

VI. C.

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 Southern Connecticut State University (SCSU) educator preparation programs for the period September 30, 2015, through September 30, 2019, with a progress report due in spring 2017 that describes SCSU's continuous improvement efforts towards meeting requirements described by NCATE standards 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6, for the purpose of certifying graduates from SCSU in the following areas:

Program	Grades	Certification	Program Type
Art Education	PK-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Comprehensive Special Education	K-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Early Childhood	Birth-K	Initial	Graduate
Early Childhood	Nursery-3	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Elementary Education	K-6*	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Elementary/Bilingual Dual	K-6*	Initial	Undergraduate
Elementary/Special Education Dual	K-6*	Initial	Undergraduate
Health Education	PK-12	Initial	Undergraduate
Physical Education	PK-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Secondary Education:			
Biology	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Chemistry	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Earth Science	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
English	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
French	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
General Science	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
German	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Italian	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
History/Social Studies	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Mathematics	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Physics	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Spanish	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Remedial Reading/Language Arts	1-12	Advanced	Graduate
School Counseling	PK-12	Advanced	Graduate
School Library Media	PK-12	Advanced	Graduate

School Psychologist	PK-12	Advanced	Graduate
Speech and Language Pathology	PK-12	Advanced	Graduate
Reading/Language Arts Consultant	PK-12	Advanced	Graduate
Intermediate Administration	PK-12	Advanced	Graduate
Superintendent of Schools	PK-12	Advanced	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 Southern 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.

Southern Connecticut State University (SCSU), currently on probationary approval by the SBE, hosted a state-mandated, focused visit in spring 2015. 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 SCSU educator preparation programs.

History/Background

Located in New Haven, Connecticut, SCSU is a comprehensive, metropolitan, public institution, offering undergraduate programs in 44 majors and 92 minors, and concentrations and graduate programs in over 50 areas of study in the fields of education, library science and information technology, business, health and human services, and arts and sciences. Employing 433 full-time faculty members, SCSU has five primary academic divisions (School of Arts and

Sciences, School of Business, School of Education, School of Health and Human Services, School of Graduate Studies) and serves over 10,000 students annually.

Three different schools on the SCSU campus – the School of Education, the School of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Health and Human Services – partner to prepare education professionals, with the School of Education being the primary unit that houses the majority of educator preparation programs. The School of Education and partner schools prepare the largest number of education professionals for teaching positions in Connecticut, offering more than 30 degree programs that serve over 2,122 full- and part-time students at the undergraduate, master's, sixth year and doctoral levels of study. The three schools together employ 76 full-time and 92 part-time faculty members, including clinical practice supervisors.

A NCATE/Connecticut partner institution since 2004, SCSU hosted its most recent NCATE/Connecticut visit in spring 2014. The visiting team determined that SCSU was generally meeting the six NCATE standards; however, several critical Areas for Improvement (AFIs) were identified by the team under NCATE standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6, with three AFIs continued from the last NCATE/Connecticut visit (spring 2009):

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

(1) AFI: The unit does not consistently assess the knowledge, skills or impact on student learning in the advanced teacher education programs.

Rationale for AFI: The unit was not able to provide data pertaining to the knowledge, skills, or impact on student learning during the onsite visit. Interviews and conversations confirmed that the unit does not systematically track data for the masters and sixth year level advanced programs for teachers not leading to state certification or submitting program reviews to the Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs).

(2) AFI: The unit does not incorporate an assessment that provides reliable evaluation of candidates' dispositions.

Rationale for AFI: Documentation provided in the Addendum confirmed that the current evaluation tool does not provide consistent criteria or inter-rater reliability across all disposition areas.

(3) AFI: The unit does not adequately assess candidates' skills prior to student teaching.

Rationale for AFI: The unit did not provide evidence of a systematic structure for candidate demonstration of skills prior to the student teaching experience.

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

(1) AFI: The unit does not have a system in place to assess the performance of candidates in the advanced programs for teachers.

Rationale for AFI: There was limited evidence that the master's and sixth year level advanced programs for teachers not leading to state certification or submitting program reviews to the SPAs are assessing knowledge, skills and dispositions at transition points beyond grades, GPA, and a culminating project. Data are not aggregated, disseminated, or utilized to improve the quality of these programs.

(2) AFI: The unit does not systematically or effectively utilize candidate assessment data or feedback from graduates and employers to improve the quality of programs and unit operations.

Rationale for AFI: Although there is evidence that program changes and unit changes have been made based on data, the unit has not yet implemented a comprehensive and systematic approach to utilizing candidate and graduate performance information to improve the efficacy of its courses, programs, and clinical experiences.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Visiting Team Decision: Met

(1) AFI: The unit does not ensure consistent management of field experiences and clinical practice (continued from 2009 NCATE/Connecticut visit).

Rationale for AFI: Current unit field, clinical, and intern placement and candidate assessment tracking systems lack systemic uniformity across programs causing inconsistent reporting of candidate placement and assessment data related to experiences. Programmatic inconsistencies have resulted in varied experiences and opportunities for P-12 candidates during program completion and reduced effective design, delivery, and evaluation of field experiences across the unit. The absence of language for each individual rubric component in the student teaching form does not provide for consistent evaluation or inter-rater reliability when assessing candidates in their clinical experience. In addition, the inconsistencies are evident at the advanced level where the unit presents no data for the assessment of field experiences for candidates in the advanced programs for teachers not submitting reports to the SPAs.

(2) AFI: The unit does not link data and assessments connected to field experiences and clinical practice to the conceptual framework.

Rationale for AFI: A lack of clear connections in field/clinical and intern experiences and corresponding assessments to the conceptual framework has resulted in the unit's inability to design, implement, and evaluate the usefulness of candidate experiences regarding expectations within the conceptual framework.

Standard 4: Diversity

Visiting Team Decision: Met

(1) AFI: The unit does not ensure that all candidates have fieldwork or clinical experiences with P-12 students from diverse populations (continued from 2009 NCATE/Connecticut visit).

Rationale for AFI: Interviews and documentation provided in the addendum confirmed that a system is not in place to ensure that all advanced candidates participate in field experiences or internships with P-12 students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups.

(2) AFI: There is little evidence that the unit assesses diversity proficiencies of advanced candidates.

Rationale for AFI: At the advanced level, proficiencies related to diversity are embedded in coursework, assignments, readings, and activities, but they are not systematically

assessed. The unit provided no evidence that data are used to provide feedback to candidates to improve their ability to help students from diverse populations.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Visiting Team Decision: Met

No AFI's identified.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

Visiting Team Decision: Met

(1) AFI: The unit budget does not adequately support the on-campus and clinical work essential for the preparation of candidates in the advanced programs for teachers. (continued from 2009 NCATE/Connecticut visit).

Rationale for AFI: The advanced programs for teachers lack support for the development of their assessment systems and evaluation of candidate performance on campus and during their field work.

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). Given the number and seriousness of the AFIs, during a spring 2014 meeting, the Review Committee recommended probationary approval for SCSU for the period September 3, 2014, through September 30, 2017, with a report due and on-site visit required no later than spring 2017 to address the AFIs identified under NCATE standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6. Additionally, the committee recommended that SCSU submit progress reports documenting their continuing work towards meeting standard requirements to the CSDE every six months until the on-site visit.

At SCSU's request, the current, state-mandated, focused visit was conducted April 24, 2015. SCSU presented to the team a progress report detailing all work that had been completed to meet each of the AFIs that had been identified during the 2014 visit, along with all required exhibit room documents and materials. Additionally, the Dean of the SCSU School of Education made a presentation to the visiting team, elaborating on critical report pieces and highlighting significant changes made to SCSU education programs since the 2014 visit. Most of the work that SCSU needed to complete to meet standard requirements involved the assessment of candidate proficiencies and the unit-wide use of data for program evaluation purposes. For all new assessments reviewed by the visiting team, SCSU was also required to present candidate data from at least one application of the assessment, which SCSU was able to do. Additionally, the Dean and faculty provided the visiting team with a demonstration of the School of Education assessment system now being used to store, analyze and report candidate and other unit-level data.

Based on SCSU's progress report, exhibit room documents and materials, and interviews with the dean, faculty members, and the university president, the visiting team determined that SCSU had completed satisfactorily all required work to meet NCATE standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.

Based on visiting team findings from the April 2015 visit, during the June 26, 2015, meeting, the Review Committee recommended full continuing approval for SCSU educator preparation

programs, for the period September 30, 2015, through September 30, 2019, with a progress report due in spring 2017 that describes SCSU’s continuous improvement efforts towards meeting the requirements described by NCATE standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6. Please note that in the case of focused visits due to either provisional or probationary approval, the five-year cycle count for the next continuing approval visit begins with the initial, mandated visit year, which in this case is 2014; hence, the next visit date is 2019 for SCSU, rather than 2020.

Recommendation and Justification

Based upon visiting team findings and the recommendation of the CSDE Program Review Committee, I recommend that SCSU educator preparation programs be granted full continuing approval for the period September 30, 2015, through September 30, 2019, with a progress report due in spring 2017 that describes SCSU’s continuous improvement efforts towards meeting the requirements described by NCATE standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.

Follow-up Activity

If granted full continuing approval by the SBE for a four-year period, SCSU will host its next NCATE/Connecticut visit during spring 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.