

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford, Connecticut**

Dianna R. Wentzell, Commissioner of Education v. Maria Moulthrop, Certificate Holder

Case No. CRT 16-01

Notice of Hearing

Pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes (C.G.S.) Section 4-177(b), the Connecticut State Board of Education (State Board) provides this Notice of Hearing:

(1) Time, Place, and Nature of the Hearing.

September 21, 2016 - 10:00 a.m.
State Office Building – Room 307B
165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, CT 06106

The purpose of the hearing is to consider the June 10, 2016 Administrative Complaint of the Commissioner of Education (Commissioner) to revoke the educator certificates issued by the State Board to Maria Moulthrop (the “Certificate Holder”). The hearing will be held before Frederick Ury, Impartial Hearing Board, who will render a proposed decision. The September 21, 2016 hearing will address procedural issues and requests for subpoenas and discovery. There will no witnesses or evidence presented on September 21, 2016.

(2) Legal Authority and Jurisdiction Under Which the Hearing is to be Held.

The State Board has jurisdiction over educator certificates pursuant to C.G.S. Section 10-144o *et seq.* The legal authority for revocation of educator certificates and conducting a hearing are contained in C.G.S. Section 10-145b and/or Section 10-145d-612 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (R.C.S.A.).

(3) Reference to the Particular Sections of the Statutes and Regulations Involved.

This matter involves C.G.S. Section 10-145b (Rev. to 2011) including, in particular, subsection (j)(1) which authorizes the State Board to revoke any “certificate, authorization or permit issued pursuant to sections 10-144o through 10-149, inclusive” for specified reasons. Procedures for revocation of certificates, authorizations, and permits are detailed in R.C.S.A. Section 10-145d-612. This request for revocation is based in part on standards set forth in R.C.S.A. Sections 10-145d-400a, Code of Professional Responsibility for Teachers, and 10-145d-400b, Code of Professional Responsibility for Administrators.

The hearing will be conducted pursuant to the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act, C.G.S. Sections 4-166 *et seq.* and the State Board’s Rules of Practice, R.C.S.A Sections 10-4-11 *et seq.*

(4) Short and Plain Statement of the Matters Asserted.

The Commissioner alleges that the Certificate Holder was the principal of Hopeville Elementary School in Waterbury (Hopeville) during the administration of the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) in March 2011 (the “March 2011 CMT”) and was responsible for ensuring that testing occurred without breaches of test security. The scores of Hopeville students on the March 2011 CMT on certain sub-tests rose

substantially from the previous year and were higher than scores at other Waterbury Public Schools, other school districts in Waterbury's District Reference Group, and the statewide average for all students. Erasure analysis conducted on the Hopeville student's answer sheets revealed an inordinately high number of erasures and answers changed from incorrect to correct. The Connecticut Department of Education determined that Hopeville's student's scores on the March 2011 CMT were invalid. Available Hopeville Students were retested in September 2011 and their scores declined substantially. The Commissioner asserts that the Certificate Holder failed to provide adequate test security by failing to ensure that the March 2011 CMT testing results accurately reflected the efforts and knowledge of the students and that various acts or omissions by the Certificate Holder constituted a violation of test protocols and improper breaches of test security. The Commissioner asserts that the facts and circumstances establish a violation of test protocols, an improper breach of security of the administration of the March 2011 CMT, and/or other due and sufficient cause within the meaning of C.G.S. Section 10-145b, and warrant revocation of the Certificate Holder's educator certificates. The factual and legal basis for the requested revocation is set forth in more detail in the Administrative Complaint.