



AAQEP Annual Report for 2024

Provider/Program Name:	Concordia University – St. Paul, MN
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or “n/a” if not yet accredited):	06/30/2029

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.

Mission of Concordia University. The mission of Concordia University, Saint Paul, a university of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, is to prepare students for thoughtful and informed living, for dedicated service to God and humanity, and for the enlightened care of God's creation, all within the context of the Christian Gospel. (1992)

Promise to Students. Concordia University, Saint Paul, empowers you to discover and engage your purpose for life, career and service, in a dynamic, multicultural, urban environment, where Christ is honored, all are welcome, and Lutheran convictions inform intellectual inquiry and academic pursuits. (2011)

Department of Undergraduate Teacher Education Mission. The Department of Undergraduate Teacher Education prepares professional, academically capable, and personally responsible entry-level educators who are professional decision makers to serve in diverse and global educational communities.

CSP is an open enrollment, urban institution committed to excellence and committed to preparing graduates to live, work, and serve in urban locations. Approximately 80% of our student body is from the seven counties of the St. Paul/Minneapolis metropolitan area. The two mission statements above articulate our reality - we prepare decision-makers for thoughtful and informed lives of service in our diverse and global educational community. Our promise to students is that they will be empowered for life, career, and service in a dynamic, multicultural, and urban educational environment.

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.csp.edu/accreditation>

2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows current enrollment and recent completion data for each program included in the AAQEP review.

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

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution or organization	State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential	Number of Candidates enrolled in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 06/24)	Number of Completers in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 06/24)
<i>Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials</i>			
K-12 Art Education	K-12 Visual Art License	13	3
K-12 Vocal/Classroom Music	K-12 Vocal/Classroom Music License	4	
K-12 Instrumental/Classroom Music	K-12 Instrumental/Classroom Music License	7	

5-12 Communication Arts and Literature	5-12 Communication Arts & Lit License	9	2
5-12 Social Studies	5-12 Social Studies License	27	5
5-12 Health/K-12 PE	Health/PE License	21	2
Math/Secondary Education Dbl. Major	5-12 Mathematics License	8	3
Chemistry/Secondary Education Dbl. Major	9-12 Chemistry License		
Biology/Secondary Education Dbl. Major	9-12 Life Science License	1	
Elementary Education	K-6 License	59	11
Early Childhood Education	B-3 License	25	5
Master of Arts in Teaching	K-6 License	100	36
Pre-K Endorsement	Pre-K license		
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		274	67
<i>Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators</i>			
NONE accredited by AAQEP			
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials			
<i>Programs that lead to credentials for other school professionals or to no specific credential</i>			
NONE accredited by AAQEP			
Total for additional programs			
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs		274	67
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers		274	67

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.)

There are no changes since the last annual report.

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

<p>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.</p>
<p>274</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>67</p>
<p>C. Number of recommendations for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.</p>
<p>60 of our 67 completers in the 2023-2024 academic year applied for and were verified by us for their MN license. We are following up with the other 7 completers to assist them in their license applications.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>78% Since we do not have traditional cohorts, this is calculated using a head count from our Introduction to Education class and tracking their completion through student teaching. This does not reflect students who choose a different major but still persist to graduation at Concordia, St. Paul.</p>
<p>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%.</p>
<p>Minnesota no longer requires the state licensure examinations for content and pedagogy. Our 23-24 completers were the first group who did not take these exams.</p> <p>At the time of this report, Minnesota still requires students to complete a teacher performance assessment (edTPA). Pass rates for the edTPA are reported by task and by program. Our pass rate scores across almost all tasks and programs continue to meet our department expectations of 70% or better, (which matches the expectations set by Minnesota’s</p>

Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board, fondly called PELSB). For example, the pass rate of our largest group of completers (K-6 Elementary Education) on Task 1: Planning has averaged 76% over the past three years. Pass rates in Task 2: Instruction have averaged 82%. And, pass rates in Task 3: Assessment have averaged 77%.

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

AAQEP Standard (2018)	Common Metrics One-Year-Out (Transition to Teaching) Survey Questions	Mean n=33	Mean score of 3.60-4.00 = 3 (Exceeds Department Expectations) Mean score of 2.60-3.59 = 2 (Meets Department Expectations) Mean score of 0-2.59 = 1 (Below Department Expectations)
Standard 2a: Understand and engage local school and cultural communities, and communicate and foster relationships with families/guardians/caregivers in a variety of communities	#42 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning?</i> ”	3.08	Meets Department Expectations
Standard 2b: Engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners and do so in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts	#22 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>effectively teach students from culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds and communities?</i> ”	3.33	Meets Department Expectations
	#29 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>differentiate instruction for English-language learners?</i> ”	2.89	Meets Department Expectations
	#37 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>create a learning environment in</i>	3.42	Meets Department Expectations

	<i>which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected?"</i>		
Standard 2c: Create productive learning environments and use strategies to develop productive learning environments in a variety of school contexts	#15 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals?</i> "	3.19	Meets Department Expectations
	#17 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>help students develop critical thinking processes?</i> "	3.22	Meets Department Expectations
	#32 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students?</i> "	3.46	Meets Department Expectations
	#35 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement?</i> "	3.46	Meets Department Expectations
Standard 2d: Support students' growth in international and global perspectives	#20 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding?</i> "	3.22	Meets Department Expectations
Standard 2e: Establish goals for their own professional growth and engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection	#40 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>seek out learning opportunities that align with my professional development goals?</i> "	3.15	Meets Department Expectations

	#44 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher?</i> "	3.50	Meets Department Expectations
Standard 2f: Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning	#43 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance?</i> "	3.50	Meets Department Expectations

The completers who finished this one-year out survey scored themselves lowest on #29 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to differentiate instruction for English-language learners?”

Many courses have undergone a review in the past year to include the new Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice as required by PELSB, our licensing board. In-class activities and assignments directly align with these new standards.

- 1I. The teacher understands language development and the benefits of multilingualism and multiliteracy and knows how to incorporate instructional strategies and resources to support language development.***
- 5D. The teacher uses learners' native languages as a resource in creating effective differentiated instructional strategies for multilingual learners, including those who are developing literacy skills.***

Our new syllabi are currently under review by PELSB. We began using them in the fall of 2024. We anticipate the 2027 surveys to include completers who have taken the new versions of these courses.

Interestingly, as the reviewer of this report will see in the next section, "G," Supervisors scored completers much higher in this area.

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

AAQEP Standard (2018)	Common Metrics Supervisor Survey Questions	Mean n=24	Mean score of 3.60-4.00 = 3 (Exceeds Department Expectations) Mean score of 2.60-3.59 = 2 (Meets Department Expectations) Mean score of 0-2.59 = 1 (Below Department Expectations)
------------------------------	---	------------------	--

	(Supervisors of the Completers who completed the One-Year-Out or Transition to Teaching survey above)		
Standard 2a: Understand and engage local school and cultural communities, and communicate and foster relationships with families/guardians/caregivers in a variety of communities	#42 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>collaborate with parents and guardians to support student learning?</i> ”	3.66	Exceeds Department Expectations
Standard 2b: Engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners and do so in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts	#22 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>effectively teach students from culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds and communities?</i> ”	3.57	Meets Department Expectations
	#29 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>differentiate instruction for English-language learners?</i> ”	3.50	Meets Department Expectations
	#37 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>create a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected?</i> ”	3.67	Exceeds Department Expectations
Standard 2c: Create productive learning environments and use strategies to develop productive learning environments in a variety of school contexts	#15 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>use digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals?</i> ”	3.58	Meets Department Expectations

	#17 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>help students develop critical thinking processes?</i> "	3.39	Meets Department Expectations
	#32 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>use effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students?</i> "	3.46	Meets Department Expectations
	#35 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>develop and maintain a classroom environment that promotes student engagement?</i> "	3.54	Meets Department Expectations
Standard 2d: Support students' growth in international and global perspectives	#20 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding?</i> "	3.45	Meets Department Expectations
Standard 2e: Establish goals for their own professional growth and engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection	#40 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>seek out learning opportunities that align with my professional development goals?</i> "	3.39	Meets Department Expectations
	#44 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>use colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher?</i> "	3.63	Exceeds Department Expectations
Standard 2f: Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning	#43 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the	3.67	Exceeds Department Expectations

	basic skills to <i>collaborate with teaching colleagues to improve student performance?</i>		
--	---	--	--

When comparing the completer survey above to this supervisor survey, it is clear that in all categories, supervisors score them the same or better than the completers score themselves. This is reassuring to the department. We typically choose a couple of areas to focus on when these surveys come back. This year we will focus on the two areas with the lowest supervisor scores, #17 - “To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to help students develop critical thinking processes?” and #40 - “To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to seek out learning opportunities that align with my professional development goals?”.

Again, many courses have undergone a review in the past year to include the new Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice as required by PELSB, our licensing board. In-class activities and assignments directly align with these new standards. For example, these new standards address the two lowest areas:

- ***1E. The teacher understands the cognitive processes associated with various kinds of learning, including critical and creative thinking, problem framing and problem-solving, invention, memorization, and recall.***
- ***5F. The teacher asks questions to stimulate discussion that serves different purposes, such as probing for learner understanding, helping students articulate their ideas and thinking processes, stimulating curiosity, and helping students to question.***
- ***5H. Consistent with the local curriculum and state and local academic standards, the teacher demonstrates the ability to nurture critical thinking about culture and race and knows how to include multiple perspectives and missing narratives from the dominant culture by offering a range of curriculum materials.***

Additionally, we will continue to explore ways to engage and support our completers. Our new syllabi are currently under review by PELSB. We began using them in the fall of 2024. We anticipate the 2027 surveys to include completers who have taken the new versions of these courses.

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

Our first “pass” at investigating the employment of program completers happens approximately 6 months after the end of the previous academic year. At this time, we contact our previous year’s completers by email to inquire about their employment status, the best email address to send the One-Year-Out Survey, and the name and contact information for their supervisor (to whom we will send the Supervisor Survey). This process can take many weeks, involving multiple emails and phone calls. We use the information in our student management system, to find personal email addresses and phone numbers. We also receive that information in the Exit Surveys (from those who complete it). We also use LinkedIn

and Facebook as needed. PELSB distributes an employment report document annually, that (by design) is to inform teacher preparation programs of all completers who have been hired within the state. So far, this document is limited compared to the information we gather from the completers themselves. The employment report does not include private or religious schools, nor, of course, does it include out-of-state employment. We have found that direct interaction with our completers is the best way to get all the information. Additionally, our faculty colleagues often know of “some” employment information. While we are currently gathering data for our 2023-24 completers, we were able to confirm employment in the field of 67% of our 2022-23 completers.

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

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

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

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
Final Student Teaching Evaluations	Score of 3.6-4.0 = 3 (Exceeds Department Expectations) Score of 2.6-3.5 = 2 (Meets Department Expectations) Score of 0-2.5 = 1 (Below Department Expectations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Elementary Education – meets or exceeds in all categories ● Early Childhood Education – meets or exceeds in all categories ● Secondary – meets or exceeds in all categories

		<p>The department ensures that all candidates are prepared for their student teaching semester. Additionally, they are provided extensive coaching by university supervisors and their mentor teachers during the 15 weeks of student teaching. We are not surprised candidates meet or exceed expectations by the end of the 15 weeks. Those candidates we are concerned about are placed on an improvement plan, and if the conditions of the improvement plan are not met, they are guided to the Child Learning and Development (non-licensure) degree.</p>
edTPA Task Scores	<p>Mean Task Score of 20.0-25.0 = 3 (Exceeds Department Expectations)</p> <p>Mean Task Score of 13.0*-19.9 = 2 (Meets Department Expectations) *13 is the cut score set by PELSB</p> <p>Mean Task Score of 0-12.9 = 1 (Below Department Expectations)</p>	<p>In the state of Minnesota, the edTPA is not a requirement for licensure, but it is a requirement in “unit rule” that states all teacher preparation programs must require the completion of the edTPA by all candidates during student teaching.</p> <p>On an aggregate report, our candidates average 13.46 on Task 1: Planning, 13.67 on Task 2: Instruction, and 13.20 on Task 3: Assessment. These aggregate scores meet department expectations.</p>
edTPA Rubric Scores	<p>Mean Rubric Score of 4.0-5.0 = 3 (Exceeds Department Expectations)</p> <p>Mean Rubric Score of 2.6-3.9 = 2 (Meets Department Expectations)</p> <p>Mean Rubric Score of 0-2.5 = 1 (Below Department Expectations)</p>	<p>In the state of Minnesota, the edTPA is not a requirement for licensure, but it is a requirement in “unit rule” that states all teacher preparation programs must require the completion of the edTPA by all candidates during student teaching</p>

		On an aggregate report, our candidates' average rubric scores meet department expectations on 12 of the 15 rubrics. Rubrics that fall below department expectations are 5, 14, and 15. Each of these rubrics are about assessment.
--	--	--

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

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
Common Metrics Exit Surveys	<p>Mean score of 3.60-4.00 = 3 (Exceeds Department Expectations)</p> <p>Mean score of 2.60-3.59 = 2 (Meets Department Expectations)</p> <p>Mean score of 0-2.59 = 1 (Below Department Expectations)</p>	<p>Teacher candidates complete this exit survey at the end of their student teaching semester. What we see annually is that they score themselves about .10 to .15 points lower on their Exit Survey than they do on their One-Year-Out, Transition to Teaching Survey. As a result, we tend to use our transition to teaching survey results as a program evaluation data source because the completers have had a year to practice their craft of teaching and have a more realistic view of their skills.</p> <p>Aggregate data on this survey, including all programs, demonstrates mean scores on each survey item that meets or exceeds department expectations.</p>
Common Metrics One-Year-Out Surveys (Transition to Teaching)	<p>Mean score of 3.60-4.00 = 3 (Exceeds Department Expectations)</p> <p>Mean score of 2.60-3.59 = 2</p>	<p>Please see sections F and G above. Candidates meet or exceed expectations on the selected survey items.</p>

	(Meets Department Expectations) Mean score of 0-2.59 = 1 (Below Department Expectations)	
Common Metrics Supervisor Surveys	Mean score of 3.60-4.00 = 3 (Exceeds Department Expectations) Mean score of 2.60-3.59 = 2 (Meets Department Expectations) Mean score of 0-2.59 = 1 (Below Department Expectations)	Please see sections F and G above. Candidates meet or exceed expectations on the selected survey items.

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.

Standard 1 → As PELSB continues to make changes to the required assessments our completers must complete to be eligible for licensure, we identified multiple data sources from the Common Metrics Exit Survey that can be used to provide a clear picture of our students and our program to be used for continuous improvement. New changes announced by PELSB were first the removal of the requirement of Task 2 within the edTPA. Recently, PELSB approved a pilot for institutions to bypass the edTPA altogether, using the Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST). “The CPAST Form was researched and developed by VARI-EPP. It is a valid and reliable formative and summative assessment during the student teaching practicum.” Coincidentally, our department adopted CPAST over the summer and just began using it this fall in place of the Final Student Teacher Evaluation. The CPAST will be the main assessment during our candidates’ spring semester. In all our syllabus revisions and alignment with the state’s new Standards of Effective Practice (SEP), all the “application” SEPs were placed into student teaching. As such, each was aligned with an assessment item on the CPAST.

Standard 2 → Our response rates on the Common Metrics Surveys did improve this past year. Our response rates on the One-Year-Out Survey, and the Supervisor Survey outpaced the average response rate across all institutions in

Minnesota. Our response rate on the One-Year-Out, Transition to Teaching Survey was 51%, and the state's response rate was 38%. Our response rate on the Supervisor Survey was 62%, and the state's response rate was 51%.

Standard 3 → All courses in the fall used our newly revised syllabi that took into account course revisions to include new SEPs, PELSB reading audit of all reading courses in all teacher preparation programs as part of the legislated "Read Act" in the state, and the right-sizing of the required curriculum of many secondary programs. (These revisions were completed during the 2023-2024 academic year as a response to the need to bring the credits of these majors more in line with the total credits required by the university.)

Standard 4 → Due to low turnout, our program to support graduates, CSP Saturdays, is being re-envisioned. Our target population to rebrand CSP Saturdays will be our Southeast Asian Teacher (SEAT) Licensure program completers.