

IX.A.

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Hartford

TO BE PROPOSED:
October 2, 2019

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 the University of Saint Joseph (USJ) for the period October 2, 2019, through December 31, 2024, with a progress report documenting continuous improvement work related to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Standard 5 due annually until USJ's spring 2024 CAEP accreditation visit, and annual progress monitoring conducted using program data from the Connecticut Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) Data Dashboard, for the purpose of certifying graduates from USJ in the following areas:

<u>Program</u>	<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Program Level</u>	<u>Program Type</u>
Elementary Education	1-6	Initial	Undergraduate/graduate
Secondary Areas:			
English	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/graduate
History/Social Studies	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/graduate
Mathematics	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/graduate
Biology	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/graduate
Chemistry	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/graduate
General Science	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/graduate
French	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/graduate
Italian	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/graduate
Latin	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/graduate
Spanish	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate/graduate
Special Education	K-12	Initial	Undergraduate/graduate
Early Childhood	N-3	Initial	Graduate
Family/Consumer Science	PK-12	Initial	Graduate
School Counselor	PK-12	Advanced	Graduate

and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of _____ this second day of October, Two Thousand Nineteen.

Signed: _____
Dr. Miguel A. Cardona, Secretary
State Board of Education

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Dr. Miguel A. Cardona, Commissioner of Education

DATE: October 2, 2019

SUBJECT: Continuing Approval of Educator Preparation Provider, University of Saint Joseph

Executive Summary

Introduction

During a fall 2018 meeting, the Connecticut State Board of Education (CSBE) placed the University of Saint Joseph (USJ) on provisional approval for the period December 1, 2018, through November 30, 2021, due to evaluation findings from a spring 2018 national accreditation visit conducted by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). The CSBE also required the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) to monitor USJ's progress towards meeting CAEP standards by conducting a focused, on-site visit no later than spring 2021. On March 18, 2019, USJ hosted the state-mandated, on-site visit. This report provides a summary of visiting team evaluation findings for the March 2019 visit and includes the Commissioner of Education's recommendation for continuing approval for USJ.

History/Background

Located in West Hartford, Connecticut, USJ is a private, coeducational university serving approximately 2,400 students through more than 30 undergraduate, graduate, doctoral, and certificate programs across three schools. USJ is regionally accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC).

The USJ Department of Education, housed in the School of Arts, Sciences, Business, and Education, offers initial licensure programs at both undergraduate and graduate levels in the areas of elementary education and various secondary subject areas, including English language arts, social studies/history, science (biology, chemistry, and general science), mathematics, and world languages (French, Italian, Spanish and Latin). Additionally, USJ offers initial licensure programs at the graduate level only in the areas of early childhood education and family and consumer science education. USJ also offers one advanced certification program in school counseling and multiple, non-certification programs leading to a Master of Arts degree in education. USJ educator preparation programs are currently nationally accredited by CAEP, but provisionally approved by the CSBE.

The USJ CAEP visit was conducted during April 4-10, 2018. Based on the 2018 visit, the CAEP Accreditation Council's final evaluation report cited two critical Areas for Improvement (AFIs), both related to CAEP Standard 5, *Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement*:

(1) Area for Improvement

There is insufficient evidence that the provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent (standard 5, component 5.2).

(2) Area for Improvement

There is insufficient evidence that the provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence (standard 5, component 5.5).

Based on the CAEP visit evaluation findings, the CSBE placed USJ on provisional approval for the period December 1, 2018, through November 30, 2021, with a focused, on-site visit required no later than spring 2021.

On March 18, 2019, USJ hosted the state-mandated, on-site visit, focusing on work completed for the two Areas for Improvement (AFIs) identified by the CAEP visiting team during the spring 2018 CAEP visit. The visit included multiple presentations by USJ program directors and other faculty, with an introduction by the Dean of the USJ College of Education. Additionally, the USJ Assessment Director provided the visiting team with a demonstration of the USJ assessment system, including how candidate performance data are collected, analyzed, and used for program evaluation efforts. The team also reviewed multiple supporting documents (e.g., revised assessments). Based on visit evidence, the visiting team determined that USJ is meeting all CAEP standard 5 assessment system requirements, including involving critical stakeholders in the assessment system development process, and program evaluation and continuous improvement efforts. Key visiting team findings include:

- The USJ College of Education has created an EPP Information Management and Quality Assurance system which describes all data sources to be used in the program evaluation and continuous improvement process according to four key categories: (1) Candidate Quality and Diversity; (2) Program Quality; (3) Clinical Partnerships; and (4) Clinical Experiences. Integral to this system are processes for assuring that all data sources are valid, reliable and sufficient to measure program quality and impact.
- Candidate progress is monitored from admission to program completion for all USJ programs using multiple assessments developed by faculty at three developmental transition points: (1) Tier 1 (program entry); (2) Tier II (development of content knowledge and pedagogy); and (3) Tier III (application of content knowledge and pedagogy in student teaching). Measures of completer satisfaction and impact on P-12 learners are also included. Creating and grouping assessments at the three developmental transition points also serves as a calendar for USJ faculty for the collection, review, analysis, and reporting of data at the unit and program level. Further, the framework provides a list of data reports to be prepared for faculty review by the college Director of Assessment.
- Candidate performance data are collected using the LiveText Learning Management System. Candidates upload key assignments to the LiveText platform where instructors complete the grading process. Key assessments associated with each Tier are graded using a common rubric, each of which is aligned with the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT) and national

content-specific standards. All college Program Directors have access to LiveText data. The college Director of Assessment is responsible for preparing aggregate and disaggregate reports for faculty review and program evaluation efforts. LiveText also serves as a platform in which samples of candidate work are reviewed and assessed by faculty.

- Web-based instruction for training and/or calibration for the administration of key assessments is available and required for all college faculty, including adjunct faculty, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers.
- The assessment and monitoring of candidate dispositions has been incorporated into each of the key assessment rubrics as well as the student teaching mid/final evaluation. More recently, further research regarding assessment of teacher candidate dispositions has resulted in the college adopting the Niagara University Disposition Instrument, given the instrument's alignment to the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards (required through CAEP) and documentation regarding validity and reliability. Beginning fall 2019, candidates will be asked to complete the Niagara University rating scale as a self-assessment, coinciding with a rating by their instructor using the scale. Based on ratings, each candidates will identify a dispositional/professional development goal to be reviewed and reassessed at each Tier level.
- Candidate performance data and other unit-wide data are discussed during monthly program meetings each semester and during two college "Data Days" at the end of each semester. The most recent Data Days produced an in-depth discussion across programs concerning data collection, display, and analysis that would align with CAEP reporting requirements, and as well, clearly show evidence of candidate growth.

During a meeting on May 17, 2019, the CSDE Review Committee (Attachment B) unanimously recommended full approval (Attachment C) for USJ, with a progress report documenting continuous improvement work related specifically to CAEP standard 5 due annually until USJ's spring 2024 CAEP accreditation visit.

Recommendation and Justification

Based on the recommendation of the CSDE Review Committee, I am recommending that USJ be granted full approval for the period October 2, 2019, through December 31, 2024, with a progress report documenting continuous improvement work related to CAEP standard 5 due annually until USJ's spring 2024 CAEP accreditation visit, and annual progress monitoring conducted using program data from the Connecticut Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) Data Dashboard.

Follow-up Activity

USJ will submit to the CSDE by June 1 annually the state-mandated progress reports. Additionally, the CSDE will conduct annual progress monitoring of all USJ educator preparation programs using program data from the Connecticut EPP Data Dashboard.

Prepared by: Katie Moirs, Ph.D., Program Approval Coordinator
Bureau of Educator Effectiveness

Approved by: Christopher M. Todd, Bureau Chief, Talent Office

**Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)
Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools,
Colleges and Departments of Education**

Standard 1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.1 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

Provider Responsibilities:

1.2 Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice.

1.3 Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music – NASM).

1.4 Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).

1.5 Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.

Standard 2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.

Partnerships for Clinical Preparation:

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.

Clinical Educators:

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple

indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.

Clinical Experiences:

2.3 The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.

Standard 3. Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.

Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs:

3.1 The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America's P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement:

3.2 The provider meets CAEP minimum criteria or the state's minimum criteria for academic achievement, whichever are higher, and gathers disaggregated data on the enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year.

The CAEP minimum criteria are a grade point average of 3.0 and a group average performance on nationally normed assessments or substantially equivalent state-normed assessments of mathematical, reading and writing achievement in the top 50 percent of those assessed. An EPP may develop and use a valid and reliable substantially equivalent alternative assessment of academic achievement. The 50th percentile standard for writing will be implemented in 2021.

Starting in academic year 2016-2017, the CAEP minimum criteria apply to the group average of enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year. The provider determines whether the CAEP minimum criteria will be measured (1) at admissions, OR (2) at some other time prior to candidate completion. In all cases, EPPs must demonstrate academic quality for the group average of each year's enrolled candidates. In addition, EPPs must continuously monitor disaggregated evidence of academic quality for each branch campus (if any), mode of delivery, and individual preparation programs, identifying differences, trends and patterns that should be addressed under component 3.1, Plan for recruitment of diverse candidates who meet employment needs.

CAEP will work with states and providers to designate, and will periodically publish, appropriate “top 50 percent” proficiency scores on a range of nationally or state normed assessments and other substantially equivalent academic achievement measures, with advice from an expert panel. Alternative arrangements for meeting the purposes of this component will be approved only under special circumstances and in collaboration with one or more states. The CAEP President will report to the Board and the public annually on actions taken under this provision.

Additional Selectivity Factors:

3.3 Educator preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

Selectivity During Preparation:

3.4 The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates’ advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates’ developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains.

Selection At Completion:

3.5 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development.

3.6 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies. CAEP monitors the development of measures that assess candidates’ success and revises standards in light of new results.

Standard 4. Program Impact

The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development:

4.1 The provider documents, using multiple measures that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. Multiple measures shall include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student-growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the provider.

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness:

4.2 The provider demonstrates, through structured validated observation instruments and/or student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

Satisfaction of Employers:

4.3. The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.

Satisfaction of Completers:

4.4 The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.

Standard 5. Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

Quality and Strategic Evaluation:

5.1 The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards.

5.2 The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

Continuous Improvement:

5.3. The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

5.4. Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

5.5. The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

Attachment B**CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Educator Preparation Program Approval Review Committee**

Name	Affiliation	Representation	Term Ending
1. Stephanie Storms	Fairfield University	Higher Education	March 2, 2022
2. Tamika La Salle	University of Connecticut	Higher Education	Jan. 3, 2020
3. Catherine O'Callaghan	Western Connecticut State University	Higher Education	Jan. 3, 2020
4. Julie Sochacki	University of Hartford	Higher Education	Jan. 3, 2020
5. Megan Mackey	Central Connecticut State University	Higher Education	March 2, 2022
6. Joseph Bonillo	Waterford Public Schools	K-12	Jan. 3, 2019
7. Thomas Danehy	Area Cooperative Educational Services	K-12	Jan. 3, 2020
8. Ana Ortiz	Oxford Public Schools	K-12	Jan. 3, 2020
9. Shuana Tucker	New Britain Public Schools	K-12	Jan. 3, 2020
10. Evette Avila	Hartford Public Schools	K-12	Jan. 3, 2020
11. Michael Livingston	Capitol Region Education Council	Community	March 2, 2022
12. Shannon Marimon	Connecticut Council for Education Reform	Community	March 2, 2022

**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.