



## AAQEP Annual Report for 2024

Provider/Program Name:	Stony Brook University's Distributed Teacher and Leader Education (D-TALE)
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 paradigm for teacher education and educational leadership diverges from that found in most other institutions. Its uniqueness and strength are inherent in its university-wide, distributed model that places its teacher education and educational leadership programs in their respective academic departments. This departmentally based model ensures academic rigor in the discipline, the integration of pedagogical theory and practice, and close contact to faculty and research opportunities for graduate and undergraduate students, as proposed in the Boyer Commission Report on recommended enhancements in undergraduate programs located at Carnegie Category I Research Universities (Boyer, 1998). Education faculty appointments within their respective academic departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences and the School of Health Professions provide fertile academic environments for research and scholarship. Faculty and teacher candidates engage in a range of department-based experiences that include research-based learning, scholarly investigations, broad use of technology and multimedia, and professional development activities with both colleagues and peers. Along with the pursuit of research and scholarship is participation in opportunities for campus and community collaborations, outreach and authentic experiences that encourage data collecting, observation and reflection.

Education faculty are also members of the Distributed Teacher and Leader Education (D-TALE) Program, which was established to coordinate the Stony Brook teacher education and educational leadership programs and to promote academic, professional, scholarly and intellectual excellence in the preparation of P-12 professionals. D-TALE is housed in the School of Professional Development and operates in conjunction with the Graduate School and the Colleges of Arts and Sciences.

D-TALE's purpose is to bring together the diverse educational units on our campus, each one a part of an academic department, and form them into a coherent unit with common principles, goals, outcomes and assessments. D-TALE

promotes cross-disciplinary discourse, curriculum development, and collaborations bringing faculty and teacher candidates together for joint exploration of shared concerns, goals and visions as well as encouraging the creation of innovative programs and workshops. D-TALE provides a forum for faculty to broaden the diverse disciplinary and pedagogical perspectives of their programs, and it creates opportunities for the cross-fertilization of pedagogic ideas and practices for both faculty and their teacher candidates.

The D-TALE paradigm for teacher education and educational leadership provides a framework that promotes professional excellence and growth for faculty and teacher candidates, fosters diverse disciplinary perspectives and learning communities, and cultivates lifelong inquiry and learning, leadership, and professional service. Each teacher education program brings forth its own unique disciplinary perspectives and approaches into D-TALE for joint research and investigation of shared concerns for teacher candidates and alumni. Our paradigm strengthens the integration of disciplinary content and pedagogy within and across departments. It enhances appreciation of diverse academic perspectives, and it strengthens collaborative partnerships on campus, in the community and with other higher education institutions. This is the context that drives our conceptual framework and our goals in building a united, yet inherently diverse, professional community that includes faculty, teacher candidates, alumni, educational personnel and P-12 students in partnering schools. D-TALE provides a unifying vision and philosophy; it fosters a cohesive approach to research-based curriculum design and assessment; and it ensures unified programs for fieldwork and clinical practice.

**Programs that are included in our AAQEP review are:**

### **Programs That Lead to Initial Teaching Credentials**

<b>Degree or Certificate</b>	<b>Initial/Professional Certificate granted by the New York State Education Department</b>
<b>Bachelor of Arts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Chinese (7-12)</li><li>• Earth Science (7-12)</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English (7-12)</li> <li>• French (7-12)</li> <li>• Italian (7-12)</li> <li>• Japanese (7-12)</li> <li>• Korean (7-12)</li> <li>• Social Studies (7-12)</li> <li>• Spanish (7-12)</li> <li>• TESOL (P-12)</li> </ul>
<b>Bachelor of Science</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chemistry (7-12)</li> <li>• Mathematics (7-12)</li> </ul>
<b>Master of Arts in English as a Second Language</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TESOL (P-12)</li> </ul>
<b>Master of Arts in Teaching</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biology (7-12)</li> <li>• Chemistry (7-12)</li> <li>• Earth Science (7-12)</li> <li>• English (7-12)</li> <li>• French (7-12)</li> <li>• Italian (7-12)</li> <li>• Mathematics (7-12)</li> <li>• Physics (7-12)</li> <li>• Social Studies (7-12)</li> <li>• Spanish (7-12)</li> </ul>
<b>Bachelor of Arts/Master of Arts in Teaching</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chemistry (7-12)</li> <li>• Earth Science (7-12)</li> <li>• English (7-12)</li> <li>• French (7-12)</li> <li>• Spanish (7-12)</li> <li>• Social Studies (7-12)</li> </ul>
<b>Bachelor of Science/Master of Arts in Teaching</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biology (7-12)</li> <li>• Mathematics (7-12)</li> <li>• Physics (7-12)</li> </ul>

- Spanish (7-12)
- TESOL (P-12)

### Programs That Lead to Additional or Advanced Credentials

**Degree or Certificate**

**Initial/Professional Certificate granted by the New York State Education Department**

**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 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 for each program included in the AAQEP review.

**Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2023-2024**

<b>Degree or Certificate</b> granted by the institution or organization	<b>State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential</b>	<b>Number of Candidates</b> enrolled in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending mm/yy)	<b>Number of Completers</b> in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending mm/yy)
<b><i>Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials</i></b>			
Bachelor of Arts	Initial Certification: Korean (Grades 7-12)	2	0
	Initial Certification: Chinese (Grades 7-12)	2	1
	Initial Certification: Japanese (Grades 7-12)	2	1
	Initial Certification: French (Grades 7-12)	1	
	Initial Certification: Social Studies (Grades 7-12)	26	7
	Initial Certification: TESOL (Grades PreK-12)	7	7
	Initial Certification: Spanish (Grades 7-12)	10	1
	Initial Certification: English (Grades 7-12)	44	14
	Initial Certification: Italian (Grades 7-12)	2	0
Bachelor of Science	Initial Certification: Mathematics (Grades 7-12)	18	4
	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)	31	10
Master of Arts in Teaching	Initial Certification: Spanish (Grades 7-12)	11	5
	Initial Certification: Social Studies (Grades 7-12)	47	22
	Initial Certification: Biology (Grades 7-12)	37	19
	Initial Certification: Mathematics (Grades 7-12)	16	12
	Initial Certification: Chemistry (Grades 7-12)	2	1
	Initial Certification: English (Grades 7-12)	37	12
	Initial Certification: Earth Science (Grades 7-12)	3	1
	Initial Certification: French (Grades 7-12)	3	2
	Initial Certification: Italian (Grades 7-12)	2	1
	Initial Certification: Physics (Grades 7-12)	4	1
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		356	149
<b><i>Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators</i></b>			
Advanced Graduate Certificate	Initial Certification: School Building Leader (Grades PreK-12) Professional Certification: School District Leader (Grades PreK-12)	569	122

Advanced Graduate Certificate	Professional Certification: School District Business Leader (Grades PreK-12)	14	5
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		583	127
<b><i>Programs that lead to credentials for other school professionals or to no specific credential</i></b>			
Master of Science in Speech-Language Pathology	Initial Certification: Speech and Language Disabilities (Grades PreK-12)	52	26
Total for additional programs		52	26
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs		991	302
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers		991	302

### 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.)

None

### 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.

991



<p><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.</p>
<p>302</p>
<p><b>C. Number of recommendations</b> for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.</p>
<p>265</p>
<p><b>D. Cohort completion rates</b> for candidates who completed the various programs within their respective program’s expected timeframe <b>and</b> in 1.5 times the expected timeframe.</p>
<p>There are various expected timeframes depending upon the program: 4 year completion for undergraduate students, 5 year completion for students who start as undergraduates and chooses a 5<sup>th</sup> year that will conclude with both a Bachelors and Masters Degree, Master of Arts in Teaching Degree where a graduate student usually spends approximately 2 years to achieve the MAT, and the EDL Advanced Graduate Certificate in Educational Administration where students are mostly full time teachers and they will complete the program at their own individual pace.</p> <p>The vast majority of undergraduate/graduate students meet the expected 4-year or 5-year timeframe for completion of both their content level Bachelors and/or Masters degree plus meeting the requirements for Teacher Certification.</p>
<p><b>E. Summary of state license examination results</b>, including teacher performance assessments, and specification of any examinations on which the pass rate (cumulative at time of reporting) was below 80%.</p>
<p>None – Our students in the 4-year undergraduate or 5-year undergraduate/graduate programs have a Passing Rate on the Educating All Students Exam at 96% for the first attempt. 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 a 95% passing rate for the first attempt. The 95% is actually higher for most content programs when you consider that several students who are not in a specific content level program will take another content level CST seeking a second teacher certification. For example, in World Languages, it is not unusual for a Spanish content degree student to also take the Italian CST and vice versa seeking the second language certification. Thus, the 95% actually includes students that aren’t majoring in that specific content level area, as well as those who are.</p>

F. Narrative 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 95% to 100% 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 95% was Question 11 which is, “Teacher education faculty clearly explained requirements for certification so that I was able to select appropriate courses.”

### **Teacher Candidate Assessment of Stony Brook Program (TCASBP)** **Questions 2023-2024**

- **Q1 represents** “My study at Stony Brook helped me understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline.”
- **Q2 represents** “My study at Stony Brook 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 Stony Brook 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 Stony Brook 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 Stony Brook 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 Stony Brook 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 Stony Brook 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 Stony Brook 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 Stony Brook helped encouraged 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 Stony Brook 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
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
<b>Neither Agree or Disagree</b>	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	0
<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	3	12	7	6	7	8	6	3	1	3	9	3	5
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	54	44	50	51	50	49	50	53	56	55	46	53	53

**PERCENTAGES**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	0%	2%	2%	2%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	2%	2%	0%
<b>Neither Agree or Disagree</b>	2%	2%	0%	0%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%	3%	2%	0%
<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	5%	21%	12%	10%	12%	14%	10%	5%	2%	5%	16%	5%	9%
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	93%	76%	86%	88%	86%	84%	86%	91%	97%	95%	79%	91%	91%
<b>Somewhat &amp; Strongly Agree</b>	98%	97%	98%	98%	98%	98%	97%	97%	98%	100%	95%	97%	100%

Our Educational Administration Candidates, upon exiting our programs, are asked to complete an assessment of the Stony Brook Educational Administrative Program. When combining “Somewhat” and “Strongly” Agree Categories, the range for the 10 questions was from 92% to 99% indicating that our students were satisfied with their experiences within our EDL program. The lowest score when combining the two categories of “Somewhat” and “Strongly” agree at 92% was Question 3 which is, “Equity and Cultural Responsiveness: Effective educational leaders strive for equity of educational opportunity and culturally responsive practices to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.” This observation has been brought to the attention of the EDL Administration for discussion with the EDL Faculty.

**Cooperating Intern Assessment of the Stony Brook Program (CIASBP)  
From the EDL Program 2023-2024**

The Educational Leadership Program helped me to promote the success of all students by:

**Standard 1:** Mission, Vision, and Core Values: Effective educational leaders develop, advocate, and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high-quality education and

academic success and well-being of each student.

**Standard 2:** Ethics and Professional Norms: Effective educational leaders act ethically and according to professional norms to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

**Standard 3:** Equity and Cultural Responsiveness: Effective educational leaders strive for equity of educational opportunity and culturally responsive practices to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

**Standard 4:** Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment: Effective educational leaders develop and support intellectually rigorous and coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

**Standard 5:** Community of Care and Support for Students: Effective educational leaders cultivate an inclusive, caring, and supportive school community that promotes the academic success and well-being of each student.

**Standard 6:** Professional Capacity of School Personnel: Effective educational leaders develop the professional capacity and practice of school personnel to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

**Standard 7:** Professional Community for Teachers and Staff: Effective educational leaders foster a professional community of teachers and other professional staff to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

**Standard 8:** Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community: Effective educational leaders engage families and the community in meaningful, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial ways to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

**Standard 9:** Operations and Management: Effective educational leaders manage school operations and resources to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

**Standard 10:** School Improvement: Effective educational leaders act as agents of continuous improvement to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

**NUMBER**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Neither Agree or Disagree</b>	2	2	6	5	0	3	2	3	4	1
<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	9	8	9	13	11	8	10	15	10	11
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	78	80	74	72	78	79	78	72	75	78

**PERCENTAGE**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Somewhat Disagree</b>	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
<b>Neither Agree or Disagree</b>	2%	2%	7%	6%	0%	3%	2%	3%	4%	1%
<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	10%	9%	10%	14%	12%	9%	11%	17%	11%	12%
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	88%	89%	82%	80%	87%	88%	87%	80%	83%	87%
<b>Somewhat &amp; Strongly Agree</b>	98%	98%	92%	94%	99%	97%	98%	97%	94%	99%

G. Narrative 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 comes from our outreach efforts to encourage alumni to join our Educators Alumni Network (EAN), where we ask members about their current employment. However, with 124 independent and distinct school districts on Long Island alone, tracking the employment of completers proves challenging. Despite these difficulties, we distribute an Employer Survey to numerous administrators across these districts, with the hope that they are aware of any teachers who may be alumni of our programs. This survey was sent to 804 principals and assistant/associate principals in Nassau and Suffolk Counties, but regrettably, only three responses were received.

As previously mentioned, following up with our completers in New York State and obtaining data from their employers remains problematic for several reasons:

1. Long Island is home to numerous local colleges and universities, and many administrators may not know which institution a faculty member attended as a completer.
2. The absence of official state data means that the Educator Preparation Program (EPP) relies on informal sources to ascertain where our completers are teaching.
3. It is also likely that in many schools where surveys were sent, there were no alumni from our program. Given these challenges, the following data is provided:

The six survey questions that were asked were:

To what extent do the recent Stony Brook teacher education graduates with whom you have worked in a professional capacity understand the following:

- 1) Understand and engage local school and cultural communities and communicate and foster relationships with families/guardians /caregivers in a variety of communities.
- 2) Engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners and do so in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts.
- 3) Create productive learning environments and use strategies to develop productive learning environments in a variety of school contexts.

- 4) Support students' growth in international and global perspectives.
- 5) Establish goals for their own professional growth and engage in self-assessment, goal setting and reflection on their own practice.
- 6) Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning.

For all six questions, 67% responded "Moderately well" and 33% responded "Extremely well." Given the small sample size and the issues mentioned above, no conclusions could be drawn from this survey.

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

As mentioned in G. there is no formal data collection of our completers from New York State. We have to rely on each of our programs (English, World Languages, Math, Sciences, Social Studies, TESOL and EDL) to attempt to maintain contact with their respective program completers. Another hinderance is that Stony Brook University does not maintain a completer's university email address so, if we do not have a personal email address or if the person changes their personal email address, it becomes a problem to maintain contact. Again, our attempt to overcome this problem, is to invite each semesters' completers to join the Educators Alumni Network (EAN) which does ask for their present educational position and personal email address.

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.

#### 4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

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



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

Provider-Selected Measures for Teacher Preparation Programs	Explanation of Performance Expectation for Teacher Preparation Programs	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation for Teacher Preparation Programs																																																																								
<p><b>Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF) Assessment</b></p>	<p>As a result of the meetings with the Program Directors of the six Teacher Education Programs along with their faculty and with the release of the new InTASC standards, the New York State Professional standards and the D-TALE Proficiencies, a subcommittee was formed to revise the TCPDF in the winter of 2010 and met throughout the spring, 2011 semester.</p> <p>At a retreat, which was held in the spring of 2011, the group spent a large portion of the retreat working on the revisions of the TCPDF. As a result of this, a new version of the TCPDF was created. All members of the faculty received the tentative new version for final comments and input.</p> <p>The 2022-2023 academic year represents the 21st year of using</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF)</u></b> <b><u>for the EPP for Methods I All Levels- 2023-2024</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PERCENTAGES</u></b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="835 950 2074 1263"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Q1</th> <th>Q2</th> <th>Q3</th> <th>Q4</th> <th>Q5</th> <th>Q6</th> <th>Q7</th> <th>Q8</th> <th>Q9</th> <th>Q10</th> <th>Q11</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ineffective</td> <td>1.7%</td> <td>1.7%</td> <td>1.7%</td> <td>1.7%</td> <td>1.7%</td> <td>1.7%</td> <td>1.7%</td> <td>1.7%</td> <td>2.2%</td> <td>1.7%</td> <td>1.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Developing</td> <td>11.0%</td> <td>6.1%</td> <td>7.7%</td> <td>19.9%</td> <td>19.9%</td> <td>22.1%</td> <td>24.9%</td> <td>23.2%</td> <td>5.0%</td> <td>7.7%</td> <td>5.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Effective</td> <td>61.3%</td> <td>80.1%</td> <td>53.6%</td> <td>59.1%</td> <td>57.5%</td> <td>59.7%</td> <td>65.7%</td> <td>58.0%</td> <td>59.7%</td> <td>54.1%</td> <td>45.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Highly Effective &amp; Highly Effective Combined</td> <td>26.0%</td> <td>12.2%</td> <td>37.0%</td> <td>19.3%</td> <td>21.0%</td> <td>16.6%</td> <td>7.7%</td> <td>17.1%</td> <td>33.1%</td> <td>36.5%</td> <td>47.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Combined</td> <td>87.3%</td> <td>92.3%</td> <td>90.6%</td> <td>78.5%</td> <td>78.5%</td> <td>76.2%</td> <td>73.5%</td> <td>75.1%</td> <td>92.8%</td> <td>90.6%</td> <td>92.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Ineffective	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	2.2%	1.7%	1.7%	Developing	11.0%	6.1%	7.7%	19.9%	19.9%	22.1%	24.9%	23.2%	5.0%	7.7%	5.5%	Effective	61.3%	80.1%	53.6%	59.1%	57.5%	59.7%	65.7%	58.0%	59.7%	54.1%	45.9%	Highly Effective & Highly Effective Combined	26.0%	12.2%	37.0%	19.3%	21.0%	16.6%	7.7%	17.1%	33.1%	36.5%	47.0%	Combined	87.3%	92.3%	90.6%	78.5%	78.5%	76.2%	73.5%	75.1%	92.8%	90.6%	92.8%
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11																																																															
Ineffective	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	2.2%	1.7%	1.7%																																																															
Developing	11.0%	6.1%	7.7%	19.9%	19.9%	22.1%	24.9%	23.2%	5.0%	7.7%	5.5%																																																															
Effective	61.3%	80.1%	53.6%	59.1%	57.5%	59.7%	65.7%	58.0%	59.7%	54.1%	45.9%																																																															
Highly Effective & Highly Effective Combined	26.0%	12.2%	37.0%	19.3%	21.0%	16.6%	7.7%	17.1%	33.1%	36.5%	47.0%																																																															
Combined	87.3%	92.3%	90.6%	78.5%	78.5%	76.2%	73.5%	75.1%	92.8%	90.6%	92.8%																																																															

the revised TCPDF. InTASC Standards have not been changed since 2010 and the D-TALE Faculty believe the assessment standards in the TCPDF adequately measure our teacher candidates' professional development.

The Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF) is administered at the end of a teacher candidate's Methods I, Methods II and Student Teaching Practicum. The Stony Brook Faculty score the TCPDF at all these transition points and the Cooperating Teachers score the teacher candidate during the student teaching clinical practice, as well.

Performance Expectations anticipate that there will be more "Ineffective" and "Developing" scores as candidates are just entering the teacher education program at Methods I and the expectation is that the numbers of students who are scored at "Ineffective" and "Developing" drop as the students move into

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 I instruction. To note, even in Methods I, as students previously mentioned are just entering the program, the vast majority of students have been assessed as "Effective" and "Highly Effective" with the lowest of these combined scores at 73.%. Simply put, the lowest assessment when combining "Effective" and "Highly Effective" indicates that over 7 out of 10 students have been scored as "Effective" or "Highly Effective" leading to the conclusion that there are no major concerns with the Methods I programs.

**Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF)**  
**for the EPP for Methods II All Levels - 2023-2024**

**PERCENTAGES**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11
Ineffective	0.6%	1.2%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	1.2%	0.6%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
Developing	3.1%	1.2%	1.8%	10.4%	10.4%	9.2%	9.8%	9.8%	2.5%	2.5%	1.8%
Effective	54.6%	63.8%	45.4%	40.5%	42.3%	60.7%	45.4%	41.1%	56.4%	54.6%	44.2%
Highly Effect	41.7%	33.7%	51.5%	48.5%	46.6%	29.4%	43.6%	48.5%	39.9%	41.7%	52.8%
Effective & Highly Effective Combined	96.3%	97.5%	96.9%	89.0%	89.0%	90.2%	89.0%	89.6%	96.3%	96.3%	96.9%

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

Methods II and finally, Student Teaching.

Just as important is the data analyzed when combining the “Effective” and “Highly Effective” categories. The data for 2023-2024 support the concept that students, as a group, grow and move into the “Effective” and “Highly Effective” categories as they move through the program.

**Questions From the TCPDF  
2023-2024 Relating to Standard 1**

**TCPDF QUESTION 1. Understand 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**

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. Notice that the scoring of students at “Ineffective” and “Developing” is lower than the Methods I student scoring and consequently, the percentage of students scored at the “Effective” and “Highly Effective” categories is higher. The vast majority of students have been assessed as “Effective” and “Highly Effective” with the lowest of these combined scores at 89.%. Simply put, the lowest assessment when combining “Effective” and “Highly Effective” indicates that almost 9 out of 10 students have been scored as “Effective” or “Highly Effective” leading to the conclusion that there are no major concerns with the Methods II programs.

**Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF)  
for the EPP for Student Teaching All Levels - 2023-2024**

**PERCENTAGES**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11
Ineffective	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%
Developing	4.9%	3.6%	2.2%	4.1%	6.8%	6.1%	3.4%	5.6%	3.7%	4.4%	0.0%
Effective	52.9%	48.8%	37.9%	45.9%	50.0%	53.0%	50.7%	50.6%	48.5%	51.5%	48.8%
Highly Effective	41.5%	47.3%	59.7%	49.8%	42.7%	40.6%	45.6%	43.6%	47.6%	43.9%	51.2%
Effective & Highly Effective Combined	94.4%	96.1%	97.6%	95.6%	92.7%	93.7%	96.4%	94.2%	96.1%	95.4%	100.0%

**appropriate and challenging learning experiences. (*Knowledge and Performance*)**

**TCPDF QUESTION 2. Use 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. Work 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. Understand and use 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. Plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by**

There are no scores that meet the self imposed marker of 10% or more when combining “Ineffective” and “Developing.” The vast majority of students have been assessed as “Effective” and “Highly Effective” with the lowest of these combined scores at 92.7.%. Simply put, the lowest assessment when combining “Effective” and “Highly Effective” indicates that more than 9 out of 10 students have been scored as “Effective” or “Highly Effective” leading to the conclusion that there are no major concerns with the Methods II programs. Note that this assessment in Student Teaching combines not only the internal scoring of the D-TALE faculty but of the External scoring of the Cooperating Teachers that have been working with our Student Teacher.

As predicted, as we moved from Methods I to Methods II and then to Student Teaching, the “Ineffective” and “Developing” assessment scoring became less as the students moved into Methods II and then to Student Teaching. This indicates a healthy and reasonable progression of improvement as our students move through the program.

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. Understand and use 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. Engage in ongoing professional learning and use 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. Seek 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*)

TCPDF QUESTION 11. Develop an awareness of dispositions, their role, and their impact on the profession as demonstrated in the disposition essay. (*Disposition*)

**Lesson Evaluation Form (LEF) 2023-2024 Assessment**

Since 2010, the LEF has been modified several times. In 2022-2023, a committee met to review and modify the LEF once again leading to an updated version of the LEF which will be used in the 2023-2024. This version will have 27 questions

**Questions From the LEF 2023-2024 Relating 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.**

**Lesson Evaluation Form (LEF) for the EPP (All Levels)**  
**2023-2024**

**PERCENTAGES**

	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14
Ineffective	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%
Developing	3.5%	4.6%	10.7%	3.4%	9.6%	8.3%	3.5%	12.9%	5.9%	7.0%	17.0%	9.1%
Effective	53.0%	55.6%	50.6%	55.2%	56.2%	57.9%	47.7%	46.5%	45.6%	54.8%	56.7%	57.5%
Highly Effective	43.5%	39.6%	38.3%	39.6%	27.6%	33.0%	48.4%	40.1%	44.9%	37.8%	25.8%	32.3%
No Evidence	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	1.6%	6.3%	0.8%	0.0%	0.1%	3.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.9%

in four subcategories.

**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. Lesson is 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 candidate has established effective classroom management routines and procedures to optimize instructional time.**

**LEF QUESTION 11. Teacher candidate monitors and responds to**

	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q20	Q21	Q23	Q24	Q25	Q26	Q27
Ineffective	0.2%	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	1.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Developing	6.5%	8.9%	4.5%	13.0%	5.2%	12.1%	11.1%	15.3%	6.0%	3.5%	1.7%
Effective	58.0%	49.3%	39.3%	49.3%	50.2%	47.4%	57.0%	54.6%	58.8%	36.3%	34.6%
Highly Effective	33.8%	41.1%	55.2%	37.3%	36.8%	31.6%	24.7%	28.4%	35.1%	59.9%	63.3%
No Evidence	1.6%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	7.6%	8.8%	7.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%

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 79% to 95.2% indicating overall students who are meeting with our expectations as they exit our program.

**student behavior in a manner conducive to a mutually respectful, safe and supportive learning environment.**

**LEF QUESTION 12. Opening of 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 lesson ending provides productive closure and enables the teacher candidate to assess actual student learning.**

Provider-Selected Measures for Educational Leadership Program	Explanation of Performance Expectation for Educational Leadership Program	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation for Educational Leadership Program																																			
<p>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</p>	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Observation Evaluation Form Q3 - “Act with cultural competence.”</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Observation Evaluation Form (OEF) 23-24</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="835 1015 1902 1295"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Q3</th> <th>Q4</th> <th>Q5</th> <th>Q6</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>0%</td> <td>1%</td> <td>1%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>30%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>33%</td> <td>33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>65%</td> <td>72%</td> <td>63%</td> <td>67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Applicable</td> <td>5%</td> <td>5%</td> <td>4%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished</b></td> <td><b>95%</b></td> <td><b>95%</b></td> <td><b>96%</b></td> <td><b>100%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Unacceptable	0%	0%	0%	0%	Acceptable	0%	1%	1%	0%	Meets Standard	30%	23%	33%	33%	Distinguished	65%	72%	63%	67%	Not Applicable	5%	5%	4%	0%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>100%</b>
	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6																																	
Unacceptable	0%	0%	0%	0%																																	
Acceptable	0%	1%	1%	0%																																	
Meets Standard	30%	23%	33%	33%																																	
Distinguished	65%	72%	63%	67%																																	
Not Applicable	5%	5%	4%	0%																																	
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>100%</b>																																	

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. The chart below indicates how the PSEL Standards are aligned with the AAQEP

**Observation Evaluation Form Q4, “Implement systems of curriculum, instruction and assessment.”**

**Observation Evaluation Form Q5, “Effective educational leaders cultivate an inclusive, caring and supportive school community that promotes the academic success and well-being of each student.**

**Observation Evaluation Form Q6 – “Empower and motivate teachers.” (Internal – Faculty)**

**EDL 515 Q1 - “Promote adult-student relationships.”**

**EDL 501 Q3 - “Act with cultural competence and responsiveness.”**

**Portfolio Assessment Form Q4 - “Use assessment data appropriately.”**

<b>EDL 515</b>	<b>Q1</b>
Unacceptable	0%
Acceptable	1%
Meets Standard	43%
Distinguished	57%
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>

<b>EDL 501</b>	<b>Q3</b>
Unacceptable	0%
Acceptable	0%
Meets Standard	35%
Distinguished	65%
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>EDL 502</b>	<b>Q2</b>
Unacceptable	0%
Acceptable	4%
Meets Standard	34%
Distinguished	62%
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>96%</b>

Standard 1 and in what course or survey the standards are assessed.

**Intern Summative Evaluation Form Q4 - “Use assessment data appropriately.”**

**Intern Summative Evaluation Form Q6 – “Empower and motivate teachers.” (External – Cooperating Administrator)**

**School Improvement Plan Q6 - “Develop systems of data collection.”**

**EDL 502 Q2 - “Use assessment data appropriately.”**

**DL 503 Q2 - “Seek resources to support curriculum, instruction, and assessment.”**

**EDL 503 Q6 - “Develop systems of data collection.”**

**EDL 528 Q1 - “Act ethically and professionally.”**

<b>EDL 503</b>	<b>Q2</b>
Unacceptable	0%
Acceptable	1%
Meets Standard	45%
Distinguished	54%
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>

<b>EDL 503</b>	<b>Q6</b>
Unacceptable	0%
Acceptable	3%
Meets Standard	60%
Distinguished	38%
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>98%</b>

<b>EDL 528</b>	<b>Q1</b>
Unacceptable	0%
Acceptable	0%
Meets Standard	59%
Distinguished	41%
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>

**EDL 555 Q3 - “Develop productive working relationships.”**

**EDL 595 Q4 - “Develop systems of data collection.”**

**EDL 571 Q2 – “Maintain a safe school environment.”**

**EDL 572 Q1 “Establish a professional culture.”**

<b>EDL 555</b>	<b>Q3</b>
Unacceptable	<b>2%</b>
Acceptable	<b>2%</b>
Meets Standard	<b>47%</b>
Distinguished	<b>49%</b>
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>96%</b>

<b>EDL 571</b>	<b>Q2</b>
Unacceptable	<b>0%</b>
Acceptable	<b>0%</b>

		<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>98%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>100%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Meets Standard	2%	Distinguished	98%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>						
Meets Standard	2%													
Distinguished	98%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>													
		<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>EDL 572</b></td> <td><b>Q1</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>98%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>EDL 572</b>	<b>Q1</b>	Unacceptable	1%	Acceptable	1%	Meets Standard	65%	Distinguished	33%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>98%</b>
<b>EDL 572</b>	<b>Q1</b>													
Unacceptable	1%													
Acceptable	1%													
Meets Standard	65%													
Distinguished	33%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>98%</b>													
		<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>EDL 595</b></td> <td><b>Q4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>47%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>52%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>99%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>EDL 595</b>	<b>Q4</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	1%	Meets Standard	47%	Distinguished	52%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>
<b>EDL 595</b>	<b>Q4</b>													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	1%													
Meets Standard	47%													
Distinguished	52%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>													
		<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>EDL Portfolio Assessment Form (PAF)</b></td> <td><b>Q4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>21%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>78%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>99%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>EDL Portfolio Assessment Form (PAF)</b>	<b>Q4</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	1%	Meets Standard	21%	Distinguished	78%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>
<b>EDL Portfolio Assessment Form (PAF)</b>	<b>Q4</b>													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	1%													
Meets Standard	21%													
Distinguished	78%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>													

		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>EDL School Improvement Plan (SIP)</b></th> <th><b>Q6</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>31%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>68%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>99%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>EDL School Improvement Plan (SIP)</b>	<b>Q6</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	1%	Meets Standard	31%	Distinguished	68%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>
<b>EDL School Improvement Plan (SIP)</b>	<b>Q6</b>													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	1%													
Meets Standard	31%													
Distinguished	68%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>													
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>EDL Intern Summative Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b></th> <th><b>Q4</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>21%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>78%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>99%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>EDL Intern Summative Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b>	<b>Q4</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	1%	Meets Standard	21%	Distinguished	78%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>
<b>EDL Intern Summative Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b>	<b>Q4</b>													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	1%													
Meets Standard	21%													
Distinguished	78%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>													
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>EDL Intern Summative Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b></th> <th><b>Q6</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>98%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>EDL Intern Summative Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b>	<b>Q6</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	1%	Meets Standard	23%	Distinguished	75%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>98%</b>
<b>EDL Intern Summative Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b>	<b>Q6</b>													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	1%													
Meets Standard	23%													
Distinguished	75%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>98%</b>													

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

<b>Provider-Selected Measures for Teacher Preparation Programs</b>	<b>Explanation of Performance Expectation for Teacher Preparation Programs</b>	<b>Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation for Teacher Preparation Programs</b>
<p><b>Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF) Assessment</b></p> <p>As a result of the meetings with the Program Directors of the six Teacher Education Programs along with their faculty and with the release of the new InTASC standards, the New York State Professional standards and the</p>	<p align="center"><i>Questions From the TCPDF 2023-2024 Relating to Standard 2</i></p> <p><b>TCPDF QUESTION 2. Use understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards. (<i>Disposition</i>)</b></p> <p><b>TCPDF QUESTION 3. Work with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social</b></p>	



<p>D-TALE Proficiencies, a subcommittee was formed to revise the TCPDF in the winter of 2010 and met throughout the spring, 2011 semester.</p> <p>At a retreat, which was held in the spring of 2011, the group spent a large portion of the retreat working on the revisions of the TCPDF. As a result of this, a new version of the TCPDF was created. All members of the faculty received the tentative new version for final comments and input.</p> <p>The 2022-2023 academic year represents the 21st year of using the</p>	<p>interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation. (<i>Disposition</i>)</p> <p><b>TCPDF QUESTION 4. Understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) s/he teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content. (<i>Knowledge</i>)</b></p> <p><b>TCPDF QUESTION 5. Understand 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. (<i>Knowledge and Performance</i>)</b></p> <p><b>TCPDF QUESTION 9. Engage in ongoing professional learning and use 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. (<i>Disposition</i>)</b></p>	
---	--	--

revised TCPDF. InTASC Standards have not been changed since 2010 and the D-TALE Faculty believe the assessment standards in the TCPDF adequately measure our teacher candidates' professional development.

The Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF) is administered at the end of a teacher candidate's Methods I, Methods II and Student Teaching Practicum. The Stony Brook Faculty score the TCPDF at all these transition points and the Cooperating Teachers score the teacher candidate during the student

**TCPDF QUESTION 10. Seek 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)**

**Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF)**  
**for the EPP for Methods I All Levels- 2023-2024**

**PERCENTAGES**

	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q9	Q10
Ineffective	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	2.2%	1.7%
Developing	6.1%	7.7%	19.9%	19.9%	5.0%	7.7%
Effective	80.1%	53.6%	59.1%	57.5%	59.7%	54.1%
Highly	12.2%	37.0%	19.3%	21.0%	33.1%	36.5%
Effective & Highly Effective Combined	92.3%	90.6%	78.5%	78.5%	92.8%	90.6%

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 I instruction. To note, even in Methods I, as students previously mentioned are just entering the program, the vast majority of students have been assessed as "Effective" and "Highly Effective" with the lowest of these combined scores at 78.5%. Simply put, the lowest assessment when combining "Effective" and "Highly Effective" indicates that over 7 out of 10 students have been scored as "Effective" or "Highly Effective" leading to the conclusion that there are no major concerns with the Methods I programs.

teaching clinical practice, as well.

Performance Expectations anticipate that there will be more “Ineffective” and “Developing” scores as candidates are just entering the teacher education program at Methods I and the expectation is that the numbers of students who are scored at “Ineffective” and “Developing” drop as the students move into Methods II and finally, Student Teaching.

Just as important is the data analyzed when combining the “Effective” and “Highly Effective” categories. The data for 2023-2024 support the concept that students, as a

**Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF)**  
**for the EPP for Methods II All Levels - 2023-2024**

**PERCENTAGES**

	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q9	Q10
Ineffective	1.2%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	1.2%	1.2%
Developing	1.2%	1.8%	10.4%	10.4%	2.5%	2.5%
Effective	63.8%	45.4%	40.5%	42.3%	56.4%	54.6%
Highly Effective	33.7%	51.5%	48.5%	46.6%	39.9%	41.7%
Effective & Highly Effective Combined	97.5%	96.9%	89.0%	89.0%	96.3%	96.3%

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. Notice that the scoring of students at “Ineffective” and “Developing” is lower than the Methods I student scoring and consequently, the percentage of students scored at the “Effective” and “Highly Effective” categories is higher. The vast majority of students have been assessed as “Effective” and “Highly Effective” with the lowest of these combined scores at 89.0%. Simply put, the lowest assessment when combining “Effective” and “Highly Effective” indicates that almost 9 out of 10 students have been scored as “Effective” or “Highly Effective” leading to the conclusion that there are no major concerns with the Methods II programs.

group, grow and move into the “Effective” and “Highly Effective” categories as they move through the program.

**Teacher Candidate Professional Development Form (TCPDF)**  
**for the EPP for Student Teaching All Levels - 2023-2024**

**PERCENTAGES**

	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q9	Q10
<b>Ineffective</b>	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%
<b>Developing</b>	3.6%	2.2%	4.1%	6.8%	3.7%	4.4%
<b>Effective</b>	48.8%	37.9%	45.9%	50.0%	48.5%	51.5%
<b>Highly Effective</b>	47.3%	59.7%	49.8%	42.7%	47.6%	43.9%
<b>Effective &amp; Highly Effective Combined</b>	96.1%	97.6%	95.6%	92.7%	96.1%	95.4%

There are no scores that meet the self imposed marker of 10% or more when combining “Ineffective” and “Developing.” The vast majority of students have been assessed as “Effective” and “Highly Effective” with the lowest of these combined scores at 92.7%. Simply put, the lowest assessment when combining “Effective” and “Highly Effective” indicates that more than 9 out of 10 students have been scored as “Effective” or “Highly Effective” leading to the conclusion that there are no major concerns with the Methods II programs. Note that this assessment in Student Teaching combines not only the internal scoring of the D-TALE faculty but of the External scoring of the Cooperating Teachers that have been working with our Student Teacher.

As predicted, as we moved from Methods I to Methods II and then to Student Teaching, the “Ineffective” and “Developing” assessment scoring became less as the students

moved into Methods II and then to Student Teaching. This indicates a healthy and reasonable progression of improvement as our students move through the program.

**Lesson Evaluation Form (LEF) 2023-2024 Assessment**

**Lesson Evaluation Form (LEF) for the EPP (All Levels)**

**2023-2024**

**PERCENTAGES**

Since 2010, the LEF has been modified several times. In 2022-2023, a committee met to review and modify the LEF once again leading to an updated version of the LEF which will be used in the 2023-2024. This version will have 27 questions in four subcategories.

***Questions From the LEF 2023-2024 Relating 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. Lesson is 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 monitors and responds to student**

	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q8	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q20	Q26	Q27
Ineffective EPP	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%
Developing EPP	10.7%	3.4%	9.6%	3.0%	5.9%	7.0%	17.0%	9.1%	6.5%	5.2%	3.5%	1.7%
Effective EPP	50.6%	55.2%	56.2%	48.5%	45.6%	54.8%	56.7%	57.5%	58.0%	50.2%	36.3%	34.6%
Highly Effective EPP	38.3%	39.6%	27.6%	36.6%	44.9%	37.8%	25.8%	32.3%	33.8%	36.8%	59.9%	63.3%
No Evidence EPP	0.4%	1.6%	6.3%	11.9%	3.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.9%	1.6%	7.6%	0.1%	0.3%

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 82.5% to 97.9% indicating overall students who are meeting with our expectations as they exit our program.

**behavior in a manner conducive to a mutually respectful, safe and supportive learning environment.**

**LEF QUESTION 12. Opening of 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.

Standard 2 – aspect “Understand and engage local school and cultural communities and communicate and foster relationships with families/guardians/caregivers in a variety of communities.”

Standard 2 – aspect “Engage in culturally responsive educational

**Teacher Candidate Work Sample for Student Learning (TCWSSL) 2023-2024 Assessment**

The Teacher Candidate Work Sample is an assessment instrument that is used by the English, World Language, Math, Science, Social Studies and TESOL disciplines to assess the teacher candidate’s professional growth focusing on the complex relationship

**(Q1) Contextual Factors**

	Q1
Inadequate EPP Unit	0.0%
Meets EPP Unit	40.0%
Exemplary EPP Unit	60.0%
<b>Meets &amp; Exemplary EPP Unit</b>	<b>100%</b>

When combining “Meets” with “Exemplary” categories, the sum is 100% indicating overall students who are meeting with our expectations as they exit our program.

**(Q2) Learning Goals**

	Q2
Inadequate EPP Unit	1%
Meets EPP Unit	45%
Exemplary EPP Unit	55%
<b>Meets &amp; Exemplary EPP Unit</b>	<b>99%</b>

between standards, assessment and instruction and to help them learn how to systematically apply pedagogical theory to classroom practice. Teacher candidates are required address the following areas:

- Contextual Factors
- Learning Goals
- Assessment Plan
- Design for Instruction
- Analysis of Student Learning
- Reflection and Self-Analysis

**practices with diverse learners and do so in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts.”**

**Standard 2 – aspect “Create productive learning environments and use strategies to develop productive learning environments in a variety of school contexts.”**

When combining “Meets” with “Exemplary” categories, the sum is 99% indicating overall students who are meeting with our expectations as they exit our program.

**(Q3) Assessment Plan  
(Q4) Design for Instruction  
(Q5) Analysis of Student Learning**

	Q3	Q4	Q5
<b>Inadequate EPP Unit</b>	1%	1%	1%
<b>Meets EPP Unit</b>	59%	45%	55%
<b>Exemplary EPP Unit</b>	41%	55%	45%
<b>Meets &amp; Exemplary EPP Unit</b>	99%	99%	99%

When combining “Meets” with “Exemplary” categories, the sum is 99% for all three questions indicating overall students who are meeting with our expectations as they exit our program.

**(Q2) Learning Goals**

	Q2
<b>Inadequate EPP Unit</b>	1%
<b>Meets EPP Unit</b>	45%
<b>Exemplary EPP Unit</b>	55%
<b>Meets &amp; Exemplary EPP Unit</b>	99%



**Standard 2 – aspect “Support students’ growth in international and global perspectives.”**

When combining “Meets” with “Exemplary” categories, the sum is 99% indicating overall students who are meeting with our expectations as they exit our program.

**(Q6) Reflection and Self-Analysis**

	<b>Q6</b>
<b>Inadequate EPP Unit</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Meets EPP Unit</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>Exemplary EPP Unit</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>Meets &amp; Exemplary EPP Unit</b>	<b>100%</b>

When combining “Meets” with “Exemplary” categories, the sum is 100% indicating overall students who are meeting with our expectations as they exit our program.

**(Q6) Reflection and Self-Analysis**

**Standard 2 – aspect “Establish goals for their own professional growth and engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection on their own practice.”**

	<b>Q6</b>
<b>Inadequate EPP Unit</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Meets EPP Unit</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>Exemplary EPP Unit</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>Meets &amp; Exemplary EPP Unit</b>	<b>100%</b>

When combining “Meets” with “Exemplary” categories, the sum is 100% indicating overall students who are meeting with our expectations as they exit our program.

**Standard 2 – aspect “Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning.”**

**Testing Results from January 2023 through June, 2024**

**Educating All Students (EAS) – required New York State Teacher Certification Exam Assessment**

<b># Taking the EAS</b>	<b>442</b>
<b># Passing the EAS</b>	<b>423</b>
<b>Passing Rate</b>	<b>96%</b>

Provider-Selected Measures for Educational Leadership Program	Explanation of Performance Expectation for Educational Leadership Program	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation for Educational Leadership Program												
<p>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</p>	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Intern Summative Evaluation Form Q6 – “Empower and motivate teachers.” (External – Cooperating Administrators)</b></p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="1018 1019 1990 1341"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1018 1019 1850 1073">EDL Intern Evaluation Form (ISEF)</th> <th data-bbox="1850 1019 1990 1073">Q6</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1018 1073 1850 1127">Unacceptable</td> <td data-bbox="1850 1073 1990 1127">0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1018 1127 1850 1180">Acceptable</td> <td data-bbox="1850 1127 1990 1180">1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1018 1180 1850 1234">Meets Standard</td> <td data-bbox="1850 1180 1990 1234">23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1018 1234 1850 1287">Distinguished</td> <td data-bbox="1850 1234 1990 1287">75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1018 1287 1850 1341"><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td data-bbox="1850 1287 1990 1341"><b>98%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	EDL Intern Evaluation Form (ISEF)	Q6	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	1%	Meets Standard	23%	Distinguished	75%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>98%</b>
EDL Intern Evaluation Form (ISEF)	Q6													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	1%													
Meets Standard	23%													
Distinguished	75%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>98%</b>													

<p>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. The chart below indicates how the PSEL Standards are aligned with the AAQEP Standard 1 and in what course or</p>	<p><b>Intern Summative Evaluation Form Q7 – “Design job-embedded opportunities.”</b></p> <p><b>Intern Summative Evaluation Form Q8 – “Create productive relationships with families.”</b></p>	<table border="1"> <tr><td><b>EDL Intern Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b></td><td><b>Q7</b></td></tr> <tr><td>Unacceptable</td><td>0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Acceptable</td><td>1%</td></tr> <tr><td>Meets Standard</td><td>19%</td></tr> <tr><td>Distinguished</td><td>80%</td></tr> <tr><td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td><td><b>99%</b></td></tr> </table>	<b>EDL Intern Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b>	<b>Q7</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	1%	Meets Standard	19%	Distinguished	80%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>
		<b>EDL Intern Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b>	<b>Q7</b>											
		Unacceptable	0%											
		Acceptable	1%											
		Meets Standard	19%											
	Distinguished	80%												
	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>												
	<table border="1"> <tr><td><b>EDL Intern Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b></td><td><b>Q8</b></td></tr> <tr><td>Unacceptable</td><td>0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Acceptable</td><td>0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Meets Standard</td><td>14%</td></tr> <tr><td>Distinguished</td><td>86%</td></tr> <tr><td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td><td><b>100%</b></td></tr> </table>	<b>EDL Intern Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b>	<b>Q8</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	0%	Meets Standard	14%	Distinguished	86%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>	
	<b>EDL Intern Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b>	<b>Q8</b>												
	Unacceptable	0%												
	Acceptable	0%												
	Meets Standard	14%												
	Distinguished	86%												
	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>												
	<table border="1"> <tr><td><b>EDL School Improvement Plan (SIP)</b></td><td><b>Q1</b></td></tr> <tr><td>Unacceptable</td><td>0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Acceptable</td><td>1%</td></tr> <tr><td>Meets Standard</td><td>38%</td></tr> <tr><td>Distinguished</td><td>62%</td></tr> <tr><td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td><td><b>99%</b></td></tr> </table>	<b>EDL School Improvement Plan (SIP)</b>	<b>Q1</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	1%	Meets Standard	38%	Distinguished	62%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>	
<b>EDL School Improvement Plan (SIP)</b>	<b>Q1</b>													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	1%													
Meets Standard	38%													
Distinguished	62%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>													
<p><b>School Improvement Plan Q1 – “Engage in two-way communication w/families.”</b></p> <p><b>School Improvement Plan Q2 – “Employ the community's cultural resources.”</b></p> <p><b>Observation Evaluation Form Q3 – “Act with cultural competence.”</b></p> <p><b>Observation Evaluation Form Q6 – “Empower and motivate teachers.” (Internal – Faculty)</b></p> <p><b>Portfolio Assessment Q6 – “Develop teachers' professional knowledge.”</b></p>	<table border="1"> <tr><td><b>EDL Intern Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b></td><td><b>Q7</b></td></tr> <tr><td>Unacceptable</td><td>0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Acceptable</td><td>1%</td></tr> <tr><td>Meets Standard</td><td>19%</td></tr> <tr><td>Distinguished</td><td>80%</td></tr> <tr><td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td><td><b>99%</b></td></tr> </table>	<b>EDL Intern Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b>	<b>Q7</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	1%	Meets Standard	19%	Distinguished	80%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>	
	<b>EDL Intern Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b>	<b>Q7</b>												
	Unacceptable	0%												
	Acceptable	1%												
	Meets Standard	19%												
Distinguished	80%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>													
<table border="1"> <tr><td><b>EDL Intern Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b></td><td><b>Q8</b></td></tr> <tr><td>Unacceptable</td><td>0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Acceptable</td><td>0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Meets Standard</td><td>14%</td></tr> <tr><td>Distinguished</td><td>86%</td></tr> <tr><td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td><td><b>100%</b></td></tr> </table>	<b>EDL Intern Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b>	<b>Q8</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	0%	Meets Standard	14%	Distinguished	86%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>		
<b>EDL Intern Evaluation Form (ISEF)</b>	<b>Q8</b>													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	0%													
Meets Standard	14%													
Distinguished	86%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>													
<table border="1"> <tr><td><b>EDL School Improvement Plan (SIP)</b></td><td><b>Q1</b></td></tr> <tr><td>Unacceptable</td><td>0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Acceptable</td><td>1%</td></tr> <tr><td>Meets Standard</td><td>38%</td></tr> <tr><td>Distinguished</td><td>62%</td></tr> <tr><td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td><td><b>99%</b></td></tr> </table>	<b>EDL School Improvement Plan (SIP)</b>	<b>Q1</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	1%	Meets Standard	38%	Distinguished	62%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>		
<b>EDL School Improvement Plan (SIP)</b>	<b>Q1</b>													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	1%													
Meets Standard	38%													
Distinguished	62%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>													

survey the standards are assessed.

**Portfolio Assessment Q7 – “Design job-embedded opportunities.”**

**Portfolio Assessment Q8 – “Partner with families.”**

**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 supports.”**

**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.”**

<b>EDL School Improvement Plan (SIP)</b>	<b>Q2</b>
Unacceptable	0%
Acceptable	0%
Meets Standard	37%
Distinguished	63%
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>EDL Observation Evaluation Form (OEF)</b>	<b>Q3</b>
Unacceptable	0%
Acceptable	0%
Meets Standard	30%
Distinguished	65%
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>95%</b>

<b>EDL Observation Evaluation Form (OEF)</b>	<b>Q6</b>
Unacceptable	0%
Acceptable	0%
Meets Standard	33%
Distinguished	67%
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>

**EDL 572 Q1 - “Establish a professional culture.”**

**EDL 595 Q1 – “Create positive family relationships.”**

<b>EDL Portfolio Assessment Form (PAF)</b>	<b>Q6</b>
Unacceptable	0%
Acceptable	1%
Meets Standard	28%
Distinguished	72%
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>EDL Portfolio Assessment Form (PAF)</b>	<b>Q7</b>
Unacceptable	0%
Acceptable	0%
Meets Standard	40%
Distinguished	60%
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>

		<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>EDL Portfolio Assessment Form (PAF)</b></td> <td><b>Q8</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>71%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>100%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>EDL Portfolio Assessment Form (PAF)</b>	<b>Q8</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	0%	Meets Standard	29%	Distinguished	71%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>EDL Portfolio Assessment Form (PAF)</b>	<b>Q8</b>													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	0%													
Meets Standard	29%													
Distinguished	71%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>													
		<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>EDL 501</b></td> <td><b>Q3</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>100%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>EDL 501</b>	<b>Q3</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	0%	Meets Standard	35%	Distinguished	65%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>EDL 501</b>	<b>Q3</b>													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	0%													
Meets Standard	35%													
Distinguished	65%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>													
		<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>EDL 501</b></td> <td><b>Q4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>36%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>64%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>100%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>EDL 501</b>	<b>Q4</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	0%	Meets Standard	36%	Distinguished	64%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>EDL 501</b>	<b>Q4</b>													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	0%													
Meets Standard	36%													
Distinguished	64%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>													

		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>EDL 502</b></th> <th><b>Q3</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>49%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>51%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>100%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>EDL 502</b>	<b>Q3</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	1%	Meets Standard	49%	Distinguished	51%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>EDL 502</b>	<b>Q3</b>													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	1%													
Meets Standard	49%													
Distinguished	51%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>													
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>EDL 515</b></th> <th><b>Q2</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>44%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>99%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>EDL 515</b>	<b>Q2</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	1%	Meets Standard	44%	Distinguished	65%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>
<b>EDL 515</b>	<b>Q2</b>													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	1%													
Meets Standard	44%													
Distinguished	65%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>													
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>EDL 555</b></th> <th><b>Q1</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>49%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>48%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>97%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>EDL 555</b>	<b>Q1</b>	Unacceptable	1%	Acceptable	2%	Meets Standard	49%	Distinguished	48%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>97%</b>
<b>EDL 555</b>	<b>Q1</b>													
Unacceptable	1%													
Acceptable	2%													
Meets Standard	49%													
Distinguished	48%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>97%</b>													



		<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>EDL 571</b></td> <td><b>Q2</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>98%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>100%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>EDL 571</b>	<b>Q2</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	0%	Meets Standard	2%	Distinguished	98%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>EDL 571</b>	<b>Q2</b>													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	0%													
Meets Standard	2%													
Distinguished	98%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>100%</b>													
		<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>EDL 572</b></td> <td><b>Q1</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>98%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>EDL 572</b>	<b>Q1</b>	Unacceptable	1%	Acceptable	1%	Meets Standard	65%	Distinguished	33%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>98%</b>
<b>EDL 572</b>	<b>Q1</b>													
Unacceptable	1%													
Acceptable	1%													
Meets Standard	65%													
Distinguished	33%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>98%</b>													
		<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>EDL 595</b></td> <td><b>Q1</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unacceptable</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acceptable</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets Standard</td> <td>44%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distinguished</td> <td>55%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b></td> <td><b>99%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>EDL 595</b>	<b>Q1</b>	Unacceptable	0%	Acceptable	1%	Meets Standard	44%	Distinguished	55%	<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>
<b>EDL 595</b>	<b>Q1</b>													
Unacceptable	0%													
Acceptable	1%													
Meets Standard	44%													
Distinguished	55%													
<b>Meets &amp; Distinguished Combined</b>	<b>99%</b>													

## 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.

### **EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS**

First, the Educational Leadership Program faculty serve in a variety of roles beyond Stony Brook University which facilitate educational improvement throughout the state. The University has faculty who serve on the following New York State Teacher Center Policy Boards: Long Beach Teacher Center; Freeport Teacher Center; Wantagh-Seaford Teacher Center; M-TRACT; Port Washington Teacher Center; South Huntington Teacher Center; Smithtown Teacher Center; OWL Teacher Center; Connetquot Teacher Center; Suffolk's Edge Teacher Center; and MESTRACT. Additionally, we have a faculty member who serves as an advisor to a New York State Regent. There are other executive boards that our faculty are members of. They include: Metropolitan Council for Educational Administration Programs; the New York Academy of Public Education; Eastern Suffolk BOCES Accreditation for Growth Council and the SCOPE Education Services Board.

Second, Stony Brook University's faculty utilizes the New York State Education Department's Data website: [data.nysed.gov](https://data.nysed.gov) to produce causal-comparative research articles that better inform on variables that have the greatest impact on K-12 student achievement and school improvement. Some of these articles have been published by the New York Academy of Public Education's Research Journal and in SCOPE Education Services which publishes a national peer-reviewed journal that is also disseminated to the school districts in this region.

Third, Stony Brook University is currently collaborating with Eastern Suffolk BOCES, Western Suffolk BOCES, the New York State Teacher Centers and the Metropolitan Council for Educational Administration Programs to keep abreast of the Next Generation Learning Standards and the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders. Our research course (Project Seminar) has evolved into a sophisticated experience that augments the EDL internship. All candidates do in-depth research of the current literature with the goal of providing current information and best practices for the chosen project.

Fourth, in the Educational Leadership Program, candidates are encouraged to use a variety of electronic platforms in their coursework. The University is a Google Education partner which parallels many of the school district within our catchment so that we strengthen candidates effective computer use. All courses utilize Brightspace as its learning management system. Additionally, the University utilized Zoom, Voicethread, and other technological platforms to augment its instruction.

Fifth, the Educational Leadership Program faculty received training in the benefits and challenges associated with their use of AI and usage by students. Faculty were provided with resources to use in their instructional practices, assessment analysis, and student product evaluation. The recently formed Educators Alumni Network (2019) (over 700 strong to date) also received training in AI through a fifth evening symposium. This symposium explored opportunities for using AI to improve education, challenges that could arise, and recommendations to guide further policy development. It should be noted that students in the recent internship had to engage with school administrators on developing a plan that would address how their school/district might increase the use of AI while protecting the rights of students and educational integrity.

Sixth, the Educators Alumni Network ran a sixth symposium for its membership on News Literacy. This symposium was designed to allow for reflection and analysis by way of pertinent information from our keynote speaker and testimonial discussion from two Hampton Bays School District administrators who have incorporated News Literacy into their curriculum. In attendance were alumni, students and faculty from both the Teacher Programs and the Educational Leadership Program.

Seventh, the Educational Leadership Program provides opportunities for a multitude of clinically rich experiences via our authentic performance activities and our two-semester administrative internship requirement during which time candidates practice clinically rich administrative experiences aligned with the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders. The Educational Leadership Internship is designed to immerse candidates in educational experiences that support and rely upon the information and skills attained from courses taken in the program. The internship includes a variety of substantial concurrent or capstone experiences in diverse settings planned and guided cooperatively by university and school district personnel and conducted in schools and school districts over an extended period.

Eighth, The Educational Leadership Program employs a multitude of diverse adjunct faculty who have a vast expertise

in supervision and instruction. These clinical based adjuncts provide students with culturally diverse learning experiences and supervised clinically rich administrative activities sensitive to diverse learning.

Ninth, with the assistance of a former student the EDL Program launched a professional looking newsletter. It highlights both students and faculty who have published or received significant honors. Faculty are also encouraged to submit articles on relevant topics.

### **TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

First, Suffolk County has one of the highest populations of ELL and bilingual students in New York State, second only to New York City. This is an area of great importance in meeting the needs of the increasing population of second language students. With this in mind, an on-campus Advanced Graduate Bilingual Program has been approved with all the required courses for the AGC written and approved. We are developing this program so we can offer it to the certified teaching population throughout Long Island (and more specifically Suffolk County) where we believe there is a tremendous need for teachers already in the field to add a bilingual component to their credentials. We are working also working to develop this face-to-face program as an online program, as well.

Also, in regard to Bilingual Education (BE) and English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Stony Brook has been awarded a CR-ITI Grant. A description of the grant program which can be found at <https://www.stonybrook.edu/spd/criti/> is named the “Clinically Rich Intensive Teacher Institute.” As the website indicates, “The School of Professional Development (SPD) has been awarded a grant which enables us to offer two Clinically Rich Intensive Teacher Institutes - one in Bilingual Education (BE) leading to a bilingual extension and a second one in English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), which allows candidates to apply for a certification in ESOL (CR-ITI BE/ESOL). This institute will run for five years with a minimum of 20 graduate students per year. Stony Brook University is partnering with five Suffolk County school districts — Longwood, Patchogue-Medford, Riverhead, Sachem, and William Floyd— for the placement of these 20 candidates with mentor teachers. These five districts together have over 4,000 English Language/Multilingual Learners (ELLs/MLLs).

Second, another area that we are exploring is the area of “News Literacy.” In cooperation with the Center for News Literacy here at Stony Brook, the Center for Teaching and Learning in Community (CTLIC) has developed two workshops: “Making Sense of the News: The Principles of News Analysis” and “News Awareness and Engagement.” These workshops along with a Summer Institute is available for our candidates in our D-TALE programs as well as offering it to certified elementary and secondary teachers. With the increased bombardment of information coming from the internet, many districts are looking to add to their curriculums some component of teaching their students about “News Literacy.” These workshops are conducted by Howard Schneider, the founding Dean of Stony Brook’s School of Journalism and former editor of “Newsday,” ranked as one of the top ten newspapers in the country, and Dr. Johnathan Anzalone, who is the assistant director of Center for News Literacy here at Stony Brook. The Center for News Literacy, in cooperation with our Social Studies Teacher Preparation Program, has been working to infuse the “news literacy” curriculum into K-12 school districts.

Third, Recognizing the financial needs of our students and also the need to gain more experience in the classroom, D-TALE embarked on a Substitute Teaching Program starting in 2019 with the Middle Country School District. The program has grown in these three years to now include not only the Middle Country School District but also the Kings Park School District, Plainedge School District and the Riverhead School District. The program is designed for students who are enrolled in any of our Methods II or Math Micro-Teaching courses, to commit to subbing in a specific district given the open days they may have in their university schedule. We started with 27 students working with the Middle Country School District in 2019 and as of the Spring of 2022, there have been over 170 students who have participated in the program. We surveyed our students who participated in the Spring of 2021, Fall 2021 and the Spring of 2022. We received 34 responses. Out of the 34 responses, 29 students said they were called to sub “more than several times” during the course of the semester with 26 out of the 34 indicating they were “very satisfied” with the program. We will continue to offer this program along with our partner districts each semester as it has become an invaluable learning experience for our students at the same time as it helps to provide them with some financial relief.

Fourth, D-TALE needs to work to maintain tenure-line, research active faculty. The trend in many teacher education units throughout the country is to hire adjuncts. While adjuncts are certainly very valuable and necessary to our

programs, Stony Brook in a Research-1 institution and we should attempt to maintain more full-time, tenure track faculty.