



AAQEP Annual Report for 2025

This report reflects data and evidence for the 2024-2025 academic year.

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, 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 05/25)	Number of Completers in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 05/25)
Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials				
Bachelor's Degree	K-12 Art Education	K-12 Visual Arts License	13	1
	K-12 Vocal/Classroom Music	K-12 Vocal/Classroom Music License	3	1
	K-12 Instrumental/Classroom Music	K-12 Instrumental/Classroom Music License	7	2

	5-12 Communications Arts and Literature	5-12 Communication Arts and Literature	9	3
	5-12 Social Studies	5-12 Social Studies License	27	2
	5-12 Health/K-12 Physical Education	5-12 Health/K-12 Physical Education License	21	6
	Mathematics/Secondary Education Double Major	5-12 Mathematics License	8	2
	Chemistry/Secondary Education Double Major	9-12 Chemistry License	0	0
	Biology/Secondary Education Double Major	9-12 Life Science License	1	0
	Early Childhood Education	B-3 License	23	9
	Elementary Education	K-6 License	61	20
	Pre-K Endorsement	Pre-K License	0	0
Master's Degree	Master of Arts in Teaching	K-6 License	100	29
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials			273	75
Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators				
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials				
Programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials				
Total for programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials				
Programs that lead to credentials for specialized professionals or to no specific credential				
Total for programs that lead to specialized professional or no specific credentials				
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs			273	75
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers			273	75

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

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.
273
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.
75
C. Number of recommendations for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.
74
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.
67% completed within the expected timeframe (50/75) and 99% completed within 150% of the expected timeframe (74/75).
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%.
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. At the time of this report, Minnesota still requires students to complete a teacher performance assessment (edTPA), though CSP is currently approved by the state PELSB (Minnesota's Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board) for a variance to replace the edTPA with the CFAST as the final evaluation of student teaching. Fall 2024 was the last semester CSP required candidates to complete the edTPA during the student teaching semester. For this final semester, our pass rate scores were slightly lower than in past years. For the final semester of edTPA submissions, we did not require candidates to resubmit if they received scores that did not meet our expectations or if they received error codes. Because of this, our scores were slightly lower

than they have been in past years. The costs associated with resubmission made it prohibitive for us to require students to resubmit when we also collected CFAST data for candidates.

This will be the final year we report edTPA scores, unless the State reinstates the requirement for edTPA versus the CFAST or terminates the variance for CSP to use the CFAST as the final evaluation of student teaching.

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

AAQEP Standards (2025)	Common Metrics Survey Transition to Teaching Survey Questions (taken one year out)	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)
2a. Communicate and foster relationships with families, guardians, and/or caregivers, and engage with the wider school community	#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> ”	3.26 (Meets)
2b. Enact culturally responsive and sustaining educational practices with diverse learners 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> ”	3.74 (Exceeds)
	#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> ”	3.37 (Meets)
	#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> ”	3.84 (Exceeds)
2c. Create positive and productive learning and work environments in a variety of settings	#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> ”	3.42 (Meets)
	#17 - “To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you	3.42 (Meets)

	the basic skills to <i>help students develop critical thinking processes?</i> "	
	#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> "	3.68 (Exceeds)
	#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> "	3.74 (Exceeds)
2d. Incorporate international and global perspectives in their professional practice and understand the global implications of education	#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> "	3.21 (Meets)
2e. Gather and use trustworthy evidence to support student learning and to inform their own professional practice	#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> "	3.37 (Meets)
	#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> "	3.68 (Exceeds)
2f. Exhibit responsible professional conduct and engage in individual and collaborative goal-setting, learning, and professional growth	#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> "	3.58 (Meets)
2g. Connect students, colleagues, and self to appropriate supports for mental well-being, including those related to trauma	#27 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to <i>differentiate instruction for students with mental health needs?</i> "	3.37 (Meets)

	#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> ”	3.37 (Meets)
--	---	--------------

The results here are the means from our most recent set of survey data collected, from Spring 2025. Completers rated themselves above our target mean of 2.60 for “Meets Expectations” in all areas, with 5/14 of the above rated above 3.6 for an “Exceeds Expectations” level.

Notably, past surveys showed results below a 3.0 (for example, a 2.89 mean reported in the 2024 AAQEP Annual Report) for the question #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?” The Spring 2025 survey results showed an increase in this score, to a 3.37. Our results from Spring 2025 do not represent anything below 3.21 in the above findings. We believe that revisions to courses described in our 2024 AAQEP Annual Report have made a difference in helping completers develop the basic skills for these key components of professional practice.

That lowest score of 3.21 is the mean response to the question “To what extent do you agree or disagree that your teacher preparation program gave you the basic skills to *know where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding?*” This is an area that we are currently looking at within our program to determine our next best steps toward supporting candidates and completers in building global awareness and understanding.

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

AAQEP Standards (2025)	Common Metrics Survey Supervisor Survey Questions (taken one year out)	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)
2a. Communicate and foster relationships with families, guardians, and/or caregivers, and engage with the wider school community	#42 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher <i>collaborates with parents and guardians to support student learning?</i> ”	3.57 (Meets)
2b. Enact culturally responsive and sustaining educational practices with diverse learners in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts	#22 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher <i>effectively teaches students from culturally and ethnically diverse backgrounds and communities?</i> ”	3.77 (Exceeds)

	#29 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher <i>differentiates instruction for English-language learners?</i> ”	3.4 (Meets)
	#37 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher <i>creates a learning environment in which differences such as race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and language are respected?</i> ”	3.77 (Exceeds)
2c. Create positive and productive learning and work environments in a variety of settings	#15 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher <i>uses digital and interactive technologies to achieve instructional goals?</i> ”	3.53 (Meets)
	#17 - “To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher <i>helps students develop critical thinking processes?</i> ”	3.4 (Meets)
	#32 - “To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher <i>uses effective communication skills and strategies to convey ideas and information to students?</i> ”	3.53 (Meets)
	#35 - “To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher <i>develops and maintains a classroom environment that promotes student engagement?</i> ”	3.67 (Exceeds)
2d. Incorporate international and global perspectives in their professional practice and understand the global implications of education	#20 - “To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher <i>knows where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding?</i> ”	3.4 (Meets)
2e. Gather and use trustworthy evidence to support student learning and to inform their own professional practice	#40 - “To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher <i>seeks out learning opportunities that align with my professional development goals?</i> ”	3.43 (Meets)
	#44 - “To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher <i>uses colleague feedback to support my development as a teacher?</i> ”	3.8 (Exceeds)

2f. Exhibit responsible professional conduct and engage in individual and collaborative goal-setting, learning, and professional growth	#43 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher <i>collaborates with teaching colleagues to improve student performance?</i> "	3.6 (Exceeds)
2g. Connect students, colleagues, and self to appropriate supports for mental well-being, including those related to trauma	#27 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher <i>differentiates instruction for students with mental health needs?</i> "	3.54 (Meets)
	#40 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher <i>seeks out learning opportunities that align with my professional development goals?</i> "	3.43 (Meets)

Similar to previous years' results, the ratings received by supervisors in this 2025 survey nearly match or exceed how completers rate their preparation for teaching. Though all areas meet or exceed our department mean, we note the three areas with the lowest rating of a 3.4 mean are:

- Standard 2b: #29 – "To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher *differentiates instruction for English-language learners?*"
- Standard 2c: #17 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher *helps students develop critical thinking processes?*"
- Standard 2d: #20 - "To what extent do you agree or disagree that this first-year teacher *knows where and how to access resources to build global awareness and understanding?*"

Though we are pleased that scores are within the "Meets Expectations" level for these questions, we note that these are areas where we have previously indicated a desire to continue to work on. Since Standard 2d (as measured by Question #20) was also the lowest score from our completers' surveys, this will become an area that we reflect on to improve.

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.

CSP surveys our graduates 6-9 months after they graduate to find out their current situation. Because of this time frame, the most recent complete data we have is from our 2023-24 graduates. We had responses from 56% of those graduates – 37 alumni. Of those 37 alumni, 3 (8.1%) are continuing their education, 33 (89%) are working full-time and 1 (2.7%) is not looking for work. For those continuing their education, two are working on Master's degrees and one is working on an Education Specialist degree.

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.

There have been no changes to staffing capacity for program delivery and administration and quality assurance system monitoring during the reporting year, though the personnel charged with these roles has undergone change. The new Director of Compliance and Accreditation was able to attend the AAQEP Institute in September 2025 which helped support onboarding for

this new position at CSP. Though CSP has a small full-time faculty, we employ outstanding Contracted Faculty of Practice (CFPs, also known as adjuncts) who support our teacher education programs, particularly the K-6 MAT program. We believe we are poised to be successful in attaining our goals for accreditation.

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
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>While we required the edTPA during Fall 2024, beginning in Spring 2025, we replaced the edTPA with the CPAST Evaluation tool, allowed through the granting of a variance by the state.</p>

		<p>On an aggregate report for the final semester using the edTPA (fall 2024), our candidates average 12.56 on Task 1: Planning, 13.23 on Task 2: Instruction, and 11.73 on Task 3: Assessment. These aggregate scores for Tasks 1 & 3 were below department expectations. Because we had been approved for a variance to use the CPASt in place of the edTPA beginning this semester, we changed our requirements to resubmit any tasks that received scores below our expectations. We also had several candidates earn 0s because of errors in their submissions. This skewed our data somewhat from where our scores have been historically. It is uncertain whether the State will continue to allow the use of the CPASt in place of edTPA or we will be required to return to the use of the edTPA. However, we continue to use this data to inform our program improvement, particularly in the area of assessment.</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> <p>While we required the edTPA during Fall 2024, beginning in Spring 2025, we replaced the edTPA with the CPASt Evaluation tool, allowed through the granting of a variance by the State PELSB Board.</p> <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 2 (Planning to Support Varied Student Needs), 5 (Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning), 13 (Student Use of Feedback), and 14 (Analyzing Students’ Language Use and Content Learning).</p>

		<p>Though we will no longer be requiring candidates to complete the edTPA during their student teaching experience, we will use this information as we continue program improvement. As assessment has historically been an area that completers have not met our department means, we are continuing to identify ways to more effectively prepare candidates for assessment tasks.</p>
CPAST Rubric Scores	<p>The State expectations for CPAST data reporting are as follows:</p> <p>Unit pass rate by task (where passing is an average score of 2 of all rubrics in a category and no “0” scores; tasks = Planning for Instruction and Assessment (4 rubrics); Instructional Delivery (5 rubrics); Assessment and Analysis of Teaching (4 rubrics); Dispositions (8 rubrics)</p>	<p>Spring 2025 represented the first semester that CSP no longer required the edTPA and replaced the edTPA with the CPAST as the final evaluation of student teaching.</p> <p>Based on the state Unit pass rate expectation, CSP as a Unit has average scores above 2.0 for each task.</p> <p>However, there are areas where improvement is needed on particular tasks and programs. As this is the first year that a State pass rate has been set, we are still identifying how we will analyze and use this data for program improvement. We will likely set an internal overall pass rate, though this is yet to be determined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Planning for Instruction and Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unit average: 2.23 (on a 3-point scale) ○ ECE pass rate: 60% ○ EIEd UG pass rate: 95% ○ EIEd MAT pass rate: 79% ○ Secondary pass rate: 65% ● Instructional Delivery: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unit average: 2.35 (on a 3-point scale) ○ ECE pass rate: 60% ○ EIEd UG pass rate: 100% ○ EIEd MAT pass rate: 82% ○ Secondary pass rate: 85% ● Assessment and Analysis of Teaching: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unit average: 2.06 (on a 3-point scale) ○ ECE pass rate: 50%

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ EIED UG pass rate: 84% ○ EIED MAT pass rate: 86% ○ Secondary pass rate: 55% ● Dispositions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unit average: 2.54 (on a 3-point scale) ○ ECE pass rate: 90% ○ EIED UG pass rate: 95% ○ EIED MAT pass rate: 96% ○ Secondary pass rate: 85%
--	--	--

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
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 have historically seen 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>The 2025 survey results indicate that some results on the Exit Survey were .10 to .15 points higher than the 2024 completers' scores on their 2025 Transition to Teaching Survey. We are hopeful that the results indicate that significant revisions to courses experienced by the 2025 completers will continue to see their preparation strongly on their Transition to Teaching Survey they will take in Spring 2026.</p> <p>Aggregate data on the 2025 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)	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.
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.

In our 2024 Annual Report to AAQEP, we identified three goals related to Standards 1, 3, and 4. Below is a summary of efforts related to each.

Goal for Standard 1: Evaluate the initial year of using the formative quantitative data gathered in practicum (Pre-CPAST) and student teaching (CPAST) to guide our instruction and coaching of student teachers.

To address our goal for Standard 1, we redesigned our student teaching Seminar course to support knowledge-building in each of the domains associated with the CPAST. Domains were assigned to specific sessions to ensure candidate understanding of the tool and the knowledge/skills they were required to demonstrate. As well the CPAST was integrated into supervisor training to ensure that University supervisors were able to support candidates and mentor teachers in using the tool. As a faculty, we continued to review the “look-fors” associated with the document during our department meetings to guide our observations and evaluations of candidates as well as to support all supervisors and mentor teachers. In addition, CSP joined a collaborative CPAST working group led by the president of the Minnesota Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (MACTE) to continue

to build our own understanding, to reach collaborative consensus about how to use the tool to evaluate our State standards, and to support one another in the use of the tool.

Goal for Standard 3: Transition to a new web-based platform to help students and faculty manage the process of learning and licensing in the teacher education program (SLL by Watermark).

To address our goal for Standard 3, we engaged in training by Watermark to ensure as a program we were well-prepared to design and implement the platform in a way that would support student learning and progress through the program. We spent much of last year and this past summer building SLL to be a centralized platform of information for data analysis and tracking of candidates from the entry of the program through their student teaching experience. As part of this tracking, we designed a new process to track candidate professional dispositions, an area we have heard from our advisory group is one that they struggle with new teachers the most and the more we can provide feedback and goal setting for our students while they are candidates in the program, the better. Following our own professional learning, we trained additional faculty and course instructors, supervisors, candidates, and mentor teachers in the use of SLL. Though we are still in the early stages of our adoption and use of SLL, we are excited about how meaningfully it has been integrated throughout the candidates' program and are looking forward to using data from SLL for program improvement.

Goal for Standard 4: Re-invigorate the concept of CSP Saturdays with our SEAT completers. Our SEAT program offers financial support to not only Southeast Asian students but any students of color who qualify. In addition to the financial support award, students also meet regularly as a group to support each other throughout their higher education journey. This work continues to be aspirational, and our new goals include: 1) Gather feedback to improve the SEAT program for current students, 2) Support SEAT graduates in their initial years of teaching, and 3) Create a connection or opportunity to have SEAT graduates mentor SEAT students.

Because of the emphasis on mentoring in districts, we have heard from alumni that they are no longer interested in additional mentoring from CSP and, as such, we are retiring this idea. Though it had been successful in the past for the CSP program as an outreach and support to completers, we have been challenged the last several years to garner interest in the program. Instead, we have shifted our focus to supporting candidates' development of skills of self-reflection in ED 470: Health Ed for Teachers and during Student Teaching Seminar so that they are better equipped as they leave the program to engage in ongoing self-reflection in their career. We look forward to evaluating candidates' development of skills through their coursework in the program so we are better able to intervene and support them before they leave CSP.