

IX.B.

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Hartford

TO BE PROPOSED:

April 5, 2017

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 approval to Sacred Heart University (SHU) educator preparation programs through September 30, 2018, with an interim report required within 12-18 months regarding SHU's on-going assessment and evaluation efforts, for the purpose of certifying graduates from SHU in the following areas:

Program	Grade Level	Program Level	Program Type
Elementary Education Secondary Grades	K – 6*	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
English	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
History/Social Studies	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Mathematics	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
General Science	7 -12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Biology	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Chemistry	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Spanish	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Intermediate Administration and Supervision	PK-12	Advanced	Graduate
Remedial Reading/ Language Arts	1-12	Advanced	Graduate
Speech/Language Pathology	K-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 fifth day of April, Two Thousand Seventeen.

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: April 5, 2017

SUBJECT: Continuing Approval of Educator Preparation Program, Sacred Heart University

Executive Summary

Introduction

Based on team findings from a National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)/state continuing approval visit in spring 2015, the State Board of Education (SBE) placed Sacred Heart University (SHU) on probationary approval through September 30, 2018. In addition, the SBE required focused monitoring by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) and an on-site visit no later than spring 2018. During fall 2016, SHU hosted the mandated on-site visit. This report presents a summary of visiting team findings, including the Commissioner of Education's recommendation regarding continuing program approval for SHU.

History/Background

Located in Fairfield, Connecticut, SHU is a private, coeducational institution of higher learning, presently offering more than 70 undergraduate, graduate, doctoral, and certificate programs, including online degree programs, through five colleges, including the Isabelle Farrington College of Education (FCE). Programs and courses are offered on the main campus in Fairfield and the satellite campus sites of Stamford and Griswold. SHU is regionally accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC).

FCE is the largest independent educator of teachers and educational administrators in the state of Connecticut. Currently, FCE has 22 full-time faculty members, 36 adjunct faculty members, and 35 university supervisors to support its education programs. FCE offers initial certification programs in elementary education and various secondary subject areas, including English, social studies/history, biology, chemistry, general science, mathematics, and Spanish. Additionally, SHU offers advanced certification programs in reading, intermediate administration, special education, and speech/language pathology; and a certificate of advanced study in teaching, administration, and literacy.

During May 3-5, 2015, SHU hosted its regularly scheduled NCATE/state visit, with the visiting team evaluating the extent to which SHU is meeting NCATE standards (Attachment A). During the visit, the team determined that three of the six NCATE standards—standards 1, 2, and 3—were not met. Additionally, the team identified areas for improvement for NCATE standards 4 and 6. Based on visit findings and the recommendation of the CSDE Review Committee (Attachment B), the SBE placed SHU on probationary approval through September 30, 2018,

requiring focused monitoring by the CSDE and an on-site visit no later than spring 2018 (Attachment C).

On October 17, 2016, SHU hosted the required focused monitoring visit, during which a visiting team reviewed the Institutional Report prepared by SHU, as well as all supporting documentation and exhibits (e.g., assessments and data). Additionally, SHU's Dean of the College of Education, Assistant Dean, Teacher Education Chair, and Griswold Site Director presented an overview and summary of work that had been completed since the spring 2015 NCATE/state visit, including a demonstration of SHU's assessment system. Finally, the visiting team interviewed SHU faculty members and administrators. Based on the on-site review, the visiting team determined that SHU addressed all areas initially identified for improvement and had successfully met all requirements for NCATE standards 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6.

The CSDE Review Committee met in January 2017. Based on findings from the focused visit, they recommended full approval for SHU through September 30, 2022. In the case of state provisional or probationary approval, the timeline for an educator preparation program's (EPP) review is based on the date of the program's most recent continuing approval visit date.

As the CSDE transitions to continuing program approval based on the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)'s standards and process, SHU's future schedule of continuing approval will align with CAEP's cycle. Consistent with CAEP standards, SHU will also be expected to submit an interim report within 12-18 months regarding the unit's on-going assessment and program evaluation efforts.

CAEP is requiring that SHU address the failed NCATE standards and all areas for improvement identified during the May 2015 NCATE/state visit in order for SHU to be CAEP accredited. To this end, SHU has negotiated an earlier on-site visit date with CAEP, during which SHU will address the failed NCATE standards and areas for improvement from the May 2015 NCATE/state visit as well as present evidence for meeting the new CAEP standards. SHU's first CAEP visit is scheduled for February 25-27, 2018.

Recommendation and Justification

In order to align the SHU continuing program approval timeline with the CAEP national accreditation timeline and requirements, I recommend that SHU educator preparation programs (EPPs) be granted full approval for the period April 5, 2017, through November 30, 2018, with an interim report required within 12-18 months regarding SHU's on-going assessment and evaluation efforts.

Follow-up Activity

SHU will host a CAEP on-site visit February 25-27, 2018. Additionally, SHU will submit to the CSDE within 12-18 months an interim report regarding SHU's on-going assessment and evaluation efforts under CAEP standard requirements.

Beginning fall 2018, upon full implementation of the CSDE EPP data dashboard system, the CSDE will begin reporting to the SBE annually key indicator data for all Connecticut EPPs, including SHU.

Prepared by: Katie Toohey, Ph.D., Program Approval Coordinator
Bureau of Educator Standards and Certification

Reviewed by: Shannon Marimón, Division Director
Bureau of Educator Effectiveness

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

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**

Name	Affiliation	Representation	Term Ending
1. Hari Koirala	Eastern Connecticut State University	Higher Education	January 3, 2019
2. Tamika La Salle	University of Connecticut	Higher Education	January 3, 2020
3. Catherine O'Callaghan	Western Connecticut State University	Higher Education	January 3, 2020
4. Julie Sochacki	University of Hartford	Higher Education	January 3, 2020
5. Joseph Bonillo	Waterford Public Schools	K-12	January 3, 2019
6. Thomas Danehy	Area Cooperative Educational Services	K-12	January 3, 2020
7. David Erwin	Berlin Public Schools	K-12	January 3, 2019
8. Ana Ortiz	Oxford Public Schools	K-12	January 3, 2020
9. Shuana Tucker	New Britain Public Schools	K-12	January 3, 2020
10. Evette Avila	Connecticut Center for School Change	Community	January 3, 2020
11. Stanley Battle	University of Saint Joseph	Community	January 3, 2020
12. A. Bates Lyons	A. Bates Lyons Associates	Community	January 3, 2019

**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.