

VI. A.

**CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford**

**TO BE PROPOSED:
February 2, 2011**

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Education, pursuant to Section 13 of the National School Lunch Act of 1946, as amended by P.L. 108-265, P.L. 110-246, P.L. 111-80 and reauthorized on December 13, 2010, under the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, P.L. 111-296, approves the State Plan for Fiscal Year 2011 - Summer Food Service Program for Children, for submission to the United States Department of Agriculture, 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: State Plan for Fiscal Year 2011 - Summer Food Service Program for Children

Executive Summary

Introduction

The Summer Food Service Program for Children addresses the critical need of proper nutrition for children and a belief that summer vacation should not end the availability of nutritious meals for children. The program is 100 percent federally funded by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) through a grant-in-aid to the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE). The Summer Food Service Program for Children is authorized by Section 13 of the National School Lunch Act of 1946, as amended by P.L. 108-265, P.L. 110-246 and P.L. 111-80. It was reauthorized on December 13, 2010, under the Healthy, Hunger-free Kids Act, P.L. 111-296. Funds are used to initiate, maintain and expand a nonprofit food service program for children during the summer months. All local sponsors in Connecticut, where 50 percent or more of the school children are eligible to receive a free or a reduced-price school meal, qualify for the Summer Food Service Program for Children.

History/Background

The Summer Food Service Program for Children is the single largest federal resource available for local sponsors who want to combine a feeding program with a summer activity program. In Connecticut, an average of 291,500 children received nutritious meals daily through the National School Lunch Program during Fiscal Year (FY) 2010. However, this program ends when school closes for the summer. The USDA Summer Food Service Program for Children was created to help fill the gap by ensuring that children in low-income areas continue to receive nutritious meals during the summer months, when they do not have access to school lunch or breakfast. The State of Connecticut has been a recipient of these funds since 1974. For additional information, the 2010 Summer Food Service Report is attached for your review.

Recommendation and Justification

I recommend that the State Board of Education approve the FY 2011 State Plan for Summer Food Service Program for Children. Good nutrition is essential for effective learning every day and throughout the year. Just as learning does not end when school lets out, neither does the need for good nutrition. The Summer Food Service Program helps children get the nutrition they need to learn, play and grow throughout the summer months and ensures that they return to school ready to learn.

Policy Implications

To continue the objective of high academic achievement, it is estimated that during the summer of 2011 a total of 480,000 meals will be served primarily to needy children during the months of June, July and August. The program provides funding, information and technical assistance to local education agencies and other qualified sponsors to ensure the health of young children by promoting good nutrition. Based on the current funding structure, the projected cost of the program will be \$1,402,843. Grant funds in the amount of \$1,330,882 will be distributed to local and regional school districts and other sponsors. The remaining funds will be used for CSDE administration (\$54,961) and for contract services to the State Department of Public Health for food safety inspections and training programs (\$17,000).

Follow-up Activities

Concentrated efforts will be directed toward expanding the program in certain areas of the state where levels of participation to date have been low or nonexistent. Collaborative efforts will include partnering with End Hunger Connecticut, the Connecticut Association for Human Services, Connecticut Infoline and other organizations interested in the well-being of children. Eligible entities, including school districts, which are not participating in the Summer Food Service Program for Children will be targeted for program involvement and participating entities will be encouraged to increase the number of children served.

Approval of the State Plan by the USDA, Food and Nutrition Service, Child Nutrition Programs Division, is a prerequisite for the CSDE to receive funding under the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended.

Copies of the plan are available upon request.

Prepared by: _____
Susan B. Bohuslaw, Education Service Specialist
Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and
Adult Education

Reviewed by: _____
Cheryl Resha, Education Manager
Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and
Adult Education

Approved by: _____
Charlene Russell-Tucker, Associate Commissioner
Division of Family and Student Support Services

**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)(2)(A) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, grants initial program approval for the period February 2, 2011, through September 30, 2014, for the purpose of certifying graduates from Fairfield University in the following areas:

<u>Program</u>	<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Program Level</u>	<u>Program Type</u>
Elementary Education	K-6	Initial	Undergraduate
Teachers of English as a Second Language	PK-12	Initial	Undergraduate

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

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: George A. Coleman, Acting Commissioner of Education

DATE: February 2, 2011

SUBJECT: New Educator Preparation Program Approval, Fairfield University: Elementary Education and Teachers of English as a Second Language (TESOL)

Introduction:

Fairfield University is currently approved by the State Board of Education to prepare candidates at the undergraduate level in the secondary areas of English, math, science, social studies and world languages; and, at the graduate level in elementary education, teachers of English as a second language (TESOL), special education and secondary-level English, math, science, social studies and world languages. Due to national trends in teacher education research supporting five-year preparation programs, Fairfield has designed five-year, integrated bachelors-masters degree and certification tracks within their existing Master of Arts certification programs in elementary, TESOL, and secondary education. Because Fairfield University is not currently approved by the Connecticut State Board of Education to offer elementary education and TESOL education programs at the undergraduate level, the five-year integrated tracks in these two certification areas were required to undergo the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) new program proposal review process. To this end, on October 5, 2010, the CSDE conducted an on-site accreditation visit at Fairfield University to ascertain the institution's readiness to launch and sustain educator preparation programs in the areas of undergraduate level Elementary Education and TESOL education.

This report presents a summary of visiting team findings and the Commissioner of Education's recommendation regarding approval for Fairfield University's undergraduate level Elementary Education and TESOL 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 (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 Information:

Fairfield University is a comprehensive Catholic Jesuit university located in Fairfield, Connecticut, a town of more than 58,000 residents located on the coast of Long Island Sound between the cities of Bridgeport and Stamford. Founded in 1942 by the Society of Jesus, Fairfield University continues the tradition of Jesuit Education, which is committed to the service of faith. More than 5,000 students from 35 states, 46 countries, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are currently enrolled at Fairfield University across six distinct schools: College of Arts and Sciences; Charles F. Dolan School of Business; Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions; School of Engineering; School of

Nursing; and the University College of Continuing Studies. All Fairfield University tenure-track, full-time faculty have earned doctorates. The University student-faculty ratio is thirteen to one. Fairfield has recently renovated and expanded campus facilities, including the Rudolph F. Bannow Science Center, the John A. Barone Campus Center, and the DiMenna-Nyselius Library.

The Fairfield University Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions consists of four departments that house 17 programs of study. The Unit offers programs leading to a Master of Arts degree and Certificate of Advanced Study, as well as certification programs in 18 endorsement areas. There are over 500 full- and part-time graduate candidates in the Unit, with 21 full-time tenure track faculty members, two full-time instructors, and one full-time administrator with faculty status carrying a half-time course load. Additionally, there are 10 student teaching supervisors in teacher education and nine clinical supervisors in counselor education who supervise field experiences. Sixty-nine part-time adjunct instructors teach courses. For a more detailed description of Fairfield University and the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions, please see the Fairfield University website (www.fairfield.edu).

The Fairfield University fall 2010 accreditation visit was conducted in accordance with CSDE accreditation procedures for new program proposal visits, which focus on four major issues related to institutional preparedness to launch and sustain a new educator preparation program in accordance with state regulatory and statutory requirements, and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standard requirements, including national, content-specific standard requirements:

- (1) syllabi and related program materials must be developed;
- (2) school-based fieldwork and clinical experiences must be developed, including the organization of school-based personnel oversight and evaluation of candidates (e.g., cooperating teachers, fieldwork directors);
- (3) all required assessments must be developed, with a data collection, data analysis and data communication system in place for program evaluation purposes; and
- (4) appropriate faculty must be hired OR there is an institutional commitment to hiring the appropriate faculty upon program approval.

Institutions are required to write a program report describing the above and show evidence in support of the program report during the time of the visit through faculty presentations; faculty, administrator, and school-based personnel interviews; and a presentation of curriculum materials and candidate assessments.

In preparation for their fall 2010 visit, Fairfield University wrote a report describing program requirements (e.g., coursework, fieldwork and clinical experiences, candidate assessments, faculty qualifications) aligning with state regulatory and statutory requirements, and NCATE standard requirements, including the International Reading Association (IRA) standards. During the on-site visit, Fairfield faculty members associated with the proposed programs made a presentation to the visiting team, elaborating upon Fairfield's vision and goals for the newly-developed five-year, integrated bachelors-masters degree and certification tracks, and describing in detail the coursework, fieldwork experiences, candidate assessments, and faculty qualifications pertaining to the two proposed undergraduate programs. Faculty also entertained visiting team questions during interview sessions, and Fairfield University administrators spoke to the institutional commitment to the proposed programs, including financial and faculty resources. The visiting team reviewed and evaluated all exhibit room materials, including course syllabi, candidate assessments and faculty vita.

Recommendation/Justification:

Based on triangulated sources of evidence—program report, faculty presentation, faculty and administrative interviews, and review of program materials (including candidate assessments)—the visiting team, consisting of three experts in the areas of elementary education and TESOL education, determined that the two proposed programs do meet CSDE regulatory and statutory requirements, NCATE standards, and national content-specific standards (IRA standards) in accordance with CSDE new program proposal requirements (Appendix A):

- The proposed programs are fully developed, including coursework and clinical/fieldwork requirements, in alignment with the Unit’s conceptual framework as well as CSDE regulatory and statutory requirements, and NCATE and national content-specific standard requirements;
- Appropriate assessments have been developed for all NCATE required levels;
- Faculty members have the required terminal degree or “exceptional expertise” necessary for the programs; and
- Fairfield University has the required resources to launch and sustain the new programs.

During the fall 2010 CSDE Review Committee meeting, the Committee recommended full approval for the Fairfield University undergraduate level Elementary Education program and the undergraduate level TESOL program. The Committee further recommended that both programs be reviewed for progress relative to implementation during Fairfield’s next NCATE/State accreditation visit, scheduled for spring 2014. Therefore, based upon visiting team findings and the recommendation of the CSDE Program Review Committee, I recommend that the Fairfield University undergraduate level Elementary Education and TESOL programs be granted initial program approval for the period February 2, 2011, through September 30, 2014.

Follow-Up Activities Planned:

If granted initial program approval by the Board of Education for the period February 2, 2011, through September 30, 2014, both programs will be reviewed for progress relative to implementation during Fairfield University’s next NCATE/State accreditation visit, scheduled for spring 2014.

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

Candidates⁴ 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 students⁵ learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional⁶ 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

⁴ 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.

⁵ “All students” includes students with exceptionalities and of different ethnic, racial, gender, language, religious, socioeconomic and regional/geographic origins.

⁶ 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

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: George A. Coleman, Acting Commissioner of Education

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2011 Second Quarter Financial Report

This report reflects the general fund budget activities of the Department through the second quarter of fiscal year 2011. As of December 31, 2010, the Department incurred expenditures of \$745 million against an adjusted appropriation of \$2.452 billion, leaving a balance of \$1.707 billion to cover operating and grant obligations through the end of the fiscal year.

Consistent with the past few years, allotment reductions were made to the Department's budget. In July 2010, \$5.2 million of reductions were implemented, mainly in the Personal Services and Other Expenses accounts. These reductions are attributable to the Office of Policy and Management (OPM) implementing required statewide savings adjustments across all executive branch agencies. Savings generated from observing furlough days, hiring restrictions, outside contractual service reductions and interagency surcharges are reflected. Mindful that the Connecticut Technical High School System (CTHSS) constitutes approximately 85 percent of the Department's annual operating budget expenditures, the reductions adversely impair the Department's ability to cover necessary instructional and energy costs at the technical high schools.

It is important to note that the Department has taken measures to absorb the reductions in Personal Services of \$1.2 million and Other Current Expenses of \$500,000. However, the gravity of a funding decrease to the magnitude of \$3.5 million in Other Expenses severely cripples any ability to meet the critical and essential needs for sustaining CTHSS operations. It is highly unlikely that the department-wide efforts toward restricting spending and redirecting any available non-fixed line item resources will be enough to meet its Other Expense fixed operating obligations through June 30, 2011. Last year the Department spent \$18.1 million. After the reduction this year, \$14 million remains, creating an estimated \$3.5 to \$4.0 million shortfall. The remaining operating accounts are anticipated to be expended within adjusted appropriated levels.

Both the Department and OPM staff have been monitoring the agency's operations and are now reviewing the school district grant expenditure levels. Firm account balances, including most of the grant accounts, will be released in the third quarter statement once projections become stabilized. As in previous years, the Department will, under the guidance of OPM, seek approval to request a Finance Advisory Committee action to balance the Department's budget by transferring funds from accounts experiencing a surplus to those in deficit. However, at this time, we are not projecting surpluses or deficits for any of the grant accounts.

Prepared by _____
Brian Mahoney, Chief Financial Officer
Division of Finance and Internal Operations

February 2, 2011