AAQEP Annual Report for 2024

Provider/Program Name:	Mount St. Mary's University
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or "n/a" if not yet accredited):	Accreditation through 12/31/2029

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.

Mount St. Mary's University (MSMU), America's second oldest Catholic university, has a mission that is committed to graduating ethical leaders who are inspired by a passion for learning and lead lives of significance in service to God and others. Founded in 1808 by Fr. John Dubois, MSMU is located on 1,400 acres near Emmitsburg, Maryland. When the Society of St. Sulpice closed its preparatory seminary in Pennsylvania, seminarians transferred to Emmitsburg. Elizabeth Ann Seton, the first citizen born in the United States to be given the title of "Saint," came to the area to establish a religious order and, later, a school. At Fr. DuBois' invitation, Mother Seton lived on the Mount's campus until a residence could be prepared for her in "the valley." She retained a love for the mountainside worship site that later became the National Shrine Grotto of Our Lady of Lourdes.

© Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation – 2024

Mount St. Mary's University enrolls undergraduate and graduate candidates in five academic divisions each headed by a Dean. The University includes the College of Liberal Arts; Division of Graduate, Professional and Continuing Education; School of Natural Science and Mathematics; School of Health Professions, Richard J. Bolte School of Business; and the School of Education (SOE). In 2009, when the Mount moved to a university structure, a School of Education and Human Services was established. In 2017 the School of Education was then designated as the Division of Education when the Human Services program moved to the College of Liberal Arts. In 2019, Former President Trainor redesignated the Division of Education as the School of Education (SOE). In 2024, The Mount was reaccredited by the Middle Commission on Higher Education, and Dr. Gerard J. Joyce was named as the 27th President of the University.

Headed by a Dean, the SOE includes a Chair and Director of Teacher Education, Director of Catholic School Excellence (CCSE), Director of Center for Instructional Design and Delivery (CIDD), three instructional technologists, Director of Early Childhood Education, Field Services, Coordinator (FSC), and four full-time faculty members. The Education Department within the SOE holds the primary responsibility as the Educator Preparation Program (EPP) for initial teacher preparation and advanced education programs for undergraduate, and graduate candidates. Faculty and administrators directly advise candidates within both initial and advanced programs

Statement of Purpose

Complemented by a liberal arts education in a Catholic setting, the teacher education unit of Mount St. Mary's University develops educators who are proficient in content and pedagogy, reflective, and ethical professionals dedicated to leadership in an increasingly diverse technological and global society.

Vision

The vision of the SOE is to create innovative and responsive programs rooted in the University's Catholic liberal arts mission that graduate ethical educators inspired by a passion for teaching and learning to lead lives of significance in service to God and others.

Governance

The SOE is led by the Dean who reports directly to the Provost of the University. The Dean meets regularly as part of an Administrative Cabinet led by the President of the University. The Chair for the SOE reports directly to the Dean. There also exists a governance structure for Local School System (LSS) partnerships. The SOE has partnerships with 15 elementary schools, 5 middle schools, 4 high schools and 2 P-8 Catholic schools through Memos of Understanding. An Advisory Council acts as the

governance structure for the partnership and includes local school system representatives, school faculty, University representatives and teacher candidate representatives who meet on a regular basis. The Partner School Advisory Council addresses broad issues of teacher candidate placement, mentoring and supervision, and monitoring of the AAQEP standards, goals, and effectiveness.

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://msmary.edu/academics/schools-divisions/school-of-education/aaqep-accreditation.html

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

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution or organization	**State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential**	**Number of Candidates** enrolled in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 06/24)	**Number of Completers** in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 06/24)
Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials			
Bachelor of Science Elementary Education	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6)	48	12
Bachelor of Science with Dual Certification, Elementary and Special Education	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6) and Special Education (1-8)	49	11
Bachelor of Science with Dual Certification, Elementary and Early Childhood	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6) and Early Childhood (PreK-3)	Launched 9/24	Launched 9/24

Bachelor of Science with Certification, Elementary, Special Education, and Early Childhood	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6), Special Education (1-8) and Early Childhood (PreK-3)	Launched 9/24	Launched 9/24
Bachelor of Science Secondary Education Social Studies	Initial Certification: Social Studies with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	8	4
Bachelor of Arts in Art with P12 Certification	Initial Certification: Fine Arts with Certification in Art (Grades P-12)	2	2
Bachelor of Arts in English with Secondary Certification	Initial Certification: English with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	5	2
Bachelor of Arts in Mathematics with Secondary Certification	Initial Certification: Mathematics with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	6	3
Bachelor of Arts in Spanish with P12 Certification	Initial Certification: Spanish with Certification in World Languages (Grades P-12)	1	0
Bachelor of Arts in German with P12 Certification	Initial Certification: German with Certification in World Languages (Grades P-12)	0	0
Bachelor of Arts in French with P12 Certification	Initial Certification: French with Certification in World Languages (Grades P-12)	0	0
Master of Arts in Teaching Elementary	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6)	31	10

Master of Arts in Teaching Dual: Elementary and Special Education	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6) and Special Education (1-8)	29	0
Master of Arts in Teaching: Elementary and Early Childhood	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6) and Early Childhood (PreK-3)	Launched 9/24	Launched 9/24
Master of Arts in Teaching, Elementary, Special Education, and Early Childhood	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6), Special Education (1-8) and Early Childhood (PreK-3)	Launched 9/24	Launched 9/24
Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary Social Studies	Initial Certification: Social Studies with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	14	4
Master of Arts in Teaching Art Education	Initial Certification: Fine Arts with Certification in Art Education (Grades P-12)	10	5
Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary Biology	Initial Certification: Biology with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	4	0
Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary Business	Initial Certification: Business with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	6	2
Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary English	Initial Certification: English with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	6	1
Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary Mathematics	Initial Certification: Mathematics with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	4	0

Master of Arts in Teaching Music Education	Initial Certification: Music with Certification in Music Education (Grades P-12)	2	0
Master of Arts in Teaching World Languages Spanish	Initial Certification: Spanish with Certification in World Languages (Grades P-12)	0	0
Master of Arts in Teaching World Languages German	Initial Certification: German with Certification in World Languages (Grades P-12)	0	0
Master of Arts in Teaching World Languages French	Initial Certification: French with Certification in World Languages (Grades P-12)	0	0
	Total for programs that lead to initial credentials	225	56
Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators			
Master of Education Instructional Leadership	Advanced Program: Recommendation for MSDE Administrator 1 Certificate	29	17
Post Baccalaureate Certificate Instructional Leadership	Advanced Program: Recommendation for MSDE Administrator 1 Certificate	25	15
Master of Education Reading (K-12)	Advanced Program: K-12 Reading Specialist Certification	9	3
Certificate of Advanced Study Reading (K-12)	Advanced Program: K-12 Reading Specialist Certification	5	2

Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		68	37
Programs that lead to credentials for other school professionals or to no specific credential			
Master of Education in Instructional Design and Technology		15	4
Post-Baccalaureate Certificate Instructional Design and Technology		1	0
Total for additional programs		16	4
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs		309	97
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers		212	97

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.)

Early Childhood Education will be launched beginning September, 2024 with dual certification in Elementary (1-6) and Early Childhood (PreK-3) option or Elementary (1-6), Early Childhood (PreK-3) & Special Education (1-8) option at both the Bachelor of Science and Master of Arts in Teaching levels. The program was in planning stages during July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024.

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.
309
B. **Total number of unique completers** (across all programs) included in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals who earned more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.
97
C. **Number of recommendations** for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.
Those received the Maryland Approved Program Statement for licensure programs from July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024 were: 18 Initial Certification; 26 Advanced Program—Instructional Leadership; and 4 Advanced Program -Reading
D. **Cohort completion rates** for candidates who completed the various programs within their respective program's expected timeframe **and** in 1.5 times the expected timeframe.
100% of Initial Licensure complete in expected timeframe and in 1.5 times the expected timeframe through completion but necessarily licensure. Licensure is not required to graduate. Of the advanced programs completion all completed in expected timeframe and in 1.5 time the expected timeframe but not necessarily licensure. Licensure is not required to graduate.
E. **Summary of state license examination results**, including teacher performance assessments, and specification of any examinations on which the pass rate (cumulative at time of reporting) was below 80%.
The most recent report from Title II has a summary pass rate of for our institution of 74%. This is a first time we have fallen below the 80% institutional pass rate with the two previous years of 90% and 88% respectively. Those individual areas that showed drops below 80% included Elementary Education CKT: Mathematics (7813); Elementary Education CKT: Social Studies (7814); Special Education Core Knowledge & Applications (5354); and Teaching Reading Elementary (5205). Our Elementary Mathematics Content Knowledge score was at 75%; the Elementary Social Studies content was at 79%; Special Education Core Knowledge and Application was at 67%; Teaching Reading Elementary was at 79%. Again, data from previous years had scores above the 80% mark on these areas. The School of Education has reviewed this data. Since this is the first time that these scores for these tests have fallen below the 80% level, we will be monitoring closely. The Director of Teacher Education organized a

Canvas resource center accessible to students and advisors with Mount accounts. The Canvas Center includes resources to help prepare for and support the preparation for Praxis tests. Instructors in elementary methods courses have begun to incorporate activities in their courses that are based on Praxis study questions from ETS. This will give students opportunities to engage in the language and test format of the Praxis experience. The School of Education will continue to monitor these tests.

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

Program completer data indicated that 46% of completers disagreed with the statement that the School of Education provided opportunities to prepare for Praxis Content Exams. This supports the need to have a Canvas site with resources for Praxis tests. Additionally, providing students with some practice questions in methods courses may also assist with this area. Because candidates do not have to take the tests for graduation, many are just in the process of taking tests and have not seen how course content relates to test content. 31% of students disagreed that the School of Education helped to prepare them for the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT). Candidates in this cohort were not required to complete a performance assessment for licensure. 27% indicated that the School of Education did not prepare candidates for job interviews. This was a little confusing for us because all candidates have access to the Career Center who coordinates interviews for multiple school systems in the region. These are communicated through the Career Center and through the Director of Teacher Education. In the seminar course, candidates heard from a LSS HR representative who came to talk about interviewing and interview protocols. The fact that nearly one fourth of candidates did not feel prepared may stem from the fact that so many candidates were hired before they got to the internship semester. Since the focus of interviewing occurs more in the semester where candidates are completing internships, those hired may not have had ample opportunities to prepare.

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

We do ask candidates for permission to send an employer survey out to schools upon completion of a first year. However, we are finding that by the time our candidates complete the program and the first year, they do not always report back to us the school for which they are hired. Moreover, we are encountering many students in our MAT and Adult Undergraduate who are completing their internships during their first year of teaching, so surveys are going out after the fact. The survey does not provide back adequate data. Therefore, we are transitioning to a conducting focus groups among our partner school principals. On August 30, 2023, We had a principal focus group along with members of the LSS's human resources. At that time, we had discussions about interns who were hired as inservice teachers while being a preservice teacher with us. This creates some unique challenges for the candidate who is being assessed by the school system as a first year teacher but is being assessed by us as a preservice teachers. The expectations do not always align.

A summary of this focus group was that anyone in the LSS who has a stake in the interest of supporting the employee/intern needs to understand that they are the teacher of record, but also an intern – so their needs are different and may require differentiation of support from FCPS. They discussed some of the disconnect between HR and the office of Professional Learning in knowing exactly where these folks are and who they are as conditional employees. A member of LSS Professional Learning group was in

our breakout group and she is looking into this as well so there is a clear communication of this information internally. The applications for alternative placement will be revised to highlight how we evaluate teacher candidates. (A special group was formed to address changing the alternative application for candidates wishing to complete internships while hired).
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.
We have relied on self- reporting of employment by the student, which is not always reliable, however with the growing number of candidates getting hired during or right after internship, we are do have a greater number of candidates that we know have been hired. The Director of Teacher Education sends in email to in December and in May explaining the licensure application procedures. In that email, she asks that candidates communicate when they are hired. In 2024, we will begin to provide candidates with a self-addressed, stamped post card that they can drop in the mail once they determine post completion status.

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

<table>
<tr><th>Provider-Selected Measures</th><th>Explanation of Performance Expectation</th><th>Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation</th></tr>
<tr><td>Gateway 4 Benchmark Assessment</td><td>The scores are based on a four-point rubric including: 1) not demonstrated, 2) partially demonstrated, 3) adequately demonstrated, and 4) effectively demonstrated. Candidates must receive an overall acceptable minimum average score of 2.0. Data reveal that average scores were between 3.3 to 3.42, which is within the 2.0 acceptable requirement. It is noted that the</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Benchmark</th><th colspan="3">Fall 2023</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Mentor N=56</td><td>Supervisor N=56</td><td>Candidate N=56</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.A. writes concise, effective lesson plans</td><td>3.53</td><td>3.68</td><td>3.69</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.B. Intern plans for diverse learners</td><td>3.46</td><td>3.46</td><td>3.71</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.E. Intern effectively teaches all learners</td><td>3.55</td><td>3.53</td><td>3.61</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td>At the midpoint of the full-time Internship II experience, the candidate, mentor, and University supervisor meet to discuss the candidate's progress based on the Gateway 4 Benchmark and Dispositions Assessment. During the midterm conference, goals are set for the candidate. At the end of the experience, the candidate, mentor, and University supervisor complete the assessment through an electronic survey and meet once again to debrief on the candidate's progress. The University supervisor uses this information as a part of determining a final internship grade.</td>
<td>lowest average was the mentor's score for the intern's knowledge about the local and state curriculum. This could be due to the fact that mentors have such a deep knowledge of the curriculum from their own time and experiences in the school system.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><td>I.F. Intern uses a variety of instructional strategies</td><td>3.55</td><td>3.6</td><td>3.61</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.G. Intern is knowledgeable about local and state curriculum</td><td>3.42</td><td>3.3</td><td>3.59</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.H. Intern demonstrates understanding of social, emotional, cognitive, physical and cultural needs of learner through instruction</td><td>3.57</td><td>3.57</td><td>3.75</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Inquiry Oral Presentation
Using the framework of pre-assessment, data analysis, planning, teaching, and the post assessment collected during a teaching episode, candidates share their findings and answer questions posed by the instructor. Candidates connect one or more appropriate pillars of Computational Thinking (Algorithms, Pattern Recognition, Decomposition and Abstraction) to the reflective inquiry process.</td>
<td>Candidates were assessed through the RIP Oral Presentation rubric with the components of context, data analysis, computational thinking connection, oral presentation, response to questions, and submission of Tasks 2 and 3. Students needed to meet 5 out of the 6 criteria points to achieve the minimum assessment requirement. Candidate averages were 5.98, exceeding the 5.0 minimum score requirement.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">2023 RIP Overall Mean Scores
Fall 2023 (N = 56)</th></tr>
<tr><th>Component</th><th>Average Score</th></tr>
<tr><td>Context</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data Analysis</td><td>.98</td></tr>
<tr><td>Computational Thinking Connection</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Oral Presentation</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Response to Question</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Project Submission</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total Score Average</td><td>5.98</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>

Gateway 4 Dispositions Assessment

Candidates are assessed on dispositions when they complete Internship II by their supervisor, mentor, and themselves. This becomes part of the discussion at the final three-way conference. The assessment is the final disposition assessment of the internship experience.

Overall average dispositions range from 2.86-3.0 in the high approaches to meets levels. This is slightly higher than the previous year of 2.82-3.0 range. Though overall means are mostly 3.0 for ethical disposition, three of the assessment items only permit one of two scores. Candidates are meeting the dispositions' expectations. Individual areas of concern are addressed by the University supervisor. When concerns arise with a candidate's dispositions, the mentor and University supervisor meet with the candidate and discuss identified areas of growth. If a dispositional concern continues, the candidate may be provided an action plan in concert with the supervisor and mentor with communication to the Director of Teacher Education. The action plan provides a detailed plan and strategies to support the teacher candidate.

	Disposition	Fall 2023		
	N = 56	Mentor	Supervisor	Candidate
Committed	The candidate demonstrates accurate and professional communication that is free of error with all audiences.	2.98	2.96	2.93
	The candidate is present and punctual.	2.98	2.95	3.0
	The candidate respects the ideas and works of others.	2.98	2.98	3.0
	The candidate takes responsibility for own behavior/learning and its impact on others.	3.0	2.98	3.0
	The candidate demonstrates commitment to learning best practices.	2.98	2.88	2.9
	The candidate demonstrates initiative in independent learning.	2.96	2.98	2.9
	The candidate demonstrates the belief that all students can learn and achieve	3.0	3.0	2.9
Adaptable	The candidate demonstrates the ability to be an active listener with all audiences.	2.98	3.0	3.0
	The candidate demonstrates a respect for students' individual differences as a context for learning.	2.96	2.93	2.98
	The candidate is able to apply feedback to make change(s) in candidate's behavior and/or teaching practice.	2.96	3.0	2.94
	The candidate demonstrates a positive rapport with others.	2.98	2.98	3.0
	The candidate collaborates in group assignments, projects, and co-teaching situations.	2.98	3.0	2.93
	The candidate demonstrates patience with others and control of emotions.	3.0	2.95	2.98
Reflective	The candidate describes, with specificity, effective and ineffective instruction.	2.96	2.86	2.96
	The candidate describes differences in the students and can explain how instruction might be differentiated.	2.875	2.88	2.91
	The candidate seeks feedback from professors, supervisors, and mentor and is open to constructive criticism.	3.0	2.89	2.98

			The candidate articulates accomplishments and areas needed for growth.	2.98	2.89	2.96
			The candidate makes thoughtful connections between internship experiences and course work.	3.0	2.98	2.95
		Ethical	The candidate uses professionally appropriate behavior in all interactions. (e.g. face-to-face, online, social media, email, etc.)	3.0	2.98	3.0
			The candidate keeps student personal information confidential unless required by law to disclose or report.	3.0	3.0	3.0
			The candidate is respectful of diversity in its broadest sense, such as race, ethnicity, gender, age, religiosity, sexual orientation and others	3.0	3.0	3.0
			The candidate adheres to the university's Code of Conduct	3.0	3.0	3.0
			The candidate adheres to the Model Code of Ethics for Educators. https://www.nasdtec.net/page/MCEE_Doc	3.0	3.0	3.0

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

<table>
<tr><th>Provider-Selected Measures</th><th>Explanation of Performance Expectation</th><th>Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation</th></tr>
<tr><td>Program Completer Survey
The 2023 Program Completer Survey, with a 46.5% return rate—the highest in the last three years, includes several items aligned to Aspect 2a. including: communicating with parents, interacting professionally in local school communities, and interacting professionally in local cultural communities.</td><td>Data show that the majority of candidates agree at some level that they have opportunities to understand and engage local school and cultural communities, and communicate and foster relationships with families/guardians/caregivers in a variety of communities. There were 4 respondents who felt they did not communicate with parents and 2 that</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">2023-2024 Program Completer Survey Data Related to Aspect 2a</th></tr>
<tr><th>Survey Item</th><th>Strongly Agree</th><th>Agree</th><th>Disagree</th><th>Strongly Disagree</th></tr>
<tr><td>Communicates with parents</td><td>10</td><td>12</td><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Interacts professionally in local school communities</td><td>16</td><td>10</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Interacts professionally in local</td><td>12</td><td>12</td><td>2</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disagreed with having opportunities to interact professionally in local cultural communities.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><td>cultural communities</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway 4 Benchmark Assessment

At the midpoint of the full-time Internship II experience, the candidate, mentor, and University supervisor meet to discuss the candidate’s progress based on the Gateway 4 Benchmark and Dispositions Assessment. During the midterm conference, goals are set for the candidate. At the end of the experience, the candidate, mentor, and University supervisor complete the assessment through an electronic survey and meet once again to debrief on the candidate’s progress. The University supervisor uses this information as a part of determining a final internship grade.</td>
<td>Data show that there are components aligned to aspect 2.b. Candidates engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners and do so in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts. Candidates are to receive a minimum of a 2 on a four-point rubric. Data show that candidates were above the 2.0 minimum requirement.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><th>Benchmark</th><th colspan="3">Fall 2023</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Mentor N= 56</td><td>Supervisor N= 56</td><td>Candidate N= 56</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.B. Intern plans for diverse learners</td><td>3.46</td><td>3.46</td><td>3.71</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.E. Intern effectively teaches all learners</td><td>3.55</td><td>3.53</td><td>3.61</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.H. Interns demonstrates understanding of social, emotional, cognitive, physical, and cultural needs of learner through instructions</td><td>3.57</td><td>3.57</td><td>3.75</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InTASC Porfolio—InTASC 3
The InTASC 3 section of the portfolio aligns to Aspect 2c. InTASC 3 states that the teacher works with others to create environments that support</td>
<td>The overall means of the InTASC 3 section for Fall 2023 was 2.76. Candidates had to meet an overall score of 2.0 for the entire portfolio.. Mean scores ranged from 2.5 to 3.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Fall 2023 InTASC Portfolio (N=56)</th></tr>
<tr><th>Certification Program</th><th>InTASC 3</th></tr>
<tr><td>All (N = 56)</td><td>2.76</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>

individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.	This is slightly higher than the previous years where the range was 2.2 to 3.0. Part of this could be how we prepared candidates to complete the portfolio. With the delay of PPAT as a requirement for certification, candidates did not have to balance the demands of the completing the performance assessment for Maryland while also completing the InTASC portfolio requirement. Candidates could spend more time in reflecting and writing for the portfolio. Based on these data, candidates meet Aspect 2c.	

Art (MAT) N = 5	2.8
Art (UG) N = 2	2.85
Biology (MAT) N = 0	N/A
Business (MAT) N = 2	2.5
Elementary (AUG) N = 0	N/A
Elementary (MAT) N = 10	2.74
Elementary (UG) N = 14	2.79
Elem. & Sp. Ed. (AUG) N = 2	3
Elem. & Sp. Ed. (MAT) N = 0	N/A
Elem. & Sp. Ed. (UG) N = 7	2.79
English (MAT) N = 1	3
English (UG) N = 2	2.5
Mathematics (MAT) N = 0	N/A
Mathematics (UG) N = 3	2.9

		Social Studies (MAT) N = 4 — 2.6 Social Studies (UG) N = 4 — 2.77

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.

A focus on 2023-2024 was to look for ways to better support candidates who are employed while completing an internship. This trend is growing rapidly in our Maryland communities and presents some new challenges in teacher preparation. A Employed Intern Advisory Committee was formed with members including university supervisors, IHE faculty, teacher mentors and a candidate. The charge of this committee was to begin to explore ways in which the school system and university could collaborate to support teacher candidates who are hired as teachers of record or long-term substitutes during Internship 1 and Internship 2. These individuals are in the unique position of being preservice teachers who are fulfilling inservice teacher obligations. The committee examined the expectations these individuals must meet as new teachers and preservice teacher obligations to meet program completion. An outcome of this committee's work was modifications to the alternative application stressing to administrators that while the administrator may evaluate the candidate as an inservice teacher, the university still views the individual as a preservice teacher and will evaluate accordingly.

As candidates graduate and move into the profession, school systems and IHEs look for ways to put appropriate supports in place that ensure the completer's success and retention in the field. This work was a result of work initially started as an innovative tiered approach to teacher retention as presented in the IHE's recent Quality Assurance Report and aligned to AAQEP Aspect 4c.
Tier 1 is the "Touchbase" tier. Focus points include:

- University offers open hours via Zoom
- Teachers can opt to Zoom in during these times or even arrange a private Zoom
- Topics are participant-driven

Tier 2 is the "Collaborative Debriefing" and includes:

- University supports dinner or light fare at a Collaborative Debriefing during designated FCPS teacher induction session

- Participants can join in a debriefing session with university to discuss focused area as well as needs/strengths of preparation

During Tier 3 “Focused Advising” focus points are:

- University provides coaching with university supervisors at PDS sites in collaboration with FCPS
- Supervisors provide non-evaluative support based on focused need of individual
- Funding sources need to be determined (Grants)

The final Tier 4 “Building Capacity” includes:

- Focus on retention, how to provide needed intervention and or professional development to retain teachers
- Consider hiring structures and school staffing arrangements that focus on effective co-teaching models

Part II: Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth

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

6. Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth and Improvement

This section charts ongoing improvement processes in relation to each AAQEP standard. Note that providers may focus their work on an aspect of one or two standards each year, with only brief entries regarding ongoing efforts for those standards that are not the focus in the current year.

Table 5. Provider Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement

	Standard 1
Goals for the 2024-25 year	We will need to reinstate performance assessment in seminar class to meet the July 1, 2025 requirement for Maryland licensure.
Actions	• Develop meetings with teaching team for seminar. • Dean and Chair will develop syllabus based on their previous experience with the assessment • Provide professional development to teaching team
Expected outcomes	Successful implementation of PPAT in the 2024-2025 academic year
Reflections or comments	We decided to use a model where the Dean and Chair coached the seminar team through the process during the first implementation in Fall 2024.
	Standard 2
Goals for the 2024-25 year	Adopt the Cultural Competence Project as a key assessment across MAT and Adult Undergraduate programs.
Actions	• Discuss project at School of Education meetings/retreat • Examine courses that are best fit for the project • Ensure system for grading

Expected outcomes	We expect a common project across all initial certification programs
Reflections or comments	We need to discuss how to ensure validity and reliability of scoring. Does there need to be a rubric?
	Standard 3
Goals for the 2024-25 year	Maryland State Department of Education will begin to incorporate new regulations that will need to be reviewed for implementation once passed.
Actions	• Monitor updates as noted from Maryland State Department of Education • Review Pillars of *Blueprint for Maryland's Future* with close attention to Pillar 2- High Quality and Diverse Teachers and Leaders
Expected outcomes	The School of Education will review in alignment to ensure program curricula meet regulatory changes once enacted.
Reflections or comments	This has been a lengthy process with ongoing changes and updates presented in House Bill 116.
	Standard 4
Goals for the 2024-25 year	Continue collaborations with local school system to diversify work force.
Actions	• The School of Education has applied and been awarded a Maryland Leads funding to support Grow Your Own initiatives through our dual certification program in elementary an special education
Expected outcomes	Increase the number of qualified teachers in special education.
Reflections or comments	Candidates have been vetted and are currently completing Internship 1 during this academic year. Most are employed in support roles in the schools.

7. Evidence Related to AAQEP-Identified Concerns or Conditions

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

N/A

8. Anticipated Growth and Development

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

To support those candidates who are employed while completing an internship, a Supervisor Summit will occur in July 2024. This summit will include supervisors and local school system administrators who will discuss ways in which those working might be given support needed as a preservice teacher. A new model of mentoring will be developed for these hired preservice teachers. From time to time, teacher candidates are hired or already hired as teachers of record. In these cases, the mentor is not always in the same classroom as the teacher candidate. It is recommended that the assigned mentor make time to meet with the teacher candidate throughout the Internship 2 experience in order to be able to address the candidate's questions, needs, and challenges. Ideally, bi-weekly meetings with the candidate that focus on a variety of professional topics aligned to the five benchmark areas can be beneficial to the candidate who is a hired preservice teacher. Recommended focus topics that can be central during these meetings will be aligned to benchmarks.

The School of Education will continue to explore funding opportunities for "Grow Your Own" initiatives to support MAT and Adult Undergraduates in becoming elementary and special education teachers, elementary and early childhood teachers or elementary, special education and early childhood teachers through Maryland Elevates. The funding will support recruiting and providing support to paraprofessionals and conditionally certified teachers with our local school system partners.

The School of Education will launch its newest certification programs in elementary and early childhood dual certification programs as well as elementary, early childhood and special education. An Early Childhood Education (ECE) Advisory Committee has been formed by the Director of Early Childhood Education, Dr. Kara Brady. With the input of the ECE Advisory Committee, Dr. Brady has been developing course syllabi to support the implementation of this program in Fall 2024.

9. Regulatory Changes

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

Regulatory changes are forthcoming for the 2024-2025 academic year in Maryland. This will include new licensure requirements of a performance assessment for assessing pedagogy.

10. Sign Off

Provider's Primary Contact for AAQEP (Name, Title)	Dean/Lead Administrator (Name, Title)
Dr. Stacey Brown-Hobbs, Chair & Director of Teacher Education	Dr. Barb Marinak, Dean School of Education

Date sent to AAQEP:	