

VI. E.

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Hartford

TO BE PROPOSED:

September 2, 2015

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Education, pursuant to Section 10-145d-9(g)(1)(C) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, grants probationary approval to Sacred Heart University (SHU) educator preparation programs for the period September 30, 2015, through September 30, 2018, and requires the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) to conduct an on-site visit no later than spring 2018 to evaluate progress towards meeting requirements described by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6, as well as focused monitoring of the program until the on-site visit, including a review and evaluation of annual progress reports, for the purpose of certifying graduates from SHU in the following areas:

Program	Grade Level	Program Level	Program Type
Elementary Education	K – 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
Business	7-12	Initial	Graduate
Intermediate Administration and Supervision	PK-12	Advanced	Graduate
Remedial Reading/ Language Arts	1-12	Advanced	Graduate

*Pursuant to Public Act 12-63, amended by Public Act 13-122 (Section 11), on or after July 1, 2017, an endorsement for elementary education will be issued for Grades 1-6 only to in-state graduates.

and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of _____ this second day of September, Two Thousand Fifteen.

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

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford

TO: State Board of Education

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

DATE: September 2, 2015

SUBJECT: Continuing Approval of Sacred Heart University Educator Preparation Programs

Executive Summary

Introduction

Connecticut statutes require State Board of Education (SBE) approval of all educator preparation programs leading to Connecticut educator certification. Once approved, programs are required to seek continuing approval every five years based on an on-site visiting team process conducted by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE). Visiting teams consist of Connecticut educators trained in the CSDE visit process.

Although not required by Connecticut, programs may also voluntarily seek national accreditation through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), in addition to continuing program approval through the SBE. If a program is seeking both continuing state program approval and NCATE accreditation, the visit is a joint visit, conducted by NCATE and the CSDE in accordance with the NCATE/Connecticut State Partnership Agreement, with the visiting team consisting of both national and state team members.

Both state program approval and NCATE accreditation require that programs meet the six performance-based NCATE standards (Attachment A), along with Connecticut certification and educator preparation regulations.

Sacred Heart University (SHU), a NCATE partnership institution since 2011, hosted its mandated NCATE/Connecticut partnership visit during spring 2015. This report presents a summary of visiting team findings based on the visit, including the Commissioner of Education's recommendation regarding continuing state program approval for SHU educator preparation programs.

History/Background

Located in Fairfield, Connecticut, SHU is the second-largest Catholic university in New England. Accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), SHU is a co-educational, independent, and comprehensive institution of higher learning, and presently offers more than 40 undergraduate, graduate and doctoral programs on its main campus in Fairfield and satellite campus sites in other Connecticut cities and towns, Luxembourg and Ireland through four colleges: the College of Arts and Sciences; the College of Education and

Health Professions; the University College; and the John F. Welch College of Business. The SHU 2014-2015 student body consisted of 7,781 students, with 4,232 full-time undergraduate students, 765 part-time undergraduate students, and 2,784 graduate students.

The College of Education and Health Professions houses the Isabelle Farrington College of Education, the largest independent educator of teachers and educational administrators in the State of Connecticut. At present, there are 23 full-time faculty members in the School of Education. Additionally, the college employs 35 adjunct faculty and 35 university supervisors to support educational programs. The college offers initial certification programs in elementary education and various secondary subject areas, including English, social studies/history, biology, chemistry, general science, mathematics and Spanish. Additionally, the college offers advanced certification programs in reading and intermediate administration. Advanced certificate programs are offered in teaching, administration and literacy.

The current mandated NCATE/Connecticut visit was conducted May 3-5, 2015, in accordance with the NCATE/Connecticut Partnership visit protocol. The visiting team determined that SHU is meeting NCATE standards 4, 5, and 6, but is currently not meeting requirements described by NCATE standards 1, 2, and 3. Additionally, two Areas for Improvement (AFI) were identified by the team, one for standard 4 and one for standard 6. Finally, the team determined that some AFI's identified during the last NCATE/Connecticut visit remained:

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
Visiting Team Decision: Not Met

(1) AFI: The unit lacks sufficient data to demonstrate that secondary level candidates possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions described by professional, state, and institutional standards (continued from 2010 NCATE/Connecticut visit).

Rationale: It is unclear how assessments are aligned with professional, state, and institutional standards and therefore difficult to discern candidates' performance levels.

(2) AFI: The unit lacks sufficient data to demonstrate that non-licensure Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) candidates possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions described by professional, state, and institutional standards (continued from 2010 NCATE/Connecticut visit).

Rationale: It is difficult to identify data for each option in the MAT program.

(3) AFI: The unit lacks sufficient data to demonstrate that Elementary Education, 5-Year MAT, Post-Baccalaureate, and Advanced candidates possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions described by professional, state, and institutional standards.

Rationale: Data for the Elementary Education, 5-year MAT, Post-Baccalaureate, and Advanced programs are insufficient.

(4) AFI: The unit assessment system does not systematically evaluate initial and advanced candidate dispositions.

Rationale: Evidence indicates that the unit does not systematically evaluate initial and advanced candidate dispositions through all defined program gates.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

Visiting Team Decision: Not Met

(1) AFI: The non-licensure MAT program does not have an assessment system in place (continued from 2010 NCATE/Connecticut visit).

Rationale: Limited evidence was provided to remove this AFI.

(2) AFI: The unit does not provide sufficient evidence as to how the assessment system addresses fairness and accuracy.

Rationale: Limited evidence was presented to address fairness and accuracy.

(3) AFI: Data are not being consistently aggregated, analyzed, and disseminated at the program or unit levels.

Rationale: The Assessment Handbook described several processes in place to aggregate, analyze, and disseminate data. However, limited evidence was provided for program and unit level data analysis and systematic review.

(4) AFI: The assessment system is minimally aligned with state and national standards.

Rationale: National recognition reports and review of exhibits indicate that rubrics are minimally aligned with state and national standards.

(5) AFI: Initial and advanced candidates are not systematically tracked at transition points.

Rationale: The unit did not provide evidence that data are systematically collected, analyzed, and tracked at transition points.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Visiting Team Decision: Not Met

(1) AFI: All programs, initial and advanced, lack a tracking system to ensure that every candidate has diverse placements.

Rationale: Candidates report seeking their own placements, completing significant portions of their required field and clinical hours in the same locations. Several candidates and alumni report completing their internship in the same location as the remainder of their field/clinical required hours. The lack of a system to track candidates in the field and clinical experiences ensures that not all candidates have a diversity of placement locations throughout their programs.

(2) AFI: PK-12 partners are not involved in the design and evaluation of clinical practices in all initial and advanced programs.

Rationale: There is no mechanism in place for PK-12 partners to have the opportunity to help design and evaluate the implementation of clinical practices in all programs.

(3) AFI: Not all initial teaching candidates are placed in internships in their area of certification.

Rationale: Interviews indicate that some candidates are being placed in internships outside of their area of certification (e.g. secondary candidates being placed in lower elementary school).

(4) AFI: Not all initial teaching candidates have clearly-defined student teaching experiences outside of the internship to meet state certification requirements.

Rationale: Interviews at two program locations indicate that there is an inconsistent unit expectation regarding the duration of student teaching and whether or not student teaching is embedded into the internship. At the Griswold campus, these are two distinct experiences; yet at the Fairfield campus, the experiences may be combined.

Standard 4: Diversity

Visiting Team Decision: Met

(1) AFI: The unit does not maintain data to ensure that candidates interact with peers from diverse groups (continued from 2010 NCATE/Connecticut visit).

Rationale: Limited evidence was provided to remove this AFI.

(2) AFI: The unit does not ensure that candidates interact with diverse faculty.

Rationale: The unit has demonstrated limited efforts to recruit and maintain professional education faculty members from diverse ethnic/racial groups. The unit does not have a tracking system in place to monitor candidate interaction with diverse faculty.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Visiting Team Decision: Met

No AFIs identified.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

Visiting Team Decision: Met

(1) AFI: The Unit lacks sufficient full-time faculty and support personnel to meet the assessment needs of the unit.

Rationale: The unit supports 23 full-time faculty members, nine of whom are tenured or tenure track and the remainder are clinical appointments. The unit also has 35 adjunct faculty members. Based on observations and a lack of organized data during the visit, it is unclear whether program coherence and integrity can be ensured.

Once visits are completed, the CSDE Review Committee (Attachment B) meets to review visiting team findings and make recommendations to the Commissioner of Education relative to continuing approval of preparation programs based upon Connecticut educator preparation program approval regulations (Attachment C). During the June 26, 2015, Review Committee meeting, SHU presented work that had been completed by the program since the spring 2015 visit to address requirements for standards 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6, including a specific timeline for continuous improvement plans. Although at the point of the Review Committee meeting SHU had completed a significant amount of required work, including the development of several key assessments, SHU still needs to report to the Review Committee on candidate performance data based on newly-developed assessments. Given the seriousness of three failed standards and unmet requirements around data reporting at the time of the on-site visit, the committee recommended probationary approval for SHU for the period September 30, 2015, through September 30, 2018, with an on-site visit required no later than spring 2018. Additionally, the committee recommended that the CSDE conduct continuous focused monitoring of SHU education programs until the on-site visit, including the review and evaluation of annual progress

reports from SHU relative to addressing requirements described by NCATE standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6.

Recommendation and Justification

Based upon visiting team findings and the recommendation of the CSDE Program Review Committee, I recommend that SHU educator preparation programs be granted probationary approval for the period September 30, 2015, through September 30, 2018, with an on-site visit required no later than spring 2018 to evaluate progress towards meeting requirements described by NCATE standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6. Further, I recommend that the CSDE conduct continuous focused monitoring of SHU educator preparation programs until the on-site visit in spring 2018 including the review and evaluation of annual progress reports from SHU.

Follow-up Activity

If granted probationary approval by the SBE for a three-year period, SHU will have until spring 2018 to prepare for and host an on-site visit to evaluate progress towards meeting requirements described by NCATE standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6. Additionally, the CSDE will conduct focused monitoring of SHU educator preparation programs until the on-site visit, including the review and evaluation of annual progress reports from SHU.

Prepared by: _____
Katie Toohey, Ph.D., Program Approval Coordinator
Bureau of Educator Effectiveness and Professional Learning

Reviewed by: _____
Shannon Marimón, Division Director
Bureau of Educator Effectiveness and Professional Learning

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

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges and Departments of Education

Standard 1 – Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

- Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates
- Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates
- Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates
- Student Learning for Teacher Candidates
- Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals
- Student Learning for Other School Professionals
- Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Standard 2 – Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

- Assessment System
- Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation
- Use of Data for Program Improvement

Standard 3 – Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

- Collaboration between Unit and School Partners
- Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
- Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Standard 4 – Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates and diverse students in P-12 schools.

- Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences
- Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty
- Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates
- Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

Standard 5 – Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

- Qualified Faculty
- Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching
- Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship
- Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service Collaboration
- Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance
- Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Standard 6 – Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

- Unit Leadership and Authority
- Unit Budget
- Personnel
- Unit Facilities
- Unit Resources Including Technology

**CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Educator Preparation Program Approval Review Committee, 2013-2016**

HIGHER EDUCATION REPRESENTATION	K-12 REPRESENTATION	COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION	CSDE/OHE REPRESENTATION (non-voting members)
Dr. Helen Abadiano Chair, Reading and Language Arts Department School of Education and Professional Studies Central Connecticut State University 9/2013-9/2016	Joseph Bonillo Educator, History/Social Studies Clark Lane Middle School Waterford Public Schools 9/2013-9/2016		
Dr. Maureen Fitzpatrick Assistant Professor, Educational Leadership Isabelle Farrington College of Education Sacred Heart State University 9/2013-9/2016	Kenneth DiPietro Superintendent Plainfield Public Schools 9/2013-9/2016		
Dr. Hari Koirala Chair, Department of Education School of Education and Professional Studies Eastern Connecticut State University 9/2013-9/2016	Dr. David Erwin Superintendent Berlin Public Schools 9/2013-9/2016		
Dr. Patricia Mulcahy-Ernt Director, Graduate Programs, Literacy/English Education Director, Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching University of Bridgeport 9/2013-9/2016	Dr. Erin McGurk Director, Education Services Ellington Public Schools 9/2013-9/2016		
Dr. Nancy Niemi Chair, Department of Education University of New Haven 9/2013-9/2016	Dr. Salvatore Menzo Superintendent Wallingford Public Schools 9/2013-9/2016		

**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.