AAQEP Annual Report for 2025

Provider/Program Name:	Stony Brook University's Distributed Teacher and Leader Education Programs
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or "n/a" if not yet accredited):	June 30, 2030

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.

Stony Brook University's (SBU) approach to teacher education is distinguished by a university-wide distributed model that combines the rigor of a disciplinary major with an integrated teacher education core curriculum. Content knowledge gained through an academic major is amplified through teaching methods courses, opportunities for observation and reflection, and mentored teaching practicums. The objective of this approach is to synergistically promote the development of subject matter expertise concurrently with the development of pedagogical expertise. SBU's teacher education program seeks to hone disciplinary strength with a set of unifying principles, goals, outcomes, and assessments. Our unique structure serves to foster cross-disciplinary dialogue, curriculum development, and innovative programming, amongst our faculty, while developing a sense of agency, identity, and purpose in our students.

Teaching and learning objectives in the teacher education program are informed broadly by the technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge (TPACK) framework, and coherent well-coordinated clinical practices that emphasize authentic learning experiences, observation, and reflective practice. Administrative coordination is achieved through the deep collaborations of faculty and staff from each of the participating schools and colleges together with the Graduate School and the Division of Undergraduate Education.

Stony Brook University's educational leadership programs are designed to promote the highest levels of excellence and professionalism in the development of the next generation of school and district leaders. Teaching and learning objectives are advanced through a contemporary evidence-based curriculum grounded in practice and applied theory, flexible teaching and learning formats, distinguished scholarly practitioner faculty, accomplished and motivated students who aspire to lead, and an extensive far-reaching professional network.

The School of Professional Development (SPD) is the academic home for the teacher education programs and post-master's educational leadership programs. The intellectual communities in our teacher and educational leadership programs are nurtured through selective admissions, evidence-based curriculum, and from faculty appointed in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), College of Engineering and Applied Sciences (CEAS), the School of Health Professions, (SHP), and the School of Professional Development.

<div align="center">Stony Brook University List of Programs included in AAQEP Review</div>

Programs that lead to initial teaching certification (NYSED)

Bachelor of Arts
- Chinese (7-12), Earth Science (7-12), English (7 -12), French (7 -12), Italian (7 -12), Japanese (7 -12), Korean (7 -12), Social Studies (7 -12), Spanish (7 -12), TESOL (P -12),

Bachelor of Science
- Chemistry (7-12), Mathematics (7-12)

Master of Arts in English as a Second Language
- TESOL (P-12)

Master of Arts in Teaching
- Biology (7 -12), Chemistry (7 -12), Earth Science (7 -12), English (7 -12), French (7 -12), Italian (7 -12), Mathematics (7 -12), Physics (7 -12), Social Studies (7 -12), Spanish (7 -12),

Bachelor of Arts + Master of Arts in Teaching
- Chemistry (7 -12), Earth Science (7 -12), English (7 -12), French (7 -12), Spanish (7 -12), Social Studies (7 -12),

Bachelor of Science + Master of Arts in Teaching
- Biology (7 -12), Mathematics (7 -12), Physics (7 -12), Spanish (7-12), TESOL (P-12)

Programs that lead to additional or advanced certification (NYSED)

Advanced Graduate Certificate
- TESOL (P-12), School Building Leader (P-12)*, School District Leader (P-12)*, School District Business Leader (P-12), Bilingual Education (Extension)

*Currently, SBU offers a combined post-master's program that leads to both Building and District Leader certifications.

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://www.stonybrook.edu/commcms/dtale/about/accreditation.php

2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows current enrollment and recent completion data, disaggregated by program and license/certificate, for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2024-2025

Degree or Program offered by the institution/organization	**Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential** granted by the state	**Number of Candidates Enrolled** in most recently completed academic	**Number of Completers** in most recently completed academic

		year (12 months ending 05/25)	year (12 months ending 05/25)
Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials			
Bachelor of Arts	Initial Certification: Korean (Grades 7-12)	2	1
	Initial Certification: Chinese (Grades 7-12)	4	1
	Initial Certification: Japanese (Grades 7-12)	3	0
	Initial Certification: French (Grades 7-12)	3	0
	Initial Certification: Social Studies (Grades 7-12)	70	14
	Initial Certification: TESOL (Grades PreK-12)	20	8
	Initial Certification: Spanish (Grades 7-12)	29	2
	Initial Certification: English (Grades 7-12)	63	19
	Initial Certification: Italian (Grades 7-12)	4	0
Bachelor of Science	Initial Certification: Mathematics (Grades 7-12)	9	3
	Initial Certification: Biology (Grades 7-12)	2	0
	Initial Certification: Chemistry (Grades 7-12)	2	0
Master of Arts in English as a Second Language	Initial Certification: TESOL (Grades PreK-12)	10	2
Master of Arts in Teaching	Initial Certification: Spanish (Grades 7-12)	14	9
	Initial Certification: Social Studies (Grades 7-12)	64	31
	Initial Certification: Biology (Grades 7-12)	41	19

	Initial Certification: Mathematics (Grades 7-12)	23	12
	Initial Certification: Chemistry (Grades 7-12)	4	3
	Initial Certification: English (Grades 7-12)	34	17
	Initial Certification: Earth Science (Grades 7-12)	9	7
	Initial Certification: French (Grades 7-12)	5	2
	Initial Certification: Italian (Grades 7-12)	1	1
	Initial Certification: Physics (Grades 7-12)	6	5
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		422	156
Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators			
Advanced Graduate Certificate	Initial Certification: Bilingual Education Extension	8	5
Advanced Graduate Certificate	Initial Certification: TESOL	3	0
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		11	5
Programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials			
Advanced Graduate Certificate	Initial Certification: School Building Leader (Grades PreK-12) Professional Certification: School District Leader (Grades PreK-12)	643	122
Advanced Graduate Certificate	Professional Certification: School District Business Leader (Grades PreK-12)	29	4
Total for programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials		672	126
Programs that lead to credentials for specialized professionals or to no specific credential			
Master of Science in Speech-Language Pathology	Initial Certification: Speech and Language Disabilities (Grades PreK-12)	63	24
Total for programs that lead to specialized professional or no specific credentials		63	24

TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs	1168	311
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers	1168	311

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.)

3. Program Performance Indicators

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

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.
1168
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.
311
C. **Number of recommendations** for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.
323

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.

We have three distinct pathways in the teacher education programs. The first pathway is at the baccalaureate level (BA/BS) where the expected timeframe for completion is 4 years (8 semesters) for first-year admitted students and 2.5 years (5 semesters) for transfer students. The second pathway is the combined BA/MAT or BS/MAT which has an expected timeframe to completion of 5.5 years (11 semesters) for first year admitted students. The third pathway is the MAT program with an expected time to completion of 2 years (4 semesters). Approximately 75% of all matriculated students are either enrolled in the MAT program or the combined BA/BS MAT programs, with 25% enrolled at the baccalaureate level. For students enrolled in the combined degree programs, SBU's historical practice has been to award both the baccalaureate and the master's simultaneously at the time that the master's degree is earned. This has the effect of otherwise and erroneously inflating the time to degree reporting for the baccalaureate portion of the combined degree. Next year, we plan to address this through a changed policy that will award baccalaureate degree at the time that students have satisfied all UGRD degree requirements rather than waiting until they have earned their Master's which is typically 1.5 to 2 years further along. The data in the table below illustrates time to completion for all students enrolled in the MAT (which includes students in the combined BA/MAT and BS/MAT programs).

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Cohort Count	76	76	92	89	86	107	118	171	170	207	165	136
Retained to Y2*	89.5%	85.5%	90.2%	88.8%	84.9%	91.6%	89.8%	93.6%	93.5%	89.9%	95.2%	94.9%
2-Yr Comp Rate	77.6%	71.1%	77.2%	65.2%	72.1%	72.9%	72.0%	76.0%	79.4%	73.9%	76.4%	
3-Yr Comp Rate	86.8%	85.5%	88.0%	83.1%	89.5%	87.9%	88.1%	88.9%	91.8%	87.0%		
4-Yr Comp Rate	89.5%	88.2%	89.1%	84.3%	89.5%	89.7%	89.8%	90.6%	92.4%			
5-Yr Comp Rate	90.8%	88.2%	89.1%	85.4%	90.7%	90.7%	89.8%	90.6%				
6-Yr Comp Rate	90.8%	88.2%	89.1%	85.4%	90.7%	90.7%	89.8%					
7-Yr Comp Rate	90.8%	88.2%	89.1%	85.4%	90.7%	90.7%						
8-Yr Comp Rate	90.8%	88.2%	89.1%	85.4%	90.7%							
9-Yr Comp Rate	90.8%	88.2%	89.1%	85.4%								
10-Yr Comp Rate	90.8%	88.2%	89.1%									

We also examined the underlined average time to completion for all students who did graduate either fall '24 or spring '25. The time to degree completion for students who earned an MAT degree completion was 1.95 years; the time to completion for students who earned their baccalaureate degree was 3.71 years (4.31 for 33 UGRD, and 2.5 for 15 UGRD transfer); and the time to completion for students enrolled in the combined BA/MAT or BS/MAT was 5.03 years.

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%.

All of our state license examination results are above 80%. The passing rate for all students on the Educating All Students Exam was **92.2**% for the first attempt, improving to 94.0% overall with additional attempts. Content Level Exams which include Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics, English, World Languages (including Spanish, Italian, French, Japanese, Korean, Chinese), Math, Social Studies and TESOL average **88.2%** passing rate for the first attempt. For the educational leadership programs, there were a total of 246 students examined with 230 passing (**93.5%**), with details provided in the table below.

Educational Leadership NYS Exam Results (07/01/24-06/30/25)						
	08-03 to 08-25	11-7 to 11/28	2/1 to 2/23	4/12 to 5/4	Total	% Passing
SBL 1 (2019)						
Examinees	9	15	13	16	53	
Passing	8	15	13	16	52	**98.11%**
SBL 2 (2019)						
Examinees	8	10	19	17	54	
Passing	8	9	16	16	49	**90.74%**
SBL 1 (2013)						
Examinees	3	6	2	2	13	
Passing	3	5	2	2	12	**92.31%**
SBL 2 (2013)						
Examinees	1	5	4	2	12	
Passing	1	4	3	2	10	**83.33%**
SDL 1						
Examinees	9	10	17	20	56	
Passing	9	10	16	18	53	**94.64%**
SDL 2						
Examinees	10	8	15	19	52	
Passing	9	8	14	17	48	**92.31%**
SDBL 1						
Examinees		1	1	1	3	
Passing		1	1	1	3	**100.00%**
SDBL 2						
Examinees		1	1	1	3	
Passing		1	1	1	3	**100.00%**
Total Examinees					246	
Total Passing					230	**93.50%**

F. Explanation of **evidence available from program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

Our Teacher Candidates, upon exiting our programs, are asked to complete an assessment of the Stony Brook Teacher Education Program. When combining "Somewhat" and "Strongly" Agree Categories, the range for the 13 questions was from 92% to 98% indicating that our students were satisfied with their experiences within our programs. The lowest score when combining the two categories of "Somewhat" and "Strongly" agree at 92% was Question 11 which is, "Teacher education faculty clearly explained requirements for certification so that I was able to select appropriate courses." This was also the lowest scored area last year and indicates we can work to be more effective at communicating the nuanced pathways to teacher education certification to all of our teacher education candidates.

Teacher Candidate Assessment of Stony Brook Program (TCASBP)

- **Q1 represents** "My study at SBU helped me understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline."
- **Q2 represents** "My study at SBU helped me understand and learn how to apply knowledge of human development and research in pedagogy to design diverse learning experiences that promote intellectual, social and personal development."
- **Q3 represents** "My study at SBU helped me understand and appreciate how students differ in their approaches to learning: is sensitive to diversity and can adapt learning experiences to diverse learners."
- **Q4 represents** "My study at SBU helped me understand and learn how to apply a variety of instructional strategies grounded in pedagogical content knowledge to creatively develop critical thinking, cognitive and performance skills, and intellectual curiosity for all learners."
- **Q5 represents** "My study at SBU helped me understand and learn how to apply knowledge of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation."
- **Q6 represents** "My study at SBU helped me understand and learn how to apply knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication strategies to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom."
- **Q7 represents** "My study at SBU taught me how to adjust learning experiences based upon knowledge of the discipline and its pedagogy, curriculum goals, the individual student, and community."
- **Q8 represents** "My study at SBU helped me understand and learn how to apply formal and informal modes of assessment to evaluate learners, monitor learner progress, and inform and improve instruction."
- **Q9 represents** "My study at SBU helped encourage me to seek opportunities to grow professionally, including engagement in reflective practice; continually evaluate the effects of actions on others and is flexible in responses; open to constructive criticism; and intellectually curious."
- **Q10 represents** "My study at SBU taught me how to foster collegial and communal partnerships to support student learning and well-being, both inside and outside the classroom."
- **Q11 represents** "Teacher education faculty clearly explained requirements for certification so that I was able to select appropriate courses."
- **Q12 represents** "My program did a good job in preparing me for a professional position in my field."
- **Q13 represents** "I was able to progress through the program in a timely manner

Numbers

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13
Srongly Disagree	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2
Somewhat Disagree	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1
Niether Agree nor Disagree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Somewhat Agree	3	6	6	3	6	9	9	3	3	9	7	5	3
Strongly Agree	46	43	42	46	42	40	40	46	46	39	39	43	44
Total Responses	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50

Percentages

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13
Srongly Disagree	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	2%	4%
Somewhat Disagree	0%	0%	2%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	4%	0%	2%
Niether Agree nor Disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Somewhat Agree	6%	12%	12%	6%	12%	18%	18%	6%	6%	18%	14%	10%	6%
Strongly Agree	92%	86%	84%	92%	84%	80%	80%	92%	92%	78%	78%	86%	88%
Somehwat & Strongly Agree	98%	98%	96%	98%	96%	98%	98%	98%	98%	96%	92%	96%	94%

G. Explanation of **evidence available from employers of program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

New York State lacks a comprehensive database to track the employment of our program completers. Most of the data we gather is anecdotal and comes from our own institutional efforts to encourage alumni to join our Educators Alumni Network (EAN), where we ask members about their current employment. In the past we have attempted to directly survey the 24 independent and distinct school districts on Long Island, but we have had exceptionally low response rates. One promising opportunity we are actively exploring in conversation with our Long Island BOCES partners, Long Island IHE's, and SCOPE, is an approach (developed by the Mid-Hudson School Study Council that utilizes an online employer survey template designed by Sunny Duer at SUNY New Paltz in 2016) to gather and share regional employment data on an annual basis, including ongoing projections by schools for anticipated openings by area, and actual hire statistics. In addition, representatives from NYSED continue to signal that a long-awaited state-wide dashboard will be available and accessible soon, perhaps as early as next year. Perhaps most importantly, under the newly hired Director of Educational Program Assessment, we plan on convening targeted focus groups with key stakeholders to gather additional evidence that can help inform change and drive continuous improvement.

H. 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.

As mentioned in G. there is no formal data collection of our completers from New York State. We will continue to work with key stakeholders including NYSED to improve our ability to report valid employment rates beyond anecdotal evidence gathered regularly from our faculty placement coordinators that suggests a robust employment market for graduates on Long Island, understanding that for teacher education graduates demand is somewhat contingent on content areas with STEM disciplines (Math, Biology, Chemistry, Physics) in perpetual strong demand. The other pressing reason for us to lean into gathering data with our partners is the looming (regional) shortage that will result from an accelerated rate of retirements in key positions. A sample data view extracted from the Mid-Hudson Valley annual survey provides an illustrative example (see table below) of the kind of data (and the back end unpacking to identify graduate's employment profiles) possible. We also plan to work more closely with SBU Center for Career Services to leverage ideas that might help us better track employment outcomes and details for this professional audience, many or most of whom secure their employment more 'directly' as a result of their teaching placement in a district ('foot in the door') or through their existing professional network (for School and Building Administrators). We will work to apply lessons learned and effective strategies from other professional programs whenever and wherever possible to improve on this critically important area.

As far as completers' ongoing education (e.g. graduate study), presently in New York State anyone that earns their "initial" certification has five years to earn a masters' degree in order to be granted their "professional" certification. Many of our EDL students are graduates of our undergraduate and/or MAT teaching programs.

Sample Table from Mid-Hudson (NY) School Study Council annual employer survey.

Projected Teacher Hiring Needs Within the Next 3 Years Versus Actual Hiring

BEDS Certification Area	March 2022 3-year Projected Hiring Need	2022-2023 Actual # Hired in 1 Year	March 2023 3-year Projected Hiring Needs	2023-2024 Actual # Hired in 1 Year	March 2024 3-year Projected Hiring Needs	2024-2025 Actual # Hired in 1 Year	March 2025 3-year Projected Hiring Needs
Grades 1-6	155	130	137	172	150	133	171
SWD: Grades 1-6	75	86	74	123	85	94	82
Math: 7-12	77	45	50	38	38	23	46
School Psychologist	30	17	25	47	39	33	29
ESOL	60	43	42	48	40	48	44
Speech & Language	42	31	40	44	35	40	44
Any 50+ CTE Certs. K-12	30	27	28	35	40	21	30

I. Explanation of how the **staffing capacity** for program delivery and administration and quality assurance system monitoring have changed during the reporting year, if at all, and how capacity matches the current size of the program.
Our Director of Assessment and Accreditation retired in the 2024/2025 academic year. We have recently hired a new Director, Dr. Wafa Deeb-Westervel. She begins her position in January 2026. In addition, we appointed Dr. Sarah Jourdain, faculty and former chair of the World Languages Department and Director of the MAT program in world languages as the Executive Director of Teacher Education with responsibility for leading and coordinating all UGRD, combined BA/BS MAT and GRAD MAT programs. The Educational Leadership program hired Dr. James Polansky, a recently retired superintendent with over 35 years' experience and a former graduate of the EDL program, who has been appointed as the Assistant Director of the Educational Leadership Program. He is responsible for the following onboarding new faculty members, ensuring that the syllabi of current faculty and courses are compliant with best practices as outlined by the SUNY OSCQR framework and best online practices of the University's Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, developing master course shells for Brightspace (LMS) to onboard new faculty and train existing faculty as well as developing master course shells.

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

Tables 3 and 4 report on select measures (3 to 5 measures for each standard) of candidate/completer performance related to AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, including the program's expectations for performance (criteria for success) 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 (name and description)	Criteria for success	Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation
The Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF) 2024-2025 is administered at the end of a teacher candidate's Methods I, Methods II and Student Teaching Practicum. The Stony Brook Faculty scored the TCPDF at each of these transition points and the Cooperating Teachers also scored the teacher candidates during the student teaching clinical practice.	It is expected that there will be more "Ineffective" and "Developing" scores as candidates enter the teacher education program (Methods I), and that these scores will decrease as candidates progress through Methods II and Student Teaching. Conversely, we can expect the percentage of those assessed as effective and/or highly effective to increase as candidates progress through the developmental stages.	**TCPDF Questions Related to Standard 1** **TCPDF Question 1.** The candidate understands how children learn and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences. *(Knowledge and Performance)* **TCPDF Question 2.** The candidate demonstrates understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards. *(Disposition)* **TCPDF Question 3.** The candidate works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation. *(Disposition)* **TCPDF Question 6.** The candidate understands and utilizes multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making. *(Knowledge and Performance)* **TCPDF Question 7.** The candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills and pedagogy as well as knowledge of learners and the community context. *(Performance)* **TCPDF Question 8.** The candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways. *(Performance)* **TCPDF Question 9.** The candidate engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, and other professionals in the learning community) and adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner. *(Disposition)* **TCPDF Question 10.** The candidate seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth and to advance the profession. *(Disposition)*

Table 1. The scores highlighted in yellow are higher than the program self-imposed marker of 10% or more when combining "Ineffective" and "Developing." These markers are discussed with the unit to ensure that there are no areas of concern that should be addressed and if, indeed, there is an area that is of concern, the programs will address it within their Methods I instruction.

Table 2. The scores highlighted in yellow are higher than the self-imposed marker of 10% or more when combining "Ineffective" and "Developing." These markers are discussed with the unit to ensure that there are no areas of concern that should be addressed and if, indeed, there is an area that is of concern, the programs will address it within their Methods II instruction.

Table 1
Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF)
Methods 1 All Levels (2024-2025)

Methods 1 All Levels	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Ineffective	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Developing	18.1%	11.6%	8.7%	27.5%	23.2%	29.0%	29.7%	26.1%	8.0%	13.0%
Effective	68.1%	73.2%	75.4%	58.7%	60.9%	63.0%	60.1%	64.5%	85.5%	82.6%
Highly Effecitve	13.8%	15.2%	15.9%	13.8%	15.9%	8.0%	10.1%	9.4%	6.5%	4.3%
Combined Effective & HE	81.9%	88.4%	91.3%	72.5%	76.8%	71.0%	70.3%	73.9%	92.0%	87.0%

(Percentages)

Table 2
Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF)
Methods II All Levels (2024-2025)

Methods 2 All Levels	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Ineffective	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Developing	3.0%	2.4%	3.6%	6.0%	7.1%	10.1%	6.5%	7.7%	3.0%	3.6%
Effective	68.6%	68.6%	66.9%	63.1%	63.3%	71.0%	58.6%	60.1%	64.5%	71.3%
Highly Effecitve	28.4%	29.0%	29.6%	31.0%	29.6%	18.9%	34.9%	32.1%	32.5%	25.1%
Combined Effective & HE	97.0%	97.6%	96.4%	94.0%	92.9%	89.9%	93.5%	92.3%	97.0%	96.4%

(Percentages)

Table 3. Note that this assessment combines three independent ratings of each student, one by the faculty member and one by each of the two cooperating teachers in the classroom.

A comparison of the data in Table 1 vs. Table 2 vs. Table 3 clearly illustrates the developmental progression of students through the teacher education program and their growing proficiency and competency.

Table 3
Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF)
Student Teaching All Levels (2024-2025)

	Percentages									
Student Teaching All Levels	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Ineffective	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Developing	4.4%	3.8%	1.1%	2.5%	5.5%	4.4%	5.2%	3.6%	2.5%	3.0%
Effective	59.9%	56.6%	45.3%	53.6%	51.1%	56.9%	52.2%	50.3%	54.8%	60.2%
Highly Effecitve	35.7%	39.6%	53.6%	44.0%	43.4%	38.7%	42.6%	46.2%	42.7%	36.8%
Combined Effective & HE	95.6%	96.2%	98.9%	97.5%	94.5%	95.6%	94.8%	96.4%	97.5%	97.0%

| Lesson Evaluation Form (LEF) 2024-225 Assessment

The LEF contains 27 questions organized into four categories. | In Student Teaching, the scoring is done by both the SBU Field Supervisor (faculty) and one or two Cooperating Teachers. Any "ineffective" scores by the Cooperating Teachers are discussed with the SBU Field Supervisor as well as the scoring for all levels. As with the TCPDF, combining "Effective" with "Highly Effective" shows a range from 82% (Q23) to 98% (Q2, Q10,)indicating overall that students are meeting program expectations. | **LEF Questions related to Standard 1**

LEF QUESTION 2. Content and learning goals reflect teacher candidate's knowledge of the central concepts of the discipline and its modes of inquiry and argumentation.
LEF QUESTION 3. Lesson plan provides students with the opportunity to acquire disciplinary vocabulary and develop the relevant academic language.
LEF QUESTION 4. Learning goals are developmentally appropriate and are based upon assessment of students' prior academic knowledge, experience, skills, pre-, and misconceptions.
LEF QUESTION 5. Lessons are founded upon essential questions that are designed to promote higher-level thinking skills.
LEF QUESTION 6. Instruction and assessment include appropriate adaptations and accommodations for ELLs and/or exceptional students.
LEF QUESTION 7. Lesson plan includes assessments that determine the extent to which students have met the lesson learning goals.
LEF QUESTION 9. Teacher candidate prepares and manages instructional materials in a manner that promotes student learning.
LEF QUESTION 10. Teacher candidates have established effective classroom management routines and procedures to optimize instructional time.
LEF QUESTION 11. Teacher candidate responds to student behavior in a manner conducive to a mutually respectful, safe and supportive learning environment.
LEF QUESTION 12. Opening of the lesson motivates students and helps prepare them to meet the lesson objectives.
LEF QUESTION 13. Teacher candidate leads questioning, facilitates discussion, models disciplinary reasoning, and allows for proper wait time in a manner that promotes higher-level thinking.
LEF QUESTION 14. Provides effective feedback in ways that promote student learning.
LEF QUESTION 15. Teacher candidate provides students with the opportunity to develop and apply relevant discipline-specific vocabulary and language functions to develop and express their content understanding.
LEF QUESTION 16. Teacher candidate uses language, body language, target language (where applicable), voice and eye contact to communicate clearly and appropriately.
LEF QUESTION 17. Teacher candidate demonstrates enthusiasm for subject matter and students.
LEF QUESTION 18. Teacher candidate effectively uses instructional time.
LEF QUESTION 20. Teacher candidate integrates authentic, real-world and/or interdisciplinary activities.
LEF QUESTION 21. Teacher candidate uses formal and informal assessment to monitor student learning and adapt instruction.
LEF QUESTION 23. Teacher candidate effectively implements adaptations for ELLs and exceptional students.
LEF QUESTION 24. The ending of the lesson provides productive closure and enables the teacher candidate to assess actual student learning. |

Lesson Evaluation Form (LEF) for Teacher Education Programs (All Levels) 2024-2025

Percentages	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q9
Ineffective	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Developing	3%	3%	5%	4%	8%	6%	3%
Effective	52%	56%	51%	51%	53%	58%	49%
Highly Effective	46%	41%	44%	43%	31%	34%	48%
No Evidence	0%	0%	0%	1%	7%	1%	0%

Percentages	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
Ineffective	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Developing	12%	5%	5%	15%	5%	15%	5%
Effective	47%	47%	54%	55%	54%	55%	58%
Highly Effective	41%	45%	40%	29%	40%	29%	36%
No Evidence	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%

Percentages	Q17	Q18	Q20	Q21	Q23	Q24
Ineffective	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Developing	5%	7%	14%	5%	6%	10%
Effective	56%	54%	51%	50%	50%	59%
Highly Effective	37%	39%	35%	45%	32%	31%
No Evidence	2%	0%	0%	0%	11%	1%

Provider-selected measures for Educational Leadership Program

Students in the EDL Advanced Graduate Certificate Program AGC) that leads to New York State Certification in both School Building and School District Certifications must take a sequence of 11 courses plus an internship. The PSEL Standards are dispersed throughout these courses, and they are evaluated by EDL Faculty and also the Cooperating Administrators during the internship. As with the Teacher Preparation Program, data are collected at the end of the school year, analyzed as both aggregated and disaggregated information and discussed with the EDL Administrators and Faculty on a yearly basis looking for ways that the program can adjust and improve.

Observation Evaluation Form (OEF)

{{Q3 - "Act with cultural competence." , Q4, "Implement systems of curriculum, instruction and assessment.", Q5, "Effective educational leaders cultivate an inclusive, caring and supportive school community that promotes the academic success and well-being of each student. Q6 – "Empower and motivate teachers."}}

EDL 501 Q3 - "Act with cultural competence and responsiveness."

EDL 502 Q2 - "Use assessment data appropriately."

Observation Evaluation Form (OEF) 2024-2025

	Percentages			
	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6
Unacceptable	0.0%	0.6%	1.2%	2.5%
Acceptable	2.5%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%
Meets Standard	30.4%	19.3%	26.1%	21.7%
Distinguished	62.1%	74.5%	70.8%	71.4%
Not Applicable	5.0%	4.3%	1.2%	3.7%
Meets Standard & Distinguished	92.5%	93.8%	96.9%	93.2%

EDL 501 Q3

EDL 501	Q3
Unacceptable	0.0%
Acceptable	1.4%
Meets Standard	31.1%
Distinguished	67.6%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	98.6%

EDL 502 Q2

EDL 502	Q2
Unacceptable	0.0%
Acceptable	0.6%
Meets Standard	50.6%
Distinguished	48.7%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	99.4%

Selected assessment questions from the various EDL course assessments that measure the various aspects of Standard 1 are listed along with the sum of the percentage of those students scored at the "Meets" and "Distinguished" levels. As this is an Advanced Graduate Certificate Program where the student must have a Masters degree plus at least three years of teaching experience, the expectations are that the vast majority of the students will be scored at either the "Meets" or "Distinguished" levels.

The tables indicate how the PSEL Standards are aligned with the AAQEP Standard 1 and in what course or survey the standards are assessed.

EDL 503 Q2 - "Seek resources to support curriculum, instruction, and assessment."
EDL 503 Q6 - "Develop systems of data collection."

EDL 515 Q1 - "Promote adult-student relationships."

EDL 528 Q1 - "Act ethically and professionally."

EDL 503 Q2 & Q6

EDL 503	Q2	Q6
Unacceptable	0.0%	0.0%
Acceptable	0.0%	0.0%
Meets Standard	52.0%	53.7%
Distinguished	48.0%	46.3%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	100.0%	100.0%

EDL 515 Q1

EDL 515	Q1
Unacceptable	0.0%
Acceptable	0.0%
Meets Standard	29.2%
Distinguished	70.8%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	100.0%

EDL 528 Q1

EDL 528	Q1
Unacceptable	0.0%
Acceptable	0.6%
Meets Standard	40.8%
Distinguished	58.6%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	99.4%

EDL 555 Q3

EDL 555 Q3 - "Develop productive working relationships."

EDL 555	Q3
Unacceptable	0.0%
Acceptable	0.0%
Meets Standard	50.3%
Distinguished	49.7%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	100.0%

EDL 571 Q2

EDL 571 Q2 – "Maintain a safe school environment."

EDL 571	Q2
Unacceptable	0.0%
Acceptable	0.0%
Meets Standard	11.2%
Distinguished	88.8%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	100.0%

EDL 572 Q1

EDL 572 Q1 "Establish a professional culture."

EDL 572	Q1
Unacceptable	0.0%
Acceptable	0.8%
Meets Standard	63.0%
Distinguished	36.2%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	99.2%

EDL 595 Q4

EDL 595 Q4 - "Develop systems of data collection."

EDL 595	Q4
Unacceptable	0.0%
Acceptable	0.0%
Meets Standard	49.7%
Distinguished	50.3%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	100.0%

EDL Intern Summative Evaluation (ISEF) Q4 & Q6

EDL Intern Summative Evaluation Form Q4 - "Use assessment data appropriately."
EDL Intern Summative Evaluation Form Q6 – "Empower and motivate teachers." (External
– Cooperating Administrator)

EDL ISEF	Q4	Q6
Unacceptable	1.1%	1.1%
Acceptable	2.1%	1.1%
Meets Standard	16.8%	31.6%
Distinguished	80.0%	66.3%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	96.8%	97.9%

EDL Portfolio Assessment Q4

EDL Portfolio Assessment Form Q4 - "Use assessment data appropriately."

EDL Portfolio Assessment	Q4
Unacceptable	0.63%
Acceptable	4.40%
Meets Standard	23.27%
Distinguished	71.70%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	94.97%

	EDL School Improvement Plan Q6 - "Develop systems of data collection."	**EDL School Improvement Plan (SIP) Q6**
		EDL School Improvement Plan / **Q6**
		Unacceptable — 0.0%
		Acceptable — 3.8%
		Meets Standard — 28.8%
		Distinguished — 67.5%
		Combined Meets & Distinguished — 96.3%

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

Provider-selected measures (name and description)	Criteria for success	Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation
The Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF) 2024-2025 is administered at the end of a teacher candidate's Methods I, Methods II and Student Teaching Practicum. The Stony Brook Faculty scored the TCPDF at each of these transition points and the Cooperating Teachers also scored the teacher candidate during the student teaching clinical practice.	It is expected that there will be more "Ineffective" and "Developing" scores as candidates enter the teacher education program (Methods I), and that these scores will decrease as candidates progress through Methods II and Student Teaching. Conversely, we can expect the percentage of those assessed as effective and/or highly effective to increase as candidates progress through the developmental stages.	**TCPDF Questions Related to Standard 2** TCPDF Question 2. The candidate demonstrates understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards. (*Disposition*) TCPDF Question 3. The candidate works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self- motivation. (*Disposition*) TCPDF Question 4. The candidate understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he/she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content (*Knowledge*) TCPDF Question 5. The candidate understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues (*Knowledge and Performance*) TCPDF Question 9. The candidate engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, and other professionals in the learning community) and adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner. (*Disposition*) TCPDF Question 10. The candidate seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth and to advance the profession. (*Disposition*)

Table 1. The scores highlighted in yellow are higher than the program self-imposed marker of 10% or more when combining "Ineffective" and "Developing." These markers are discussed with the unit to ensure that there are no areas of concern that should be addressed and if, indeed, there is an area that is of concern, the programs will address it within their Methods I instruction.

Table 1-Standard 2
Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF)
Methods 1 All Levels (2024-2025)

	Percentages					
Methods 1 All Levels	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q9	Q10
Ineffective	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Developing	11.6%	8.7%	27.5%	23.2%	8.0%	13.0%
Effective	73.2%	75.4%	58.7%	60.9%	85.5%	82.6%
Highly Effecitve	15.2%	15.9%	13.8%	15.9%	6.5%	4.3%
Combined Effective & HE	88.4%	91.3%	72.5%	76.8%	92.0%	87.0%

Table 2. The scores highlighted in yellow are higher than the self-imposed marker of 10% or more when combining "Ineffective" and "Developing." These markers are discussed with the unit to ensure that there are no areas of concern that should be addressed and if, indeed, there is an area that is of concern, the programs will address it within their Methods II instruction.

Table 2-Standard 2
Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF)
Methods II All Levels (2024-2025)

	Percentages					
Methods 2 All Levels	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q9	Q10
Ineffective	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Developing	2.4%	3.6%	6.0%	7.1%	3.0%	3.6%
Effective	68.6%	66.9%	63.1%	63.3%	64.5%	71.3%
Highly Effecitve	29.0%	29.6%	31.0%	29.6%	32.5%	25.1%
Combined Effective & HE	97.6%	96.4%	94.0%	92.9%	97.0%	96.4%

Table 3. Note that this assessment combines three independent ratings of each student, one by the faculty member and one by each of the two cooperating teachers in the classroom.

A comparison of the data in Table 1 vs. Table 2 vs. Table 3 clearly illustrates the developmental progression of students through the teacher education program and their growing proficiency and competency over time with cumulative experience, feedback, reflection, and metnoring.

The vast majority of students have been assessed as "Effective" and "Highly Effective" with the lowest of these combined scores at 94.5.%.

Table 3-Standard 2
Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF)
Methods II All Levels (2024-2025)

	Percentages					
Student Teaching All Levels	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q9	Q10
Ineffective	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Developing	3.8%	1.1%	2.5%	5.5%	2.5%	3.0%
Effective	56.6%	45.3%	53.6%	51.1%	54.8%	60.2%
Highly Effecitve	39.6%	53.6%	44.0%	43.4%	42.7%	36.8%
Combined Effective & HE	96.2%	98.9%	97.5%	94.5%	97.5%	97.0%

Lesson Evaluation Form (LEF) 2024-225 Assessment	In Student Teaching, the scoring is done by both the SBU Field Supervisor (faculty) and one or two Cooperating Teachers.	**LEF Questions related to Standard 2**

Left column:

Lesson Evaluation Form (LEF) 2024-225 Assessment

The LEF contains 27 questions organized into four categories.

Middle column:

In Student Teaching, the scoring is done by both the SBU Field Supervisor (faculty) and one or two Cooperating Teachers. Any "ineffective" scores by the Cooperating Teachers are discussed with the SBU Field Supervisor as well as the scoring for all levels. As with the TCPDF, combining "Effective" with "Highly Effective" shows a range from 84.4% (Q13) to 97.9% (Q27)indicating overall that students are meeting program expectations.

Right column:

LEF Questions related to Standard 2

LEF QUESTION 4. Learning goals are developmentally appropriate and are based upon assessment of students' prior academic knowledge, experience, skills, pre-, and misconceptions.
LEF QUESTION 5. Lessons are founded upon essential questions that are designed to promote higher-level thinking skills.
LEF QUESTION 6. Instruction and assessment include appropriate adaptations and accommodations for ELLs and/or exceptional students.
LEF QUESTION 8. Lesson integrates technology as a learning tool.
LEF QUESTION 11. Teacher candidate responds to student behavior in a manner conducive to a mutually respectful, safe and supportive learning environment.
LEF QUESTION 12. Opening of the lesson motivates students and helps prepare them to meet the lesson objectives.
LEF QUESTION 13. Teacher candidate leads questioning, facilitates discussion, models disciplinary reasoning, and allows for proper wait time in a manner that promotes higher-level thinking.
LEF QUESTION 14. Provides effective feedback in ways that promote student learning.
LEF QUESTION 15. Teacher candidate provides students with the opportunity to develop and apply relevant discipline-specific vocabulary and language functions to develop and express their content understanding.
LEF QUESTION 20. Teacher candidate integrates authentic, real-world and/or interdisciplinary activities.
LEF QUESTION 26. Teacher candidate seeks input in lesson planning and preparation and incorporates feedback and suggestions from mentoring teachers.
LEF QUESTION 27. Teacher candidate arrives on time, is professionally dressed, is well prepared, demonstrates necessary organizational skills, and always returns assignments in a timely fashion.

Lesson Evaluation Form (LEF) for Teacher Education Programs (All Levels) 2024-2025

	Percentages										
	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q20	Q26	Q27
Innefective	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%
Developing	4.9%	3.9%	8.3%	5.2%	5.4%	15.3%	5.5%	5.4%	4.7%	2.5%	2.1%
Effective	50.9%	51.5%	53.3%	46.7%	54.4%	55.2%	57.7%	56.2%	48.4%	38.1%	36.4%
Highly Effective	44.2%	43.4%	31.3%	44.9%	40.0%	29.2%	35.5%	36.9%	39.7%	58.6%	61.5%
Effective & Highly Effective	95.1%	94.9%	84.6%	91.6%	94.4%	84.4%	93.3%	93.1%	88.2%	96.7%	97.9%
No Evidence	0.0%	1.3%	6.8%	3.1%	0.2%	0.3%	1.3%	1.6%	7.1%	0.6%	0.0%

Teacher Candidate Work Sample for Student Learning (TCWSSL) 2024-2025 Assessment The Teacher Candidate Work Sample is an assessment used by English, World Languages, Math, Science, Social Studies and TESOL to assess a candidate's professional growth. The focus is on the complex relationship between standards, assessment and instruction, and on the systematic application of pedagogical theory to classroom practice. Candidates are required to address: (Q1) contextual factors, (Q2) learning goals, (Q3) assessment plans, (Q4) design for instruction, (Q5) analysis of student learning, (Q6) reflection and self-analysis.	Standard 2 – "Understand and engage local school and cultural communities and communicate and foster relationships with families, /guardians, caregivers in a variety of communities." Standard 2 – "Engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners and do so in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts." Standard 2 – "Create productive learning environments and use strategies to develop productive learning environments in a variety of school contexts." Standard 2 – "Support students' growth in international and global perspectives." Standard 2 – "Establish goals for their own professional growth and engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection on their own practice." Standard 2 – "Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning."	**Teacher Candidate Work Sample for Student Learning (TCWSSL) 2024-2025**

Teacher Candidate Work Sample for Student Learning (TCWSSL) 2024-2025

Teacher Candidate Work Sample	Percentages					
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6
Inadequate EPP Unit	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%
Meets EPP Unit	44.5%	52.7%	60.3%	54.8%	55.5%	52.1%
Exemplary EPP Unit	55.5%	46.6%	39.0%	45.2%	43.2%	47.9%
Combined Meets & Exemplary	100.0%	99.3%	99.3%	100.0%	98.6%	100.0%

Educating All Students (EAS) – required New York State Teacher Certification Exam Assessment	Testing Results from July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025.		

Educating All Students (EAS)	2024-2025
# Taking the EAS	309
# Passing the EAS	284
Passing Rate	91.9%

Students in the EDL Advanced Graduate Certificate Program (AGC) that leads to NYS Certification in both School Building and School District Certifications must take a sequence of 11 courses plus an internship. The PSEL Standards are dispersed throughout these courses, and they are evaluated by EDL Faculty and also the Cooperating Administrators during the internship.

As with the Teacher Education Program, data are collected at the end of the school year, analyzed as both aggregated and disaggregated information and discussed with the EDL Administrators and Faculty on a yearly basis looking for ways that the program can adjust and improve.

The data contained in the embedded charts indicate how the PSEL Standards are aligned with AAQEP

Selected assessment questions from the various EDL course assessments that measure the various aspects of Standard 2 are listed along with the percentage of students scored at the "Meets" and "Distinguished" levels. As this is an Advanced Graduate Certificate Program where the student must have a master's degree plus at least three years of teaching experience, the expectations are that the vast majority will be at the "Meets" or "Distinguished" levels.

Assessment Questions:

Intern Summative Evaluation Form Q6 – "Empower and motivate teachers." (External – Cooperating Administrators)

Intern Summative Evaluation Form Q7 – "Design job-embedded opportunities."

Intern Summative Evaluation Form Q8 – "Create productive relationships with families."

Intern Summative Evaluation

	Percentages		
EDL ISEF	**Q6**	**Q7**	**Q8**
Acceptable	1.1%	1.1%	2.1%
Meets Standard	31.6%	26.3%	17.9%
Distinguished	66.3%	71.6%	80.0%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	97.9%	97.9%	97.9%

Standard 2 and in what course or survey the standards are assessed.

School Improvement Plan Q1 – "Engage in two-way communication w/families."

School Improvement Plan Q2 – "Employ the community's cultural resources."

School Improvement Plan

	Percentages	
EDL School Improvement Plan	Q2	Q3
Acceptable	2.5%	2.5%
Meets Standard	36.9%	23.1%
Distinguished	60.0%	73.1%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	96.9%	96.3%

Observation Evaluation Form

Observation Evaluation Form Q3 – "Act with cultural competence."

Observation Evaluation Form Q6 – "Empower and motivate teachers." (Internal – Faculty)

	Percentages	
EDL Observation Evaluation Form	Q3	Q6
Acceptable	2.5%	0.6%
Meets Standard	30.4%	21.7%
Distinguished	62.1%	71.4%
Not Applicable	5.0%	3.7%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	92.5%	93.2%

Portfolio Assessment

Portfolio Assessment Q6 – "Develop teachers' professional knowledge."

Portfolio Assessment Q7 – "Design job-embedded opportunities."

Portfolio Assessment Q8 – "Partner with families."

	Percentages		
EDL Portfolio Assessment	Q6	Q7	Q8
Acceptable	0.6%	5.0%	4.4%
Meets Standard	31.4%	42.8%	23.3%
Distinguished	63.5%	52.2%	72.3%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	95.0%	95.0%	95.6%

EDL 501 Q1 - "Develop and promote a vision."

EDL 501 Q3 - "Act with cultural competence and responsiveness."

EDL 501 Q4 - "Provide coherent systems of academic and social support."

EDL 502 Q3 - "Foster continuous improvement."

EDL 515 Q2 - "Engage in two-way communication with families."

EDL 555 Q1 - "Promote instructional practice."

EDL 571 Q2 - "Maintain a safe school environment."

EDL 572 Q1 - "Establish a professional culture."

EDL 595 Q1 – "Create positive family relationships."

Select Questions from EDL Coursework

	Percentages								
	EDL 501 Q1	EDL 501 Q3	EDL 501 Q4	EDL 502 Q3	EDL 515 Q2	EDL 555 Q1	EDL 571 Q2	EDL 572 Q1	EDL 595 Q1
Acceptable	2.0%	1.4%	1.4%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
Meets Standard	39.2%	31.1%	42.6%	38.0%	35.0%	52.0%	11.2%	63.0%	43.9%
Distinguished	58.8%	67.6%	56.1%	60.1%	65.0%	48.0%	88.8%	36.2%	56.1%
Combined Meets & Distinguished	98.0%	98.6%	98.6%	98.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.2%	100.0%

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.

<u>Educational Leadership Programs:</u>

The Strengthening Diversity in Leadership Initiative was made possible through the work of the Metropolitan Council of Education Administration Programs (MCEAP) executive committee and Stony Brook University and has received funding from a New York State Education Department (NYSED) grant. The grant's objectives were to help create a pipeline for emerging school leaders, conduct and disseminate research on the effective strategies being used in the field, and foster new and better leadership skills to integrate diversity and inclusion efforts deeply into school priorities, culture, and operations. Here are our grant findings: https://bit.ly/3L7iAH7

Dr. Ken Forman, the Associate Director of the educational leadership program, has been named President of the Metropolitan Council of Education Administration Programs (MCEAP). This prestigious appointment places Dr. Forman as the leader of an organization that brings together 27 downstate university educational leadership programs. MCEAP plays a role in shaping the future of educational leadership by fostering collaboration, sharing best practices, and promoting strong leadership programs. In addition, Dr. Forman serves as Executive Director of the New York Academy for Public Education, a downstate organization that facilitates and supports education and leadership. Dr. Craig Markson, the Program Director of the educational leadership program has been named as Secretary of MCEAP in support of Stony Brook University's influence on Educational Leadership across the state. In addition, Dr. Markson has been appointed to the position of Secretary and Research Editor of the New York Academy for Public Education. The Academy successfully provides a common forum and meeting ground in fostering educational activities between the professional community and the public-at-large across New York.

The Professional Certificate with Superintendent's Extension was approved by the New York State Board of Regents in January 2025 which established the Professional Administrator Certificate with a Superintendent Extension. The Educational Leadership program has been approved by the New York State Education Department for the Professional Administrator Certificate with Superintendent Extension, July 1, 2025. This new certification is designed to reflect the changing landscape of administrator positions in New York State by combining all building-level and district-level leadership positions, except those that include "superintendent" in the title, into a single certification title aligned to the New York State version of the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSELs). To work in positions that include "superintendent" in the title, candidates who hold the new Professional Administrator certificate would also need to obtain the new Superintendent Extension. Because of the quality of our dual licensure educational leadership program, we have successfully implemented the requirements for licensure for these new certifications.

Dr. James Polansky, a recently retired superintendent with over 35 years' experience and a former graduate of the EDL program, has been appointed as the Assistant Director of the Educational Leadership Program. He is responsible for onboarding new faculty members, ensuring that the syllabi of current faculty and courses are compliant with best practices as outlined by the SUNY OSCQR framework and best online practices of the University's CELT Department, developing master course shells for Brightspace to onboard new faculty and train existing faculty as well as developing master course shells.

The Administrative Externship is a virtual <u>pilot program</u> that focuses on building relationships, offering advice, and reinforcing career goals to new graduates of the Educational Leadership Program. Agendas for virtual meetings will be organically derived based on externs' needs and include sharing leadership information, reinforcing learned skills, and providing support for career advancement. This voluntary program incurs no cost to the graduates. The externship is structured as a virtual experience with Zoom meetings. There are two main components to the program, Group 1 includes grant program graduates who are currently in or are considering moving rapidly into administrative roles. Participants are linked with EDL faculty members who have experience in the positions the graduates are seeking. Group 2 grant program graduates who are not immediately seeking leadership positions but would benefit from career mentoring by identified EDL faculty.

The EDL Program has undertaken several initiatives to extend professional learning to faculty. Program leaders, Dr. Craig Markson, Dr. James Polansky and Dr. Ken Forman have undertaken this responsibility. Topics have included understanding artificial intelligence and its use in teaching and learning in the leadership program, using artificial intelligence responsibility in courseware, making documents more accessible, more effective delivery of online synchronous and asynchronous instruction, and effectively using original sources in coursework. As part of ongoing professional development, the EDL program has initiated an ongoing communication mechanism, The EDL News, to meet the needs to share our expertise in an environment other than a conference or faculty meeting. It is published virtually twice a year (Fall and Spring) in which we share happenings in our Educational Leadership Program, individual research articles by our numerous instructors, and what is happening in teaching and learning at Stony Brook University and across the region.

The Educational Leadership Program has developed strategic partnerships to further extend leadership opportunities for candidates and leadership instructors from participating partners. Our participating partners include the Suffolk County School Superintendents Association, Nassau County/SCOPE Superintendents Partnership, The Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) of Western Suffolk County, SCOPE Education Services (a non-profit organization that supports education across Long Island), the New York Academy for Public Education and a number of Teachers Centers (a professional hub designed to support the growth, mental well-being, and instructional skills of educators). The University hosted a Spring 2025 conference with the Suffolk County School Superintendents Association and our faculty covering areas "Building Robust Plans in Unpredictable Times" and "Leading A Community with Resilience & Perseverance".

As part of our commitment to sustaining the knowledge base of theory and practice in the Educational Leadership community, faculty have produced a variety of research in the Journal for Leadership & Instruction (Forman, K., & Markson, C. (2024). No

aftermath: A comparison of pre-and post-pandemic assessment scores for Mathematics and English Language Arts in grades 3-8. 23(1), 15-18; The Opt-Out Movement revisited: A deep dive into the 2023 data 24(1), 10-15; and in the New York Academy of Public Education Research (Cucinello, K., Forman, K., & Markson, C. (2025). The relationships between digital devices, per pupil spending, and student achievement on the English Language Arts and Mathematics Assessments for grades 3-8 14(1), 1-6.

A focus on AI capabilities (from the professors' and students' perspectives) was the focus at multiple EDL faculty meetings and continues to stimulate detailed and ongoing discussions about how to incorporate its capabilities to advance teaching and learning outcomes in accordance with University guidelines   Faculty also took advantage of multiple professional development opportunities related to the use of AI and on many other topics through SBU's Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching. One of the three main Internship projects for program interns focused on developing responsible AI policies for their respective school districts to promote student achievement. Stony Brook University (SBU) has comprehensive accessibility guidelines focusing on digital content (websites, apps, course materials), physical spaces (events, classrooms), and services, mandating compliance with standards like WCAG 2.1 AA for digital materials, requiring accessible design for new EIT, and offering support via the Student Accessibility Support Center (SASC) for accommodations. Key requirements include 'alt' text for images, captioned videos, accessible PDFs, accessible event planning (parking, routes, restrooms), and proactive design for inclusive digital experiences, with a strong emphasis on making everything accessible from the start. The Educational Leadership Program is sensitive to these requirements. A staff member from CELT will be presenting at our February 2026 faculty meeting, to discuss upcoming changes/deadlines to policies relating to accessibility and demonstrate new/emerging compliance software for the learning management system and individual documents.

One critical component of the Educational Leadership program is the Internship program which is designed to provide students with opportunities to develop into effective instructional leaders and effective managers. To develop the skills necessary to carry out the comprehensive and systematic work of administrators as instructional leaders, candidates design, implement and evaluate three (3) comprehensive action projects. The third project has evolved to reflect the unique needs or challenges facing education since the Covid Pandemic. This modification reflects the commitment of the Educational Leadership Program to train and educate a new cadre of administrators prepared to meet the unique challenges facing educators. During the spring 2025 internship interns were required to meet with administrators and develop and adopt a News Literacy curriculum for project #3. During the fall 2025 internship interns were required to meet with administrators to develop a plan for project #3 that addresses the challenges of chronic absenteeism.

Teacher Education: This past year was a challenging one from an administrative drain perspective. NYSED established a policy that all IHE's needed to put in place 'MOUs' with any participating school district where student teachers were placed either for their teaching observation or teaching practicum. While not intended at the outset to lead to formal legal agreements, that is the direction that this initiative eventually took. The implication was that as much as 50% of administrative time was spent on back-and-forth communications with specific school districts to ensure that MOU's were established and in place. This was an

enormous undertaking and quite frankly one that added little value from all vantage points with many still trying to determine what problem was solved by this solution.

On a more positive note, we made great strides this year in supporting the actively budding Future Teachers Association. This is a student organized and managed group that promotes awareness of teacher education career pathways and promotes ongoing co-curricular professional development for teacher education candidates. In the fall of 2024, they hosted their annual Teacher Meet & Greet, an event designed to afford current students an opportunity to listen and learn from a panel of current K-12 teachers as they discuss their personal experiences in the classroom and offer advice for students who will be entering the field. In the spring of 2025, a representative from Stony Brook's Career Services met with the students to discuss resume and cover letter preparation and interviewing techniques. At other FTA meetings, students discussed teacher education program requirements, including NYSED workshops, fingerprinting, TEACH profiles, lesson planning, and time organizational tips just to name a few.

Our English Education Program hosted two summits for our current students, alumni, school district faculty, and SBU professors. The topic of the fall summit was "Building the Bridge: Connecting HS English Teachers with SBU English Professors: An Open Roundtable. The spring summit focused on English Language Learners and how best to help them in the context of a secondary English classroom.

Twice a year since 2003 the Authentic Interviewing Event for Interns in the EDL Program and Student Teachers in all the teacher programs have successfully prepared all candidates for the interview process. Consistently over 200 individual interviews occur in the span of one night with each participant getting 4 interviews. This event is a hallmark for both programs and serves to advance the intersectionality of program participants in productive ways for all.

Finally, members of the Educators Alumni Network (EAN) (over 700 strong to date) received valuable information through a seventh evening symposium on Chronic Absenteeism. This symposium explored the reasons behind chronic absenteeism and potential solutions to this growing problem. A leading Senior Director of Strategic Initiatives and National Partnerships at EdTrust was the keynote speaker with alumni, students and faculty from both the Teacher Programs and the Educational Leadership Program in attendance. It should be noted that students in the recent internship had to engage with school administrators on developing a plan that would address specifically how their school/district might address this challenge and improve student attendance.

Part II: Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth

AAQEP does not require public posting of the information in Part II, but programs **may** post it at their discretion.

6. Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth and Improvement

This section charts ongoing improvement processes in relation to each AAQEP standard and recent activities related to investigating data quality. Table 5 may focus on an aspect of one or two standards each year, with only brief entries regarding ongoing efforts for those standards that are not the focus in the current year.

Table 5. Provider Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement

Standard 1	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	Educational Leadership Programs: To continue to hire and support highly qualified faculty who have the expertise necessary to impart the knowledge and skills necessary for our students to become effective educational and building/district leaders. Teacher Education: The TCPDF is well equipped to address standard 1 foundational skills and knowledge with 3 data points across 3 semesters on all criteria. We have additional goals this year including updating/revising curricula for LIN 344/544/CEE 594 to better address language acquisition and development, updating/revising curricula for CEF 347/547 to enhance evidence-based support, and adding a new course on Educational Technology for all teacher candidates to more effectively support thoughtful and appropriate utilization of educational technologies including AI. Both Teacher Education and Educational Leadership: To review the Stony Brook Online Assessment System for which has been written and developed by members of both the D-TALE Faculty and technology experts from DoIT (Division of Information Technology) to ensure we are collecting accurate quantitative and qualitative data for meaningful data analysis for continuous improvement.
Actions	Educational Leadership Programs: This goal can be attained by designing an effective pipeline for attracting qualified individuals and vetting their expertise through effective selection processes. Teacher Education Programs: This goal can be achieved through the efforts of the teacher education faculty across unique academic areas and with direct support from our Department of Linguistics. Both: Our existing home-grown data system is in need of review and

	updating in partnership with our Division of Information Technology and Director of Program Assessment.
Expected outcomes	Educational Leadership Programs: If the focus stays on finding highly qualified individuals, then students will exhibit the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions of competent, caring, and effective professional educators. Teacher Education: Elevated teaching and learning outcomes in the identified core education courses and enhanced outcomes for standard 1(f) focus on educational technologies that support learning. Both: Either we will continue to use the SBU homegrown assessment system or will be looking at purchasing another assessment system.
Reflections or comments	Overall, we plan to pursue a multi-pronged strategy to ensure we continue to have the best faculty, the most appropriate and aligned curriculum, and the most effective technology.
Standard 2	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	Educational Leadership Program: To continue to support program interns in their desire to engage in clinical work in multiple school settings and to expand the pilot externship program. Teacher Education: While we have data to address standard 2 from TCPDF and DSF (Disciplinary Standard Forms, we recognize the need to enhance our data gathering efforts to better understand how our teacher graduates fare after graduation. We will increase our commitment to gathering and tracking post-employment outcomes.
Actions	Educational Leadership Programs: Once interns have secured another school setting a collaborative relationship will be established to ensure that the intern has a meaningful experience. Build out needed support for pilot externship program. Teacher Education: Convene focus groups with key stakeholders to better understand (comparative) post graduate outcomes, identify strengths and areas for improvement, and continue to advocate for a broader Mid-Hudson valley replica assessment program for Long Island.
Expected outcomes	Educational Leadership Programs: Interns who have elected to work in another school setting will develop those strategies and reflective habits that will enhance their effectiveness as school leaders. Teacher Education: Faculty will have a greater understanding of detailed comparative strengths and weaknesses based on additional survey and focus group data.
Reflections or comments	Overall we recognize the need to develop a more robust data gathering ecosystem to inform continuous improvement with a focus on better understanding post-employment outcomes particularly within the first 1-5 years post-graduation.
Standard 3	

Goals for the 2025-26 year	Sustain and strengthen extensive network of K-12 educators and administrators across Long Island
Actions	Increase number and type of convenings (.e.g hosting superintendent conferences on campus and theme-based conferences like the SUNY AI conference to explore intersection of AI and education.
Expected outcomes	Increased visibility of SBU program and students. Continued access to attractive and supportive clinical placement sites in proximity to the SBU campus. High levels of stakeholder engagement.
Reflections or comments	We are most fortunate to have a strong regional brand presence and extended professional network that spans across teacher education and leader education spheres. Our goal this year is to spend more time nurturing these relationships and actively seeking synergistic opportunities (e.g. we are home to a NYS Master Teacher program that provides 5 years of enrichment and networking to approximately 100 high performing high school teachers, and yet we have yet to fully leverage this network systematically to the benefit of all of our students.

Standard 4	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	We plan to provide greater clarity to prospective students, key K-12 stakeholders and SBU faculty and staff about the pathways toward teacher education and certification and educational leader education and certification. Strengthening partnership with local community colleges to nurture transfer student population to SBU.
Actions	Complete redesign of Teacher Education and Educational Leader Webpages to align with new accessibility standards and updated communications and program marketing materials. Increased networking with SBU Enrollment Management and SBU Graduate School. Review the 'Guide to Teacher Education' by July 1, 2026.
Expected outcomes	Increased number of applications (consistent with growing UGRD applications overall at SBU) and a greater proportion of total SBU UGRD students enrolled in teacher education. Increased number of applications to the MAT programs.
Reflections or comments	We have known for some time that we need to do a much more effective job communicating teacher education pathways (in particular) to prospective students and key stakeholders. The changing web accessibility standards provide a convenient and timely nudge to support this goal.

Update on Activities to Investigate Data Quality

Data quality investigations are essential to work across the standards. This section documents activities in the 2024-25 reporting year related to ensuring data quality.

> As noted previously, we maintain an in-house data eco-system to facilitate the distribution of surveys and curation and collection of data. This is the same system we utilized in 2023-24 reporting period. It is dense but functional. We push out data regularly to faculty in both the Teacher Education and Educational Leadership programs. We provide both automatic and manual nudges for students, faculty, and cooperating teachers/administrators to complete required surveys in a timely fashion. Also as mentioned earlier, one activity we spent significant time on this year related to data quality was back-end work to unpack enrollment data to more effectively identify joint BA/MAT and BS/MAT student pathways, something made more complicated because of the manner and timing in which degrees are awarded. Simply put, there is more manual effort required to examine the data for this joint degree population of students than there is in tracking data for the other unique populations (undergraduate only, MAT only, or AGC in EDL).

7. Evidence Related to AAQEP-Identified Concerns or Conditions

This section documents how concerns or conditions that were noted in an accreditation decision are being addressed (indicate "n/a" if no concerns or conditions were noted). If a condition has been noted, a more detailed focused report will be needed in addition to the description included here. Please contact staff with any questions regarding this section.

> We noted in the response to the 2023-24 review a request for greater clarity in relation to time to degree completion rates for both teacher education candidates and educational leadership candidates. We have provided the relevant data for this year but caution the interpretation of the data in a standard fashion with respect to teacher education candidates. Stony Brook University's historic practice has been to award 'both' the bachelor's and master's degrees earned for joint BA/MAT and BS/MAT candidates at the same time---upon completion of the master's degree. These joint degree candidates make up a significant portion of all teacher education conferrals, and the data is skewed as a result. We are currently working with senior administration, the Registrar's office, and the Graduate School at SBU to change this practice such that in the future, candidates in joint BA/MAT and BS/MAT degree programs will be awarded their baccalaureate degree once all requirements for that degree have been met, which in most cases will be similar to the time frame for BA/BS candidates. The joint programs offer students an opportunity to enroll in and utilize 15 credits of graduate course work in their senior year to count toward their UGRD degree. We hope to have this change in place for the graduating class in May 2027.
>
> We also recognize the need to more effectively capture, track, and communicate post graduate employment outcomes for all our teacher and educational leader graduates.

8. Anticipated Growth and Development

This section summarizes planned improvements, innovations, or anticipated new program developments, including description of any identified potential challenges or barriers.

<u>Educational Leadership Programs</u>: The EDL program is very large, and changes are best accomplished through focused pilot programs, two of which we are planning for the next year. The first pilot involves enhanced instructional/technological design support for faculty teaching online courses from our Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching whereby each lead faculty for a course spends ~6 months redesigning and enhancing courses to ensure ongoing alignment of course and program learning outcomes, ongoing development of authentic assessments, and ensuring that new accessibility standards are realized. The second pilot involves expanding the size of the administrative externship program which is designed to help develop professional elationships and networks and provide additional mentorship to junior level administrators.

<u>Teacher Education</u>: We are currently discussing and considering the development of new program proposals for: (1) an Advanced Graduate Certificate in Elementary Math, (2) an Advanced Graduate Certificate or possibly an MAT in Computer Science Education, (3) Creating a path for combined BA in Linguistics and English with an MAT in English leading to two certifications (TESOL/ENL + English), (4) Seeking initial certification for a program in Native American and Indigenous Studies, (5) Developing online MAT's for Italian and Spanish to complement the one we already have in French, (6) possible development of an MAT in Music, and (7) possible development of an Advanced Graduate Certificate in TESOL.

9. Regulatory Changes

This section notes new or anticipated regulatory requirements and the provider's response to those changes (indicate "n/a" if no changes have been made or are anticipated).

N/A

10. Sign Off

Provider's Primary Contact for AAQEP (Name, Title)	Dean/Lead Administrator (Name, Title)
Susan Ross, Associate Director School Partnerships, Teacher and Educational Leader Certification	Peter Diplock, Vice Provost, Continuing, Professional and Online Education, and the School of Professional Development

Date sent to AAQEP:	December 31, 2025