

**CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
Hartford**

**TO BE PROPOSED:**

February 6, 2019

**RESOLVED**, That the State Board of Education, pursuant to Section 10-145d-9(g)(2)(A) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, grants full approval for the period February 6, 2019 through March 31, 2023, to the University of Hartford (UHART), with annual progress monitoring conducted using program data from the Connecticut Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) Data Dashboard until UHART’s Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) fall 2022 site visit, for the purpose of certifying graduates from UHART in the following new certification area:

| <b><u>Program</u></b> | <b><u>Grade Level</u></b> | <b><u>Program Level</u></b> | <b><u>Program Type</u></b> |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Special Education     | K-12                      | Initial                     | Graduate                   |

and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of \_\_\_\_\_ this sixth day of February, Two Thousand Nineteen.

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:** February 6, 2019

**SUBJECT:** Approval of New Educator Preparation Program: University of Hartford, Special Education Program

**Executive Summary**

**Introduction**

Connecticut educator preparation providers (EPPs) and other organizations proposing new educator preparation programs must seek official approval through the Connecticut State Board of Education (SBE). EPPs are required to participate in a Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) evaluation process designed to guide and support new program proposals. The proposal then moves forward to the CSDE Review Committee (Attachment A), which makes recommendations to the Commissioner of Education regarding new program approval based on evaluation findings. This report presents a summary of evaluation findings for the University of Hartford (UHART) proposal for a special education program and includes the Commissioner of Education's recommendation for approval.

**History/Background**

UHART consists of seven schools and colleges. The institution offers more than 100 degree programs in the arts, humanities, business, engineering and technology, education, and health professions and draws over 7,000 undergraduate and graduate students from 48 states and 63 countries.

The UHART Department of Education is housed within the College of Education, Nursing and Health Professions, and offers initial teacher preparation programs in early childhood education, elementary education, integrated elementary/special education, and secondary English. Three other educator certification programs—music, secondary mathematics, and school psychology—are housed in the Hartt School and the College of Arts and Sciences, respectively. UHART educator preparation programs are fully approved by the SBE and nationally accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

During spring 2018, UHART submitted to the CSDE for review and evaluation a proposal for an initial certification program in special education that will also lead to a Master of Education degree. The CSDE review and evaluation of new program proposals is an iterative process

designed to provide comprehensive but targeted feedback to the proposing institution based on evaluation findings to support further program development, if necessary, in these four areas:

- (1) design, scope and sequence, including coursework and fieldwork/clinical experiences;
- (2) candidate assessments, including data collection, analysis, and reporting methods;
- (3) faculty and instructor qualifications; and
- (4) resources to support training of program candidates and program viability.

Based on an initial review of the UHART program proposal, an evaluation team consisting of CSDE and external experts in the field of special education identified key areas for improvement, including concerns that the proposed program did not provide sufficient fieldwork and clinical practice opportunities for candidates throughout the program. The team determined that UHART needed to submit a second proposal that addressed identified concerns before the proposal could move on to the CSDE Review Committee for consideration (Attachment A). Based on evaluation team feedback, UHART either clarified program components or revised components as required and submitted a second proposal for review and evaluation during fall 2018. Based on a review of the second proposal, the evaluation team unanimously recommended that the proposal move forward to the Review Committee for consideration. During November 2018, the Review Committee recommended full approval for the UHART special education program (Attachment B).

### **Recommendation and Justification**

Based upon the recommendation of the CSDE Review Committee, I recommend that the UHART special education program be granted full approval for the period February 6, 2019 through March 31, 2023, and that the new program be reviewed next with all UHART educator preparation programs during the EPP's fall 2022 Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) visit (Attachment C).

### **Follow-up Activity**

If granted full approval by the SBE, the dean of the UHART College of Education, Nursing and Health Professions will be notified immediately so that the EPP may start recruiting for the fall 2019 cohort. Additionally, the CSDE will conduct annual progress monitoring of this new program with all UHART 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: Sarah J. Barzee, Ph.D., Chief Talent Officer, Talent Office

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

| <b>Name</b>              | <b>Affiliation</b>                    | <b>Representation</b> |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 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           | Sprague 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.

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.