

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford

TO BE PROPOSED:
December 5, 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 the University of Bridgeport (UB) for the period January 1, 2019, through December 31, 2025, with a progress report documenting continuous improvement work related to the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standard three due in spring 2022 and annual progress monitoring conducted using program data from the Connecticut Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) Data Dashboard, for the purpose of certifying graduates from UB in the following areas:

Program	Grade Level	Program Level	Program Type
Elementary Education	K-6	Initial	Graduate
Middle Level Areas:			
English	4-8	Initial	Graduate
History/Social Studies	4-8	Initial	Graduate
Mathematics	4-8	Initial	Graduate
Science	4-8	Initial	Graduate
Secondary Areas:			
English	7-12	Initial	Graduate
History and Social Studies	7-12	Initial	Graduate
Mathematics	7-12	Initial	Graduate
Biology	7-12	Initial	Graduate
Chemistry	7-12	Initial	Graduate
Earth Science	7-12	Initial	Graduate
General Science	7-12	Initial	Graduate
Physics	7-12	Initial	Graduate
Business	7-12	Initial	Graduate
Music	PK-12	Initial	Graduate
Remedial Reading/Language Arts	1-12	Initial	Graduate
Reading/Language Arts Consultant	PK-12	Advanced	Graduate
Intermediate Administration or Supervision	PK-12	Advanced	Graduate

and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of _____ this fifth day of December, Two Thousand Eighteen.

Signed: _____
Dr. 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: December 5, 2018

SUBJECT: Continuing Approval of Educator Preparation Provider, University of Bridgeport

Executive Summary

Introduction

The University of Bridgeport (UB) hosted a Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) on-site visit April 15-17, 2018. This report presents a summary of visiting team findings for the February 2018 visit and includes the Commissioner of Education’s recommendation regarding continuing state program approval for UB educator preparation programs.

History/Background

Located in Bridgeport, Connecticut, UB is a private, coeducational university serving approximately 5,434 students through more than 125 undergraduate, graduate, doctoral, and certificate programs across 14 schools. UB is regionally accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC).

The UB School of Education offers initial licensure programs at the graduate level in elementary education; the middle level (4-8) areas of English language arts, history/social studies, mathematics, and general science; the secondary (7-12) subject areas of English language arts, history/social studies, mathematics, and science (biology, chemistry, earth science, general science and physics); and music education, which is a PK-12 endorsement. Additionally, UB offers advanced certification programs in remedial reading and language arts, the reading and language arts consultancy, and educational leadership; and two doctoral programs in education leadership and international education. UB educator preparation programs are currently fully approved by the Connecticut State Board of Education (SBE).

During April 2018, UB hosted its first CAEP visit. 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 (Attachment A) and reports on Areas for Improvement (AFIs). The CAEP visiting team for the UB spring 2018 visit determined that UB had one AFI for CAEP standard three, citing that UB needed to expand its candidate recruitment plan to more strategically focus on the needs of community, state, national, regional, and local needs, specifically referencing hard-to-staff schools and Connecticut shortage areas.

During a spring 2018 CSDE Review Committee meeting, UB reported on an expanded strategic recruitment plan that now includes the needs of community, state, national, regional, and local needs, specifically focused on hard-to-staff schools and Connecticut shortage areas. Based on the CAEP spring 2018 visit findings and the work completed by UB since the on-site visit to address the CAEP standard three AFI, the Review Committee recommended full continuing approval (Attachment C) for UB through fall 2025, which would align UB with the state-adopted CAEP seven-year visit cycle, with a progress report documenting continuous improvement work related to CAEP standard three due in three years.

Recommendation and Justification

Based on the recommendation of the CSDE Review Committee, I am recommending that UB be granted full continuing approval for the period January 1, 2019, through December 31, 2025, with a progress report documenting continuous improvement work related to CAEP standard three due in spring 2021.

Follow-up Activity

UB will submit to the CSDE during spring 2021 an interim report documenting UB's continuous improvement work related to CAEP standard three and host a CAEP on-site visit during spring 2025. Additionally, the CSDE will conduct annual progress monitoring of all UB 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

**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
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
8. Ana Ortiz	Oxford Public Schools	K-12
9. Shuana Tucker	New Britain Public Schools	K-12
10. Evette Avila	Hartford Public Schools	K-12
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.