



## AAQEP Annual Report for 2025

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| Provider/Program Name:   | Iona University |
| End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or "n/a" if not yet accredited): | 12/31/2031      |

## 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.

In keeping with the mission of the University and the demands of the teaching profession, the Education Department at Iona University is committed to preparing teacher candidates who will be:

- Committed to the service of others as the fundamental condition of educational practice and to social justice as its guiding principle.
- Directed by the needs of diverse communities of learners and the belief that every child can learn.
- Motivated to excel as lifelong learners, critical thinkers, and problem-solvers, as well as leaders in their classrooms and communities.

At Iona, our students experience a supportive environment and graduate with the skills necessary to be exceptional educators and 21st century leaders. Students leave Iona with the strategies, knowledge, content and pedagogy needed to become a New York state certified teachers and bring the joy of learning into their classrooms

## 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.iona.edu/academics/schools-institutes/school-arts-science/education-department>

## 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**

| <b>Degree or Program</b> offered by the institution/organization | <b>Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential</b> granted by the state | <b>Number of Candidates Enrolled</b> in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 06/25) | <b>Number of Completers</b> in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 06/25) |
|--|--|--|---|
| <b><i>Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials</i></b> |  |  |   |
| Bachelor of Science  | Initial Certificate - Childhood Education (1-6)                                    | 24   | 8   |
|  | Initial Certificate – Childhood & Early Childhood Education (B-2) (Dual Program)   | 54   | 15  |
|  | Initial Certificate – Adolescent Education: Biology (7-12)                         | 0  | 0   |
|  | Initial Certificate – Adolescent Education: Mathematics (7-12)                     | 2 (BA)   | 1 (BA)  |

|   |   |     |    |
|---|---|-----|----|
| Bachelor of Art   | Initial Certificate – Adolescent Education: Social Studies (7-12)             | 4   | 3  |
|   | Initial Certificate – Adolescent Education: English (7-12)                    | 3   | 2  |
|   | Initial Certificate - Adolescent Education: Spanish (7-12)                    | 1   | 0  |
| Master of Science in Teaching (MST)   | Initial Certificate: Childhood Education (1-6)                                | 8   | 3  |
|   | Initial Certificate: Childhood/Early Childhood Education (B-2) (Dual Program) | 17  | 4  |
|   | Initial Certificate: Childhood/Special Education (1-6) (Dual Program)         | 19  | 7  |
|   | Initial Certificate: Adolescent Education: Biology (7-12)                     | 0   | 0  |
|   | Initial Certificate: Adolescent Education: Mathematics (7-12)                 | 3   | 1  |
|   | Initial Certificate: Adolescent Education: Spanish (7-12)                     | 2   | 1  |
|   | Initial Certificate: Adolescent Education: Social Studies (7-12)              | 6   | 0  |
|   | Initial Certificate: Adolescent Education: Chemistry (7-12)                   | 0   | 0  |
|   | Initial Certificate: Adolescent Education: English (7-12)                     | 5   | 4  |
| Total for programs that lead to initial credentials   |   | 148 | 49 |
| <b><i>Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators</i></b> |   |     |    |

|  |   |                       |    |
|--|---|-----------------------|----|
| Master of Science in Education   | Initial Certificate – Special Education (All Grades)            | 5                     | 6  |
|  | Initial Certificate – Literacy (All Grades)                     | 7                     | 1  |
|  | Initial Certificate – Literacy & Special Education (All Grades) | 11                    | 2  |
|  | Initial Certificate – Early Childhood Special Education (B-2)   | 1                     | 1  |
| Bilingual Certification  |   | 8 (School Psychology) | 2  |
| Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials  |   | 32                    | 12 |
| <b><i>Programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials</i></b>  |   |                       |    |
| n/a  |   |                       |    |
| Total for programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials  |   |                       |    |
| <b><i>Programs that lead to credentials for specialized professionals or to no specific credential</i></b>             |   |                       |    |
| Interdisciplinary Advanced Certificate in Working with Young Deaf and Hard of Hearing Children & Their families (IACD) |   | 13                    | 8  |
| Integrated Language and Literacy   |   | 1                     | 0  |
| Total for programs that lead to specialized professional or no specific credentials                                    |   | 14                    | 8  |
| TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs   |   | 194                   | 69 |
| Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers  |   | 182                   | 69 |

## **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.)

Discontinued Programs: Adolescent Education BS/BA / Grade banded MSEd (except Early Childhood Special Education)

## **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. <b>Total enrollment</b> 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.         | 182 |
| B. <b>Total number of unique completers</b> (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. | 69  |
| C. <b>Number of recommendations</b> for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.   | 84  |

**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.

**EDU Undergraduate**

| Cohort | Cohort Count | 2 <sup>nd</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> Yr Retention Count | 2 <sup>nd</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> Yr Retention Rate | 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> Yr Retention Count | 3 <sup>rd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> Yr Retention Rate | 4-Yr Graduate Count | 4-Yr Graduation Rate | 5-Yr Graduate Count | 5-Yr Graduation Rate | 6 Year Graduate Count | 6-Yr Graduation Rate |
|--------|--------------|---|--|---|--|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 2017   | 37           | 37  | 100  | 37  | 100  | 32                  | 86.5                 | 34                  | 91.9                 | 34                    | 91.9                 |
| 2018   | 37           | 36  | 97.3   | 34  | 91.9   | 31                  | 83.8                 | 31                  | 83.8                 | 31                    | 83.8                 |
| 2019   | 35           | 32  | 91.4   | 31  | 88.6   | 26                  | 74.3                 | 26                  | 74.3                 | 26                    | 74.3                 |
| 2020   | 32           | 29  | 90.6   | 28  | 87.5   | 20                  | 62.5                 | 22                  | 68.8                 |                       |                      |
| 2021   | 34           | 34  | 100  | 33  | 97.1   | 24                  | 70.6                 |                     |                      |                       |                      |
| 2022   | 33           | 30  | 90.9   | 29  | 87.9   |                     |                      |                     |                      |                       |                      |
| 2023   | 27           | 23  | 85.2   |   |  |                     |                      |                     |                      |                       |                      |

Notes on undergraduate completion rates – Undergrads typically declare the major in the second semester of their Sophomore Year. Retention rates are based on persistence at the university

**EDU Graduate**

|                    | Cohort | Graduated in One Year | Graduated in 2 Years | Graduated in 3 Years | Total Graduated Within 3 Years | 3-Year Graduation Rate |
|--------------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>MSED</b>        | 21     | 3                     | 10                   | 2                    | 15                             | 71%                    |
| Spring 2022        | 2      | 0                     | 1                    | 1                    | 2                              | 100%                   |
| Summer (2-3) 2022  | 9      | 3                     | 3                    | 0                    | 6                              | 67%                    |
| Fall 2022          | 10     | 0                     | 6                    | 1                    | 7                              | 70%                    |
| <b>MST</b>         | 35     | 2                     | 20                   | 7                    | 29                             | 83%                    |
| Spring 2022        | 10     | 0                     | 6                    | 3                    | 9                              | 90%                    |
| Summer (2-3) 2022  | 7      | 1                     | 3                    | 0                    | 4                              | 57%                    |
| Fall 2022          | 18     | 1                     | 11                   | 4                    | 16                             | 89%                    |
| <b>Grand Total</b> | 56     | 5                     | 30                   | 9                    | 44                             | 79%                    |

**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%.

| Test Number | Test Name  | # Passed | # Taken | Pass Rate |
|-------------|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| 201         | Educating All Students   | 48       | 55      | 87.2%     |
| 211         | Multi Subject: Teachers of Early Childhood (B-2) Part 1 – ELA/Literacy | 16       | 20      | 80%       |
| 246         | Multi Subject: Teachers of Early Childhood (B-2) Part 2 – Mathematics  | 22       | 23      | 95.7%     |
| 221         | Multi Subject: Teachers of Childhood (1-6) Part 1 – Literacy/ELA       | 17       | 18      | 94.7%     |
| 222         | Multi Subject: Teachers of Childhood (1-6) Part 2 - Mathematics        | 22       | 29      | 76%       |
| 245         | Multi Subject: Part 3 – Arts & Sciences                                | 29       | 29      | 100%      |
| 003         | Content Specialty Test - English                                       | 4        | 7       | 57.1%     |
| 002         | Content Specialty Test - Mathematics                                   | 2        | 2       | 100%      |
| 115         | Content Specialty Test – Social Studies                                | 3        | 6       | 50%       |
| 160         | Content Specialty Test - Biology                                       | 4        | 4       | 100%      |
| 060         | Content Specialty Test – Students with Disabilities                    | 9        | 11      | 81.8%     |
| 065         | Content Specialty Test - Literacy                                      | 4        | 4       | 100%      |

Examinations with pass rates (cumulative at time of reporting) below 80% - Multi Subject: Teachers of Childhood (1-6) Part 2 – Mathematics, English CST, & Social Studies CST.

To combat low pass rates, the department is creating practice exams to be made available year-round to students as well as test simulations to make students more familiar with testing environments and expectations. The department will also work with content-area departments and faculty to better understand curriculum being taught and potentially align with content-area rubric items.

The department also purchased certification vouchers to offset costs of exams in an effort to increase Ns.

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

The program gathers evidence from recent completers through annual one- and two-year alumni surveys designed to capture employment outcomes and graduates' perceptions of how well the program prepared them for the workforce. Surveys were distributed to the 2022-23 and 2023-24 alumni cohorts to assess graduates' progress into employment, continued professional growth, and readiness to meet the demands of educational settings. Alumni were asked to indicate their level of agreement, on a five-point scale with statements aligned with the program's student learning outcomes (SLO's). While response rates were modest, the data provide meaningful insight into early career outcomes and offer valuable feedback from completers who recently transitioned from preparation to practice.

Our surveys suggested that completers generally perceive the program as effective in preparing them for the professional expectations of the field. Alumni from the 23-24 cohort most strongly agreed that the program supported their development of professional dispositions including punctuality, professional demeanor, ethical practice, respect for students, and collaboration with peers. Similarly, the 2022-23 cohort reported high levels of agreement related to collaboration and content knowledge expertise. Across both cohorts, alumni identified assessment design, application of learning theory, educational research, and technological literacies as areas for continued program improvement, providing actionable evidence to inform ongoing review and refinement aligned with AAQEP standards. The program also recognizes the need to strengthen alumni outreach and engagement efforts in order to improve survey response rates and ensure more comprehensive feedback from completers in future data collection cycles.

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

Iona University examines employer feedback annually through the Mid-Hudson School Study Council (MHSSC) Employer Survey, which evaluates the preparedness and performance of first-year teachers across the region. Employers consistently rate new teachers as positive contributors. This year's cohort averaged ratings around 4.0+ in overall teacher quality areas such as professional responsibility and impact on student learning. (p. 5). However, employer data also reveal regional instructional gaps. Indicators tied to project-based learning, inquiry methods, and differentiated instruction remain below pre-pandemic levels, with Project-Based Learning dropping from 3.56 (2019-2020) to 3.39 (2024-2025) and Inquiry Method of Instruction from 3.64 to 3.45 (p. 6-7). Open-ended responses reinforce these trends. 38% of administrators cited a need for stronger classroom management, and 38% emphasized better preparation in designing differentiated, student-centered instruction. (p. 8). Additionally, 24% highlighted the need for deeper literacy knowledge for all candidates, regardless of the certification area.

Iona uses these findings to strengthen alignment between program experiences and employer expectations. Regional hiring projections further shape program responsiveness. Districts anticipate needing 46 new secondary mathematics teachers and 77 new SWD 7-12 generalists within the next three years (p. 11). Together, these data points clarify the landscape: employers value

the professionalism and immediate impact of new teachers, including Iona graduates, while signaling persistent instructional gaps and shortage areas that guide Iona's ongoing curricular refinement and clinical preparation efforts.

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.

The program works with the Career Center for Career Development and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics to evaluate completers' post-graduate outcome data. We follow the NACE (National Association of Colleges and Employers) standards and protocols. Approximately six months after the commencement ceremony in May, a survey is sent to graduates by the Career Center. Two key metrics guide the reporting: the knowledge rate, which reflects the percentage of graduates for whom we have verifiable information, and the career outcomes rate, which measures the proportion of graduates achieving positive outcomes. Throughout the process, we verify data whenever possible, adhere to consistent collection protocols, and report all findings in aggregate form to ensure accuracy and transparency.

The table below illustrates the 2024 Education completer's post-graduate outcome data.

|                                    | Number of Survey Respondents | Percentage employed, enrolled in grad school, or participating in volunteer/service projects | Knowledge rate | Employed full-time | Continuing Education | Seeking employment |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|----------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Education Undergraduate Completers | 17                           | 88%  | 71%            | 29%                | 59%                  | 12%                |
| Education Graduate Completers      | 34                           | 100%   | 69%            | 100%               | --                   | --                 |

The Education Department also sends out a 1- and 2-year alumni survey in January to all program completers. The purpose of the alumni survey is to understand our graduates' post-graduate employment status as well as to measure completers' own perceptions of how well they were prepared in the areas aligned with the Education department's Student Learning Objectives (d-SLOs).

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.

Since the submission of the Education Department's QAR and decision meeting, the full-time faculty and staff have remained consistent. The department has hired six adjunct instructors to teach a variety of undergraduate and graduate-level courses. The department is also in the process of hiring up to 4 clinical supervisors to support the Director of Clinical Experiences in observing and supporting our undergraduate and graduate students in their student teaching and practicum placements.

#### 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**

| <b>Provider-selected measures<br/>(name and description)</b> | <b>Criteria for success</b>   | <b>Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation</b>  |
|--|---|---|
| Completer Survey   | 90% of rubric scores are at a proficient level or higher. For all measures, a score of 3 or higher indicates proficiency. <i>Assessed via the Education Department's d-SLO Rubric</i> | On a 4-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 4 = Strongly Agree), average ratings across all Standard 1 indicators ranged from 3.62 to 3.72, demonstrating consistent agreement that completers felt adequately prepared in instructional planning/design, assessment, learning theory application, and creating supportive learning environments. These results exceeded the program's benchmark of 90% of scores at or above 3 (Meeting Expectations) and indicate strong perceived preparedness across all domains of candidate performance. |

| <p>Mid-Hudson School Study Council (MHSSC) Employer Survey</p> | <p>Because the MHSSC uses a 1-5 preparedness scale rather than the program's 4-point rubric, the program interprets a mean rating of 3.0 ('Adequately Prepared') as the equivalent of meeting expectations for proficiency. This interpretation was used in the previous QAR cycle and continues to support consistency in evaluating employer feedback. <i>Assessed via Rubrics Unique to the Assessment</i></p> | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Standard</th><th>MHSSC Indicator</th><th>Mean Score</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1a</td><td>Blended Learning</td><td>3.48</td></tr> <tr> <td>1a</td><td>Project-Based Learning</td><td>3.39</td></tr> <tr> <td>1a</td><td>Inquiry Method of Instruction</td><td>3.45</td></tr> <tr> <td>1a</td><td>Content Knowledge</td><td>3.71</td></tr> <tr> <td>1b</td><td>Pedagogy and Differentiation of Instruction</td><td>3.58</td></tr> <tr> <td>1c</td><td>Culturally Responsive Educational Practice</td><td>3.52</td></tr> <tr> <td>1d</td><td>Designing Valid Student Assessments (Including SLO's)</td><td>3.51</td></tr> <tr> <td>1d</td><td>Understanding and Interpreting IEP/504's</td><td>3.53</td></tr> <tr> <td>1d</td><td>Benchmarking Student Progress</td><td>3.49</td></tr> <tr> <td>1d</td><td>Using Data Effectively</td><td>3.43</td></tr> <tr> <td>1e</td><td>Classroom Management</td><td>3.53</td></tr> </tbody> </table> | Standard       | MHSSC Indicator   | Mean Score          | 1a | Blended Learning | 3.48 | 1a | Project-Based Learning | 3.39 | 1a | Inquiry Method of Instruction | 3.45 | 1a | Content Knowledge | 3.71 | 1b | Pedagogy and Differentiation of Instruction | 3.58 | 1c | Culturally Responsive Educational Practice | 3.52 | 1d | Designing Valid Student Assessments (Including SLO's) | 3.51 | 1d | Understanding and Interpreting IEP/504's | 3.53 | 1d | Benchmarking Student Progress | 3.49 | 1d | Using Data Effectively | 3.43 | 1e | Classroom Management | 3.53 |
|--|---|---|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|----|------------------|------|----|------------------------|------|----|-------------------------------|------|----|-------------------|------|----|---|------|----|--|------|----|---|------|----|--|------|----|-------------------------------|------|----|------------------------|------|----|----------------------|------|
| Standard   | MHSSC Indicator   | Mean Score  |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1a   | Blended Learning  | 3.48  |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1a   | Project-Based Learning  | 3.39  |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1a   | Inquiry Method of Instruction   | 3.45  |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1a   | Content Knowledge   | 3.71  |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1b   | Pedagogy and Differentiation of Instruction   | 3.58  |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1c   | Culturally Responsive Educational Practice  | 3.52  |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1d   | Designing Valid Student Assessments (Including SLO's)   | 3.51  |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1d   | Understanding and Interpreting IEP/504's  | 3.53  |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1d   | Benchmarking Student Progress   | 3.49  |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1d   | Using Data Effectively  | 3.43  |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1e   | Classroom Management  | 3.53  |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| <p>Iona TPA (Teacher performance Assessment)</p>               | <p><i>90% of rubric scores are at a proficient level (3 or higher on each item indicates proficiency). Iona's TPA correlates with and assesses AAQEP standards 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, &amp; 1f.</i></p>  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>AAQEP Standard</th><th>Mean Rubric Score</th><th>Percentage <math>\geq</math> 3</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1a</td><td>3.76</td><td>98%</td></tr> <tr> <td>1b</td><td>3.40</td><td>93%</td></tr> <tr> <td>1c</td><td>3.71</td><td>98%</td></tr> <tr> <td>1d</td><td>3.76</td><td>100%</td></tr> <tr> <td>1e</td><td>3.98</td><td>100%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>   | AAQEP Standard | Mean Rubric Score | Percentage $\geq$ 3 | 1a | 3.76             | 98%  | 1b | 3.40                   | 93%  | 1c | 3.71                          | 98%  | 1d | 3.76              | 100% | 1e | 3.98  | 100% |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| AAQEP Standard   | Mean Rubric Score   | Percentage $\geq$ 3   |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1a   | 3.76  | 98%   |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1b   | 3.40  | 93%   |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1c   | 3.71  | 98%   |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1d   | 3.76  | 100%  |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |
| 1e   | 3.98  | 100%  |                |                   |                     |    |                  |      |    |                        |      |    |                               |      |    |                   |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |   |      |    |  |      |    |                               |      |    |                        |      |    |                      |      |

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

| Provider-selected measures<br>(name and description)    | Criteria for success   | Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation   |                  |                   |                     |                  |    |                       |     |     |    |                                  |      |     |    |                               |      |     |    |                                   |      |     |
|---|--|---|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|----|-----------------------|-----|-----|----|----------------------------------|------|-----|----|-------------------------------|------|-----|----|-----------------------------------|------|-----|
| Completer Survey  | 90% of rubric scores are at a proficient level or higher. For all measures, a score of 3 or higher indicates proficiency. <i>Assessed via the Education Department's d-SLO Rubric</i>  | Completers met expectations for Standard 2, with mean scores on rubric items between 3.63 - 3.80. All indicators exceeded the benchmark of 90% scoring at or above 3, reflecting strong preparation in communication, collaboration, culturally responsive practice, and continued growth. The strongest indicators included professional growth and development (3.80), collaboration with colleagues (3.72), and professional integrity (3.75). No indicators fell below proficiency.   |                  |                   |                     |                  |    |                       |     |     |    |                                  |      |     |    |                               |      |     |    |                                   |      |     |
| Mid-Hudson School Study Council (MHSSC) Employer Survey | Because the MHSSC uses a 1-5 preparedness scale rather than the program's 4-point rubric, the program interprets a mean rating of 3.0 ('Adequately Prepared') as the equivalent of meeting expectations for proficiency. This interpretation was used in the previous QAR cycle and continues to support consistency in evaluating employer feedback. <i>Assessed via Rubrics Unique to the Assessment</i> | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Standard</th> <th>MHSSC Indicator</th> <th>Mean Score</th> <th>Met Expectation?</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2a</td> <td>1.2 Parent Engagement</td> <td>3.5</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2b</td> <td>1.11 Working w/ Diverse Students</td> <td>3.62</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2e</td> <td>1.14 Engagement in Prof. Dev.</td> <td>3.56</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2f</td> <td>1.3 Collaboration with Colleagues</td> <td>3.68</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>All standard 2 indicators exceeded the program's proficiency benchmark of 3.0 on the 1-5 preparedness scale. This indicates that employers rate graduates as adequately to well prepared in the core competencies of Standard 2.</p> | Standard         | MHSSC Indicator   | Mean Score          | Met Expectation? | 2a | 1.2 Parent Engagement | 3.5 | Yes | 2b | 1.11 Working w/ Diverse Students | 3.62 | Yes | 2e | 1.14 Engagement in Prof. Dev. | 3.56 | Yes | 2f | 1.3 Collaboration with Colleagues | 3.68 | Yes |
| Standard  | MHSSC Indicator  | Mean Score  | Met Expectation? |                   |                     |                  |    |                       |     |     |    |                                  |      |     |    |                               |      |     |    |                                   |      |     |
| 2a  | 1.2 Parent Engagement  | 3.5   | Yes              |                   |                     |                  |    |                       |     |     |    |                                  |      |     |    |                               |      |     |    |                                   |      |     |
| 2b  | 1.11 Working w/ Diverse Students   | 3.62  | Yes              |                   |                     |                  |    |                       |     |     |    |                                  |      |     |    |                               |      |     |    |                                   |      |     |
| 2e  | 1.14 Engagement in Prof. Dev.  | 3.56  | Yes              |                   |                     |                  |    |                       |     |     |    |                                  |      |     |    |                               |      |     |    |                                   |      |     |
| 2f  | 1.3 Collaboration with Colleagues  | 3.68  | Yes              |                   |                     |                  |    |                       |     |     |    |                                  |      |     |    |                               |      |     |    |                                   |      |     |
| Iona TPA (Teacher Performance Assessment)               | <i>90% of scaled* rubric scores are at a proficient level or higher. (3 or higher on each rubric item indicates proficiency) Iona's TPA</i>  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>AAQEP Standard</th> <th>Mean rubric Score</th> <th>Percentage <math>\geq</math> 3</th> </tr> </thead> </table>  | AAQEP Standard   | Mean rubric Score | Percentage $\geq$ 3 |                  |    |                       |     |     |    |                                  |      |     |    |                               |      |     |    |                                   |      |     |
| AAQEP Standard  | Mean rubric Score  | Percentage $\geq$ 3   |                  |                   |                     |                  |    |                       |     |     |    |                                  |      |     |    |                               |      |     |    |                                   |      |     |

|  |   |    |      |      |
|--|---|----|------|------|
|  | <i>correlates with and assesses AAQEP standards 2b, 2c, and 2e.</i> | 2b | 3.93 | 100% |
|  |   | 2c | 3.86 | 98%  |
|  |   | 2e | 3.90 | 100% |

## 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 Education Department has made significant student-centered progress in strengthening certification readiness and post-completion support. We expanded direct exam preparation by securing and distributing state exam vouchers, removing a major financial barrier for candidates, and increasing exam preparation. In tandem, we are actively working on creating additional preparation initiatives – including practice exams for CSTs and upcoming test-simulation experiences – to build students’ confidence and familiarity with certification assessments.

We also invested in meaningful alumni engagement and workforce development by expanding our CTLE (Continuing Teacher and Leader Education) offerings and moving toward a more cohesive alumni network. Our team developed and hosted new CTLE eligible workshops designed to support graduates and our external stakeholders in meeting professional requirements while staying connected to the institution. In addition, we strengthened our outreach strategies to maintain consistent communication with alumni, support their certification needs, and foster a more cohesive alumni community within the department. Together, these efforts signal a more integrated approach to candidate and alumni support.