

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford

TO BE PROPOSED:

April 6, 2016

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Education, pursuant to Section 10-145d-9(g)(1)(A) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, grants full continuing approval to University of Hartford (UHART) educator preparation programs for the period September 30, 2016, through September 30, 2021, for the purpose of certifying graduates from UHART 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

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

and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of _____ this sixth day of April, Two Thousand Sixteen.

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

**CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford**

TO: State Board of Education

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

DATE: April 6, 2016

SUBJECT: Continuing Approval of University of Hartford Educator Preparation Programs

Executive Summary

Introduction

Connecticut statutes require State Board of Education (SBE) approval of all educator preparation programs leading to Connecticut educator certification. Once approved, programs are required to seek continuing approval every five years. Although not currently required by Connecticut, programs may also voluntarily seek national accreditation through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

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

The University of Hartford (UHART), a NCATE partnership institution, hosted its mandated, NCATE/Connecticut visit in spring 2015. This report presents a summary of the visiting team's findings, including the Commissioner of Education's recommendation regarding continuing state program approval for UHART educator preparation programs.

History/Background

UHART consists of seven schools and colleges. The institution offers more than 100 degree programs in the arts, humanities, business, engineering and technology, education, and health professions and draws over 7,000 undergraduate and graduate students from 48 states and 63 countries.

The UHART Department of Education is housed within the College of Education, Nursing and Health Professions, and offers initial teacher preparation programs in early childhood education

(undergraduate and graduate), elementary education (undergraduate and graduate), integrated elementary/special education (undergraduate), and secondary English (undergraduate).

Additionally, the Department offers one advanced, non-certification program in educational technology. Three other educator certification programs—music, secondary mathematics, and school psychology—are housed in the Hartt School and the College of Arts and Sciences, respectively. There are approximately 375 undergraduate candidates and 140 graduate candidates enrolled across the Department's educator preparation programs.

The NCATE/Connecticut joint visit was conducted November 8-10, 2015, in accordance with the NCATE/Connecticut Partnership visit protocol. The visiting team determined that UHART's educator preparation programs meet the six NCATE standards:

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
Visiting Team Decision: Met

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
Visiting Team Decision: Met

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
Visiting Team Decision: Met

Standard 4: Diversity
Visiting Team Decision: Met

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
Visiting Team Decision: Met

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources
Visiting Team Decision: Met

Once visits are completed, the CSDE Review Committee (Attachment B) meets to review visiting team findings and make recommendations to the Commissioner of Education relative to continuing approval of preparation programs based upon Connecticut educator preparation program approval regulations (Attachment C). During a January 8, 2016, meeting, the Review Committee recommended full continuing approval for UHART preparation programs, for the period September 30, 2016, through September 30, 2021, based upon visiting team findings from the fall 2015 visit.

Recommendation and Justification

Based upon visiting team findings and the recommendation of the CSDE Review Committee, the CSDE recommends that UHART educator preparation programs be granted full continuing approval for the period September 30, 2016, through September 30, 2021.

Follow-up Activity

If granted full continuing approval by the SBE for a five-year period, UHART will host its next visit during fall 2020.

Prepared by: _____
Katie Toohey, Ph.D., Program Approval Coordinator
Talent Office

Reviewed by: _____
Shannon Marimón, Division Director
Talent Office

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

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

Standard 1 – Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

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

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

Standard 2 – Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

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

Standard 3 – Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

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

Standard 4 – Diversity

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

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

Standard 5 – Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

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

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

Standard 6 – Unit Governance and Resources

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

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

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

Educator Preparation Program Representation	K-12 Representation	Community Representation	CSDE/OHE Representation (non-voting members)
<p>1. Dr. Helen Abadiano Chair, Reading and Language Arts Department School of Education and Professional Studies Central Connecticut State University (9/2013-9/2016)</p> <p>2. Dr. Hari Koirala Chair, Department of Education School of Education and Professional Studies Eastern Connecticut State University (9/2013-9/2016)</p> <p>3. Dr. Patricia Mulcahy-Ernt Director, Graduate Programs, Literacy/English Education Director, Center for Excellence, Learning and Teaching University of Bridgeport (9/2013-9/2016)</p>	<p>1. Joseph Bonillo Teacher, History/Social Studies Waterford High School Waterford Public Schools (9/2013-9/2016)</p> <p>2. Kenneth Di Pietro Superintendent Plainfield Public Schools (9/2013-9/2016)</p> <p>3. Dr. David Erwin Superintendent Avon Public Schools (9/2013-9/2016)</p> <p>4. Dr. Erin McGurk Director, Educational Services Ellington Public Schools (9/2013-9/2016)</p> <p>5. Dr. Salvatore Menzo Superintendent Wallingford Public Schools (9/2013-9/2016)</p>	<p>1. A. Bates Lyons President Bates Lyons and Associates Torrington, CT (9/2013-9/2016)</p>	<p>Dr. Katie Toohey CSDE</p> <p>Shannon Marimón CSDE</p> <p>Dr. Noah Dion OHE</p>

**Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies
for Educator Preparation Program Approval
Section 10-145d-9(g)**

Board Action

After reviewing the recommendation of the Program 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 Program 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 Program 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 Program 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 Program Review Committee, on a date set by the Board, a written report which addresses the professional education unit's process 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 Program Review Committee, after two semesters of operation, a written report which addresses the professional education unit's progress in implementing the new program. The Board shall require an on-site visit in addition to this report.
- (B) Following the on-site visit after two years of operation, grant full program approval for three years. The Board may require that a written report be submitted to the Department, on a date set by the Board, prior to the end of the approval period.
- (C) Following the on-site visit after two years of operation, grant provisional approval for a time period not to exceed three years, if substantial non-compliance with current standards is identified. The institution shall submit to the Program 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 Program 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.