the Establish Respectful and Productive Relationships with Students and Families component, undergraduates (N=111) scored an average score of 3.06 out 4, while graduates (N=221) scored 3.11.</p> <p>For the Design Measurable, Challenging, and Relevant Lessons component, undergraduates (N=108) scored an average score of 2.95 out 4, while graduates (N=217) scored 3.17.</p> <p>For the Engage Students in Learning component, undergraduates (N=109) scored an average score of 2.99 out 4, while graduates (N=222) scored 3.17.</p> <p>For the Make Content and Language Comprehensible for All Learners component, undergraduates (N=108) scored an average score of 2.93 out 4, while graduates (N=217) scored 3.10.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>For the Promote Rigorous Academic Talk component, undergraduates (N=109) scored an average score of 2.80 out 4, while graduates (N=219) scored 2.98.</p> <p>For the Use Formal and Informal Assessment Data to Monitor Student Progress Toward Learning Targets component, undergraduates (N=103) scored an average score of 2.87 out 4, while graduates (N=212) scored 2.93.</p> <p>For the Differentiate Instruction to Challenge Students and Meet Diverse Student Needs component, undergraduates (N=105) scored an average score of 2.82 out 4, while graduates (N=216) scored 2.94.</p> <p>For the Reflect on Teaching component, undergraduates (N=111) scored an average score of 3.09 out 4, while graduates (N=221) scored 3.21.</p>
Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Scale (EBMAS)	<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 pre-service teachers' beliefs about education in multicultural settings,</p>	<p>For both Bachelor's and Master's program completers, the observed mean scores from the pre-EBMAS survey exceed the program standard of 4.50 on three of the five scales.</p> <p>Both groups fell short on the Personal Teacher Student Problem Solving and Personal Teacher</p>

	<p>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>The EBMAS is administered to 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 of 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,</p>	<p>Efficacy Student Success scales, with mean scores of 4.12 for Bachelors and 4.18 for Masters, and 3.81 for Bachelors and 4.06 for Masters, respectively.</p> <p>Both groups exceeded on the General Teacher Efficacy Scale, with mean scores of 4.74 for Bachelors and 5.10 for Masters. Both groups exceeded on the Multicultural Awareness scale, with mean scores of 5.04 for Bachelors and 5.42 for Masters. Both groups exceeded on the Social Justice Scale, with mean scores of 4.72 for Bachelors and 5.09 for Masters. Consistent with previous cohorts, the cohort's highest pre-EBMAS mean scores corresponded with Multicultural Awareness (5.33 out of 6).</p> <p>For both Bachelor's and Master's program completers, the observed mean scores from the post-EBMAS survey exceed the program standard of 4.50 on four of the five scales.</p> <p>Both groups fell short on the Personal Teacher Efficacy Student Success scale, with mean scores of 4.24 for Bachelors and 4.31 for Masters.</p> <p>Both groups exceeded on the General Teacher Efficacy scale with mean scores of 5.06 for Bachelors and 4.90</p>
--	---	---

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>for Masters. Both groups exceeded on the Multicultural Awareness scale, with mean scores of 5.49 for Bachelors and 5.42 for Masters. Both groups exceeded on the Personal Teacher Efficacy Student Problem Solving scale, with mean scores of 4.60 for Bachelors and 4.58 for Masters. Both groups exceeded on the Social Justice scale, with mean scores of 5.42 for Bachelors and 5.27 for Masters.</p> <p>Consistent with previous graduating cohorts, the 2021-2022 cohort's highest mean scores corresponded with Multicultural Awareness (5.44 out of 6.00).</p>
GPA Data	<p>In the past we used Grade Point Averages (GPA) to assess teacher education students' mastery of the content and skills required to be a competent and qualified teacher. However the Teacher Education Council decided that this is not a reliable measure and it will no longer be used.</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	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>When asked about the extent to which NYU prepared [residents/interns] to be effective educators, employers responded positively. More specifically, 85.71% of employers reported that NYU prepared the teachers to either "an adequate extent" or "a great extent" in terms of content knowledge.</p> <p>76.19% of employers reported that NYU prepared the teachers to be overall effective educators to either "an adequate extent" or "a great extent."</p> <p>78.57% of employers reported that NYU prepared the teachers to either "an adequate extent" or "a great extent" in terms of instructional skills.</p> <p>Employers were asked if they would hire [residents/interns] who completed the program and 85.71% would hire them in the absence of staffing or funding constraints. In fact, 85.37% of employers stated that they are more likely to hire an NYU graduate compared to graduates of other teacher preparation programs.</p>

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
		<p>When NYU Graduates were hired into their first teaching position, 93.94% employers rated their readiness to teach in their first few weeks of school positively.</p>
<p>Candidate Survey (This replaces the previous Exit Survey).</p>	<p>The Candidate Survey is distributed at the end of each teaching placement. The second distribution, typically at the end of the spring term, asks graduating students to reflect on their learning, their experiences in the program, their experiences in their teaching placement, and their overall opinions of the program."</p>	<p>Shortly before graduation, when asked about the extent to which the sequence of NYU coursework increased their knowledge and skills, 81.60% of students responded positively with either "to an adequate extent" or "to a great extent." When asked about the extent to which there are connections between the courses in the program, 84.53% of students responded positively with either "to an adequate extent" or "to a great extent." When asked about the extent to which NYU coursework is relevant to placement experiences, 73.53% of students responded positively with either "to an adequate extent" or "to a great extent."</p> <p>Data from this section measured candidate professional plans for the</p>

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
		<p>future. When asked about the extent in which the career support received had positively impacted the ability to get employed upon completion of the degree, 65.45% of students responded positively with either “to an adequate extent” or “to a great extent.” 73.98% of students responded positively on how well the program informed them about the requirements for certification. 84.18% of students rated their access to the necessary resources to complete their program requirements positively.</p> <p>When asked about the frequency to which they implement strategies they learn in their NYU coursework, 80.00% of students are able to implement strategies at their placement sites at least weekly. When asked to rate their confidence on how well their placement experience prepared them for teaching, students with residency placements (81.45%) self-reported their confidence higher than that of students with PK-12 placements (78.93%). However, when asked if their</p>

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
		<p>placement was a good place to learn how to teach, students with PK-12 placements rated higher than that of students with residency placements, with an average score of 4.24 out of 5, where 1 is “strongly disagree” and 5 is “strongly agree.”</p> <p>Data from this section measuring perceptions of preparation for teaching are used to assess the programs’ influence on the teaching skills and knowledge of the students.</p> <p>When asked how effectively they manage classroom procedures, 85.11% rated themselves positively as either “highly effective” or “effective.”</p> <p>85.64% rated their effectiveness in using classroom management strategies as either “highly effective” or “effective.”</p> <p>87.77% rated their effectiveness in</p>

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
		<p>establishing respectful and productive relationships with students and families as either “highly effective” or “effective.”</p> <p>87.23% rated their effectiveness in designing measurable, challenging, and relevant lessons as either “highly effective” or “effective.”</p> <p>92.02% rated their effectiveness in engaging students in learning as either “highly effective” or “effective.”</p> <p>82.98% rated their effectiveness in making content and language comprehensible for all learners as either “highly effective” or “effective.”</p> <p>72.19% rated their effectiveness in promoting rigorous academic talk as either “highly effective” or “effective.”</p> <p>74.87% rated their effectiveness in</p>

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
		<p>using formal and informal assessment data to monitor student progress toward learning targets as either “highly effective” or “effective.”</p> <p>77.01% rated their effectiveness in differentiating instruction to challenge students and meet diverse student needs as either “highly effective” or “effective.”</p> <p>92.55% rated their effectiveness in reflecting on teaching as either “highly effective” or “effective.”</p> <p>87.77% rated their effectiveness in growing and developing professionally as either “highly effective” or “effective.”</p> <p>83.07% of students rated their confidence with having the content knowledge necessary to be an effective educator.</p>

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
		<p>When asked to rate their confidence with having the content knowledge necessary to be an effective educator, 83.07% of students responded “adequately confident” or “very confident.”</p> <p>When asked to rate their confidence with having the instructional skills necessary to be an effective educator, 79.89% of students responded “adequately confident” or “very confident.”</p>
Alumni Surveys (1 and 3 yr follow up)	A One-Year Follow-Up survey and a Three-Year Follow-Up survey are distributed 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. These surveys provide information about program completers’ early professional experiences and the degree to which their programs prepared them for teaching. Since many of the questions are aligned with the Candidate Survey, the results from the three surveys can be compared to	When asked about the extent to which NYU prepared them to be teachers, alumni’s most highly rated standards were “reflect on teaching,” “use formal and informal assessment data to monitor student progress toward learning targets,” “design measurable, challenging, and relevant lessons,” and “differentiate instruction to challenge students and meet diverse student needs.”

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
	<p>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.</p>	<p>More specifically, alumni rated the effectiveness of their teacher preparation program at NYU to prepare them to “reflect on teaching” higher than any other standard with an average score of 3.31 out of 4, where 1 is “basic” and 4 is “highly effective,” with 89.09% reporting that NYU’s preparation was “effective” or “highly effective.” “Use formal and informal assessment data to monitor student progress toward learning targets” was the next highest scored standard at 3.16 out of 4, with 78.18% reporting that NYU’s preparation was “effective” or “highly effective.”</p> <p>The lowest rated standard was “manage classroom procedures,” with an average score of 2.75 out of 4. Even so, 60.00% reported that NYU’s preparation was “effective” or “highly effective.” When comparing the two groups of alumni, the 3-year alumni (56.00%) rated the effectiveness lower than the 1-year alumni (63.33%).</p>

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
		<p>The next two standards with the lowest self-reported ratings of program preparation among graduate students were “use equitable classroom management strategies” with an average score of 2.87 out of 4. Nonetheless, 69.09% reported that NYU’s preparation was “effective” or “highly effective.” “Make content and language comprehensible for all learners” received an average score of 2.87 out of 4. Even so, 61.82% reported that NYU’s preparation was “effective” or “highly effective.”</p> <p>75.47% of alumni felt prepared to be an effective educator with the content knowledge necessary, reporting that NYU prepared them “moderately” or “very well.”</p> <p>62.96% of alumni felt prepared to be an effective educator with the instructional skills necessary, reporting that NYU prepared them “moderately” or “very well.”</p>

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
		<p>62.96% of alumni felt prepared to be an effective educator to meet the needs of diverse learners, reporting that NYU prepared them “moderately” or “very well.”</p> <p>Overall, 75.93% of alumni felt prepared to be an effective educator, reporting that NYU prepared them “moderately” or “very well.”</p> <p>These surveys suggest that NYU has done a strong job of preparing educators in “reflecting on teaching” and “using formal and informal assessment data to monitor student progress toward learning targets,” while further work is needed to prepare students to “manage classroom procedures,” “use equitable classroom management strategies,” and “make content and language comprehensible for all learners.”</p>

5. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

This section describes program accomplishments, efforts, and innovations (strengths and outcomes) to address challenges and priorities over the past year.

The former Field Office has now been renamed to better reflect its role. It is now called the Office of School and Community Partnerships (OSCP).

In the 2021-2022 AY, the TEC was awarded two small grants through NYU.

1. The first was to train the (mostly) adjunct faculty who are field mentors for our interns in using the new Framework instrument. This is in process through materials created by the OSCP. It is a process that is never completed, but what used to jump start the use of the new Framework. The OSCP is currently creating a resource folder including videos, suggestions and “look fors,” that will enable the field mentors to continually return to this folder for guidance. The constant engagement with Field Mentors and applying the Framework is coordinated by the OSCP. The goal is to have the Field Mentors comfortable using this instrument.
2. The second was to create a reliability and validity assessment of all our new instruments. A faculty member in our college in the field of Data Science was engaged to work with teacher education faculty, view the first responses to the new instruments, and analyze those responses. This analysis is still in process.