CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford

TO BE PROPOSED:
November 7, 2018

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 Sacred Heart University (SHU) for the period December 1, 2018, through November 30, 2025, with a progress report documenting continuous improvement work related to the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standard 5 due in spring 2021 and annual progress monitoring conducted using program data from the Connecticut Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) Data Dashboard, for the purpose of certifying graduates from SHU in the following areas:

Program	Grade Level	Program Level	Program Type
Elementary Education	1-6	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Secondary Grades			
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
Remedial Reading/			
Language Arts	1-12	Advanced	Graduate
Speech/Language Pathology	K-12	Advanced	Graduate
Intermediate Administration			
and Supervision	PK-12	Advanced	Graduate
Superintendent of Schools	PK-12	Advanced	Graduate

and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of _____ this seventh day of November, Two Thousand Eighteen.

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

TO: State Board of Education

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

DATE: November 7, 2018

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

Executive Summary

Introduction
Sacred Heart University (SHU) hosted a Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) on-site visit February 25-27, 2018. This report presents SHU's state program approval and national accreditation history, a summary of visiting team findings for the February 2018 visit, and includes the Commissioner's recommendation regarding continuing state program approval for SHU.

History/Background
Located in Fairfield, Connecticut, SHU is a private, coeducational university serving approximately 5,600 full- and part-time undergraduate students and 3,000 graduate students through 70 undergraduate, graduate, doctoral, and certificate programs across five colleges. SHU is regionally accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC).

The SHU Isabelle Farrington College of Education offers initial certification programs in elementary education and various secondary subject areas, including English language arts, social studies/history, science (biology, chemistry, and general science), mathematics, and Spanish. Additionally, SHU offers advanced certification programs in reading, special education, speech/language pathology, and intermediate administration. A new advanced program, which prepares individuals for the role of superintendent of schools, was approved by the state board of education (SBE) in April 2018. SHU also offers multiple non-certification programs leading to a Master of Arts degree in education. SHU educator preparation programs are currently fully approved by the Connecticut State Board of Education (SBE) and nationally accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

During May 2015, SHU hosted its regularly scheduled NCATE/state partnership visit. Based on visit findings and the recommendation of the CSDE Review Committee (Attachment A), the SBE placed SHU on probationary approval (Attachment B) through September 30, 2018 and required that the CSDE conduct an on-site, focused visit at SHU no later than spring 2018. NCATE—at the time transitioning to CAEP—also required SHU to address concerns identified during the May 2015 visit in order for SHU to continue to be nationally accredited, now through CAEP.

SHU scheduled the required state focused visit for fall 2016. Additionally, SHU scheduled a full CAEP accreditation visit for spring 2018 to address concerns identified during the May 2015 visit and to provide evidence of meeting the new CAEP standards (Attachment C).

Based on the fall 2016 state visit findings and the recommendation of the CSDE Review Committee, the SBE granted full approval to SHU through November 30, 2018 in order to align the SHU continuing program approval timeline with the CAEP national accreditation timeline and requirements.

SHU hosted the CAEP visit February 25-27, 2018. The CAEP visiting team first determined that SHU had satisfactorily addressed all outstanding concerns based on NCATE standards from the May 2015 visit. The team also reviewed SHU's progress towards meeting the new CAEP standards. Under the new CAEP evaluation protocol, the visiting team does not determine whether standards are "met" or "not met"; rather, the team gathers and reviews required evidence for each of the five CAEP standards and reports on Areas for Improvement (AFIs). The CAEP visiting team for the SHU spring 2018 visit determined that SHU had only one AFI, which was for CAEP standard five, pertaining to the reliability and validity of an assessment used by SHU to assess candidate dispositions.

During a spring 2018 CSDE Review Committee meeting, SHU reported on work completed since the CAEP visit to ensure that the assessment in question is now meeting technical standards of reliability and validity. Based on the CAEP spring 2018 visit findings and the work completed by SHU since the visit, the Review Committee recommended full continuing approval for SHU through to spring 2025, which would align SHU with the state adopted CAEP seven-year visit cycle, with a progress report documenting continuous improvement work related to CAEP standard five due in three years.

Recommendation and Justification
Based on the recommendation of the CSDE Review Committee, and in order to align the SHU continuing program approval timeline with the CAEP national accreditation timeline and requirements, I recommend that SHU be granted full approval for the period December 1, 2018, through November 30, 2025, with a progress report documenting continuous improvement work related to CAEP standard five due in spring 2021.

Follow-up Activity
SHU will submit to the CSDE during spring 2021 an interim report documenting SHU's continuous improvement work related to CAEP standard five and host a CAEP on-site visit during spring 2025. Additionally, the CSDE will conduct annual progress monitoring of all SHU educator preparation programs using program data from the Connecticut Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) Data Dashboard.

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

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

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Educator Preparation Program Approval Review Committee

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

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.

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.