

IX.A.

**CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford**

TO BE PROPOSED:

February 2, 2011

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Education, pursuant to Section 10-226d of the Connecticut General Statutes, approves the Fairfield Board of Education's "2010 Plan to Address Racial Imbalance" submitted by the Fairfield Board of Education and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of _____ this second day of February, Two Thousand Eleven.

Signed: _____

George A. Coleman, Secretary

State Board of Education

**CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford**

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: George A. Coleman, Acting Commissioner of Education

SUBJECT: Fairfield Board of Education's Plan to Correct Racial Imbalance

Introduction

On April 7, 2010, the Connecticut State Board of Education ("CSBE") accepted a report concerning the racial imbalance statistics for all schools in the state. Racial imbalance exists when the proportion of minority students for any school exceeds 25 percentage points more or less than the comparable proportion for the school district. The comparable proportion for the school district is determined by comparing the total number of racial minorities in a school to the district-wide total pupil enrollment in the same grades.

History/Background

The McKinley School in Fairfield ("McKinley") was originally identified as racially imbalanced in April 2007. The Fairfield Board of Education ("Fairfield Board") proposed an opt-in/opt-out option in its original racial imbalance plan. Specifically, McKinley parents were given the opportunity to transfer their children to one of three elementary schools identified by the Fairfield Board. If available seats were oversubscribed, the students would be assigned through a lottery with the priority given to McKinley students who were not achieving proficiency on the CMT in reading or not yet achieving at a high level on district assessments in reading and/or qualified for free and reduced lunch. Students from the three identified elementary schools were also given the option to "opt-in" to McKinley. In addition, the Fairfield Board's plan provided for the Superintendent to lead a task force, which would develop a series of options to reduce racial imbalance and improve student achievement for all students to be used in conjunction with the choice option at McKinley School.

The April 7, 2010, report, which was based upon enrollment as of October 1, 2009, indicated that McKinley continued to be racially imbalanced with an increase of 3.25 percent over the previous year's data. As a result of this continued imbalance, on April 12, 2010, Commissioner Mark McQuillan asked the Fairfield Board to submit an addendum to its plan, and such addendum was submitted to the CSBE on December 1, 2010. The CSBE, after considering the proposed changes to the plan, asked the Fairfield Board to resubmit its addendum with a more specific course of action to address the racial imbalance. The CSBE requested detailed information on the proposed relocation of the prekindergarten program at McKinley and its potential effect on the racial balance at the school. In addition, the CSBE asked the Fairfield Board to consider proposing other options that might increase the number of families who choose to participate in the opt-in/opt-out program. Finally, the CSBE requested data for the 2010 school year to determine whether changes in the federal guidelines concerning the identification of a student's race will affect the racial balance of the school.

The table below illustrates the racial imbalance statistics for McKinley, including the preliminary data for 2010.

School	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
McKinley Elementary School	22.22 (Impending imbalance)	28.74	27.40	25.45	28.70	25.89

Included is Enclosure A, the letter to Acting Commissioner George Coleman in response to the CSBE's request at its meeting on December 1, 2010; Enclosure B, the amended plan, submitted by Dr. David Title, Superintendent of Fairfield Public Schools; Enclosure C, the NCLB Report Card for McKinley School for 2009-10; Enclosure D, the 2009 and 2010 Public School Enrollment by District by Racial Imbalance Categories for Fairfield Public Schools; and Enclosure E, a copy of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies concerning the implementation of the racial imbalance law.

The Fairfield Board's Proposed Plan

The Fairfield Board proposes two additional actions that it can implement in the short-term to address the racial imbalance. First, the Fairfield Board proposes to expand the pre-school program for low-income students at Burr Elementary School ("Burr") from twenty to thirty-six students. Students who participate in this pre-school program are permitted to continue at Burr through the elementary grades. The Fairfield Board anticipates that at a minimum four additional students will elect to remain at Burr. (See, Enclosure A, paragraph three.) Second, the Fairfield Board plans to merge the McKinley pre-school program with the Early Childhood Center at Warde High School. Because the percentage of minority students in the pre-school program exceeds the percentage of minority students in the remaining grades, this move should improve the racial balance of the school.

As indicated in the December amendment to its plan, the Fairfield Board plans to expand the "opt-in" to McKinley to all Fairfield elementary students, and it plans to expand the "opt-out" provision for McKinley parents to include a fourth elementary school. Students who "opt-in" or "opt-out" will be provided transportation. In addition, the Fairfield Board is considering a before and after school program that should attract McKinley parents to "opt-out" to that school. It will also conduct a community conversation on the topic of diversity through a grant with the William Casper Graustein Memorial Foundation. Finally, the Fairfield Board will seek input from the community and from parents to determine community preferences for a magnet school program. The results from this survey are expected within the next month.

Recommendations and Justification

Pursuant to Section 10-226e-6 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies ("Regulations"), the CSBE shall determine whether a board of education's plan meet the requirements of the regulations and shall (1) approve, (2) conditionally approve, or (3) disapprove the plan.

I recommend that the CSBE approve the Fairfield Board's plan to address racial balance. Based upon the information provided by the Fairfield Board and discussions with Dr. Title, I believe that these adjustments to the plan will create greater balance at McKinley. We will continue to monitor the district's progress in the next year to determine whether these changes have a significant impact on the imbalance at McKinley.

Follow-up Activities

Section 10-226e-7 of the Regulations requires that all plans be subject to continuing review and evaluation by the CSBE. This review will include annual monitoring to determine the Fairfield Board’s progress in its plan to eliminate racial imbalance. If the CSBE finds that the actions of the Fairfield Board are not in conformity with the timetable submitted in the plan or if the Fairfield Board does not take substantial steps to implement the plan or fails to make sufficient progress, the CSBE may take further action to compel compliance. We will monitor the Fairfield Board’s progress and recommend further action if necessary.

Prepared by:

Attorney Laura L. Anastasio
Division of Legal and Governmental Affairs

Reviewed by:

Attorney Daniel P. Murphy, Director
Division of Legal and Governmental Affairs

February 2, 2011

Regulations to Implement the Racial Imbalance Law

Sec. 10-226e-1. Definitions

As used in sections 10-226e-1 to 10-226e-8, inclusive, of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies:

(1) "Pupil" means an individual for whom instruction is provided in a public elementary and secondary school under the jurisdiction of a local or regional board of education.

(2) "School" means any public elementary or secondary school under the jurisdiction of a local or regional board of education, excluding a unique school.

(3) "Board of education" means the board of education of a local or regional school district.

(4) "Grade" means that portion of a school program which represents the work of one regular school term, identified either as kindergarten, grade one, grade two, etc., or in an ungraded school program, identified on the basis of educational need.

(5) "School district" means a school system under the jurisdiction of a local or regional board of education.

(6) "Jurisdiction" means the authority granted local and regional boards of education by statute to exercise control and supervision of pupils, schools and school districts.

(7) "Plan" means that document submitted by a board of education in compliance with Section 10-226c of the Connecticut General Statutes.

(8) "Racial minorities" means those groups listed under subsection (b) of Section 10-226a of the Connecticut General Statutes.

(9) "Diverse school" means a school, within a school district having a minority school population of fifty percent or more; which school has a minority population of at least twenty-five percent, *but less than seventy five percent*.

(10) "Unique school" means an interdistrict or intradistrict magnet, local or state charter, lighthouse, regional vocational agriculture, regional vocational-technical, alternative, or special education school or other school designated by the Commissioner which offers specialized programs or provides for the voluntary enrollment of students.

(Effective April 1, 1980; amended November 29, 1999)

Sec. 10-226e-2. School reports

Each board of education shall annually submit, in such manner and at such time as specified by the Commissioner of Education, information on the racial composition of each school by grade, the racial composition of the teaching staff of each school, and the number of pupils in each elementary school who are eligible to receive free or reduced price lunches pursuant to federal law and regulation.

(Effective April 1, 1980; amended November 29, 1999)

Sec. 10-226e-3. Determination of racial imbalance

(a) Reports submitted pursuant to Section 10-226e-2 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies will be reviewed annually by the State Department of Education. The proportion of pupils of racial minorities in each school will be compared to the proportion of pupils of racial minorities in comparable grades in the school district as a whole, as follows:

(1) Proportion for the school. The total number of pupils of racial minorities in the school, as reported pursuant to Section 10-226e-2 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, shall be divided by the total number of pupils in the school. The resulting percentage shall be the Proportion for the School.

(2) Comparable proportion for the school district. For all grades of a given school, the total number of pupils of racial minorities enrolled in the same grades throughout the school district shall be divided by the district-wide total pupil enrollment in such grades. The resulting percentage shall be the Comparable Proportion for the School District for such school.

(b) Any school in which the Proportion of the School falls outside of a range from 25 percentage points less to 25 percentage points more than the Comparable Proportion for the School District, shall be determined to be racially imbalanced.

(c) If the State Board of Education determines that one or more school in a school district is racially imbalanced, said board shall promptly notify the board of education having jurisdiction of such school or schools.

(Effective April 1, 1980; amended November 29, 1999)

Sec. 10-226e-4. Determination of impending racial imbalance

(a) Any school not previously cited for racial imbalance, in which the Proportion for the School falls outside a range of from 15 percentage points less to 15 percentage points more than the Comparable Proportion for the School District, shall be deemed to have impending racial imbalance.

(b) The State Board of Education shall notify, in writing, a board of education having jurisdiction of a school district which includes one or more schools with impending racial imbalance.

(c) Any board of education notified pursuant to subsection (b) of this section may be required to provide the Commissioner of Education with information concerning student building assignments, interdistrict educational activities and other evidence of addressing issues of racial, ethnic and economic isolation.

(Effective April 1, 1980; amended November 29, 1999)

Sec. 10-226e-5. Plans

(a) Any board of education which has received notification from the State Board of Education pursuant to Section 10-226e-3 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies shall submit to the State Board of Education a plan to correct racial imbalance in the school which has been determined to be racially imbalanced. All plans shall be subject to the requirements of this section; provided, however, that any school district so notified, which has a minority student enrollment of fifty percent or more may, in lieu of filing a plan, demonstrate that such racially imbalanced school is a diverse school.

(b) Preparation of the plan.

(1) Upon notification of a determination of racial imbalance, the board of education shall prepare a policy statement addressing racial imbalance in the school district.

(2) The board of education may, in writing, request technical assistance from the Commissioner of Education for the development of a plan. The Commissioner shall, within the limits of available resources, provide such assistance.

(3) The board of education shall conduct a public hearing on its plan prior to submission to the State Board of Education. Adequate notice of the time and place of such hearing shall be published and a complete record of such hearing shall be kept.

(4) A plan shall be submitted to the State Board of Education within 120 days following receipt of notification of a determination of racial imbalance, except that a school district may request an extension of time, not to exceed ninety days, if the number of students causing said imbalance in any school is fewer than five.

(c) Content of the plan.

A plan shall include at least the following items:

(1) The board of education policy statement addressing racial imbalance in the school district;

(2) A description of the process the board of education undertook to prepare the plan;

(3) Presentation and analysis of relevant data, including (A) projections of the racial composition of the public schools in the school district for the subsequent five-year period under the proposed plan, (B) analysis of conditions that have caused or are contributing to racial imbalance in the school district, and (C) analysis of student achievement in the cited school as compared to other schools in the district;

(4) The proposed methods for eliminating racial imbalance and for preventing its recurrence in the school district. These methods may include voluntary interdistrict and intradistrict enrollment plans

acceptable to the State Board of Education as an alternative to mandatory pupil reassignment, provided any such voluntary enrollment plan addresses methods which will be used to increase student achievement;

(5) Identification of proposed school construction and school closings, if any, and an explanation of any impact on the plan;

(6) Specific proposals for minimizing any disruptive effects of plan implementation;

(7) Provisions for monitoring plan implementation and evaluating plan effectiveness, including procedures for revising and updating the plan, if necessary.

(8) A timetable for completion of each step in the plan and for implementation of the plan as a whole;

(9) Demonstration that school district resources have been equitably allocated among all schools within the district; and

(10) Demonstration that any disparity in student achievement levels among schools is being addressed and a description of the methods being used to decrease the disparity.

(d) Other plan requirements.

(1) Any inconvenience caused by implementation of the plan shall not be borne disproportionately by any single racial minority nor disproportionately by racial minorities as a whole within the school district.

(2) Implementation of the plan shall not result in segregation within schools, or among or within programs. Any substantially disproportionate racial minority representation within school classes and programs shall (A) be justified solely on the basis of educational need and (B) occur less than a majority of the time during the school day with the exception of pupils enrolled in bilingual education.

(3) A plan shall not include reassignment of pupils whose dominant language is other than English and whose proficiency in English is limited if such reassignment is a denial of existing participation in a program of bilingual education.

(4) Upon submission of a plan, a board of education may request exceptions to one or more of the plan requirements pursuant to this section. The State Board of Education (A) may grant such exception when said board finds such exception shall otherwise contribute to the purposes of Sections 10-226a to 10-226e, inclusive, of the Connecticut General Statutes; and (B) shall grant such exception when the plan is in compliance with a final order of a court of competent jurisdiction or federal administrative agency order which addresses the requirements of Sections 10-226a to 10-226e, inclusive, of the Connecticut General Statutes and which addresses the current condition of racial imbalance found in accordance with Section 10-226e-3 of the Regulations of the Connecticut State Agencies.

(Effective April 1, 1980; amended November 29, 1999)

Sec. 10-226e-6. Approval of plans

(a) Upon receipt of a plan pursuant to Section 10-226e-5 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, the State Board of Education shall determine whether the plan complies with the requirements of said section and shall (1) approve, (2) conditionally approve, or (3) disapprove such plan, within 60 days.

(b) If the State Board of Education approves the plan, said Board shall promptly notify the board of education submitting the plan, which board shall implement the plan in accordance with the timetable indicated in such plan.

(c) If the State Board of Education conditionally approves the plan, said board shall promptly give written notice to the board of education submitting the plan. Such notice shall specify the portions of the plan requiring revision and the date for submission of such revisions. Those portions of the plan which do not require revision shall be implemented by the board of education in accordance with the timetable indicated in such plan.

(d) If the State Board of Education disapproves the plan, said board shall promptly notify the board of education submitting the plan. Such notice shall specify the reasons for disapproval and the date for resubmission of the plan.

(e) Upon receipt of a revised plan or portion thereof, the State Board of Education shall (1) approve, (2) conditionally approve, or (3) disapprove such revised plan or portion thereof in accordance with the

provisions of subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this Section within 30 days following receipt of such revised plan or portion thereof.

(f) If a board of education submits a plan or a revision to such a plan which is not approved by the State Board of Education within one year of notification to the board of education of the existence of racial imbalance pursuant to Section 10-226e-3 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies or a board of education fails to submit a plan or revision within the required time limits, the State Board of Education may undertake such other actions as may be authorized by law to cause the board of education to be in compliance with the provisions of Sections 10-226a to 10-226e, inclusive, of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 10-226e-1 to 10-226e-8 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

(Effective April 1, 1980; amended November 29, 1999)

Sec. 10-226e-7. Review of plan implementation

(a) All approved and conditionally approved plans shall be subject to continuing review and evaluation by the State Board of Education. If the State Board of Education finds that the status of the plan is not in conformity with the timetable indicated in such plan, said board shall investigate the reasons for such discrepancy. If the State Board of Education finds that the board of education has failed to take substantial steps to implement the plan in accordance with the timetable therein, the State Board of Education shall notify the board of education of non-compliance with the provisions of Section 10-226a to 10-226e, inclusive, of the Connecticut General Statutes and Sections 10-226e-1 to 10-226e-8, inclusive, of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies and may undertake such other actions as may be authorized by law to cause the board of education to be in compliance.

(b) A board of education may submit proposed amendment to an approved or conditionally approved plan. Such proposed amendment shall not take effect until after review and approval by the State Board of Education. Such proposed amendment shall be accompanied by written materials documenting the reasons for the amendment.

(Effective April 1, 1980; amended November 29, 1999)

Sec. 10-226e-8. Review of the decision of the State Board of Education

(a) Upon notification of disapproval of a plan, a board of education may file written notice with the Commissioner of Education requesting a review of such disapproval. Such request shall be submitted within 30 days following receipt of notification by the State Board of Education of such disapproval.

(b) Within 30 days following receipt of a request for review, a hearing shall be held in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 54 of the General Statutes.

(Effective April 1, 1980; amended November 29, 1999)

Sec. 10-226e-9. Unique schools requirements

(a) Unique schools shall provide data in the same manner as required of all other schools pursuant to Section 10-226e-2 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

(b) Unique schools shall report to the Commissioner on all activities undertaken to provide educational opportunities for students to interact with students and teachers from other racial, ethnic and economic backgrounds.

(c) The Commissioner may require the responsible authority of any unique school to appear before him to respond to inquiries concerning the racial, ethnic or economic diversity of students or teaching staff and the educational opportunities provided for students to interact with students and teachers from other racial, ethnic and economic backgrounds.

(Effective April 1, 1980; amended November 29, 1999)

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford

TO BE PROPOSED:

February 2, 2011

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Education, pursuant to Section 10-145d-9(g)(1)(B) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, grants provisional program approval for the period October 1, 2011, through September 30, 2012, with an interim visit required in Spring 2012, for the purpose of certifying candidates from the University of Hartford in the following areas:

<u>Program</u>	<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Program Level</u>	<u>Program Type</u>
Early Childhood Education	Birth - K	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Early Childhood Education	Nursery - 3	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Elementary Education	K - 6	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Elementary and Special Education	K - 6 & K - 12	Initial	Undergraduate
Music	PK - 12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
English	7 - 12	Initial	Undergraduate
Mathematics	7 - 12	Initial	Undergraduate
School Psychology	PK - 12	Advanced	Graduate

and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of _____ this second day of February, Two Thousand Eleven.

Signed: _____
George A. Coleman, Acting Secretary
State Board of Education

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: George A. Coleman, Acting Commissioner of Education

DATE: February 2, 2011

SUBJECT: Continuing Educator Preparation Program Approval: University of Hartford

Introduction

During October 16-20, 2010, the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE), in conjunction with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), conducted a continuing approval accreditation visit at the University of Hartford (UHART) pertaining to the following educator preparation programs leading to initial and advanced certification:

<u>Program</u>	<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Program Level</u>	<u>Program Type</u>
Early Childhood Education	Birth - K	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Early Childhood Education	Nursery - 3	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Elementary Education	K - 6	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
Elementary and Special Education	K - 6 & K - 12	Initial	Undergraduate
Music	PK - 12	Initial	Undergraduate/Graduate
English	7 - 12	Initial	Undergraduate
Mathematics	7 - 12	Initial	Undergraduate
School Psychology	PK - 12	Advanced	Graduate

This report presents a summary of visiting team findings and the Commissioner of Education's recommendation regarding continuing program approval for UHART educator preparation programs based on CSDE Review Committee recommendations. The CSDE Review Committee is a 12-member, decision-making body that makes recommendations to the Commissioner of Education relative to new and continuing program approval of Connecticut educator preparation programs based on accreditation team findings (Appendix A). The committee consists of five representatives from Connecticut institutions of higher education, five K-12 educators from Connecticut public school systems, and two representatives from the community (Appendix B).

Historical Context/Background

The University of Hartford was chartered on February 21, 1957, as a university for the Hartford community by merging three existing schools: the Hartford Art School, the Hartt School of Music, and Hillyer College. UHART now consists of seven schools and colleges and offers six associate degrees, 74 bachelor's degrees, six graduate certifications, 30 master's degrees, two sixth-year certifications, and six doctoral degrees. The institution has transitioned from a commuter school to a residential campus that now offers over 80 undergraduate majors and over 30 graduate degree programs. UHART draws 7,400 undergraduate and graduate students from 45 states and 49 countries.

The UHART Educational Unit is comprised of programs in three colleges: The College of Education, Nursing and

Health Professions (ENHP); the College of Arts and Sciences; and the Hartt School. There are approximately 375 undergraduate students and 140 graduate students enrolled across the three colleges. Within the Unit, the Department of Education and Human Services is primarily responsible for: preparing educators; offering initial teacher preparation programs in early childhood education (undergraduate and graduate); elementary education (undergraduate and graduate); integrated elementary/special education (undergraduate); and secondary English (undergraduate). The Department also offers one advanced, non-certification program in educational technology. Two other teacher certification programs – music, secondary mathematics and school psychology – are housed in the Hartt School and the College of Arts and Sciences, respectively. For a more detailed description of the University of Hartford and its educator preparation programs, please go to the UHART website at www.hartford.edu.

The UHART fall 2010 accreditation visit was conducted in accordance with CSDE/NCATE partnership accreditation visit procedures for educator preparation programs seeking continuing national accreditation approval in addition to continuing state approval. The visiting team consisted of three NCATE-appointed national representatives, three state-appointed representatives, and the CSDE educator preparation program approval coordinator.

For this accreditation visit, UHART was required to prepare an Institutional Report describing the institution's compliance with NCATE standards (Appendix C), and state regulatory and statutory requirements governing educator preparation programs. Additionally, UHART was required to complete individual program or Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Reports for all content areas for which the institution was seeking continuing accreditation, documenting compliance with content-specific, national standards for educator preparation. On-site visit activities included: faculty presentations; faculty and administrator interviews; candidate presentations and interviews; school visits and school-based personnel (e.g., cooperating teachers) interviews; and an exhibit room materials review, including candidate performance data and work samples.

Recommendation/Justification

The visiting team for the University of Hartford fall 2010 NCATE/State accreditation visit determined that UHART educator preparation programs are meeting the general requirements of the six NCATE standards (Appendix C), with some "Areas for Improvement" identified by the team. The CSDE Review Committee determined that the "Areas for Improvement" identified by the visiting team were significant enough to warrant a recommendation of provisional approval for a one-year period, with an interim visit to be conducted during spring 2012. Therefore, based upon visiting team findings and the recommendation of the CSDE Program Review Committee, I recommend that the University of Hartford initial and advanced level educator preparation programs be granted provisional approval for the period October 1, 2011, through September 30, 2012.

A summary of visiting team findings for each of the six NCATE standards, with "Areas for Improvement," is presented below. The protocol for NCATE/State accreditation visits provides one of two final ratings for each of the six NCATE standards – "Met" or "Not Met" – which is determined by the visiting team through the application of rubrics that have been developed by NCATE to evaluate the standards:

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.

- 1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates
- 1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates
- 1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates
- 1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates
- 1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals
- 1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals
- 1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Recommendation: MET

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- Corrected Areas for Improvement (from last visit – October 26-30, 2002):

1. Neither the initial nor the advanced programs have identified dispositions they seek to develop in candidates.

Rationale for Correction: The unit has recently identified five dispositions it seeks to develop in candidates in both initial and advanced programs; candidate dispositions will now be monitored at multiple points in the program using a disposition checklist with clearly delineated indicators.

- Continued Areas for Improvement (from last visit – October 26-30, 2002): NONE
- New Areas for Improvement (based on current visit – October 16-20, 2010):

1. (Initial Programs) Key assessments for the unit (student teaching evaluation instrument and student teaching portfolio rubric) are not aligned with Connecticut's professional standards, the Common Core of Teaching.

Rationale for Area of Improvement: Although key assessments are aligned to national standards and to the conceptual framework, they do not provide direct evidence that candidates are meeting the performance expectations identified in state standards.

2. (Initial Programs) The pass rate for the Foundations of Reading Test, a content assessment required for licensure in Connecticut, is below 80 percent, which is the requirement for NCATE Standard 1 and Higher Education Act (HEA) Title II.

Rationale for Area of Improvement: While the unit has implemented an additional reading course to support candidate success on this assessment, there is not yet sufficient evidence to indicate that this will ensure that candidates have the necessary skills to pass this assessment for licensure.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

2a. Assessment System

2b. Data Collection, Analysis and Evaluation

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

Recommendation: MET

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- Corrected Areas for Improvement (from last visit – October 26-30, 2002):

1. Assessment data are not summarized nor analyzed in a systematic fashion.

Rationale for Correction: There is a systematic process for collecting data, including summary and analysis of the data.

2. The assessment plan does not clearly articulate how assessments will be used to evaluate and improve program and unit operations.

Rationale for Correction: The unit clearly uses data in the evaluation of its operations and has articulated the process for using candidate and unit assessment data to improve program and unit operations.

- Continued Areas for Improvement (from last visit – October 26-30, 2002): NONE

- New Areas for Improvement (based on current visit – October 16-20, 2010):

1. The unit lacks a fully developed and implemented assessment system.

Rationale for Area for Improvement: Assessments at pre-student teaching gate points need to be developed and implemented.

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.

3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

3b. Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

3c. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Recommendation: MET

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- Corrected Areas for Improvement (from last visit – October 26-30, 2002):

1. Field and clinical experiences in school counseling and school psychology are not explicitly aligned with state standards.

Rationale for Correction: Class syllabi list the National Association of Psychologists (NASP) domains addressed during each course. The school counseling program is no longer offered.

2. Candidates in initial programs are not informed sufficiently early about the unit's portfolio requirements.

Rationale for Correction: Candidates report introduction to portfolio requirements and collection of initial artifacts during coursework prior to practicum and student teaching experiences.

3. The current rubric to assess student teacher portfolios lacks rigor and depth.

Rationale for Correction: The rubric has been rewritten as an analytic rubric with multiple indicators aligned to the conceptual framework.

4. Field experiences for early childhood and elementary initial candidates vary (in length and types of experiences).

Rationale for Correction: Field experiences for candidates in initial programs have been increased to make expectations more equitable.

5. The Educational Technology program lacks a field component.

Rationale for Correction: Field experiences are embedded in four courses, and the program has been recognized by its SPA.

- Continued Areas for Improvement (from last visit – October 26-30, 2002): NONE
- New Areas for Improvement (based on current visit – October 16-20, 2010): NONE

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.

- 4a. Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences
- 4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty
- 4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates
- 4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

Recommendation: MET

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- Corrected Areas for Improvement (from last visit – October 26-30, 2002):

1. Candidates do not apply their knowledge of diversity in developing lesson plans, strategies, and

interventions for all students.

Rationale for Correction: Interviews with candidates showed that they are knowledgeable about, sensitive to, and aware of diverse populations. Interviews—coupled with lesson plan documents, faculty conversations, and interviews with school-based personnel—demonstrate candidates' abilities to articulate how they have and would vary their teaching to ensure that all students learn.

- Continued Areas for Improvement (from last visit – October 26-30, 2002):

1. The unit has a small percentage of minority candidates.

Rationale for Continuation: Although efforts have been made to increase candidate diversity, the candidate population of the professional education unit remains less diverse compared to the university candidate population.

- New Areas for Improvement (based on current visit – October 16-20, 2010): NONE

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.

- 5a. Qualified Faculty
- 5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching
- 5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship
- 5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service
- 5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance
- 5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Recommendation: MET

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- Corrected Areas for Improvement (from last visit – October 26-30, 2002):

1. Adjunct faculty in the unit not reflect the conceptual framework and the objectives of the unit.

Rationale for Correction: Review of course syllabi and artifacts, such as the candidate professional portfolios, as well as interviews with candidates and faculty, reveal that faculty members align their instructional practices with the unit conceptual framework and objectives.

- Continued Areas for Improvement (from last visit – October 26-30, 2002): NONE
- New Areas for Improvement (based on current visit – October 16-20, 2010): NONE

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.

- 6a. Unit Leadership and Authority
- 6b. Unit Budget
- 6c. Personnel
- 6d. Unit Facilities
- 6e. Unit Resources including Technology

Recommendation: MET

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- Corrected Areas for Improvement (from last visit – October 26-30, 2002):

1. The annual teaching load for doctoral faculty mitigates against effective involvement in scholarship and service.

Rationale for Correction: The doctoral faculty in educational leadership is no longer a unit program.

2. Exceptionally high advising loads for some faculty limit the time available for service and for individual student advising.

Rationale for Correction: Advising loads have been lowered, and additional faculty members have been employed.

- Continued Areas for Improvement (from last visit – October 26-30, 2002): NONE
- New Areas for Improvement (based on current visit – October 16-20, 2010):

1. The unit lacks personnel resources to support the implementation of a fully developed assessment system.

Rationale for Area for Improvement: As the unit implements its plan to coordinate and systemically collect, analyze and use candidate performance data, current personnel resources are inadequate.

Additionally, a review of candidate files during the on-site visit by CSDE certification analysts indicated that UHART continues to meet Connecticut regulatory and statutory requirements governing educator preparation (Appendix D).

Copies of the 2010 UHART Institutional Report, the 2010 UHART Visiting Team (BOE) Report, and the 2010 UHART Rejoinder document are available electronically through the Office of Board Matters.

Follow-Up Activity

If granted provisional approval by the Board of Education for a one-year period from October 1, 2011, to September 30, 2012, UHART will host an interim visit during Spring 2012, in order for a state accreditation team to determine whether or not UHART has addressed, to the satisfaction of the CSDE Review Committee, the “Areas

for Improvement” identified by the NCATE/State accreditation team during the fall, 2010 NCATE/State accreditation visit.

Prepared by: _____
Katie Moirs, Ph.D., Program Approval Coordinator
Bureau of Educator Standards and Certification

Reviewed by: _____
Nancy L. Pugliese, J. D., Chief
Bureau of Educator Standards and Certification

Approved by: _____
Marion H. Martinez, Ed.D., Associate Commissioner
Division of Teaching, Learning and Instructional Leadership

February 2, 2011

**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.

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Educator Preparation Program Approval Review Committee, 2009-2010

HIGHER EDUCATION REPRESENTATION	K-12 REPRESENTATION	COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION	CSDE/DHE REPRESENTATION (non-voting members)
<p>Dr. Kathy Butler, Chair Department of Education Saint Joseph College West Hartford, CT (9/2008-9/2011)</p> <p>Dr. Jack Gillette, Director Teacher Preparation and Education Studies Yale University New Haven, CT (9/2008-9/2011)</p> <p>Dr. Ed Malin, Director Isabelle Farrington School of Education Sacred Heart University Fairfield, CT (9/2008-9/2011)</p> <p>Dr. Yuhang Rong, Assistant Dean NEAG School of Education University of Connecticut Storrs, CT (9/2009-9/2012)</p> <p>Dr. Mitchell Sakoff, Dean School of Education and Professional Studies Central Connecticut State University New Britain, CT (9/2008-9/2011)</p>	<p>Brian Ferrell, Director Special Services Redding Elementary School Redding, CT (9/2010-9/2013)</p> <p>Dr. Abie Quiñones-Benítez, Principal Christopher Columbus Family Academy New Haven, CT (9/2009-9/2012)</p> <p>Dr. David Erwin, Superintendent Berlin Public Schools Berlin, CT (9/2010-9/2013)</p> <p>Dr. Erin McGurk, Director Educational Services Ellington Public Schools Ellington, CT (9/2010-9/2013)</p> <p>Dr. Christina Kishimoto, Assistant Superintendent Secondary Schools Hartford Public Schools Hartford, CT (9/2008-9/2011)</p>	<p>Kelly Houston, Consultant Old Greenwich, CT (9/2008-9/2011)</p> <p>A. Bates Lyons, President A. Bates Lyons & Associates Torrington, CT (9/2010-9/2013)</p>	<p>Dr. Katie Moirs CSDE</p> <p>Nancy Pugliese CSDE</p> <p>Dr. Christine Thatcher DHE</p>

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

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK(S)

The conceptual framework(s) establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service and unit accountability. The conceptual framework(s) is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated. The conceptual framework includes the following aligned structural elements:

- vision and mission of the institution and unit;
- philosophy, purposes, goals/institutional standards of the unit;
- knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit;
- candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state and institutional standards; and
- a summarized description of the unit's assessment system.

Standard 1 – Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Candidates¹ 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 students² learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional³ 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 the applicant qualifications, the 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

¹ Candidates include persons preparing to teach, teachers who are continuing their professional development, and persons preparing for other professional roles in schools such as principals, school psychologists and school library media specialists.

² “All students” includes students with exceptionalities and of different ethnic, racial, gender, language, religious, socioeconomic and regional/geographic origins.

³ Institutional standards are reflected in the unit's conceptual framework and include candidate proficiencies.

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

INSTITUTION: University of Hartford

DATE OF VISIT: October 16-20, 2010

Met or Not Met	Regulatory or Statutory Citation	Explanation/Findings
<p>Initial Programs: Met</p> <p>Advanced Programs: Met</p>	<p>Program Approval Regulatory Requirement</p> <p>10-145d-11(b)(1)</p> <p>Student admissions criteria include appropriate academic and non-academic standards that are stated and enforced. All students are admitted to the educator preparation program after taking no more than two courses in professional education. These standards shall include, but not be limited to:</p> <p>(1) passing Praxis I CBT or its equivalent as approved by the board, prior to admission to the educator preparation program;</p> <p>(2) achieving a cumulative grade point average of at least a B-minus average for all undergraduate courses; and,</p> <p>(3) if justified by unusual circumstances, a waiver for the (B) may be granted, provided that a statement of justification is added to the candidate's records.</p>	<p>Based on a review of the student records and an interview with the college certification officer, admission criteria include the appropriate academic and non-academic standards.</p>
<p>Initial Programs: Met</p> <p>Advanced Programs: Met</p>	<p>Program Approval Regulatory Requirement</p> <p>10-145d-11(b)(2) 2. The professional education unit shall:</p> <p>(A) demonstrate that students are knowledgeable about Connecticut standards including the Code of Professional Responsibility for educators;</p> <p>(B) provide on-site access to education resource material in current use in public schools;</p> <p>(C) ensure that students demonstrate current Connecticut certification competencies;</p> <p>(D) ensure that the responsibility for recommending candidates for certification centralized in an individual who shall attest, if appropriate, that the candidates have:</p> <p>(i) met admissions standards for the institution's educator preparation program; fulfilled the institution's criteria to student teach; successfully completed the planned program; have the qualities of character and personal fitness for teaching, and fulfilled the state's certification and assessment requirements, including Praxis I and Praxis II.</p>	<p>A review of the college records and course descriptions indicate that the following courses meet the regulatory requirement:</p> <p>EDF 120 EDE 441</p>
<p>Initial Programs: Met</p>	<p>Statutory Requirement</p> <p>C.G.S. Sec. 10-145d(a)(8)</p> <p>On and after July 1, 1993...each person be</p>	<p>A review of the college records and course descriptions, along with an interview with the certification officer, indicate that the following</p>

Met or Not Met	Regulatory or Statutory Citation	Explanation/Findings
<p>Advanced Programs:</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>required to complete a survey course in U.S. History of no less than three semester hours of credit.</p>	<p>courses meet the regulatory requirement:</p> <p>AUCW 210 AUCW 211 AUCW 212</p>
<p>Initial Programs:</p> <p>Met</p> <p>Advanced Programs:</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Statutory Requirement C.G.S. Sec. 10-145d(a)(9)</p> <p>On and after July 1, 2004 ... each person be required to complete a comprehensive reading instruction course comprised of not less than six semester hours of credit.</p>	<p>A review of the college records and course descriptions, along with an interview with the certification officer, indicate that the following courses meet the regulatory requirement:</p> <p>EDR 344 EDR 345 EDR 444</p>
<p>Initial Programs:</p> <p>Met</p> <p>Advanced Programs:</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Statutory Requirement C.G.S. Sec. 10-145b(e)</p> <p>In order to obtain a ... provisional educator certificate or an initial educator certificate, each person shall be required to complete a course of study not fewer than thirty-six (36) hours, which shall include an understanding of growth and development of exceptional children, including handicapped and gifted and talented children and children who may require special education, and methods for identifying, planning for and working effectively with special needs children in a regular classroom.</p>	<p>A review of the college records and course descriptions, along with an interview with the certification officer, indicate that the following course meets the regulatory requirement:</p> <p>EDH 120</p>
<p>Initial Programs:</p> <p>Met</p> <p>Advanced Programs:</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Statutory Requirement C.G.S. Sec. 10-145a (b)</p> <p>Any candidate in a program of teacher preparation leading to professional certification shall be encouraged to complete an intergroup relations component which shall be developed with the participation of both sexes, and persons of various ethnic, cultural and economic backgrounds. Such intergroup relations program shall have the following objectives:</p> <p>(1) the imparting of an appreciation of the contributions to American civilization of various ethnic, cultural and economic groups comprising American society and an understanding of the lifestyles of such groups;</p> <p>(2) the counteracting of biases, discrimination and prejudices; and</p> <p>(3) the assurance of respect for human diversity and personal rights.</p>	<p>A review of the college records and course descriptions, along with an interview with the certification officer, indicate that the following courses meet the regulatory requirement:</p> <p>AUCC 110 AUCC 120 AUCC 150 AUCC 210</p>
<p>Initial Programs:</p> <p>Met</p> <p>Advanced Programs:</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Statutory Requirement C.G.S. Sec. 10-145a(c)</p> <p>Any candidate in a program of teacher preparation leading to professional certification shall be encouraged to complete a</p> <p>(1) health component of such a program, which includes, but need not be limited to, human growth and development, nutrition, first aid, disease prevention and community and consumer health;</p>	<p>A review of the college records and course descriptions, along with an interview with the certification officer, indicate that the following course meets the regulatory requirement:</p> <p>HE 112</p>

Met or Not Met	Regulatory or Statutory Citation	Explanation/Findings
	and (2) mental health component of such a program which includes, but need not be limited to, youth suicide, child abuse and alcohol and drug abuse.	
Initial Programs: Met Advanced Programs: N/A	Statutory Requirement C.G.S. Sec. 10-145a (d) Any candidate in a program of teacher preparation leading to professional certification...shall be encouraged to complete a school violence prevention and conflict resolution component.	A review of the college records and course descriptions, along with an interview with the certification officer, indicate that the following course meets the regulatory requirement: HE 112
Initial Programs: Met Advanced Programs: N/A	Statutory Requirement C.G.S. Sec. 10-145a (e) On and after July 1, 1998, any candidate in a program of teacher preparation leading to professional certification shall complete a computer and other information technology skills component of such program, as applied to student learning and classroom instruction, communications and data management.	A review of the college records and course descriptions, along with an interview with the certification officer, indicate that the following course meets the regulatory requirement: CT 243
Initial Programs: Met Advanced Programs: N/A	Statutory Requirement C.G.S. Sec. 10-145a (f) On and after July 1, 2006, any program of teacher preparation leading to professional certification shall include as part of the curriculum, instruction in literacy skills and processes that reflects current research and best practices in the field of literacy training. Such instruction shall be incorporated into requirements of student major and concentration.	A review of the college records and course descriptions, along with an interview with the certification officer, indicate that the following courses meet the regulatory requirement: EDR 344 EDR 345 EDR 444
Initial Programs: Met Advanced Programs: N/A	Statutory Requirement C.G.S. Sec. 10-145a (g) On and after July 1, 2006, any program of teacher preparation leading to professional certification shall include as part of the curriculum, instruction in the concepts of second language learning and second language acquisition and processes that reflects current research and best practices in the field of second language learning and second language acquisition. Such instruction shall be incorporated into requirements of student major and concentration.	A review of the college records and course descriptions, along with an interview with the certification officer, indicate that the following course meets the regulatory requirement: EDR 344

Met or Not Met	Regulatory or Statutory Citation	Explanation/Findings
<p>Initial Programs: Met</p> <p>Advanced Programs:</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Statutory Requirement C.G.S. 10-19 (a) The knowledge, skills and attitudes required to understand and avoid the effects of alcohol, of nicotine or tobacco and of drugs, as defined in subdivision (17) of section 21a-240, on health, character, citizenship and personality development shall be taught every academic year to pupils in all grades in the public schools; and, in teaching such subjects, textbooks and such other materials as are necessary shall be used. Institutions of higher education approved by the State Board of Education to train teachers shall give instruction on the subjects prescribed in this section and concerning the best methods of teaching the same.</p>	<p>A review of the college records and course descriptions, along with an interview with the certification officer, indicate that the following course meets the regulatory requirement:</p> <p>HE 112</p>

**CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford**

TO BE PROPOSED:

February 2, 2011

Whereas, Mark K. McQuillan served as Connecticut's Commissioner of Education from April 2007 to January 2011; and

Whereas, He dedicated forty years to the improvement of public education in Massachusetts and Connecticut; and

Whereas, **under Commissioner McQuillan's leadership, Connecticut has raised its standards for** educators and students; provided additional supports to districts; adopted enhanced certification requirements; implemented a system of accountability for results and continuous improvement; initiated secondary school reform measures that better prepare students for college and the workplace; and made notable progress toward closing the achievement gaps; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Connecticut State Board of Education accepts with deep regret the resignation of Dr. Mark K. McQuillan and extends to him its appreciation for his years of service to the State of Connecticut and best wishes for continued success in his professional endeavors.

Approved by a vote of _____ this second day of February, Two Thousand Eleven.

Signed:

George A. Coleman, Secretary
State Board of Education

**CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford**

TO BE PROPOSED:

February 2, 2011

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Education, pursuant to Section 10-3a and Section 1-200 of the Connecticut General Statutes, appoints to a Personnel Search Committee the members of the State Board of Education whose terms extend beyond March 10, 2011, and those whose nomination by the Governor to serve a term that extends beyond March 10, 2011 is pending, and Alvin Wilson, Director of Operations, Office of the Governor; and

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Education charges said Personnel Search Committee with responsibility for conducting a search for a Commissioner of Education; and submitting to the Board for its consideration a candidate for Commissioner of Education, whose appointment shall by recommended to the Governor.

Approved by a vote of _____ this second day of February, Two Thousand Eleven.

Signed:

George A. Coleman, Secretary
State Board of Education

Substitute Resolution IX.E.

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Hartford

TO BE PROPOSED:
February 9, 2011

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Education (Board) approves the proposed Core Values and Design Principles prepared by the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Education Cost Sharing and Choice Funding (Ad Hoc Committee) and directs the Commissioner to commend them to the Governor and General Assembly to guide their efforts in designing a funding system for public education in Connecticut; and

RESOLVED, That the Board, in response to the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee, directs the Commissioner to request the Connecticut Alliance of Regional Educational Service Centers and a representative of the Connecticut Technical High School System to conduct a study of a regional school transportation system and common school calendar in Connecticut, and to submit its report to the State Board of Education by August 30, 2011; and

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Education extends its appreciation to the members of the Ad Hoc Committee for their time and commitment to addressing the State's public school financing system, and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of this ninth day of February, Two Thousand Eleven.

Signed: _____
George A. Coleman, Secretary

**CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford**

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Allan B. Taylor, Chairman

DATE: February 2, 2011

SUBJECT: Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Education Cost Sharing and Public School Choice Funding

In March 2010, the State Board of Education formed an Ad Hoc Committee to Study Funding for Public School Choice Programs. The Committee held its first meeting in March 2010. In June 2010, the Board revised the title of the committee to "Ad Hoc Committee to Study Education Cost Sharing and Choice Funding," and set forth the charge to the committee, the objectives, deliverables, and timelines; and the appointments thereto (see Attachment A). Between March 2010 and January 2011, the Committee met 17 times, concluding its work on January 24, 2011.

Below please find the Committee's recommendations for State Board of Education consideration. In all cases, the proposals were adopted by at least a majority of members present and voting.

Proposal Regarding Coordination of Statewide Regional Transportation:

The Committee recommended that the State Board of Education charge the Connecticut Alliance of Regional Educational Service Centers (RESC Alliance) with responsibility for assessing the opportunities for the regionalization of public school transportation. Having a past record of success in regional student transportation and realizing cost savings, the RESC Alliance is well-positioned to review current district contracts (costs, timelines and operations) and to assess the level of interest that districts have for regional transportation. Further, the Alliance will identify fiscal incentives to encourage participation.

Proposal Regarding Developing a Common School Calendar:

Committee members discussed the relationship between a regional transportation approach and the adoption of a common school calendar. Members agreed to recommend that the State Board of Education request that the RESC Alliance also study the feasibility of a common school calendar (regionally and statewide) in terms of contractual issues, cost efficiencies, variations in the number of school days, etc.

Core Values and Design Principles:

In order to facilitate design principles around a preferred funding system, the Committee, with the assistance of a meeting facilitator, agreed upon six core values. The core values provided the framework upon which the design principles were developed.

Core Values

1. Every student has a right to, and the state has an obligation to ensure that every student receives a high-quality education provided by highly qualified and effective educators, irrespective of his/her race, ethnicity, wealth, zip code and individual needs, which means targeting a larger percentage of funding for students in need.
2. Within limitations, parents should be able to enroll their student in any public school choice opportunity.
3. State public school funding decisions should primarily focus on individual students and their learning needs while accounting for different fiscal capacities and other conditions of communities.
4. In addition to highly functioning traditional schools, inter- and intra-district public school choice is an effective part of a strong, diverse statewide public school system that has the potential to improve student outcomes, reduce racial and economic isolation, foster regionalism and contain system costs, including transportation.
5. Excluding federal funds, the State should pay for at least 50 percent of the cost of operating public schools, and state funds allocated for education should be spent on education locally.
6. The ECS formula and accompanying programs are not functioning effectively, thereby disadvantaging many different types of communities.

Design Principles

1. The system must be student based and transparent with both the need factors of students and the income, the property wealth and property tax burden of the communities in which the students reside consistently included as significant factors. (Eight members voted in favor of this principle; two were opposed.)
2. When children are enrolled in a public school outside of their school district, the funding calculations for those children must be scaled to reflect actual savings and costs. (Eight members voted in favor of this principle, as amended; two were opposed.)
3. While serving programmatic goals, school districts must have flexibility to deploy categorical and other funding in ways that respond to student need and to develop incentives to economize. (The committee reached consensus on this principle.)
4. Given that access to choice options is in the interest of the state, then the state must accept responsibility for the additional associated costs and provide a greater portion of school funding statewide. (Five members voted in favor of this principle; four were opposed; one abstained.)
5. Any funding system must ensure that the state provides at least 50% of non-federal funding for education statewide. Given that all children must receive an equal opportunity for a free public education, the proportion of state funding must be related to the wealth and need of a community, but all communities must receive a minimum amount of state funding regardless of wealth. (The committee, with one exception, reached consensus on this principle.)
6. Variables in any funding formula, including the foundation amount, weights for student need, and share ratios, should be based on a rigorous analysis that considers effective spending patterns and promising student outcomes to determine the appropriate level of state aid, ensuring that students will be funded at least at the level the formula dictates at whatever public school they attend. (Six members voted in favor of this principle; four were opposed.)
7. The transition to any new system should be phased in to give the state, local districts and choice options an opportunity to adjust. (The committee reached consensus on this principle.)