



AAQEP Annual Report for 2025

Provider/Program Name:	Hobart & William Smith Colleges (HWS)/Teacher Education Program (TEP)
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or "n/a" if not yet accredited):	6/30/2031

PART I: Publicly Available Program Performance and Candidate Achievement Data

1. Overview and Context

This overview describes the mission and context of the educator preparation provider and the programs included in its AAQEP review.

There is a long tradition of teacher education at Hobart & William Smith Colleges (HWS) extending back more than 100 years. The current Teacher Education Program (TEP) was established in 1971 and is based on two assumptions: 1) Students learn to teach best by teaching, and 2) All teachers need a firm grounding in the liberal arts and sciences. These assumptions have meant that the TEP is relatively unique in New York State in that HWS does not offer a major or minor in education leading to teacher certification, but instead offers a broad and innovative program that combines extensive classroom experience in local schools with a strong grounding in the liberal arts. HWS offers 15 undergraduate programs leading to New York State Initial certification: Adolescent Education (Grades 7-12) in Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, English, French, Latin, Mathematics, Physics, Social Studies, and Spanish; Childhood Education (Grades 1-6); Dual Childhood Education and Students with Disabilities (Grades 1-6); Music (P-12); TESOL (P-12); and Visual Arts (P-12).

In addition, we offer a Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) degree which is a fifth-year graduate program leading to Initial certification. Admissions to the MAT is competitive, and currently only available to admitted candidates who are completing one of the following three undergraduate certification areas at HWS: Adolescent Education (in the above disciplines), Childhood Education, or dual Childhood Education & Students with Disabilities.

In 2002, the Education Department (now Educational Studies) created a set of TEP goals and indicators that identify the competencies that our candidates should develop during their time in the program. These goals serve to frame and inform the TEP curriculum throughout all levels of the program and are aligned with New York State certification program guidelines, NYS Professional Teaching Standards, InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, and AAQEP Standards. The ten TEP goals are:

- Goal 1: A Solid Grounding in the Liberal Arts
- Goal 2: Curriculum Planning and Assessment
- Goal 3: Diversifying Instruction to Empower All Learners
- Goal 4: Appreciating Cultures and Encouraging Family Participation in Schools
- Goal 5: Promoting Literacy and Communication Skills
- Goal 6: Facilitating Student Learning
- Goal 7: Using Technology for Teaching and Learning
- Goal 8: Promoting the Physical, Emotional, and Social Well-being of Students
- Goal 9: Preparing Students for Engaged Citizenship
- Goal 10: Preparing for the Professional Aspects of Teaching

All candidates must satisfactorily complete four semesters of early fieldwork and associated teacher education seminars before a final semester of full-time student teaching. Candidates do not receive academic credit for the field experiences and teacher education seminars, although they are recorded as Credit or No Credit on their academic transcript and must be successfully passed (CR) in order to be recommended for certification.

Early Field Placements - The TEP is distinguished by its commitment to requiring candidates to complete 160 clock hours of classroom experience prior to student teaching (exceeding the 100 minimum clock hours required by NYSED). During the four semesters of early field placements (representing 40 hours/semester), candidates work in a variety of classrooms, growing their responsibilities in preparation for full-time student teaching. These teaching placements ensure that candidates have the opportunity to work in diverse classroom environments at multiple grade levels and in urban, suburban and rural districts, and benefit from the extensive collective experience of our region's teacher leaders.

All TEP candidates complete at least one semester in the Geneva City School District, a racially and economically diverse district, as well as at least one semester working with students with disabilities. During these early field placements, candidates work in conjunction with not only school partners, but also with multiple members of the Educational Studies Department who supervise their practicum experiences and teach seminars where candidates are able to reflect on their experiences with other teacher education candidates.

TEP Seminars and Coursework - In addition to completing four semesters of fieldwork, all candidates must complete a sequence of teacher education seminars that run concurrently with the field experiences. Seminars address pedagogical topics, theoretical concepts, and issues related to the teaching profession. In these teacher education seminars, candidates participate in in-class activities and complete assignments that require them to reflect deeply on what they are seeing in their P-12 classroom placements and make connections between pedagogical theories and practice. Candidates also complete courses in their content area specializations.

Student Teaching - In the final semester of the program, candidates complete one full semester of student teaching in the academic area(s) in which they intend to obtain certification. Student teaching can take place during senior year, a post-graduate 9th semester, or, if admitted, during the 5th year MAT program. Student teachers follow the public school calendar while teaching five days a week for fourteen weeks in a local school district. Candidates completing the dual Childhood Education and Students with Disabilities certifications student teach in both a general education classroom and in a special education classroom, and candidates pursuing visual arts, music or TESOL certifications complete student teaching in both elementary (grades K-6) and middle/high school (grade 7-12) classrooms (for a total of seven weeks in each placement). Candidates also complete a student teaching seminar, are observed teaching lessons on a weekly basis by a faculty supervisor, assessed at the 7-week midpoint and 14-week endpoint, and complete a TPA (Teacher Performance Assessment) Portfolio. Candidates receive academic credit for four courses during the student teaching semester.

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.hws.edu/academics/education/accreditation.aspx>

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)
<i>Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials</i>			
Bachelor of Arts (BA) or Bachelor of Science (BS)	Adolescent Education – Biology (Grades 7-12) Initial	0	0
Bachelor of Arts (BA) or Bachelor of Science (BS)	Adolescent Education - Chemistry (Grades 7-12) Initial	2	0
Bachelor of Arts (BA) or Bachelor of Science (BS)	Adolescent Education - Earth Science (Grades 7-12) Initial	1	0
Bachelor of Arts (BA)	Adolescent Education – English (Grades 7-12) Initial	5	0
Bachelor of Arts (BA)	Adolescent Education - French (Grades 7-12) Initial	0	0
Bachelor of Arts (BA)	Adolescent Education - Latin (Grades 7-12) Initial	0	0
Bachelor of Arts (BA) or Bachelor of Science (BS)	Adolescent Education – Mathematics (Grades 7-12) Initial	4	1
Bachelor of Arts (BA) or Bachelor of Science (BS)	Adolescent Education - Physics (Grades 7-12) Initial	0	0

Bachelor of Arts (BA)	Adolescent Education - Social Studies (Grades 7-12) Initial	13	0
Bachelor of Arts (BA)	Adolescent Education - Spanish (Grades 7-12) Initial	1	0
Bachelor of Arts (BA) or Bachelor of Science (BS)	Childhood Education (Grades 1-6) Initial	5	1
Bachelor of Arts (BA) or Bachelor of Science (BS)	Dual Childhood Education (Grades 1-6) & Students with Disabilities (Grades 1-6) Initial	37	4
Bachelor of Arts (BA)	Music Education (Grades 7-12) Initial	1	0
Bachelor of Arts (BA)	TESOL (grades P-12) Initial	4	1
Bachelor of Arts (BA)	Visual Arts Education (Grades P-12) Initial	3	0
Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT)	Adolescent Education (Grades 7-12) Initial	4	4
Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT)	Childhood Education (Grades 1-6) Initial	0	0
Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT)	Childhood Education & Students with Disabilities (Grades 1-6) Initial	7	6
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		87	17
<i>Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators</i>			
N/A		N/A	N/A
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials		N/A	N/A
<i>Programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials</i>			
N/A		N/A	N/A
Total for programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials		N/A	N/A
<i>Programs that lead to credentials for specialized professionals or to no specific credential</i>			
N/A		N/A	N/A

Total for programs that lead to specialized professional or no specific credentials	N/A	N/A
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs	87	17
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers	87	17

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.)

N/A

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.	
87	
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.	
17	
C. Number of recommendations for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.	
27	

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%*

(*One candidate has not completed their certification program within the expected timeframe, but the time has not yet exceeded 1.5 times the expected timeframe)

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%.

Source: NYSTCE EdReports Reporting Range: August 1, 2024 – July 31, 2025

Sixty-nine NYS teacher certification exams were taken by program candidates/completers between August 1, 20024 and July 31, 2025, representing 23 unique test takers. The pass rate was 100% on all exams except the Multi-Subject – Part 2 mathematics* which was not passed twice by the same completer within the reporting range under review. Note: Two individuals listed on EdReports were excluded from reporting because they were not candidates/completers from our program.

Test	# Completed	# Passed	# Pass Rate
201 Educating All Students (EAS)	18	18	100%
221 Multi-Subject: Teachers of Childhood (Grades 1-6) Part 1: English Language Arts	11	11	100%
222 Multi-Subject: Teachers of Childhood (Grades 1-6) Part 2: Mathematics	13	11*	84.5%
245 Multi-Subject: Teachers of Childhood (Grades 1-6) Part 3: Arts & Sciences	9	9	100%
003 Content Specialty Test English: Language Arts	1	1	100%
116 Content Specialty Test English: English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)	2	2	100%
004 Content Specialty Test: Mathematics	2	2	100%
115 Content Specialty Test: Social Studies	2	2	100%
129 Content Specialty Test: Spanish	1	1	100%
060 Content Specialty Test: Students with Disabilities	9	9	100%
167 Content Specialty Test: Visual Arts	1	1	100%
Total	69	67	

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

In 2024 – 2025, there were 17 completers. Evidence from completers include an **Exit Survey** ('TEP Goals and Professional Dispositions') completed after the completion of the TEP and student teaching. The Exit Survey asks completers to assess their level of preparation for teaching as described by the indicators addressed in the 10 TEP goals. Respondents (N=10) reported that they felt prepared to teach across all goals.

Another source of evidence is the **1-year Alumni Survey** which sent to completers after they've completed their first year of teaching. The survey consists of questions about employment and graduate school status, and 33 4-scale Likert-style questions related to how the TEP prepared them for teaching. 92% of the respondents (N=12) indicated they were working as full-time teachers (elementary, middle school, high school, special education), primarily in public schools (69%). Five were enrolled in post-HWS graduate programs. On 94% (31/33) of the survey questions related to their preparation for teaching, a ponderance of completers indicated they felt prepared for teaching as a result of the TEP. All respondents indicated that they were well-prepared to teach effectively, meet the diverse learning needs of their students, create safe, productive learning environments, work effectively with families and colleagues, and judged themselves to be effective first year teachers. While there often will be areas of growth as completers gain more experience, three respondents (31%) indicated they felt less prepared to address the needs of students facing complex personal and familial issues, and were less prepared to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of the students who were English language learners; therefore, the Department will identify specific strategies to increase candidate preparation in these two focal areas.

A final source of evidence is from the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) Portfolio. The **TPA Portfolio** is a direct performance measure that serves as a multi-measure assessment of candidate pedagogical knowledge and skills identified in the NYS Teaching Standards, knowledge and skills related to the four principles of the NYS Culturally Responsive-Sustaining Educational Framework, and content knowledge and skill in teaching to the State learning standards in the grade band and subject area of a certificate sought. Candidates select three lesson plans, each of which addresses one of the following themes: Culturally Responsive and Sustaining Practices, Literacy and Language Acquisition, and Assessment and Data-Informed Instruction. Each lesson is taught by the candidate during student teaching and is observed by both a faculty supervisor and cooperating teacher using a rubric based on the updated Danielson Framework for Teaching. Copies of the written observations are submitted with the lesson plans, along with candidate self-reflections. The TPA Portfolio assignments are assessed by the instructor of the student teacher seminar using a grading rubric with 4 assessment categories (lesson planning and preparation, instructional area of focus, reflection on teaching, application of feedback). In fall 2024 and spring 2025, there were 18 student teachers. All 18 completed and passed the TPA Portfolio with grades ranging from B- (skilled) to A (accomplished), with 14 candidates receiving predominantly A range scores, and 4 receiving predominantly B range scores.

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

We plan to collect evidence from completers and employers through 360-degree case study approach that involves interviewing program completers along with their employers, conducting classroom observations, and reviewing classroom documents (for example completer's APPR feedback, lesson plans, etc.). We plan to pilot this approach in spring 2026.

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.

Due to our small size, we are typically able to stay in touch with most of our program completers; therefore, we typically have direct knowledge of their plans once they graduate. We also conduct an annual survey of completers one year after graduation, and if needed, we also check social media sites like LinkedIn to see if completers have posted employment updates. Of the 17 completers from the 2024-2025 school year, all reported being hired as educators, with 13 teaching in public schools, two in charter schools, one in a boarding school, and one teaching internationally. Sixteen were hired in full-time positions, and one was working as a substitute teacher.

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.

Staff capacity remained stable last year during the reporting period, but the department has felt stretched to cover all responsibilities for teaching necessary courses and seminars in the undergraduate and graduate programs along with program reorganization planning and accreditation responsibilities. The Educational Studies Department has four full-time tenured/tenure track faculty, two Assistant Professors of Praxis - one who serves as the Director of the TEP and Secondary Education and one who serves as the Director of Elementary Education and Supervision, one full-time Coordinator of Teacher Certification & Accreditation who oversees early field and student teaching placements, certification requirements, and data management, and a part-time academic coordinator who provides administrative support to the department. The Department also hires adjunct instructors and adjunct faculty supervisors for student teaching, when needed, and works with approximately 50 K-12 school partners ('cooperating teachers') across about eleven local school districts each semester. We additionally have two tenured faculty members long affiliated with the department who currently play a very limited role (one serves as an Associate Provost, and another is sub-contracted to provide 86% of their time to an external academic program). Both of these faculty are STEM-related instructors, which has impacted our ability to provide additional STEM-related courses.

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

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

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

Provider-selected measures (name and description)	Criteria for success	Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation																																																																																				
<p>Student Teacher Evaluation. Using the updated Danielson Framework for Teaching, student teachers are evaluated twice: once at the midpoint of the semester (Week 7) and again at the end of the semester (Week 14). For candidates in the Dual Childhood Education and Students with Disabilities certification program (grades 1–6), as well as those in P–12 content areas (i.e., TESOL, art, music), these evaluations occur at the end of each of their two required 7-week placements. Candidates in Adolescent Education (grades 7–12) typically complete only one 14-week student teaching placement, so the evaluation occurs at the mid-point and at the end of their student teaching placement.</p>	<p>Student teachers are assessed on the Danielson Framework performance indicators and are rated on a four-point scale: Not Yet Acceptable (1), Approaching Expectations (2), Meets Expectations (3), and Exceeds Expectations (4). When a student teacher receives a rating of Not Yet Acceptable at the 7-week evaluation, a formal action plan is developed to outline targeted steps for improvement. By the 14-week evaluation, candidates are expected to demonstrate performance at the Meets Expectations or Exceeds Expectations level across all indicators.</p>	<p>Mean Score Comparisons for Student Teacher Evaluations 24-25</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Category</th> <th rowspan="2">7-Week Mean Scores Elementary</th> <th rowspan="2">14-Week Mean Scores Elementary</th> <th rowspan="2">7-Week Mean Scores Secondary/ Special Area</th> <th rowspan="2">14-Week Mean Scores Secondary/ Special Area</th> </tr> <tr> <th>7-Week Mean Scores Elementary</th> <th>14-Week Mean Scores Elementary</th> <th>7-Week Mean Scores Secondary/ Special Area</th> <th>14-Week Mean Scores Secondary/ Special Area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning and Preparation</td> <td>3.15</td> <td>3.46</td> <td>3.14</td> <td>3.64</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3.16</td> <td>3.42</td> <td>2.68</td> <td>3.64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Instruction and Environment</td> <td>3.18</td> <td>3.49</td> <td>3.11</td> <td>3.68</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3.1</td> <td>3.4</td> <td>3.19</td> <td>3.61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Professional Practice</td> <td>3.39</td> <td>3.66</td> <td>3.07</td> <td>3.59</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>2.83</td> <td>3.16</td> <td>2.78</td> <td>3.48</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3.19</td> <td>3.71</td> <td>2.95</td> <td>3.42</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3.7</td> <td>3.81</td> <td>3.66</td> <td>3.92</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3.27</td> <td>3.63</td> <td>3.43</td> <td>3.85</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3.59</td> <td>3.57</td> <td>3.54</td> <td>3.85</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3.62</td> <td>3.78</td> <td>3.59</td> <td>3.92</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3.36</td> <td>3.63</td> <td>3.26</td> <td>3.78</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3.05</td> <td>3.16</td> <td>3.14</td> <td>3.61</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>2.93</td> <td>3.52</td> <td>3.38</td> <td>3.66</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3.52</td> <td>3.61</td> <td>3.52</td> <td>3.76</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(Link to Mean Score Comparison Chart)</p> <p>To support program-level analysis and trend identification, and due to our small sample size, evaluation data are grouped into two broader categories: Elementary (Childhood/Students with Disabilities) and Secondary/Content Area (Adolescence and P–12 Content Areas).</p>	Category	7-Week Mean Scores Elementary	14-Week Mean Scores Elementary	7-Week Mean Scores Secondary/ Special Area	14-Week Mean Scores Secondary/ Special Area	7-Week Mean Scores Elementary	14-Week Mean Scores Elementary	7-Week Mean Scores Secondary/ Special Area	14-Week Mean Scores Secondary/ Special Area	Planning and Preparation	3.15	3.46	3.14	3.64		3.16	3.42	2.68	3.64	Instruction and Environment	3.18	3.49	3.11	3.68		3.1	3.4	3.19	3.61	Professional Practice	3.39	3.66	3.07	3.59		2.83	3.16	2.78	3.48		3.19	3.71	2.95	3.42		3.7	3.81	3.66	3.92		3.27	3.63	3.43	3.85		3.59	3.57	3.54	3.85		3.62	3.78	3.59	3.92		3.36	3.63	3.26	3.78		3.05	3.16	3.14	3.61		2.93	3.52	3.38	3.66		3.52	3.61	3.52	3.76
Category	7-Week Mean Scores Elementary	14-Week Mean Scores Elementary						7-Week Mean Scores Secondary/ Special Area	14-Week Mean Scores Secondary/ Special Area																																																																													
			7-Week Mean Scores Elementary	14-Week Mean Scores Elementary	7-Week Mean Scores Secondary/ Special Area	14-Week Mean Scores Secondary/ Special Area																																																																																
Planning and Preparation	3.15	3.46	3.14	3.64																																																																																		
	3.16	3.42	2.68	3.64																																																																																		
Instruction and Environment	3.18	3.49	3.11	3.68																																																																																		
	3.1	3.4	3.19	3.61																																																																																		
Professional Practice	3.39	3.66	3.07	3.59																																																																																		
	2.83	3.16	2.78	3.48																																																																																		
	3.19	3.71	2.95	3.42																																																																																		
	3.7	3.81	3.66	3.92																																																																																		
	3.27	3.63	3.43	3.85																																																																																		
	3.59	3.57	3.54	3.85																																																																																		
	3.62	3.78	3.59	3.92																																																																																		
	3.36	3.63	3.26	3.78																																																																																		
	3.05	3.16	3.14	3.61																																																																																		
	2.93	3.52	3.38	3.66																																																																																		
	3.52	3.61	3.52	3.76																																																																																		

The Mean Score Comparison data illustrate clear growth across all categories from week 7 to week 14 for both groups. Mean scores for the 2024–2025 academic year ranged from 2.83 to 3.92, with the lowest scores occurring during the 7-week evaluations. By week 14, all mean scores for both groups were within the Meets or Exceeds Expectations range, indicating that student teachers are progressing appropriately and demonstrating competency by the end of their placements.

The three lowest mean scores across both groups appeared in the 7-week evaluations, specifically in the areas of:

- Assessment methods and analysis techniques (Elementary: 2.83; Secondary/Content Area: 2.78)
- Articulating rigorous student learning goals (Secondary/Content Area: 2.68)
- Oral communication skills, including communication with families (Elementary: 2.93)

While these scores still fall within the “Approaching Expectations” range, they highlight areas where additional instructional support may be beneficial. In particular, the data suggest opportunities to strengthen candidates’ skills in assessment literacy, goal-setting aligned to standards, and

		<p>communication with families.</p> <p>Overall, the upward trend from week 7 to week 14 across all categories demonstrates that student teachers are successfully developing the competencies expected of them and are meeting or exceeding expectations by the end of their placements.</p>
<p>Cumulative GPA of candidates and completers. Candidate GPA is a widely used indicator of academic performance and content knowledge.</p>	<p>The TEP requires undergraduate candidates to have a cumulative 2.75 GPA (out of 4.0) in order to advance to student teaching (a cumulative 2.5 GPA or above is required by NYSED for certification), and candidates admitted to the MAT program are required to maintain a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.0 (per NYSED requirements).</p>	<p>At the end of the spring 2025 semester, undergraduate candidates (N=76) had an average GPA of 3.58 (range 1.56 to 4.23). Graduate candidates (N=11) had an average GPA of 4.11 (range 4.06 to 4.18). Average cumulative GPA scores exceed the minimum requirement for both undergraduate and graduate candidates, and only one candidate was below the minimum requirement (and has since withdrawn from the program).</p>
<p>Student Teacher Readiness ‘AT2 Observation’. During the last of four early field placements prior to student teaching, a faculty supervisor conducts a formal observation of the candidate teaching a prepared lesson (the ‘AT2 Observation’) as a required decision point prior to a candidate advancing to student teaching. The candidate is required to submit a lesson plan in advance of the observation, and the supervisor meets with the candidate before and after the observation to discuss the lesson. The supervisor uses the same observation rubric based on the Danielson Framework for Teaching that is used during the student teaching semester (as described above).</p>	<p>The candidate must pass the AT Observation by demonstrating satisfactory pedagogical skills and knowledge prior to advancing to student teaching. If a candidate does not pass the observation, they are typically provided an opportunity to repeat the observation, and in situations where the candidate is not yet ready to advance to student teaching, they may be required to complete another early field experience and observation cycle or may be counseled out of the program.</p>	<p>There was a 100% Pass Rate (N=14) on the AT Observation. Seven candidates were observed in fall 2024 and seven observed in spring 2025, and all met the requirement and were able to advance to student teaching.</p>

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

Provider-selected measures (name and description)	Criteria for success	Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation
<p>Exit Survey ‘TEP Goals & Professional Dispositions’. An exit survey conducted with candidates who have completed the TEP and student teaching is conducted at the end of each academic year. The survey asks completers to assess their level of preparation for teaching as described by the 10 TEP goals (see Part 1 – Item 1 above for a list of goals).</p>	<p>The survey uses a 6-scale Likert-style score: very well-prepared, prepared, slightly prepared, slightly unprepared, unprepared, completely unprepared. The criterion for success is at least 80% of candidates indicate they feel prepared or well-prepared across each of the TEP goals.</p>	<p>In fall 2024, there were 14 student teachers, and in spring 2025, there were 4 student teachers. 10 student teachers completed the exit survey (55%), 6 from the fall and 4 from the spring semester.</p> <p>Overall, 90 – 100% of the respondents indicated feeling prepared or well-prepared for teaching based on the goal indicators after completing the TEP program and student teaching.</p> <p>100% of the respondents indicated they felt prepared or very well prepared related to TEP goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9.</p> <p>For Goal 8: Promoting the Physical, Emotional, and Social Well-Being of Students, one candidate (10%) indicated feeling slightly well-prepared, while the other 90% (N=9) indicated they felt either prepared or very-well prepared.</p> <p>Regarding Goal 10: Preparing for the Professional Aspects of Teaching/ Dispositions, 100% of the completers felt prepared or well-prepared related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Developing the ability to reflect on and improve one's practice, b) Viewing teaching as life-long learning,

		<p>c) Developing the work habits of a professional educator.</p> <p>For the following sections of goal 10, one candidate (10%) indicated feeling slightly well-prepared, while the other 9 (90%) indicated they felt either prepared or very-well prepared for:</p> <p>d) Knowing professional educational organizations and other resources that help teachers grow professionally,</p> <p>e) Demonstrating leadership in the field of education.</p> <p>Note: The response rate (55%) is lower than expected and the department will review exit survey procedures with the goal to increase the response rate to at least 75%.</p>
<p>Alumni Survey – 1 year post-graduation. An annual survey is sent to completers approximately one and a half years after graduating.</p>	<p>The survey asks questions related to employment status, graduate school attendance, professional experiences and opportunities, and preparation for teaching. Completers were asked thirty-three 4-point scale Likert-style questions related to their preparation for teaching: strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. The criteria for success is that at least 80% of the respondents indicate that they are either employed as teachers or are attending graduate school, and indicate that they agree or strongly agree with the majority of survey statements regarding their level of preparation for teaching.</p>	<p>Responses received during the 2024-2025 school represented completers from the previous two cohorts (2022-2023 & 2023-2024). Thirteen responses were received from December 2024 thru June 2025. Six responses were from the 2023-2024 cohort (6/14 completers = 43% response rate) and seven responses were from the 2022-2023 cohort (7/16 completers = 44% response rate). Six respondents completed Initial certification at HWS as undergraduates, and seven completed their Initial certification requirements through the MAT program.</p>

At the time of the survey, 92% (12/13) of the respondents indicated they were working as full-time teachers (elementary, middle school, high school, special education), primarily in public schools (69%). Five were enrolled in post-HWS graduate programs.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
use a broad range of instructional strategies to make subject matter accessible to all students.	6 (46%)	7 (54%)	0	0
differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of students receiving special education services.	9 (69%)	4 (31%)	0	0
acknowledge and be responsive to the economic, social, cultural, linguistic, family and community factors that influence my students' learning.	11 (86%)	2 (15%)	0	0
create a physically safe, and supportive learning environment that is inclusive of every student.	11 (86%)	2 (15%)	0	0
The TEP prepared me to: engage in ongoing self-reflection to address personal biases and their impact on students and families.	9 (69%)	4 (31%)	0	0
communicate in a way that builds, nurtures and facilitates relationships with students, families, and caregivers in the school community.	8 (62%)	5 (38%)	0	0
collaborate with families/guardians/caregivers to create opportunities for family participation in schools that reflect the assets of the students, school, and the surrounding community.	8 (62%)	5 (38%)	0	0
create a learning environment that is safe, welcoming, and fosters positive student relationships.	10 (77%)	3 (23%)	0	0
be an effective first year teacher.	7 (54%)	6 (46%)	0	0
reflect on my practices and set goals for professional growth.	9 (70%)	3 (29%)	0	0
communicate effectively with my school colleagues and staff.	8 (62%)	5 (38%)	0	0
collaborate with colleagues to support student learning.	8 (62%)	5 (38%)	0	0
communicate effectively with parents/guardians/caregivers about what students could turn for classroom guidance and support.	8 (62%)	5 (38%)	0	0
The TEP observation system based on the Danielson rubric prepared me for my first year observations and post observation conferences with administrators.	10 (77%)	3 (23%)	0	0
utilize feedback from my first-year mentor, my instructional coaches, and my administration to set goals and identify areas for professional growth.	11 (86%)	2 (15%)	0	0
design instruction in my content area and make my content meaningful to students.	5 (38%)	7 (54%)	1 (8%)	0
design relevant instruction that connects students' prior understandings and experiences to new knowledge.	3 (23%)	9 (69%)	1 (8%)	0
adapt my curriculum to make interdisciplinary connections and connections outside of the classroom.	4 (31%)	8 (62%)	1 (8%)	0
engage students in critical thinking and problem solving.	6 (46%)	6 (44%)	1 (8%)	0
create and deliver lessons that are aligned with learning standards.	7 (54%)	5 (38%)	1 (8%)	0
develop a variety of assessment tools and processes to document student learning and growth.	4 (31%)	8 (62%)	1 (8%)	0
create a learning environment that encourages student engagement and motivates my students to learn.	9 (69%)	3 (23%)	1 (8%)	0
help students work collaboratively, recognize communities, respect individual differences, and develop positive self-efficacy.	7 (54%)	5 (38%)	1 (8%)	0
measure and assess student progress towards curricular goals and adapt instruction to meet student needs.	6 (46%)	5 (38%)	2 (15%)	0
analyze and interpret assessment data to plan and differentiate instruction to meet student needs.	5 (38%)	6 (46%)	2 (15%)	0
teach vocabulary building, reading, and writing skills appropriate to the subject and the developmental levels of my students.	4 (31%)	7 (54%)	2 (15%)	0
create clear classroom routines and procedures that facilitate consistent behavioral and academic expectations for all students.	6 (46%)	5 (38%)	2 (15%)	0
utilize a variety of instructional technologies in ways that promote collaboration, creativity, authentic learning, and critical thinking.	5 (38%)	6 (46%)	1 (8%)	0
teach social skills and conflict resolution to my students.	7 (54%)	4 (31%)	2 (15%)	0
plan and teach curricula that explore opportunities for students beyond their school community.	5 (38%)	6 (46%)	2 (15%)	0
manage multiple instructional duties in accordance with school district guidelines or other expectations.	6 (46%)	5 (38%)	2 (15%)	0
know how to use school resources to work with students who may be dealing with personal or familial substance, physical, and emotional abuse.	7 (54%)	3 (23%)	3 (23%)	1 (8%)
differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of students identified as English language learners.	4 (31%)	5 (38%)	3 (23%)	1 (8%)

([Link](#) to Alumni Survey Questions Chart)

94% (31/33) of the survey questions related to preparation for teaching, a ponderance of completers indicated they felt prepared or well-prepared for teaching as a result of the TEP. All respondents indicated that they were well-prepared to teach effectively, meet the diverse learning needs of their students, create safe, productive learning environments, work effectively with families and

		<p>colleagues, and judged themselves to be effective first year teachers.</p> <p>While there will often be areas of growth as completers gain more experience and skills, two areas where three respondents (31%) indicated they felt less prepared to address were the needs of students facing complex personal and familial issues, and being able to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of their students who are English language learners; therefore, the department will identify specific strategies to increase candidate preparation in these two areas.</p> <p>Note: The Department will review survey procedures with the goal to increase the response rate to higher than 50% (the most recent rates were 44% and 43%).</p>
<p>Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) Portfolio. The TPA Portfolio is a direct performance measure that takes place in lieu of the edTPA which was discontinued by the NYS Board of Regents in April 2022. NYSED requires a TPA to be developed by local educator preparation programs to serve as a multi-measure assessment where candidates demonstrate the pedagogical knowledge and skills identified in the NYS Teaching Standards, the four principles of the NYS Culturally Responsive-Sustaining Educational Framework, and content knowledge and skill in teaching to the State learning standards in the grade</p>	<p>The TPA Portfolio assignments are assessed by the instructor of the student teacher seminars using a grading rubric with 4 assessment categories: lesson planning and preparation, instructional area of focus, reflection on teaching, application of feedback. Graduate candidates are required to pass the seminar with a grade of a B- or better, while undergraduate candidates are required to pass the seminar with a grade of C or better; therefore, similarly, the criteria for success on the TPA assignment is a grade of B- or better for graduate</p>	<p>In fall 2024, there were 14 student teachers, and in spring 2025, there were 4 student teachers. All completed and passed the TPA Portfolio. Rubric grades ranged from B- (skilled) to A (accomplished), with 14 candidates receiving predominantly A range scores, and 4 receiving predominantly B range scores.</p>

<p>band and subject area of their certification areas.</p> <p>For the TPA Portfolio assignment, candidates select three lesson plans, each of which addresses one of the following themes: <i>Culturally Responsive and Sustaining Practices, Literacy and Language Acquisition, and Assessment and Data-Informed Instruction</i>. Each lesson is taught by the candidate during student teaching and is observed by both the faculty supervisor and the cooperating teacher using a rubric based on the Danielson Framework for Teaching. Copies of the written observations are submitted with the lessons, along with a candidate self-reflection.</p>	<p>candidates and C or better for undergraduate candidates. Rubric criteria: A = Accomplished , B = Skilled, C = Developing, F = Ineffective</p>	
---	--	--

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.

Our work in 2024-2025 was part of a year's long effort to bring our Teacher Education Program up to date with the most current understandings of how to best prepare K-12 educators for success in the classroom. We proposed substantial improvements to our pedagogical core while maintaining our commitment to liberal arts study as the foundation for great teaching. We began the process of revising our entire seminar program into credit-bearing courses that we anticipate will appeal to students beyond the Teacher Education Program, while still providing the necessary coursework for aspiring teachers. We drafted new TEP goals, began to design Methods course proposals, revised our Student Teaching course sequence, and outlined new Inclusive Adolescent Education, Inclusive Childhood Education, Childhood Education, and Adolescent Education majors that would lead to NYSED Initial teacher certification. We re-designed all of the majors to be in line with our campus and department priorities, while adhering to the ever-evolving New York State Education Department's requirements for teacher certification. Ultimately, we are confident that these changes will have a substantial positive impact on our ability to attract, retain, and graduate a larger and even more prepared cohort of graduates each year. Additionally, our new graduate program ambitions that are currently in the works could not have occurred without the re-imagining of the undergraduate program.

We hope that this programmatic shift will make teacher education at HWS more accessible to a wider range of students, and we anticipate seeing bigger cohorts move through the process of becoming teachers. This will help address the teacher shortage facing the city of Geneva, New York state, and beyond. By taking full courses instead of seminars, we hope our candidates will have a deeper understanding of the pedagogical and curricular content they need to become impactful teachers. These changes also bring us into compliance with recent guidance from NYSED about P-12 licensure for teachers of students with disabilities.

Next, in the fall 2025 semester, we will seek approval from the Committee on Academic Affairs (COAA), the faculty governance committee overseeing new program and course approvals, and once approved, we will submit our application to NYSED for approval. We hope to have the new program available to students during the spring 2026 semester. We began identifying potential instructors for new courses and planning our staffing cycles for upcoming two years. Moving forward, we will work with HWS administration to fill an upcoming retirement vacancy in STEM education with a more permanent staffing solution. We are also will be turning our sights to a new graduate program for future teachers, with the support and encouragement from the Provost, President, and the Board of Trustees.

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Welcome a new Associate Director of Teacher Certification and Educational Studies- Develop new candidate survey instruments (e.g., TEP Goals & Dispositions) that align with new TEP goals- Continue to evaluate and update the Candidate Observation Tool (for use with AT2 and Student Teaching), 7-week & 14-week Student Teacher Evaluation forms, and early field assessment tools- Examine the findings from candidate data to determine trends and programmatic needs and set priorities
Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Onboarding of new Associate Director with review of current TEP structures and processes- Update candidate and completer surveys using revised TEP Goals- Review data at the Department's semi-annual retreats in August and January and set programmatic priorities- Code and score the results of the 7-week & 14-week Student Teacher Evaluation tools
Expected outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Deploy new survey instruments and collect data aligned with the new TEP goals and potentially other assessments related to new program structure- Identify trends and areas of need to improve candidate and completer outcomes
Reflections or comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Search for a new Associate Director of Teacher Certification and Educational Studies took place during the fall 2025 semester. A candidate was hired who will start in early January 2026. This role will be integral in reviewing and revising current practices.

Standard 2	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Revise Exit Survey to be aligned with updated TEP goals and program revisions. – Revise 1 year Alumni Survey to be aligned with new TEP goals and program revisions. – Develop and administer a 4-year Alumni survey aligned with new TEP goals and program revisions. – Pilot a 360-Degree case study assessment approach in order to gain a more robust, in-depth picture of completer performance in professional practice from multiple perspectives, including completer, employer, and faculty observer.
Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Revise the Exit Survey and 1-year alumni survey questions based on the new TEP goals using a more effective software management tool (e.g., Baseline). Assess validity and reliability of the new survey instrument. – Gather updated contact information (May 2024 completers) and administer the survey with robust and personal follow up to increase response rate. – Organize the results and reflect on the data collected to identify trends and program needs. – Create questions for the 4-year alumni survey based on the revised one-year alumni survey. Assess validity and reliability of the new survey instrument. – Gather contact information (May 2022 completers) and administer the survey with robust and personal follow up to increase response rate. – Organize the results and reflect on the data collected to identify trends and program needs. – Develop a methodological protocol for the 360-degree case study. – Assess validity and reliability of the case study methodology. – Recruit at least one completer to participate in the pilot. – Carry out the pilot case study: conduct interviews with the completer and their employer (school administrators and/or department supervisors), review direct performance measures (e.g., APPR, lesson plans), when made available by the completer, and conduct a classroom observation by a faculty supervisor, when possible.
Expected outcomes	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The Exit Survey and 1 year alumni survey will yield data insights from completers aligned with updated TEP goals.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The 4-year alumni survey will provide additional insights from seasoned completers who may have a more informed perspective about the preparation they received from the TEP than when they were fresh out of school and in their first teaching jobs. – The 360-degree case study will provide useful data from completer and employer perspectives and an established protocol will be important for implementation consistency.
Reflections or comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Piloting the 360-degree case study approach will allow us to make a determination about the value and effectiveness of the assessment methodology and whether we want to continue with the assessment approach or identify alternative methods for collecting data from completers and employers (e.g., surveys, focus groups).
Standard 3	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complete the restructuring of Teacher Education Program from non-credit seminar-based program to credit-bearing majors - Finalize updated TEP goals, aligned with NYSED, InTASC, and AAQEP standards and expectations. - Add the new Students with Disabilities (All Grades) certification option to both Childhood Education and Adolescent Education certification tracks. - Discontinue the old Students with Disabilities (grades 1-6) certification once candidates completing the program have all graduated. - Adopt a new software platform for TEP data management (e.g., shifting from Watermark/TK20 to CORE) and alignment to Canvas course software.
Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complete program change and new program forms and submit them to COAA and NYSED for approval - Design the new required courses in the certification majors. - Audit TEP candidates and plan course offerings to address student instructional needs and gaps. - Enroll students in new courses - Set up new advising protocols, handbooks, websites, and user-friendly web portal

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collaborate with Registrar to update PeopleSoft software with the new program requirements. - Collaborate with Admissions to promote new programs and offerings - Update TEACH profile to attract incoming students
Expected outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approval of new programs from COAA (received November 2025) and NYSED (anticipated February 2026). - Updated Educational Studies/TEP website, materials, and procedures
Reflections or comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The new Associate Director of Teacher Certification and Educational Studies will start in January 2026 and will be integral in communicating changes to students, faculty, staff and community partners and helping to update materials.
Standard 4	
Goals for the 2025-26 year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TEP Advisory Board expansion to broader range of community partners - Renewed completer outreach: surveys, networking opportunities, PD offerings - Increased involvement in local initiatives – school outcomes, administrative changes, residency partnership exploration
Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recruit new & additional TEP Advisory Board members - Plan and execute regional alumni events (Rochester/Syracuse/Ithaca/NY/Boston) - Extend membership to local school committees and educator prep forums - Formalize alumni network communications
Expected outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advisory Board recommendations for new program initiatives
Reflections or comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We anticipate that the new software platform will assist in streamlining communication with students, community partners, and alumni

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.

Data quality was investigated on the Student Teacher Evaluation (7 weeks & 14 weeks). The observation tool was updated with the revised Danielson Framework for Teaching. Improvements were made with the training process and scoring practice with faculty supervisors. Observational data is triangulated with simultaneous observations from both the cooperating teacher and faculty supervisor, and a self-reflection by the candidate after completing the lesson.

Due to the significant changes in the TEP program (as outlined above) and the need to develop and revise assessment instruments based on new TEP goals in the upcoming year, the Department held off on additional data quality investigations on instruments that will be revised or retired.

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 HWS Educational Studies Department is undertaking a significant curricular redesign and expansion of our teacher preparation offerings to meet shifting state regulations, institutional priorities, and the needs of HWS students and local educators. This work includes the development of a new undergraduate program in teacher education (projected launch Spring 2026), a new stand-alone graduate program in initial teacher certification (projected launch Summer 2027), and the exploration of new certification pathways in early childhood education and physical education.

Building on the foundation of last year's accreditation review, our 2024-2025 work involved finalizing program and course proposals, designing new course syllabi, managing state and institutional approval processes, piloting innovative fieldwork structures, and developing scheduling models that support both undergraduate and graduate students, including an

innovative summer graduate program. The goal of these changes is to increase enrollment and retention in teacher certification pathways, address urgent staffing gaps in local districts, and plan for long-term sustainability across our certification programs. We first aligned on major goals and smaller tasks, then planned and facilitated whole group meetings and communicated as needed about the group's progress. We met six times during Summer 2025 for half-day work sessions in order to arrive at consensus on the structure of our new teacher certification program. We then generated necessary tasks to move forward and assigned tasks to individuals or smaller groups, who would report back at subsequent meetings.

2024-2025 Outcomes:

- Updated TEP learning objectives
- Curriculum map of learning objectives in courses
- Design of new credit-bearing undergraduate TEP
- Complete applications to CoAA for six new majors and three new courses (approved November 2025)
- Drafted applications to NYSED for new teacher preparation tracks (submitted November 2025)

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).

- NYSED has mandated changing the Students with Disabilities (SWD) certification from grade band programs (e.g., grades 1-6, grades 7-12) to a certification covering all grades (P-12). We have revised the SWD certification program requirements and are seeking NYSED approval for the new SWD P-12 program in 2025-2026.
- NYSED required EPPs to conduct an assessment survey called the Science of Reading Baseline Assessment. We have completed the survey.

10. Sign Off

Provider's Primary Contact for AAQEP (Name, Title)	Dean/Lead Administrator (Name, Title)
Mary Kelly, Associate Professor	Andie Huskie, TEP Director

Date sent to AAQEP:	December 31, 2025
---------------------	-------------------