AAQEP Annual Report for 2025

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 – 2025

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 Science, Mathematics, and Technology; 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 States 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 six 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, disaggregated by program and license/certificate, for each program included in the AAQEP review.

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

Degree or Program offered by the institution/organization	**Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential** granted by the state	**Number of Candidates Enrolled** in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 06/25)	**Number of Completers** in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 06/25)
Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials			
Bachelor of Science Elementary Education	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6)	18	11
Bachelor of Science with Dual Certification, Elementary and Special Education	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6) and Special Education (Grades 1-8)	31	11

Bachelor of Science with Dual Certification, Elementary and Early Childhood	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6) and Early Childhood (PreK-3)	12	0
Bachelor of Science with Certification, Elementary, Special Education, and Early Childhood	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6), Special Education (Grades 1-8) and Early Childhood (PreK-3)	4	0
Bachelor of Science Secondary Education Social Studies	Initial Certification: Social Studies with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	5	3
Bachelor of Arts in Art with P12 Certification	Initial Certification: Fine Arts with Certification in Art (Grades P-12)	0	0
Bachelor of Arts in English with Secondary Certification	Initial Certification: English with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	3	1
Bachelor of Arts in Mathematics with Secondary Certification	Initial Certification: Mathematics with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	3	1
Bachelor of Arts in Spanish with P12 Certification	Initial Certification: Spanish with Certification in World Languages (Grades P-12)	0	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)	32	4

© Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation – 2025

Master of Arts in Teaching Dual: Elementary and Special Education	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6) and Special Education (1-8)	30	15
Master of Arts in Teaching: Elementary and Early Childhood	Initial Certification: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6) and Early Childhood (PreK-3)	5	0
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)	1	0
Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary Social Studies	Initial Certification: Social Studies with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	14	6
Master of Arts in Teaching Art Education	Initial Certification: Fine Arts with Certification in Art Education (Grades P-12)	10	2
Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary Biology	Initial Certification: Biology with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	5	1
Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary Business	Initial Certification: Business with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	5	1
Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary English	Initial Certification: English with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	6	2
Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary Mathematics	Initial Certification: Mathematics with Certification in Secondary Education (Grades 7-12)	7	0

Master of Arts in Teaching Music Education	Initial Certification: Music with Certification in Music Education (Grades P-12)	2	1
Master of Arts in Teaching World Languages Spanish	Initial Certification: Spanish with Certification in World Languages (Grades P-12)	1	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)	1	0
	Total for programs that lead to initial credentials	195	59
Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators			
Master of Education Reading (K-12)	Advanced Program: K-12 Reading Specialist Certification	16	3
Certificate of Advanced Study Reading (K-12)	Advanced Program: K-12 Reading Specialist Certification	4	1
	Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials	20	4
Programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials			
Master of Education Instructional Leadership	Advanced Program: Recommendation for MSDE Administrator 1 Certificate; *(effective September 2025- Supervisor of Instruction, Assistant Principal, and Principal)*	15	2
Post Baccalaureate Certificate Instructional Leadership	Advanced Program: Recommendation for MSDE Administrator 1 Certificate;	18	7

	(effective September 2025- Supervisor of Instruction, Assistant Principal, and Principal)		
Total for programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials		33	9
Programs that lead to credentials for specialized professionals or to no specific credential			
Master of Education in Instructional Design and Technology		22	2
Post-Baccalaureate Certificate Instructional Design and Technology		1	0
Total for programs that lead to specialized professional or no specific credentials		23	2
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs		271	74
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers		197	74

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.)

No programs have been added or discontinued within the past year.

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.
271
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.
74
C. **Number of recommendations** for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.
Those who received the Maryland Approved Program statement for licensure programs from July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025, were: 54 Initial Certification; 14 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 not necessarily licensure. Licensure is not required to graduate. Of the advanced programs, all completed in expected timeframe and in 1.5 times 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 2023-2024 report from Title II has a summary pass rate for our institution of 65%. The 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 reports from Title II have summary pass rates for our institution above 80%, with 2021-2022 at 90%. Those individual areas that showed drops below 80% included: Elementary Education CKT: Mathematics (7813); Elementary Education CKT: Reading Language Arts (7812); Elementary Education CKT: Social Studies (7815); and Teaching Reading: Elementary

(5205). Our Elementary Mathematics Content Knowledge score was at 65%; the Elementary Reading Language Arts score was at 71%; our Elementary Social Studies Content Knowledge score was at 79%; and our Teaching Reading Elementary was at 79%. Data from the previous years had scores above 80% in these areas.

The School of Education reviews this data at retreats and meetings. A Canvas resource center has been provided 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 course 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. Explanation of **evidence available from program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

The 2024-2025 program completer data indicates that of the initial certification candidates who completed the survey, the majority strongly agreed or agreed that the School of Education prepared candidates to plan for, deliver, and assess student learning. Results also indicate that candidates strongly agreed or agreed the School of Education prepared them to manage classroom learning and behavior. However, about 40% disagreed or strongly disagreed that the School of Education did not prepare candidates to manage classroom learning in remote settings. This was confusing as all candidates engaged in field and Internship experiences face-to-face in a classroom setting. Also, with many courses online, candidates have opportunities to present their work using an online platform (via Zoom). Results indicate most candidates strongly agreed or agreed that the School of Education prepared them to communicate with various stakeholders, follow the Code of Ethics, seek out professional development opportunities as well as analyze and reflect upon learning and teaching. Preparing candidates for Praxis Content Exams improved from our reporting last year in that the majority strongly agreed (28.12%) or agreed (59.38%) that they were prepared for their Praxis exam. The Canvas site with resources for Praxis tests as well as practice questions in methods courses are some of the ways we have addressed this area. In the area of preparing candidates for employment, 31.25% disagreed that the School of Education provided opportunities to complete a job application. This is a topic that is usually discussed in our Seminar course during their Internship II experience. During the 2024-2025 seminar course, much of the focus was on preparing candidates for the Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT). However, candidates have access to our Career Center and the Director of Teacher Education to learn more about this process. Lastly, 28.12% of candidates strongly disagreed with the statement that the School of Education provided opportunities to grow in international and global perspectives. Our traditional undergraduate students are required to take Modernity in Education as well as Globalization and Education. Acknowledging that our adult undergraduate and graduate candidates need more preparation in this area, content around diversity and global perspectives will be added to the Foundations of Education and Current Trends in Education courses.

The 2024-2025 program completer data indicated that all advanced candidates either strongly agreed or agreed that the School of Education prepared them to demonstrate professional knowledge in the field and engage/collaborate with a variety of stakeholders. One candidate shared that a strength of the advanced program was being provided with "hands-on practice with assessments" as well as "opportunities to analyze varying pieces of data and supporting with research supports decision making in the profession."

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

Evidence from employers of program completers is gathered through the PDS Principal meeting in which we discuss needs based on employed students. One area that continues to be explored is supporting our interns who are hired as inservice teachers while being preservice teachers with us. Many times, the mentor is not always in the same classroom as the teacher candidate, which means there needs to be an intentional effort to make time to meet with the candidate to address candidate questions, needs, and challenges. During this PDS Principal Meeting, the "Models for Mentoring Candidates Hired as Teachers of Record" document was presented and discussed. This document can be used during bi-weekly meetings with the mentor and candidate to focus on a variety of professional topics aligned to our five benchmark areas (Planning, Instruction, & Assessment; Management & Engagement; Communication; Professionalism & Leadership; and Analysis & Reflection) that can be beneficial to the candidate who is a hired preservice teacher.

Also, during this meeting, principals were able to provide input and feedback on readjusting phases of Internship II. This timeline serves as a guide for how we expect to see teacher candidates proceed chronologically through the phases. Adjustments to this timeline should be made based on the needs of the students and the professional development needs of the candidate. Candidates assume responsibilities as they proceed through Phases One and Two. They are then building professional responsibilities in Phase Three in which they are prepared to assume the full responsibilities of the classroom teacher. As candidates work through Phases Four and Five, they focus on reflection and professional development as they participate in culminating assignments and professional exercises that allow them to gain additional perspectives and opportunities. In each of these phases, an intervention is in place if there is a concern regarding candidate performance.

Lastly, to ensure clear communication of expectations for Internship experiences, verification statements were added to the Alternative Application. The verification statements are initialed by the principal, assigned mentor, and candidate to ensure agreement on the number of formal observations required, acknowledgement that the candidate will be viewed and assessed as a preservice teacher, impact on initial licensure if the candidate fails to successfully meet the school system's expectations, and the possibility of needing to be released from duties to attend workshops/classes on campus.

H. Explanation of how the program investigates **employment rates for program completers**, with a characterization of findings. This section may also indicate rates of completers' ongoing education, e.g., graduate study.
We have relied on self-reporting of employment by the student. With the growing number of candidates getting hired during or right after internship, we do have a greater number of candidates that we know have been hired. The Director of Teacher Education sends an email 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 provided candidates with self-addressed, stamped post cards that they could drop in the mail once they determine post completion status. Teacher candidates will also reach out to individual professors or their advisors and let them know when they are hired. This employment information is then shared with the program coordinator who maintains a database of employment information for our program completers. We still find challenges in self-reporting.
I. Explanation of how the **staffing capacity** for program delivery and administration and quality assurance system monitoring have changed during the reporting year, if at all, and how capacity matches the current size of the program.
Beginning on July 1, 2025, we had a change in administrative positions. Our Dean of the School of Education, Dr. Barbara Marinak, became the University Provost; the Chair/Director of Teacher Education, Dr. Stacey Brown-Hobbs, became the Dean of the School of Education; and Dr. Angela Mucci-Guido, a lecturer and the Director for the Center of Catholic School Excellence, became the Chair/Director of Teacher Education. With the change in administrative positions, we hired a full-time lecturer that replaced both Dr. Stacey Brown-Hobbs and Dr. Angela Mucci-Guido.

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

Tables 3 and 4 report on select measures (3 to 5 measures for each standard) of candidate/completer performance related to AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, including the program's expectations for performance (criteria for success) and indicators of the degree to which those expectations are met.

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

<table>
<tr><th>Provider-selected measures (name and description)</th><th>Criteria for success</th><th>Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation</th></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>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 3.45 to 3.79, which is within the 2.0 acceptable requirement. It is noted that the lowest average was the candidate's score for the intern's knowledge about the local and state curriculum. Access to the curriculum and teaching resources requires authorized access. While our candidates go through the necessary requirements to have some access to curriculum and teaching resources, they do not hold the same access as their mentor teacher. To obtain the full breadth and depth of resources available, candidates must seek out their mentor teacher to request needed resources.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><th>Benchmark</th><th colspan="3">Fall 2024</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>Mentor N=56</th><th>Supervisor N=57</th><th>Candidate N=51</th></tr>
<tr><td>I.A. writes concise, effective lesson plans</td><td>3.68</td><td>3.79</td><td>3.59</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.B. Intern plans for diverse learners</td><td>3.66</td><td>3.67</td><td>3.73</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.E. Intern effectively teaches all learners</td><td>3.63</td><td>3.63</td><td>3.53</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.F. Intern uses a variety of instructional strategies</td><td>3.66</td><td>3.74</td><td>3.67</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.G. Intern is knowledgeable about local and state curriculum</td><td>3.54</td><td>3.51</td><td>3.45</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.H. Intern demonstrates understanding of social, emotional, cognitive, physical and cultural needs of learner through instruction</td><td>3.64</td><td>3.68</td><td>3.69</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, oral presentation, response to questions, and submission of Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT) Tasks 2 and 3. Students needed to meet 4 out of the 5 criteria points to achieve the minimum assessment requirement. Candidate averages were 4.94. One candidate scored below the minimum assessment requirement. This candidate did not continue in the program.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">2024 RIP Overall Mean Scores
Fall 2024 (N = 62)</th></tr>
<tr><td>RIP Component</td><td>Average Score</td></tr>
<tr><td>Context</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data Analysis</td><td>.98</td></tr>
<tr><td>Oral Presentation</td><td>.98</td></tr>
<tr><td>Response to Question</td><td>.98</td></tr>
<tr><td>Project Submission</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total Average Score</td><td>4.94</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 2.82-3.0 in the high approaches to meets levels. For the adaptable disposition, "the candidate demonstrates a respect for students' individual differences as a context for learning", an overall mean of 3 was rated across the mentor, supervisor, and candidate rating. An overall mean of 3 was rated across the mentor, supervisor, and candidate rating for the ethical disposition, "the candidate keeps student personal information confidential unless required by law to disclose or report." 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 2024		
		Mentor N=56	Supervisor N=57	Candidate N=50
Committed	The candidate demonstrates accurate and professional communication that is free of error with all audiences.	2.91	2.89	2.9
	The candidate is present and punctual.	2.91	2.91	2.98
	The candidate respects the ideas and works of others.	2.91	2.95	3
	The candidate takes responsibility for own behavior/learning and its impact on others.	2.89	2.91	3
	The candidate demonstrates commitment to learning best practices.	2.89	2.93	2.96
	The candidate demonstrates initiative in independent learning.	2.89	2.89	2.96
	The candidate demonstrates the belief that all students can learn and achieve.	2.95	2.89	2.98
Adaptable	The candidate demonstrates the ability to be an active listener with all audiences.	2.91	2.95	3
	The candidate demonstrates a respect for students' individual differences as a context for learning.	3	3	3
	The candidate is able to apply feedback to make change(s) in candidate's behavior and/or teaching practice.	2.88	2.91	3
	The candidate demonstrates a positive rapport with others.	2.93	2.95	3
	The candidate collaborates in group assignments, projects, and co-teaching situations.	2.88	2.91	2.98
	The candidate demonstrates patience with others and control of emotions.	2.91	2.96	3
Reflective	The candidate describes, with specificity, effective and ineffective instruction.	2.88	2.93	2.98
	The candidate describes differences in the students and can explain how instruction might be differentiated.	2.88	2.82	2.94
	The candidate seeks feedback from professors, supervisors, and mentor and is open to constructive criticism.	2.89	2.89	3
	The candidate articulates accomplishments and areas needed for growth.	2.89	2.89	2.96

			The candidate makes thoughtful connections between internship experiences and course work.	2.95	2.95	2.96
		Ethical	The candidate uses professionally appropriate behavior in all interactions. (e.g. face-to-face, online, social media, email, etc.)	2.95	2.96	3
			The candidate keeps student personal information confidential unless required by law to disclose or report.	3	3	3
			The candidate is respectful of diversity in its broadest sense, such as race, ethnicity, gender, age, religiosity, sexual orientation and others.	3	2.98	3
			The candidate adheres to the university's Code of Conduct.	3	2.96	3
			The candidate adheres to the Model Code of Ethics for Educators. (https://www.nasdtec.net/page/MCEE_Doc)	2.96	2.96	3

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

<table>
<tr><th>Provider-selected measures (name and description)</th><th>Criteria for success</th><th>Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation</th></tr>
<tr><td>Program Completer Survey
The 2024-2025 Program Completer Survey, with a 52% (32 of 62 candidates) return rate—the highest in the last four 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 6 respondents who felt they did not have opportunities to communicate with parents and 5 that disagreed with having opportunities to interact professionally in local cultural communities.</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">2024-2025 Program Completer Survey Data Related to Aspect 2a
(N = 32)</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>14
(43.75%)</td><td>12
(37.50%)</td><td>6
(18.75%)</td><td>0
(0.00%)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Interacts professionally in local school communities</td><td>23
(71.88%)</td><td>9
(28.12%)</td><td>0
(0.00%)</td><td>0
(0.00%)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Interacts professional in local cultural communities</td><td>19
(59.38%)</td><td>8
(25.00%)</td><td>5
(15.62%)</td><td>0
(0.00%)</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<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 2024</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Mentor N=56</td><td>Supervisor N=57</td><td>Candidate N=51</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.B. Intern plans for diverse learners</td><td>3.66</td><td>3.67</td><td>3.73</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.E. Intern effectively teaches all learners</td><td>3.63</td><td>3.63</td><td>3.53</td></tr>
<tr><td>I.H. Intern demonstrates understanding of social, emotional, cognitive, physical and cultural needs of learner through instruction</td><td>3.64</td><td>3.68</td><td>3.69</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InTASC Portfolio—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 individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.</td>
<td>The overall means of the InTASC 3 section for Fall 2024 was 3.17, which was higher than the previous year where there was a mean of 2.76. Candidates had to meet an overall score of 2.0 for the entire portfolio. Mean scores ranged from 2.5 to 3.0. This was the same as the previous year. Part of this could be how we prepared candidates to complete the portfolio. Based on these data, candidates meet aspect 2c.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Fall 2024 InTASC portfolio (N=62)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Certification Program</td><td>InTASC 3</td></tr>
<tr><td>All
N =56</td><td>3.17</td></tr>
<tr><td>Art (MAT)
N = 2</td><td>2.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>Art (UG)
N = 0</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Biology (MAT)
N = 1</td><td>3.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Business (MAT)
N = 1</td><td>2.7</td></tr>
<tr><td>Elementary (AUG)
N = 4</td><td>3.0</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>

Elementary (MAT) N = 4	3.0
Elementary (UG) N = 9	3.0
Elem & Sp. Ed. (AUG) N = 6	2.83
Elem. & Sp. Ed. (MAT) N = 17	2.82
Elem. & Sp. Ed. (UG) N = 3	2.77
English (MAT) N = 2	3.0
English (UG) N = 1	3.0
Mathematics (MAT) N = 0	N/A
Mathematics (UG) N = 1	3.0
Music (MAT) N = 1	3.0
Social Studies (MAT) N = 7	2.67
Social Studies (UG) N = 3	2.9

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.

We continue to reflect on ways to ensure that candidates are ready to engage in professional practice, to adapt to a variety of professional settings, and to grow throughout their careers. To engage in discussion on our Internship experiences, we held a Supervisor Summit with our university supervisors (aspect 3b). During the summit, we discussed how we can improve the Internship experience to better prepare our teacher candidates. Discussions during this summit focused on how we better support candidates who are employed while completing an internship. The "Models for Mentoring Candidates Hired as Teachers of Record" document originated from this meeting as a way for the mentor and candidate who is a hired preservice teacher to focus on beneficial professional topics aligned to our five benchmark areas (Planning, Instruction, & Assessment; Management & Engagement; Communication; Professionalism & Leadership; and Analysis & Reflection).

The PDS Principal meeting (partner school principals) and PDS Coordinating Council (partner school site coordinators) were held to engage these key stakeholders from our partner schools in analysis, planning, improvement, and innovation (aspect 3c). Discussions around Maryland regulations, updates on our program and requirements, and dispositions are shared to gain feedback and input. During these meetings, feedback and input are obtained on strengths and ways we can improve our teacher preparation program.

As part of our Maryland Elevates grant, we began to institute a coaching framework in collaboration and partnership with Frederick County Public Schools (FCPS). This allows us to engage in continuous improvement of our program and investigate opportunities for innovation (aspect 3e) as well as demonstrate our commitment to meeting state and local educator workforce needs and to diversify participation in the educator workforce through candidate recruitment and support (aspect 4b). Candidate support will employ a model of gradual release whereby coaching transitions to supervision as the teacher candidates move from field experiences to internships. This university-based support will be provided in addition to the mentoring provided by FCPS. As much as possible, MSMU will make every attempt to retain coaches/supervisors for the duration of the candidates' programs. Collaboration between MSMU and FCPS includes regular meetings of the Mount Grow-Your-Own Leadership Team. This team includes leaders and professors from MSMU as well as key stakeholders from FCPS including but not limited to the Director of Special Education and the Director of Early Childhood Education. Intentional collaboration is being used to frame these conversations and planning. To sustain this

coaching framework, a new grant was awarded for the upcoming year. The new grant expands these coaching efforts to other districts.

The Early Childhood program was initiated during the 2024-2025 academic year with a focus on planning, improvement, and innovation with key stakeholders (aspect 3c). An Early Childhood Advisory Committee was formed to share updates and seek feedback from early childhood classroom teachers and the local school system Director of Early Childhood. The program has a focus in play, which is unique compared to other programs. Recognizing this unique quality, an adjunct with expertise in play who is also an early childhood classroom teacher was hired to teach the play course in the program. We also had an increase in our triple certification (elementary/early childhood/special education) candidates, one of which was to begin their Internship II experience in Fall 2025. To plan for this candidate's Internship II experience, we collaborated with the local school system Director of Early Childhood to identify program sites that were available for a combined early childhood education and special education experience or half of their internship experience in early childhood education and the other half of their internship experience in special education. During Internship I in spring 2025, this candidate participated in their Internship I experience, which focused on elementary grades 1-5.

We continue to seek ways to better support candidates who are employed while completing an internship. These efforts involve close collaboration with administration in schools to ensure these candidates are supported and meet the requirements of the internship experience (aspect 3b). This includes individual meetings with administrators and our teacher candidates to answer specific questions pertaining to the candidate's teaching position in relation to field and internship experience expectations. These conversations allow individual candidates and administrators to discuss unique situations and problem solve ways in which field and internship experiences are feasible for these candidates who are a preservice teacher while fulfilling inservice teacher obligations. To confirm understanding of the internship expectations for these candidates, an alternative application is verified and signed by the administrator, candidate, and mentor.

Part II: Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth

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

6. Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth and Improvement

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

Table 5. Provider Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement

Standard 1	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	Beginning July 1, 2025, all teacher licensure areas will require a performance-based assessment. Candidates who graduate on or after July 1, 2025, must take one of the performance-based assessments for licensure, which includes edTPA or PPAT. PPAT is retiring in December 2025. Therefore, edTPA would be the only option. Advocate for alternate performance assessment for licensure.
Actions	• Since we are accredited by AAQEP, we have a nationally accredited portfolio-based performance assessment, the InTASC Portfolio. • Write a bill with the sponsorship of Maryland House delegate, Kris Fair. • Pass HB 888 altering the qualifications for an initial teacher certificate to include passing a portfolio-based assessment of a nationally accredited teacher preparation program.
Expected outcomes	Internship II teacher candidates will complete the InTASC portfolio during seminar in conjunction with Internship II. In Fall 2025, the InTASC portfolio will fulfill the requirement of a portfolio-based assessment for licensure. Candidates still need to complete their subject-area content test for licensure with ETS.
Reflections or comments	We relooked at our seminar course with an intentional focus on the InTASC portfolio and our five benchmark areas- Planning, Instruction, & Assessment; Management & Engagement; Communication; Professionalism & Leadership; and Analysis & Reflection.

Standard 2	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	Implement the Cultural Competence Project as a key assessment across MAT (in MEDUC 501) and Adult UG (in EDUC 100-1) programs.
Actions	• Ensure consistent system for grading • Ensure system collection of data through Chalk and Wire/Anthology
Expected outcomes	This project will enhance and deepen students' understanding of content in these courses by providing an opportunity for direct application of what they are learning in the course.
Reflections or comments	Discuss implementation of this key assessment with instructors who teach MEDUC 501 and EDUC 100-1 as well as seek their feedback on overall performance of students on this assessment. Review data in Chalk and Wire/Anthology to ensure consistency in grading.
Standard 3	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	MSDE competencies in reading and cultural competence will be analyzed and aligned in initial certification courses.
Actions	• Meet with course instructors to discuss competencies in relation to courses • Review courses with regards to what is already being implemented and changes needed
Expected outcomes	We will continue to review/revise courses to ensure competencies can be implemented successfully
Reflections or comments	Continue to monitor implementation and alignment
Standard 4	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	Investigated and awarded a Maryland Elevates Grant to support Grow-Your-Own initiatives and coaching for dual certification in elementary and special education.
Actions	• Select and meet with coaches • Collaborate with local school system and partner school administrators • Evaluate effectiveness of gradual release whereby coaching transitions to supervision as teacher candidates move from field experiences to internships.

Expected outcomes	Increase the number of qualified teachers in special education who have the skills and dispositions to impact student learning.
Reflections or comments	Candidates have been vetted and are currently completing Internship experiences during this academic year. Most are employed in support roles or teachers of record in the schools.

Update on Activities to Investigate Data Quality

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

The School of Education meet in August, December, and May to learn updates and review data from courses as well as field and internship experiences. These meetings include the School of Education faculty, the Dean, Field Experience Coordinator, and Chair, Director of Teacher Education. Raw data is provided to faculty working in small groups who are tasked with reviewing and discussing insights and patterns. These insights and patterns are then shared with the whole group. After each group has shared, we discuss next steps based on our discussion. These data discussions allow for transparency regarding candidate progress and performance. It also allows for faculty to reflect on their courses and consider improvements to better target the needs of our teacher candidates.

The Chair, Director of Teacher Education meet with faculty who teach courses with key assessments to discuss the assessment and scoring. Touch point meetings are had to ensure consistency in implementation. Data from key assessments are scored and stored in Chalk and Wire/Anthology to allow for access and analysis. These data are frequently shared and reflected upon in our School of Education retreat meetings.

Data related to field and Internship experiences are also reviewed and discussed with university supervisors at the Supervisor Summit as well as with local school system partner administrators and site coordinators. Discussions on these data have resulted in implementation supports to better meet the needs of our teacher candidates in the field. One example of this is the “Models for Mentoring Candidates Hired as Teachers of Record” as we recognized the challenge for our teachers of record to meet regularly with their assigned mentor during their Internship II experience. Discussions on data also allow for the School of Education to seek feedback and input on what is working well in our program and what changes need to be made to strengthen our program.

7. Evidence Related to AAQEP-Identified Concerns or Conditions

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

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.

The Chair, Director of Teacher Education will continue the Supervisor Summit. This day long summit allows for review of data and discussion. Specifically, continued discussion will occur regarding those candidates who are employed while completing an internship. It is important that we continue to ensure these preservice teacher candidates receive the necessary supports from their principals, assigned mentor, and university supervisor. Similarly, meetings with partner principals (PDS Principal meeting) and partner school site coordinators (PDS Coordinating Council) will continue to communicate Internship expectations and seek feedback regarding hired preservice teachers.

The School of Education will continue "Grow Your Own" initiatives to support MAT and Adult Undergraduates in becoming elementary and special education teachers; elementary and early childhood teachers; or elementary, early childhood, and special education teachers through Maryland Elevates. The funding will support recruitment and provide support to paraprofessionals and conditionally certified teachers with our local school system partners. A specific focus will be on evidence-based job-embedded coaching/supervision in which a model of gradual release will be used to transition candidates from coaching to supervision. Intentional collaborations will be had with Mount St. Mary's University and participating local school systems to support these efforts.

With the launch of our newest certification program in elementary and early childhood dual certification programs as well as elementary, early childhood, and special education, the Early Childhood Education Advisory Committee led by our Director of Early Childhood Education, met in Fall 2024 and Spring 2025. The focus of these meetings was on implementation and feedback on coursework as well as recruitment/enrollment. We have further explored our focus of our

early childhood program on play. We have recognized this as a unique quality of our program and have sought out the expertise of an adjunct and local school representative to teach this course. To ensure consistency in advising for our traditional undergraduate candidates seeking certification in early childhood, the Director of Early Childhood Education serves as their advisor.

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).

New regulations are to be implemented July 2025-
https://dsd.maryland.gov/Pages/COMARSearch.aspx#Default=%7B%22k%22%3A%22%22%2C%22r%22%3A%5B%7B%22n%22%3A%22dsdFullTitleName%22%2C%22t%22%3A%5B%22%5C%22%C7%82%C7%82737472696e673b23313412 02d20537461746520426f617264206f66204564756361746696f6e%5C%22%22%5D%2C%22o%22%3A%22and%22%2C%22k%22%3Afalse%2C%22m%22%3Anull%7D%2C%7B%22n%22%3A%22dsdFullSubtitleName%22%2C%22t%22%3A%5B%22%5C%22%C7%82%C7%82737472696e673b233132202d204544554341544f52204c4943454e53555245%5C%22%22%5D%2C%22o%22%3A%22and%22%2C%22k%22%3Afalse%2C%22m%22%3Anull%7D%5D%2C%22l%22%3A1033%7D

10. Sign Off

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

Date sent to AAQEP:	12/16/2025