IX.B.

Connecticut State Board of Education Hartford

To Be Proposed: September 6, 2023

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 Hartford (UHART) for the period September 6, 2023, through October 31, 2030, until UHART's 2029 CAEP site visit, for the purpose of certifying graduates from UHART in the following areas and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action:

| Program | Grade Level | Program I | evel P | rogram Type |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---------------|------------------------|
| Early Childhood Education | Birth-K Ini | | rgraduate/Gra | duate |
| Early Childhood Education | Nursery-3 | Initia | 1 | Undergraduate/Graduate |
| Elementary Education | K-6 ¹ | Initia | 1 | Undergraduate/Graduate |
| Elementary & Special Education | K-6 & K-1 | 2 Initia | 1 | Undergraduate |
| Comprehensive Special Education | n K-12 | Initia | 1 | Graduate |
| English | 7-12 | Initia | 1 | Undergraduate |
| Mathematics | 7-12 | Initia | 1 | Undergraduate |
| Music Education ² | PK-12 | Initia | 1 | Undergraduate/Graduate |
| School Psychology | PK-12 | Adva | nced | Graduate |

Approved by a vote of ______ this sixth day of September, Two Thousand Twenty-Three.

Signed: ______Charlene M. Russell-Tucker, Secretary State Board of Education

¹Pursuant to section 10-145d (f) of the Connecticut General Statues, on or after July 1, 2017, an endorsement for elementary education will be issued for Grades 1-6 only to in-state graduates.

² Accredited by National Association of Schools of Music

Connecticut State Board of Education Hartford

| То: | State Board of Education |
|----------|---|
| From: | Charlene M. Russell-Tucker, Commissioner of Education |
| Date: | September 6, 2023 |
| Subject: | Continuing Approval of University of Hartford Educator Preparation Programs |
| | |

Executive Summary

Introduction

Per Connecticut legislation (Special Act No. 16-22) and State Board of Education (SBE) policy, all Connecticut educator preparation providers (EPPs) must become a Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) partner and become nationally accredited through CAEP. Additionally, per the SBE as of October 2021, Connecticut uses accreditation decisions based on CAEP accreditation visits to determine state continuing approval status for Connecticut EPPs. During fall 2022, The University of Hartford (UHART) hosted its first CAEP visit to determine continuing national accreditation and state program approval for all programs offered. This report provides a summary of accreditation findings and the CAEP accreditation decision for UHART based on the fall 2022 visit, including the Commissioner's recommendation for continuing 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, secondary English, and Special Education. 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, previously nationally accredited through the now retired National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), hosted its first CAEP accreditation visit during fall 2022. The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) received the CAEP Action Report (action report) pertaining to the fall 2022 accreditation visit on May 17, 2023. As indicated in the report, CAEP has granted UHART accreditation for initial and advanced programs for seven years, in alignment with the CAEP accreditation visit cycle. Five areas for improvement (AFIs) were identified for initial programs. AFIs indicate areas which must be improved by the time of the next CAEP accreditation visit, with progress reporting relative to remediation of AFIs included as part of the annual reports that EPPs are required to submit to CAEP. Accreditation for seven years is granted if the EPP meets all CAEP Standards and components, even if AFIs are identified in the CAEP Action Report based on the accreditation visit. The chart below shows the AFIs identified for UHART.

| | A | Declarate |
|---|---|--|
| Initial Programs: | Areas for Improvement | Rationale |
| STANDARD R3: Candidate Quality and Selectivity | The EPP provided limited evidence that candidates possess critical dispositions reflecting positive beliefs about the learning potentials of all students. (component R3.3) | The EPP disposition data lacked disaggregation and analysis of candidates' critical dispositions. |
| STANDARD R4: Satisfaction with Preparation | The EPP provided limited evidence to demonstrate that program completers effectively contributed to P-12 student learning. (component R4.1) | One cycle of data was provided; however, no Transition Plan was included. |
| | The EPP provided limited evidence that employers were satisfied with program completers. (component R4.2) | Data provided were in the form of reporting on informal interviews only with school officials. |
| | The EPP provided limited evidence that completers were satisfied with program preparation. (component R4.3) | Data provided were not evidence of completer satisfaction. |
| STANDARD 5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement | The EPP provided limited evidence of a functioning Quality Assurance System (QAS). (component R5.1) | While the EPP provided the parts of a QAS, the system lacked sufficient evidence of system capability and systematic functionality, of valid and reliable data, and of the collection, review, and analysis supporting program improvement. |

Once CAEP Action Reports are received, the CSDE Review Committee (Attachment A) meets to review the report and makes a recommendation to the Commissioner of Education relative to continuing approval of preparation programs based upon Connecticut educator preparation program approval regulations (Attachment B). On June 21, 2023, the CSDE Review Committee reviewed the CAEP action report and unanimously recommended full continuing approval for the period of September 6, 2023, through October 31, 2030.

Recommendation and Justification

I am recommending full continuing approval for UHART's educator preparation programs at the initial and advanced level for the period September 6, 2023, through October 31, 2030, due to UHART's CAEP accreditation status based on a fall 2029 accreditation visit. Based on the CAEP seven-year visit cycle, UHART's next CAEP accreditation visit is scheduled for fall 2029. The September 31, 2030, state approval deadline allows time for the CSDE to receive the final CAEP Action Report based on the fall 2029 visit and prepare a report for the SBE.

Follow-up Activity

If the SBE grants full approval for The University of Hartford's educator preparation programs, the Talent Office will immediately communicate UHART's approval status with the university leadership. Additionally, the CSDE Review Committee will annually review the CAEP staff reports to monitor the remediation of UHART's Areas for Improvement.

Prepared by: Lauren Tafrate, EPP Program Approval Coordinator, Talent Office Approved by: Shuana K. Tucker, Ph.D., Chief Talent Officer

Attachment A

Connecticut State Department of Education Educator Preparation Program Approval Review Committee

| Name | Affiliation | Representation | Term Ending |
|--------------------------|--|------------------|----------------|
| 1. Megan Mackey | Central Connecticut State University mackey@ccsu.edu | Higher Education | March 31, 2025 |
| Vacant | | Higher Education | |
| 2. Catherine O'Callaghan | Western Connecticut State University ocallaghanc@wcsu.edu | Higher Education | June 30, 2023 |
| 3. Julie Sochacki | University of Hartford SOCHACKI@hartford.edu | Higher Education | June 30, 2023 |
| 4. Mel Horton | Sacred Heart University hortonm3@sacredheart.edu | Higher Education | March 31, 2025 |
| 5. Joseph Bonillo | Waterford Public Schools jbonillo@waterfordschools.org | K-12 | June 30, 2023 |
| 6. Thomas Danehy | Area Cooperative Educational Services TDanehy@aces.org | K-12 | June 30, 2023 |
| 7. Vacant | | K-12 | |
| 8. Kevin Walston | Danbury Public Schools walstk@danbury.k12.us 203.595.1404 (cell) | K-12 | June 30, 2023 |
| 9. Paul Whyte | New Haven Public Schools PAUL.WHYTE@new-haven.k12.ct.us | K-12 | June 30, 2023 |
| 10. Camille Cooper | Yale Child Study Center Camille.cooper@yale.edu | Community | March 31, 2025 |
| 11. Shannon Marimón | ReadyCT shannon.marimon@readyct.org | Community | March 31, 2025 |

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 yearsⁱ, 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 farreaching 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 semesters 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.

ⁱ Seven years to align with CAEP accreditation cycle.