

BOE Report for Continuous Improvement Pathway (Updated May 2013)

Summary for Professional Education Unit

Institution Name:

Eastern Connecticut State University

Team Recommendations on Meeting Standards:

| Standards | Initial | Advanced |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| Standard 4: Diversity | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources | Standard Met | Standard Met |

Not Applicable = Unit not reviewed for this standard and/or level

Team Recommendations on Movement Toward Target:

| Standards | Initial | Advanced |
|--|--|--|
| Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice | Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging) | Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging) |
| Standard 4: Diversity | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |

Not Applicable = Unit did not select this as a target standard

I. Introduction

I.1 Brief Overview of the institution and the unit.

Eastern Connecticut State University (ECSU) began in 1889 as the Willimantic State Normal School preparing elementary teachers. Located midway between New York City and Boston in Willimantic, ECSU is the only designated public liberal arts university in Connecticut. The commitment of ECSU to a liberal arts education is exemplified in its Liberal Arts Core Curriculum - a sequenced, interdisciplinary program that all students share, independent of their chosen major. According to university documents, enrollment for fall 2013 was 5358, choosing from more than 35 undergraduate and graduate majors. The enrollment is 37 percent male, 63 percent female, and 30 percent minority students. ECSU offers 12 initial certification programs—six baccalaureate and six advanced (master's) programs.

The university is fully accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges. ECSU's mission, found in the University Strategic Plan, is to provide high quality undergraduate and select graduate programs to a diverse population of talented students in the traditional arts and sciences, as well as in pre-professional programs that are grounded in the liberal arts. Academically, ECSU is organized into three schools, each managed by a dean: the School of Arts and Sciences, the School of Education and Professional Studies, and the School of Continuing Education. Graduate study programs are offered through the School of Education and Professional Studies. Within the School of Education and Professional Studies (SEPS), the dean serves as the unit head and works through the Departments of Education and Health/Physical Education to administer the unit's programs.

As a community of scholars and teachers, the Professional Education Unit at ESCU is committed to providing an excellent educational opportunity for all students to meet the challenge of a complex and rapidly changing society in the 21st Century. Both the University and the unit emphasize a student-centered learning environment and the need to foster intellectual integrity, academic rigor, cultural diversity, and social responsibility.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

This continuing accreditation visit to ECSU operated under the partnership protocol between the state of Connecticut and NCATE/CAEP. The visit to ECSU is classified as an NCATE-legacy visit conducted in fall 2014. The visiting team consisted of four national team members joined by two Connecticut state team members, one serving as the state team chair for all activities.

The offsite visit occurred in July 2014 with a six member team. In November 2014, the onsite team had one new team member, named the week of the visit due to illness of an original team member. In accordance with state protocol, the six onsite team members worked together, sharing equal roles and responsibilities throughout the process.

There were no deviations from the state protocol.

I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

No programs are offered off-campus, at branch campuses, or via distance learning.

I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

There were no unusual circumstances that affected the visit.

II. Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework 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 is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The mission of the unit at Eastern Connecticut State University is twofold: to prepare reflective, responsive professional educators with evidence-based teaching skills and strategies to support students in their learning and development in a global community; and to advocate for best practices for all students in diverse educational environments.

The unit is committed to: building knowledge upon students' experience, which leads to learner-centered practice; instilling an appreciation of individuality and multiculturalism within a national and global context; creating and adapting general education environments for all learners, including those with exceptionalities; developing open-minded, reflective problem solvers who are lifelong learners; student-centered, teacher-facilitated instruction and authentic assessment that integrate traditional and technology-enhanced approaches; and advocacy for children.

This mission aligns with the unit's conceptual framework, founded on constructivist, learner-centered epistemology with emphasis on inquiry, reflection, and collaboration.

III. Unit Standards

The following pages contain a summary of the findings for each of the six NCATE unit standards.

Standard 1

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

1.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

ECSU offers 12 initial certification programs—six baccalaureate and six advanced (master's) programs. Twelve unit programs were reviewed by national Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs). SPA reports and BOE team responses are available in AIMS. Three initial programs, including English Education Secondary (baccalaureate/master's levels) and Physical Education (baccalaureate level) are nationally recognized until 2023; seven initial programs, including Early Childhood Education (baccalaureate/master's levels), Secondary Biology and Earth Science (master's level), Secondary Mathematics (baccalaureate/master's levels), and Secondary Social Studies (baccalaureate/master's levels) are recognized with conditions until 2015; and two initial programs—Elementary Education (baccalaureate/master's levels) are recognized with probation until 2015.

The offsite report raised concern regarding the SPA reviewers' primary feedback to reports that were recognized with conditions or recognized with probation, which is the lack of clear alignment between program assessments, standards, and rubrics. SPA reviewers also cited lack of or insufficient data to provide evidence of candidate performance. The SPA rejoinders, which have been submitted to the SPAs in fall 2014, for the M.S. in Elementary Education (K-6), B.S. in Elementary Education (K-6), M.S. in Early Childhood Education (N-3), B.S. in Early Childhood Education (N-3), M.S. in Secondary Education: Social Studies/History (7-12), B.S. in Secondary Certification in Social Studies/History (7-12), and M.S. in Science Education-Biology and Environmental Science (7-12), include revised assessments and rubrics that align with standards and at least one round of data collection and analysis

in 2013-2014. Specifically, the M.S. in Elementary Education (K-6) and B.S. in Elementary Education (K-6), which received Further Development Required, provide substantial documentation of redesigned assessments and rubrics that align with the ACEI standards, including evidence of one round of data collection and data analysis.

Evidence of meeting Standard 1 is found in the IR and addendum exhibits. Eighty percent of program completers pass the state initial licensure tests, PRAXIS II and the Connecticut Reading Foundations Test (C-FRT). A GPA of 2.7 for baccalaureate programs and 3.0 for master's programs are required for program admission. The IR describes coursework, field and clinical experiences, and assessments that support candidate content and pedagogical knowledge, skills, dispositions, and impact on student learning. A Unit Initial/ Advanced Candidate Assessment System Schema presents the various assessments to meet standards. Exhibit 1.4.c establishes the unit Conceptual Framework Alignment with Professional and State Standards. Examples of course syllabi presented in the IR Exhibit 1.5.b and the IR Addendum for both initial and advanced programs such as ECE 335-Integrated Curriculum in Early Childhood Education, ECE 435/575-Assessment in Early Childhood Education, and ECE 505-Young Children with Special Needs, EDU 222-Creative Expressions for Children and Youth, EDU 450-Pre-Student Teaching, EDU 518 Methods of Teaching English Learners, EDU 450-Pre-Student Teaching, EDU 555-Education and Society, EDU 573-Student Teaching (Elementary Education), EDU 571-Student Teaching (Secondary Schools), and EDU 518-Methods of Teaching English Learners, include alignment of course goals and objectives to state and professional standards as well as assessment rubrics. Exhibit 1.4.c.i presents a course outline and rubrics for the Capstone Seminar (EDU 570), which includes elements on professionalism and respect.

The IR indicates that at midpoint, initial candidates are currently evaluated on their Core I and II performance to allow them to progress to pre-student teaching (ELE, SEC, HPE) or practicum (ECE). Exhibit 2.4.g CORE I & II Data presents a list of six individual candidates and their ratings (1-3) on elements of Class climate, Standards of Behavior, Assessment Strategies, Feedback, Reflection, Collaboration and Code of Professional Responsibilities. A column for Comments is also provided.

IR exhibits include an ECE Practicum Rubric on a 4-point scale for Spring 2014 (Exhibit 1.4.c.iv), a Clinical Rubric for Advanced Candidates in EDU 518 and a Student Teaching Evaluation (Exhibit 3.4.f). Student Teaching data are presented in Exhibit 1.4.e and data on the ECE UG Clinical/Practicum indicate candidate mean ratings as follows: knowledge = 4.6, skills = 4.45, and dispositions = 4.41 (Exhibit 1.4.d.iii & iv). The unit administers surveys at the beginning and end of initial programs. Teacher candidates are administered a 23-item 5-point Likert scale survey at the start of their program followed by a more comprehensive 34-item 5-point Likert scale survey after student teaching. Exhibit 1.4.d-1.4.f Survey Data shows data for "Content: Planning stimulating lessons for students" with entry mean ranging from 2.93 to 3.48 and exit mean from 4.1 to 4.45 in Fall 2011 through Fall 2012. The unit has developed a disposition assessment plan for initial and advanced candidates (Exhibit 1.4.f), including the rubrics, processes and procedures for assessment of candidates. Specifically, the disposition instrument is an interview of candidates with questions based on a video candidates view prior to interview. The interview questions focus on candidate knowledge of professional disposition qualities. The unit has evidence of using data to effect positive changes to courses and programs (Exhibit 2.4.g).

Initial and advanced candidate work samples such as a teaching portfolio in ECE 425/575 for initial candidates and a capstone portfolio in EDU 570 for advanced candidates, case study, reflections, critical papers, clinical report and presentation, unit plans, families project, and integrated curriculum web/inquiry project, demonstrate candidates' ability to positively impact K-12 student learning. During visits to early childhood, elementary, and secondary schools, where initial candidates are placed for their field and clinical experiences, the BOE team interviews with cooperating teachers as well as brief observation of student teachers in classroom reveal candidates' pedagogical competencies and ability to

positively impact on student learning. Interviews with faculty and program coordinators also confirm a commitment to developing initial and advanced candidates who are knowledgeable in the content of their discipline. In interviews student teachers declare their confidence and preparedness in teaching content in their discipline.

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

1.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable for this standard.

1.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Initial program completers pass PRAXIS II and/or the Connecticut Foundations Reading Test (C-FRT). The unit describes coursework, field and clinical experiences, and assessments that support initial and advanced candidate content and pedagogical knowledge, skills, dispositions, and impact on student learning. The unit has revised all assessments and rubrics in programs that were initially recognized with conditions or further development required by their SPA and has submitted the rejoinders to the SPAs including evidence of one round of data collection and analysis. The unit has provided substantial initial and advanced candidate work samples to demonstrate candidates' ability to positively impact P-12 student learning.

1.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Initial and advanced candidate work samples demonstrate candidates' knowledge through inquiry, critical analysis, and synthesis of content. Candidates can develop meaningful learning experiences to facilitate learning for all students and can reflect on their practice. They can also assess and analyze student learning and have a positive effect on learning for students.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

| NO EVIDENCE | MOVING TOWARD TARGET | | AT TARGET |
|---|--|---|--|
| | EMERGING | DEVELOPING | ATTAINED |
| Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. |
| <u>AND</u> | <u>OR</u> | <u>AND</u> | <u>AND</u> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.] | There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. |
|--|---|---|--|

1.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|-----|---------------|
| | |

1.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|-----|---------------|
| | |

1.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|-----|---------------|
| | |

1.4 Recommendations

For Standard 1

| Level | Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Initial Teacher Preparation | Met |
| Advanced Preparation | Met |

Target Level

| Level | Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Initial Teacher Preparation | Not Applicable |
| Advanced Preparation | Not Applicable |

Standard 2

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 performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

In the offsite report, the team identified nine areas to be validated during the onsite visit. These nine areas are aspects of the unit assessment system, role of the unit's Assessment Committee, TK20 tool, portfolio, unit assessments, evaluation of unit operations, assessment data sharing, technical properties of assessments, and remediation.

The Unit Assessment Committee, composed of all program coordinators, reviews and discusses all PRAXIS analyses and survey reports prepared by a faculty member, specializing in assessment. The mission of this committee is to begin establishing an assessment culture. Aside from the assessment faculty member, this group has extensive experience with assessment through their other affiliations (e.g., university assessment liaison), and work with program-specific assessments.

The assessment system has been more clearly described relative to the data collected and analyzed across AY 2010-2014. As shared by the Unit Assessment Committee and provided in the addendum and exhibits, entry and exit surveys are administered and analyzed annually for students in the initial and advanced programs. Similarly, alumni and employer surveys are analyzed and results by members which include all program leaders. The Unit Assessment Committee did not receive aggregate or disaggregated data on the clinical/student teaching assessment; however, the Coordinator of Educational and Clinical Experiences does share disaggregated results with each program coordinator.

Two tools are used throughout the unit to collect data on applicant information and candidate performance according to the Unit's Assessment Committee, program coordinators, and those responsible for clinical/student teaching placements. This include Select Survey and TK20. It should be noted that importing of data into TK20 began two months ago, while students report that they have been assessed the technology fee for two years.

The Unit Assessment committee reports that the unit has discussed measuring dispositions for the past 10 years. For the initial programs, the unit is in the second iteration of developing this disposition instrument. The disposition instrument is administered during the admission process and during each clinic and student teaching experience. For advanced programs, a disposition instrument exists but no data has been collected yet.

Retention data is supplied by the university and the unit's statistics indicate about 90 percent of the candidates are retained for AY 2013-2014.

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 2.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.

2.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable for this standard.

2.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The Unit Assessment Committee members contend they serve a vital role now and in the future. For instance, they cite a number of programs to be monitored. They cite the need to examine inter-rater

reliability of some of the instruments, such as the dispositions instrument, and to oversee the training of all faculty on TK20. Their vision is that within the next 10 years, assessment would influence the whole unit. During the unit overview, it was stated that the work of the Unit Assessment Committee would be re-conceptualized, but additional information was not provided.

Additionally, the Unit Assessment Committee points to a number of data/evidence-based programmatic changes. For example, the liberal arts major came into existence in part due to elementary candidates' PRAXIS results, and the English department's implementation of the Shakespeare course.

2.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

None cited for this standard.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

| NO EVIDENCE | MOVING TOWARD TARGET | | AT TARGET |
|---|---|---|--|
| | EMERGING | DEVELOPING | ATTAINED |
| Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. |
| <u>AND</u> | <u>OR</u> | <u>AND</u> | <u>AND</u> |
| There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.] | There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. |

2.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|-----|---------------|
| | |

2.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|-----|---------------|
| | |

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|---|---|
| The unit does not assess unit operations. | Some data on assessments using rubrics that align with standards and results exist and are disaggregated by program. However, no feedback loop among stakeholders is evident. |
| The unit does not have a minimum of three years of candidate performance data for all of its advanced programs. | While the unit has plans to collect this data, no data were presented. |

2.4 Recommendations

For Standard 2

| Level | Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Initial Teacher Preparation | Met |
| Advanced Preparation | Met |

Target Level

| Level | Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Initial Teacher Preparation | Not Applicable |
| Advanced Preparation | Not Applicable |

Standard 3

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 professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

3.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The evidence presented by the unit, observations by the onsite team, and interviews with unit faculty and school based faculty support the continuing effort of the unit to design, implement, and evaluate field experience and clinical practice. Clarification of the processes were clearly established from the university's website; however, there were verbal discrepancies between expectation and processes of the clinical process and also the field experiences between faculty and candidate interviews. The unit has data to support the claims of candidate trust and confidence in the quality of faculty and university supervisors. The triangulation of data in both the clinical and field experiences (candidate, host teacher, cooperating teacher/supervising teacher) shows evidence of mutual voice in the overall assessment of growth.

As stated in the offsite report, although the curriculum framework and handbooks indicate a diverse population of schools, school districts, and experiences for candidates, the diversity of cooperating teachers and peers was not evident. In interviews with candidates, it was stated by candidates currently in a field placement setting that they have only had experience with one minority faculty that they are aware of and only one candidate had experiences with a minority host teacher during a Health/Physical Education (HPE) placement for a practicum.

The "Educational and Clinical Experience" as stated on the school website is highly respected by community educators, and education administrators across the area. When visiting the host schools, the

administrators, host/cooperating teachers, and placement coordinators spoke very highly of the placement process from the communication of the university to the supports given to the schools during the process. A visible level of trust and professional respect was seen from varied levels of placements including high school, middle school, elementary, and early childhood.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

The unit has increased the opportunity for candidates to apply their content knowledge from coursework to classroom practice by increasing the number of field experiences to four semesters. With the progression of the pre-candidate teaching experience of 135 hours (Core I) to candidate teaching of 10-12 weeks (Core II), more time is provided to institute professional practice while also seeing the continuity of instruction, formative and summative assessment, and progressive growth. Clinical and field experiences along with other assessment measures are anticipated to be calculated and measured in the TK20 system, which is not fully implemented. According to candidate interviews, this system is not yet running, even for candidates who purchased the assessment tool during the 2013-14 school year. Health/Physical Education (HPE) candidates have attempted to receive a refund unsuccessfully since they have not benefited from this resource. According to the overseer of this tool, currently TK20 keeps the assessments of field experiences and the goal is that it will eventually hold all of the data to support candidate growth.

Although cooperating and supervising teachers completed the state-lead TEAM training for supervising candidate teachers, there is not a calibration system assuring consistency of how observations are measured. There are clear descriptors for clinical and candidate teaching placement provided on website and through the candidate teaching handbook; however, interviews contradicted the clarity of this process with the candidates currently in clinical placements. Also, a majority of candidates interviewed had no background around the information within the candidate teacher handbook or were aware of a formal handbook.

The clinical course does not appear to have clear and consistent parameters for all candidates within the clinical experience. According to the candidate interviews, there is flexibility given to the supervising teacher regarding expectation during the clinical experience. The consistent action is that the clinical experience is a minimum of 45 hours with a minimum of 2 observations by the supervising teacher. Some candidates report this experience is strictly observational while others discuss creating lessons and instructing on multiple occasions. Although there are clear expectations listed on the website, these expectations do not appear to be consistently measured with fidelity with the same expectation from candidate to candidate.

There is little evidence to support candidates are receiving meaningful experiences with special education and/or disabled students in field experience placements outside of HPE and Early Childhood Education (ECE). Although the assessment data states the candidates feel strongly about their ability to teach in different cultural settings, interviews confirm they had very little training on cultural competency, culturally responsive teaching, and diversified learning.

Triangulated assessment of the candidate's ability to complete clinical or field experiences are very clear, but there does not appear to be clear feedback channels for candidates to voice concerns around

the process to the cooperating/host teacher or the supervising teacher (i.e.: survey at midterm to discuss overall experience). The candidates are provided a minimum of 2 observations during the clinical experience and five to seven observations during the candidate teaching experience. Evidence of opportunities to address any concerns from the perspective of the candidates are only informal.

The graduate (advanced) course EDU 518 does not appear to have an assessment based on the syllabus. Also, this course do not clearly measure or provide reflection on a candidate's knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The syllabus for EDU 518 allows for a case study and a reflective log with little direction of the outcome or expectation. Based on the log, there are elements that examine knowledge, skills, and dispositions; however, there is not a clear framework that establishes targets for the measure of each of these items, which lead to scoring based on individual interpretation.

The unit and school partners jointly determine the specific placements of student teachers and interns for other professional roles to maximize the learning experience for candidates and P–12 students. They have instituted a data system that currently has data from candidates' field experience and have a plan to input program data. Clinical projects are theoretically based, involve the use of research and technology, and have real-world application in the candidates' field placement setting. Although there are plans, there are not clear plans nor timelines for attaining target level performance at the initial or advanced levels.

3.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Not applicable to this standard.

3.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Initial- movement toward target\ emerging

- They jointly determine the specific placements of student teachers and interns for other professional roles to maximize the learning experience for candidates and P–12 students.
- They have instituted a data system that currently has data from candidates' field experience and have a plan to input program data

Advanced- movement toward target\ emerging

- Clinical projects are theoretically based, involve the use of research and technology, and have real-world application in the candidates' field placement setting.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

| NO EVIDENCE | MOVING TOWARD TARGET | | AT TARGET |
|--|--|---|--|
| | EMERGING | DEVELOPING | ATTAINED |
| Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| for this standard. | <u>OR</u> | <u>AND</u> | <u>AND</u> |
| <u>AND</u> | There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. |
| There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.] | | |

3.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|-----|---------------|
| | |

3.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|-----|---------------|
| | |

3.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|---|--|
| The unit did not provide clarity and consistency of expectations for clinical practice for initial and advanced program candidates. | There were inconsistencies in the communication and explanation of the documents. This resulted in candidates having lack of information of how they were being assessed and a lack of consistency among cooperating teachers. |

3.4 Recommendations

For Standard 3

| Level | Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Initial Teacher Preparation | Met |
| Advanced Preparation | Met |

Target Level

| Level | Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Initial Teacher Preparation | Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging) |
| Advanced Preparation | Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging) |

Standard 4

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to

diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools.

4.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Materials provided during the onsite visit confirmed that the unit has included an item on the initial program disposition instrument that is related to diversity as identified in the unit's conceptual framework. This proficiency is measured through the initial interview and in each field and clinical experience. Initial candidates' statements in interviews, however, suggested that there was limited awareness of the language of culturally responsive instruction, privilege, and bias.

During the offsite visit similar proficiencies and measures for diversity for the advanced program were not apparent. The unit indicates that it has initiated a process during which advanced candidates are assessed three times during their program for "dispositions." A document "Eastern Connecticut University of Candidate Professional Dispositions Approved 12/5/13 by Education Department" indicates that dispositions, including those related to diversity, will be assessed (a) during an interview complete an initial disposition rubric in TK20, (b) through an assessment of dispositions in a clinical component of the EDU518 Second Language Acquisition course, and (c) an interview prior to qualifying for capstone. Documents of current implementation indicate that the questions in the admission interview do not appear to include diversity proficiencies, but are related to the advanced candidates' goals for the master program, aspirations, research ideas, knowledge of professional responsibilities, and communication skills and interview dispositions. The current admission interview provided does not assess if candidates in advanced programs have attained proficiencies in diversity or receive feedback related to their diversity competencies. The conceptual framework includes statements related to diversity, but the interview provided does not appear to be related to those statements. The current process has only been piloted during Fall 2014; there are no data available. A second assessment of diversity proficiencies for advanced candidates is reported to be conducted through the field experience in the EDU 518 Methods of Teaching English Language course. However, the assignments for the course described include a case study and reflective log, rather than an assessment of diversity proficiencies. The process for assessing dispositions as described in the December 2013 document is not consistent with that currently in place.

There is evidence of good faith efforts in attracting and retaining faculty members from diverse ethnic/racial group. Interviews with administrators indicate a commitment to diverse representation on both the search committee and in the candidate pool by the advertisement of positions and additional funds used to recruit diverse applicants. However, there are very few school based faculty members from diverse groups in the schools used for field and clinical placements (for example, in one district there was reported to be two teachers from diverse ethnic or racial groups of 800 teachers). Candidates report no direct experience with school based faculty members who were not white.

Candidates have experiences in working with P-12 students from diverse ethnic/cultural groups. Though a question about tracking candidates' field experiences arose in the offsite report, an interview with staff members who manage placements clarified that spreadsheets of each candidate are used to insure that various and diverse settings are used. The schools used in field and clinical experiences are diverse in terms of culture, race, ethnicity, and language.

Initial candidates have limited experiences with peers from at least two racial/ethnic groups. Due to the low numbers of students of color, there are few experiences for initial candidates to work together on committees and education projects related to education and the content areas with peers from diverse groups. There are no direct recruitment efforts for diversity put forth by the unit; the Minority Teacher

Incentive Grants are managed by the state and initiated by the candidates themselves.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable for this standard.

4.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The program has made a concentrated and successful effort to attract and retain faculty from diverse cultural, ethnic, or language groups. In recognition of the significant and growing number of English language learners, a second language acquisition course has been added to the graduate programs. This data-based decision recognizes candidates' needs to have additional knowledge and skills related to English language learners.

4.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

| NO EVIDENCE | MOVING TOWARD TARGET | | AT TARGET |
|---|--|---|--|
| | EMERGING | DEVELOPING | ATTAINED |
| Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. |
| <u>AND</u> | <u>OR</u> | <u>AND</u> | <u>AND</u> |
| There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. |

| | |
|--|--|
| [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.] | |
|--|--|

4.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|-----|---------------|
| | |

4.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|-----|---------------|
| | |

4.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|--|---|
| 1. There is no evidence provided that advanced candidates are assessed or that the data are used to provide feedback to candidates for improving their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping students from diverse populations learn. | The unit has piloted the use of an interview to assess advanced student proficiencies related to diversity. However, the interview questions do not directly address diversity, and no data are provided. The 12/5/2013 process documented is not being implemented. |
| 2. Initial candidates have limited opportunities to work with peers from diverse ethnic and cultural groups. | 2. There are few individuals from diverse ethnic/racial groups in the initial program. The Minority Teacher Grants are initiated by the student and managed by the state. No direct recruitment efforts are made to recruit candidates of color. Initial Candidates have few opportunities to work on committees and projects with peers from various cultural and linguistic groups. |

4.4 Recommendations

For Standard 4

| Level | Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Initial Teacher Preparation | Met |
| Advanced Preparation | Met |

Target Level

| Level | Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Initial Teacher Preparation | Not Applicable |
| Advanced Preparation | Not Applicable |

Standard 5

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.

5.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit, at the time of the onsite visit, had 17 full time faculty, all of whom had confirmed terminal degrees in the area in which they teach. In addition, the unit during the onsite visit had seven part time faculty teaching courses, and 17 clinical faculty, which are according to unit leadership considered part time faculty as well. In addition, the unit provided additional information clarifying one year appointments. During an interview with unit leadership, it was described that in some circumstances, faculty can be appointed for a one year temporary full time position. These faculty teach 12 credits a semester, and are treated as full time faculty. During Fall 2014, the unit did not have anyone designated as a one year appointment faculty.

In regard to hiring and evaluation of part time faculty, the unit provided additional information in the IR Addendum. Part time faculty are hired and interviewed by the Department Chair. Full time faculty are able to provide input on part time faculty hirings, and part time faculty are hired based on how their credentials and experiences meet the need for that semester/year. Department Chairs confirmed during onsite interviews that part time faculty are evaluated primarily on course evaluations. During the onsite visit, candidates confirmed that all (full and part time) seemed to be up to date with best practices and their clinical faculty were all appropriately certified.

During the onsite interviews with faculty, they confirmed assertions made in the IR regarding how they are evaluated. The faculty interviewed stated that the evaluations are consistent with Connecticut State University American Association of University Professors (CSU-AAUP) collective bargaining agreement, with teaching being the primary emphasis of the evaluation, followed by research, service, and professional development.

During the onsite visit the faculty further discussed the importance of research and professional development. The faculty provided examples as to how their academic, research, and professional experiences were in line with the areas they teach. Specifically, faculty highlighted attending/presenting at conferences, working as consultants in P-12 schools, and researching areas related to what they teach as professional development they have used to stay current. In conversations with P-12 partners, the confirmed assertions made in the IR that there was a collaborative approach with the various programs.

In onsite interviews with candidates, they confirmed faculty the assertion in the IR that faculty emphasized student learning. Additionally, recent graduates discussed how faculty cultivated support of intellectual integrity and cultural diversity. The candidates confirmed that all faculty modeled best practices and a learner centered approach. Specifically candidates and recent graduates discussed how each faculty member modeled specific practices that aligned with the content they were learning and cited this as a strength of the program.

The unit's IR Addendum provided a detailed overview of the review process, which confirmed findings in the IR that stated teaching as a primary element in faculty evaluation. Faculty discussed and described the evaluation process to be in compliance with their union contracts. This reflected information as cited in the offsite report. Full time faculty are expected as part of their evaluations for promotion and tenure to conduct research and participate in service related to the community. During onsite interviews faculty described that there were university wide funds available, and their unit head also provided several examples of grant funding to support research and professional development. The faculty confirmed that the unit utilized the thorough collective bargaining agreement as highlighted in the IR's exhibits.

In the IR Addendum the unit provided a detailed list of most recent faculty research. During the onsite interviews the faculty highlighted several research endeavors that directly contribute to the enhancement of the profession. In addition, several faculty and candidates discussed shared research projects. The candidates described this shared research as an opportunity to delve deeper into the profession.

Please respond to 5.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.

5.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable for this standard.

5.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

In areas of research, current candidates and faculty discussed how they are collaborating on several areas of research to enhance practice and their profession. Faculty and candidates alike, discussed how research projects are centered around either candidate interest or shared interest of faculty and students which relate to the mission of the particular department. For example candidates were involved in doing research on innovative practices related to Early Childhood education that focus on literacy skills and enhancing home literacy environments. Candidates cited this as evidence of commitment to professionalism and due to this become more increasingly committed to enhancing the profession. The faculty, during onsite interviews, discussed a consistent effort to increase candidate involvement in research each year.

5.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

During the onsite visit the faculty discussed several areas in which they are modeling differentiation and using various methods of assessment, including the use of technology to enhance candidate learning. During interviews with both current candidates and recent graduates, the cited faculty modeling and demonstration of assessments strategies as a strength of the program. According to interviews with faculty, they have provided professional development and assisted faculty from other units to enhance their teaching practice using current methodology and best practices.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

| NO EVIDENCE | MOVING TOWARD TARGET | | AT TARGET |
|---|--|---|--|
| | EMERGING | DEVELOPING | ATTAINED |
| Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. |
| <u>AND</u> | <u>OR</u> | <u>AND</u> | <u>AND</u> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.] | There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. |
|--|---|---|--|

5.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|-----|---------------|
| | |

5.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|-----|---------------|
| | |

5.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|-----|---------------|
| | |

5.4 Recommendations

For Standard 5

| Level | Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Initial Teacher Preparation | Met |
| Advanced Preparation | Met |

Target Level

| Level | Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Initial Teacher Preparation | Not Applicable |
| Advanced Preparation | Not Applicable |

Standard 6

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.

6.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The School of Education and Professional Studies (SEPS) houses the education unit. Responsibility for initial and advanced programs resides with the dean of SEPS along with faculty within the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Physical Education. The Dean of SEPS is responsible for five academic departments as well as the Graduate Division. The Dean has the responsibility to lead, administer, and implement governance over the programs offered by the unit.

Since February 2014, the unit has undergone significant changes. A new dean for the School of Education and Professional Studies was named in June 2014, and this change in leadership is significant to many of the procedures and processes outlined by the unit. Although the organizational structure states that the dean has the authority to lead, administer, and implement governance over the programmatic offerings of the school, evidence does not support this claim prior to June 2014. During the onsite visit, through interviews with faculty, students, and stakeholders, the team found there to be inconsistencies in policies and practices. These inconsistencies seem to stem from a decentralized approach in governance of the unit, where each department functioned with their own standards of practice and expectations. This resulted in the team being unable to identify practices that demonstrated a shared consistency of unit wide expectations and practices.

The Dean's Cabinet, Graduate Advisory Council, Teacher Education Faculty Council, and Teacher Education Community Advisory Council are discussed by the unit; however, interviews with stakeholders indicate the groups may be no longer functioning as described or in the process of restructuring. Interviews with faculty and administrators indicate that the Teacher Education Faculty Council is no longer functioning. Interviews with school partners speak of an informal end-of-the-year gathering as an opportunity to provide feedback regarding clinical practice but they were unaware of the Advisory Council. Evidence provided indicate the Graduate Division Advisory Council (GDAC) met in October 2014 to begin strategic planning for marketing of all graduate programs as well as a systematic customer service initiative.

Team findings show unit support for the work of the Unit Assessment Committee and the Committee for Admission and Retention in Education (CARE). Both committees are collecting and analyzing data; however, evidence was limited to support collaboration between the two groups for program improvement.

In the offsite report, the team asked for information regarding the currency and accuracy of publications. Interviews confirm that publications and the website are updated annually, although upon review, the website contains multiple broken links.

The unit provides professional development for part-time faculty regarding assessment for candidates, TK20, and other unit documents. In the addendum and confirmed by interviews, each part time faculty is partnered with a full time faculty member for mentoring in policies, procedures, and assessments as well as program goals and expectations of candidate performance.

As per the CSU-AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement 2007-2016, full time faculty members are assigned a 12-credit hour teaching load, which includes additional hours committed to advising, committee work, and research. Faculty are limited to three course preparations per semester. Part time faculty are limited to seven credit hours per semester, by contract.

The process of applying for a faculty sabbatical is set by the Connecticut System Office. Full-time faculty are eligible to apply for a sabbatical in their fifth year of employment; however, the ECSU Faculty Senate committee reviews all applications, making recommendations to the Provost and University President. Budget reports indicate that 36 faculty load credits (FLC) are allocated to sabbaticals within the department of Education for fall 2014. Travel funds and release time are

determined by faculty committees, the department chair, and/or the Dean of SEPS.

The university's J.Eugene Smith Library has a vibrant, relevant curriculum center designed to support education majors at Eastern. The liaison between the library and the Department of Education is proactive is seeking to support and assist both faculty, candidates, and community members. Library resources are consistently allocated to increase collections in children's literature, young adult literature, support materials for PRAXIS licensure tests, and teaching materials. Recently, the library purchased a SmartBoard for the classroom used by education majors. The librarian assigned as a liaison to the Department of Education is providing professional development on using the SmartBoard as well as offering movie viewings and discussion on topics current to the field (i.e., bullying).

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 6.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 6.2.b.

6.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable for this standard.

6.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has plans to fully implement TK20 as well as strategic planning for continued improvement in the governance structure. In the last five years, documents and interviews support efforts by individual faculty for improvement. However, systematic procedures were not realized without leadership and plans are in progress for strategic development within the unit.

6.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

None cited for this standard.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

| NO EVIDENCE | MOVING TOWARD TARGET | | AT TARGET |
|---|--|---|--|
| | EMERGING | DEVELOPING | ATTAINED |
| Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. | Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. |
| <u>AND</u> | <u>OR</u> | <u>AND</u> | <u>AND</u> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.] | There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. |
|--|---|---|--|

6.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|-----|---------------|
| | |

6.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|-----|---------------|
| | |

6.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

| AFI | AFI Rationale |
|---|---|
| The unit lacks appropriate structure to effectively manage all of its programs. | The unit has a decentralized structure where individual programs act independently. Committees within the unit and university are collecting data regarding candidate progress along with field and clinical experiences; however, these committees provide little evidence regarding cohesiveness and structure regarding unit and all programs. |

6.4 Recommendations

For Standard 6

| Level | Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Initial Teacher Preparation | Met |
| Advanced Preparation | Met |

Target Level

| Level | Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Initial Teacher Preparation | Not Applicable |
| Advanced Preparation | Not Applicable |

IV. Sources of Evidence

Documents Reviewed

Institutional Report (IR)
Exhibits attached to IR
IR Addendum
Exhibits attached to Addendum

University websites

Persons Interviewed

see attached list

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

EAsern Connecticut list of participants.docx

See **Attachment** panel below.

V. State Addendum (if applicable)

Please upload the state addendum (if applicable).

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.