

VI. B.

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Hartford

TO BE PROPOSED:

September 2, 2015

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Education, pursuant to Section 10-145d-9(g)(1)(A) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, grants full continuing approval to Eastern Connecticut State University (ECSU) educator preparation programs for the period September 30, 2015, through September 30, 2020, with a progress report due in spring 2017 that addresses requirements described by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards 2, 3, 4 and 6, for the purpose of certifying graduates from ECSU in the following areas:

Program	Grade Level	Program Level	Program Type
Early Childhood Education	N- 3	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Elementary Education	K-6*	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
English	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
History and Social Studies	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Mathematics	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Biology	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Earth Science	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Physical Education	PK-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate

*Pursuant to Public Act 12-63, amended by Public Act 13-122 (Section 11), on or after July 1, 2017, an endorsement for elementary education will be issued for Grades 1-6 only to in-state graduates.

and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of _____ this second day of September, Two Thousand Fifteen.

Signed: _____
Dianna R. Wentzell, Secretary
State Board of Education

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Dr. Dianna R. Wentzell, Commissioner of Education

DATE: September 2, 2015

SUBJECT: Continuing Approval of Eastern Connecticut State University Educator Preparation Programs

Executive Summary

Introduction

Connecticut statutes require State Board of Education (SBE) approval of all educator preparation programs leading to Connecticut educator certification. Once approved, programs are required to seek continuing approval every five years based on an on-site visiting team process conducted by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE). Visiting teams consist of Connecticut educators trained in the CSDE visit process.

Although not required by Connecticut, programs may also voluntarily seek national accreditation through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), in addition to continuing program approval through the SBE. If a program is seeking both continuing state program approval and NCATE accreditation, the visit is a joint visit, conducted by NCATE and the CSDE in accordance with the NCATE/Connecticut State Partnership Agreement, with the visiting team consisting of both national and state team members.

Both state program approval and NCATE accreditation require that programs meet the six performance-based NCATE standards (Attachment A), along with Connecticut certification and educator preparation regulations.

Eastern Connecticut State University (ECSU), a NCATE partnership institution since 2004, hosted its mandated, NCATE/Connecticut partnership visit in fall 2014. This report presents a summary of visiting team findings based on the visit, including the Commissioner of Education's recommendation regarding continuing state program approval for ECSU educator preparation programs.

History/Background

Located in Willimantic, Connecticut, ECSU is the only public, liberal arts institution within the Connecticut State University (CSU) system. Originally established as the Willimantic State Normal School in 1889, ECSU began expanding its programmatic offerings in the mid-1960s to include the study of liberal arts and sciences, while holding firm to its roots in teacher education. In 1998, the CSU system significantly refined ECSU's core mission, including enlarging its role as a regional, undergraduate, liberal arts and science-based institution. Today, ECSU academic

programming at the associate and baccalaureate levels includes more than 35 undergraduate and graduate majors in the arts and sciences and multiple professional programs across three divisions (School of Arts and Sciences; School of Education and Professional Studies; and School of Continuing Education). Enrollment for fall 2015 was over 5,000 students, with the majority of students being full-time, undergraduate students. ECSU has 228 full-time faculty members and is supported by approximately 300 adjunct faculty members or lecturers.

ECSU's professional education unit includes the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Physical Education, both housed within the School of Education and Professional Studies. The unit is relatively small, serving approximately 450 candidates annually across all programs and consisting of 20 full-time faculty members. The unit is also supported by 27 adjunct faculty members. The Health and Physical Education Department offers a baccalaureate program leading to initial licensure in physical education. The Education Department offers baccalaureate and master's level programs leading to initial licensure in early childhood education, elementary education, and secondary education (biology, English, environmental earth science, history/social studies, and mathematics). Additionally, the department offers non-certification programs for advanced candidates in early childhood education, elementary education, secondary education, educational technology, reading and language arts, and science education.

The current mandated, NCATE/Connecticut visit was conducted November 2-4, 2014, in accordance with the NCATE/Connecticut Partnership visit protocol. The visiting team determined that ECSU is meeting the six NCATE standards, with Areas for Improvement (AFIs) identified for standards 2, 3, 4, and 6:

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
Visiting Team Decision: Met

No AFIs Identified.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
Visiting Team Decision: Met

(1) AFI: The unit does not assess unit operations.

Rationale for AFI: Some data on assessments using rubrics that align with standards and results exist and are disaggregated by program. However, no feedback loop among stakeholders is evident.

(2) AFI: The unit does not have a minimum of three years of candidate performance data for all of its advanced programs.

Rationale for AFI: While the unit has plans to collect this data, no data were presented.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
Visiting Team Decision: Met

(1) AFI: The unit did not provide clarity and consistency of expectations for clinical practice for initial and advanced program candidates.

Rationale for AFI: There were inconsistencies in the communication and explanation of the documents. This resulted in candidates having lack of information of how they were being assessed and a lack of consistency among cooperating teachers.

Standard 4: Diversity

Visiting Team Decision: Met

(1) AFI: There is no evidence provided that advanced candidates are assessed or that the data are used to provide feedback to candidates for improving their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping students from diverse populations learn.

Rationale for AFI: The unit has piloted the use of an interview to assess advanced student proficiencies related to diversity. However, the interview questions do not directly address diversity, and no data are provided. The December 5, 2013, process documented is not being implemented.

(2) AFI: Initial candidates have limited opportunities to work with peers from diverse ethnic and cultural groups.

Rationale for AFI: There are few individuals from diverse ethnic/racial groups in the initial program. The Minority Teacher Grants are initiated by the student and managed by the state. No direct recruitment efforts are made to recruit candidates of color. Initial candidates have few opportunities to work on committees and projects with peers from various cultural and linguistic groups.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Visiting Team Decision: Met

No AFIs identified.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

Visiting Team Decision: Met

(1) AFI: The unit lacks appropriate structure to effectively manage all of its programs.

Rationale for AFI: The unit has a decentralized structure where individual programs act independently. Committees within the unit and university are collecting data regarding candidate progress along with field and clinical experiences; however, these committees provide little evidence regarding cohesiveness and structure regarding unit and all programs.

Once visits are completed, the CSDE Review Committee (Attachment B) meets to review visiting team findings and make recommendations to the Commissioner of Education relative to continuing approval of preparation programs based upon Connecticut educator preparation program approval regulations (Attachment C). During a spring 2015 Review Committee meeting, ECSU presented to the committee work that had been completed by the program since the fall 2014 visit to address AFIs identified under standards 2, 3, 4, and 6, including a specific timeline for continuous improvement plans. Based upon visiting team findings and the work presented, the committee recommended full continuing approval for ECSU preparation programs for the period September 30, 2015, through September 30, 2020, with a progress report due in spring 2017 that addresses requirements described by NCATE standards 2, 3, 4, and 6.

Recommendation and Justification

Based upon visiting team findings and the recommendation of the CSDE Program Review Committee, I recommend that ECSU educator preparation programs be granted full continuing approval for the period September 30, 2015, through September 30, 2020, with a progress report due in spring 2017 that addresses requirements described by NCATE standards 2, 3, 4 and 6.

Follow-up Activity

If granted full continuing approval by the SBE for a five-year period, ECSU will host its next NCATE/Connecticut visit during fall 2019.

Prepared by: _____
Katie Toohey, Ph.D., Program Approval Coordinator
Bureau of Educator Effectiveness and Professional Learning

Reviewed by: _____
Shannon Marimón, Division Director
Bureau of Educator Effectiveness and Professional Learning

Approved by: _____
Sarah J. Barzee, Ph.D., Chief Talent Officer
Talent Office

Attachment A

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education

Standard 1 – Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

- Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates
- Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates
- Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates
- Student Learning for Teacher Candidates
- Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals
- Student Learning for Other School Professionals
- Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Standard 2 – Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

- Assessment System
- Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation
- Use of Data for Program Improvement

Standard 3 – Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

- Collaboration between Unit and School Partners
- Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
- Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Standard 4 – Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates and diverse students in P-12 schools.

- Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences
- Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty
- Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates
- Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

Standard 5 – Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

- Qualified Faculty
- Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching
- Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship
- Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service Collaboration
- Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance
- Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Standard 6 – Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

- Unit Leadership and Authority
- Unit Budget
- Personnel
- Unit Facilities
- Unit Resources Including Technology

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Educator Preparation Program Approval Review Committee, 2013-2016

HIGHER EDUCATION REPRESENTATION	K-12 REPRESENTATION	COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION	CSDE/OHE REPRESENTATION (non-voting members)
Dr. Helen Abadiano Chair, Reading and Language Arts Department School of Education and Professional Studies Central Connecticut State University 9/2013-9/2016	Joseph Bonillo Educator, History/Social Studies Clark Lane Middle School Waterford Public Schools 9/2013-9/2016		
Dr. Maureen Fitzpatrick Assistant Professor, Educational Leadership Isabelle Farrington College of Education Sacred Heart State University 9/2013-9/2016	Kenneth DiPietro Superintendent Plainfield Public Schools 9/2013-9/2016		
Dr. Hari Koirala Chair, Department of Education School of Education and Professional Studies Eastern Connecticut State University 9/2013-9/2016	Dr. David Erwin Superintendent Berlin Public Schools 9/2013-9/2016		
Dr. Patricia Mulcahy-Ernt Director, Graduate Programs, Literacy/English Education Director, Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching University of Bridgeport 9/2013-9/2016	Dr. Erin McGurk Director, Education Services Ellington Public Schools 9/2013-9/2016		
Dr. Nancy Niemi Chair, Department of Education University of New Haven 9/2013-9/2016	Dr. Salvatore Menzo Superintendent Wallingford Public Schools 9/2013-9/2016		

**Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies for Educator Preparation Program Approval
Section 10-145d-9(g)**

Board action

After reviewing the recommendation of the Review Committee, the Commissioner shall make one or more recommendations to the Board. Based on the Commissioner's recommendation, the Board shall take one of the following actions.

(1) For programs requesting continuing approval:

- (A) Grant full program approval for five years, or for a period of time to bring the program into alignment with the five year approval cycle. The Board may require that an interim report be submitted to the Department, on a date set by the Board, prior to the end of the approval period.
- (B) Grant provisional approval for a time period not to exceed three years, if substantial non-compliance with current standards is identified. The institution shall submit to the Review Committee, on a date set by the Board, a written report which addresses the professional education unit's progress in meeting the standards which were not fully met. The Board may require an on-site visit in addition to this report.
- (C) Grant probationary approval for a time period not to exceed three years, if significant and far-reaching non-compliance with current standards is identified. The institution shall submit to the Review Committee, on a date set by the Board, a written report which addresses the professional education unit's progress in meeting the standards which were not fully met. The Board shall require an on-site visit in addition to this report.
- (D) Deny approval.

(2) For new programs in institutions which have current approved programs:

- (A) Grant full program approval for a period of time to bring the new program into the five year approval cycle of all other programs offered by the institution. The Board may require that a written report be submitted to the Department, on a date set by the Board, prior to the end of the approval period.
- (B) Grant provisional approval for a time period not to exceed three years, if substantial non-compliance with current standards is identified. The institution shall submit to the Review Committee, on a date set by the Board, a written report which addresses the professional education unit's progress in meeting the standards which were not fully met. The Board may require an on-site visit in addition to this report.

- (C) Grant probationary approval not to exceed three years, if significant and far-reaching non-compliance with current standards is identified. The institution shall submit to the Review Committee, on a date set by the Board, a written report which addresses the professional education unit's progress in meeting the standards which were not fully met. The Board shall require an on-site visit in addition to this report.
- (D) Deny approval.

(3) For new programs starting in institutions without other approved programs:

- (A) Grant program approval for two years. The institution shall submit to the Review Committee, after two semester of operation a written report which addresses the professional education unit's progress in implementing the new program. The Board shall require an on-site visit in addition to this report.
- (B) Following the on-site visit after two years of operation, grant full program approval for three years. The Board may require that a written report be submitted to the Department, on a date set by the Board, prior to the end of the approval period.
- (C) Following the on-site visit after two years of operation, grant provisional approval for a time period not to exceed three years, if substantial non-compliance with current standards is identified. The institution shall submit to the Review Committee, on a date set by the Board, a written report which addresses the professional education unit's progress in meeting the standards which were not fully met. The Board may require an on-site visit in addition to this report.
- (D) Following the on-site visit after two years of operation, grant probationary approval for up to three years, if significant and far-reaching non-compliance with current standards is identified. The institution shall submit to the Review Committee, on a date set by the Board, a written report which addresses the professional education unit's progress in meeting the standards which were not fully met. The Board shall require an on-site visit in addition to this report.
- (E) Deny approval.