NCATE

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★ *Report*

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:
Dr. Leah T. Engelhardt
Mrs. Deborah I. Tully
Dr. Sandra J. Winn Tutwiler

State Team:
Dr. Helen R. Abadiano
Christine Sullivan

State Consultant:
Dr. Katie Moirs

NEA or AFT Representative:
N/A

Continuous Improvement Pilot Visit to:

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

Unit 2064
249 Glenbrook Road
Storrs, CT 06269-2064
April 18-20, 2010

Type of Visit:
Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

Board of Examiners Report for Continuous Improvement Pilot Visit

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

Institution:

University of Connecticut

Team Recommendations:

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

Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

I. INTRODUCTION

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

The University of Connecticut (UConn), founded in 1881, with a class of 12 students, was designated a land grant institution by the state legislature in 1893; it became a sea grant institution in 1988. More than 21,000 undergraduate and 8000 graduate and professional students were enrolled in fall 2009; its alumni number more than 178,000. Academic programs reside in 14 colleges and schools with seven undergraduate degrees available in 101 majors and 17 graduate degrees in 86 research and professional fields. In addition to the flagship campus in Storrs, programs are offered at five regional campuses. Some education programs can be completed at Stamford, Waterbury and West Hartford. One of 58 public research universities in the U.S., UConn ranks 21st among that group in graduation rate for all freshmen and 22nd in graduation rate for minority freshmen. U. S. News and World Report ranked it as the number one public university in New England and among the top 26 in this category nationally. Full-time faculty on the main and regional campuses number 1,286 with 60 percent holding tenure and 93 percent having Ph.D. or terminal degrees. The university is designated as a "Doctoral/Research University – Extensive" by the Carnegie Foundation. External funding and sponsored activities in FY 2009, excluding financial aid, totaled $120 million on the main and regional campuses. The 20-year investment program of $2.3 billion in the university's infrastructure has enhanced the physical plant and resulted in state-of-the-art technology on the Storrs campus and at the regional sites. Additional information is available in electronic exhibits and on the university website.

The university is fully accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges. Its mission, found in the university academic plan 2009-2014, describes its commitment to freedom of academic inquiry and expression and dedication to excellence as demonstrated in national and international recognition of faculty, students and programs. Creation and dissemination of knowledge occurs in scholarly and creative achievements, programs and outreach. Research, teaching and service provide

avenues for embracing diversity and cultivating leadership, integrity and engaged citizenship.

The professional education unit, the Neag School of Education (NSOE), manages and coordinates all programs offered for the initial and advanced preparation of K-12 teachers and other school professionals, regardless of where programs are administratively housed. Ray Neag, an alumnus of the university, committed $21 million to the School of Education in 1999 for faculty and program support and development. The Integrated Bachelor's and Master's Program (IB/M) for K-12 teachers and professionals in elementary and secondary education (including agriculture, English, mathematics, music, science, social studies, and world languages) and special education and the Teacher Certification Program for College Graduates (TCPCG) - in special education and agriculture, English, mathematics, science, social studies, and world language - provide initial certification at the master's level. The music program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). The educational technology program, offered in a two-summer format, is the single program for the advanced preparation of teachers. Advanced preparation programs for other school professionals are offered in education leadership administrator preparation (UCAPP), educational leadership executive program (ELP), reading and language arts, remedial reading and language arts, school counselor – accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), school psychology, and speech and language pathology – accredited by American Speech – Language Hearing Association (ASHA). The Speech and Language Pathology certification program is located in the Communication Disorders Division of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; it received findings of its most recent ASHA visit, conducted in Fall 2009, indicating that the program had been reaccredited with one area of non compliance and two areas of partial compliance noted.

The unit reported 106 professional education faculty, of whom 55 are full-time, 37 are part-time, and 14 are graduate teaching assistants, in addition to content faculty from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the School of Agriculture, the School of Fine Arts and other professional schools. Approximately 30 university supervisors are employed to work with student teachers. It reported Fall 2009 enrollments of 386 candidates in initial programs and 248 in advanced preparation programs in the IR and a cohort of 19 in the educational technology master's program in the IR addendum. Although agricultural education was listed as an initial certification option for both the IB/M and TCPCG programs, according to Table 2 in the IR, no candidates are enrolled. During the previsit, it was determined that the information in the IR was in error; there have been no candidates in the I/BM program but candidates were enrolled in the TCPCG program at West Hartford, and there are currently candidates in the TCPCG program at Waterbury. Data for Standard 2 in the exhibits on the NSOE website included agriculture education in the TCPCG aggregated data and student teaching evaluations for candidates as recently as Fall 2009. The team met faculty and two candidates from the program.

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?

The continuing accreditation visit was among the continuous improvement pilot visits conducted in Spring 2010; it operated under the NCATE/state partnership protocol for Connecticut. NCATE BOE members joined two Connecticut team members, one serving as state team chair, in all activities.

In January 2010, four NCATE BOE members and the two state team members participated in an offsite review of the IR, conducted by conference call in consultation with the NCATE senior vice president and the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) Education Preparation Program Approval Coordinator. Team members completed the offsite feedback report, which was posted on AIMS prior to the onsite previsit.

The previsit was conducted in February 2010 by the BOE chair and state chair and attended by the CSDE program approval coordinator. Discussion focused on the unit's draft response to the BOE offsite report and logistics for the onsite visit. Due to the abbreviated onsite visit schedule, the five-person onsite team, and the fact that the unit operates multiple programs on four campuses, it was agreed that the state chair and CSDE program approval coordinator would conduct site visits at the Waterbury and West Hartford campuses prior to the arrival of the entire team in order to tour the facilities and interview candidates and recent graduates. Team members interviewed candidates and graduates of the educational leadership and UCAPP programs in Stamford via video conference.

The onsite visit was conducted by a five-member team composed of three NCATE BOE team members and the two state team members. Two members of the BOE offsite team were not assigned to the onsite team. The third BOE member joined the team approximately six weeks prior to the onsite visit. In accordance with the state protocol, the five onsite team members worked together, sharing equal roles and responsibilities throughout the review. The CSDE Education Preparation Program Coordinator attended all team meetings and assisted with interviews throughout the visit. The CSDE conducted a state records audit of programs on the four campuses in conjunction with the visit. The Senior Associate of Academic Affairs from the Connecticut Department of Higher Education joined the team as an observer on Monday afternoon.

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.).

As described above, the unit offers programs on three of the university's five regional campuses. Candidates can complete the TCPCG initial certification program at the campuses in Waterbury and West Hartford; the program was available in the past at Stamford but is not active at the present time. The educational leadership-administrator program (University of Connecticut Administrator Preparation Program - UCAPP) is offered at three off-campus sites in southeastern Connecticut, Farmington, and East Hartford in addition to the regional campus in Stamford. The state chair interviewed candidates and graduates at Waterbury and West Hartford.

No program offers 50 percent or more of its courses via a distance – learning format. However, in interviews, candidates and recent graduates of the educational technology program described a format in which the first week of the course was attended on campus and all other course activities and requirements were completed on line.

Faculty members who teach on the Storrs campus also teach courses on the regional campuses. Adjunct faculty teach the majority of courses in the educational leadership programs. Programs offered on regional campuses are identical in their requirements; assessment data were disaggregated for each site within the unit's assessment system. See Addendum to the IR, page 11 (Section 1.4) and page 19 (Section 1.7) for additional information about disaggregation of data for candidates at regional campuses.

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 unit's mission is to develop candidates with strong ethical standards who become teachers and leaders dedicated to improving education for all children, and who strive to improve and enhance the quality of life in the ever changing society. It achieves this mission via a strong professional knowledge base, modeling evidence-based professional practice, committing to inquiry, demonstrating leadership, and embracing diversity. Formal coursework, which infuses multicultural and diversity education into the curriculum, required clinical experiences in diverse settings, and a commitment to the integration of technology in education settings are the bases by which the unit achieves its mission. Candidates and recent graduates in the advanced programs described the emphasis on moral leadership by providing examples of how the moral dimension was stressed by instructors.

The conceptual framework (Exhibit 0.4) reflects national and state professional standards and practices in all program areas; it incorporates research findings in the effects of educator preparation, characteristics of educators, diversity, accountability processes, and pedagogical models. The unit believes educators must be reflective professionals, defined as interactive decision makers who are able to formulate situation-specific decisions rooted in professional knowledge and research. The conceptual framework is defined by three themes: learning (professional knowledge base/evidence-based professional practice), leading (inquiry/leadership) and lighting the way (inspiration/diversity). The unit expects its candidates to possess strong professional knowledge bases and skills for implementing evidence based practice. Course work, seminars, and field experiences emphasize the development of expertise in the subject area. In addition, candidates are expected to demonstrate a breadth of understanding related to human culture and intellectual experiences. Evidence-based practice is developed through a deep understanding of and reflection upon theory and practical dimensions of professional practice. Learning means instilling in candidates a commitment to inquiry, transformative leadership, and moral leadership. Candidates are encouraged to develop intellectual habits of inquiry in courses, field experiences, seminars, and the creation of research products. The unit strives to prepare candidates whose behavior and examples promote positive social and educational change. Lighting the way is defined as candidates embracing diversity and succeeding in meeting the challenges of a changing world. Candidate progress toward the goals of the three conceptual framework themes is assessed in courses, collected in the assessment system, and reported to candidates and stakeholders. The unit's continuous assessment process is based upon the conceptual framework and its underlying national and state standards. Tables 1, 2, and 3 in the conceptual framework document (Exhibit 0.4) align it to major assessments at key points and to key components/elements. Candidates and recent graduates were able to articulate the major components of the conceptual framework, especially the moral leadership dimension of its dispositions in advanced programs.

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?

Initial Teacher Preparation

The University of Connecticut Professional Education Unit offers a total of nine programs and/or concentrations that prepare candidates at the initial certification level in the Integrated Bachelor's and Master's Program (IB/M) for Initial Preparation of K-12 school teachers and professionals in elementary and secondary education, including agricultural sciences, English, mathematics, music education, science, social studies, world languages, and special education. The Teacher Certification Program for College Graduates (TCPCG) provides initial certification for 7-12 teachers in special education and secondary education. All initial teacher certification programs, with the exception of music education, underwent SPA review prior to the NCATE visit. Among the nine initial teacher preparation programs, six have been nationally recognized—elementary education (IB/M), English (7-12, IB/M), mathematics (7-12, IB/M and TCPCG), science (7-12, IB/M and TCPCG), social studies (7-12, IB/M), and social studies (7-12, TCPCG). The remaining three initial teacher preparation programs—English (7-12, TCPCG), special education (IB/M and TCPCG), and world languages (IB/M and TCPCG) have been recognized "with conditions." Agricultural sciences received state approval.

Revised SPA reports, reports on the Status of Meeting SPA Standards, electronic exhibits, and interviews with faculty in the initial teacher preparation programs in English (7-12, TCPCG), special education (IB/M and TCPCG), and world languages (IB/M and TCPCG) that were nationally recognized "with conditions" confirm that steps have been taken to address SPA concerns related to alignment between assessments, rubrics and SPA standards.
Although the Teacher Certification Program for College Graduates in English (7-12, TCPCG) is nationally recognized "with conditions," the NCTE report on the Status of Meeting Standards acknowledges that the program "has made a strong effort to revise the alignment of their assessment system with the NCTE standards and has provided multiple opportunities for teacher candidates to demonstrate mastery and to revise teacher practices in order to meet individual standards." An interview with faculty confirmed this ongoing effort. The candidates' professional portfolio, lesson plan requirement, inquiry project, and the English language learner infusion project demonstrate candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Similarly, the Integrated Bachelor's and Master's Program (IB/M) in special education and Teacher Certification Program for College Graduates (TCPCG) meets CEC Standard 1: Foundations— candidates "understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse historical points of view, and human issues that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional need both in school and society."

Finally, the world languages (IB/M and TCPCG) program meets ACTFL standards in the areas of language acquisition theories and instructional practices, integration of standards into curriculum and instruction, and assessment of language and cultures. The SPA report and interviews with faculty also confirm that although the program has been requiring "intermediate high" as the target score on the OPI, the program is working toward requiring "advanced low" as the target score. Interviews with faculty also indicate strong efforts in revising assessments and rubrics to align with ACTFL standards.

Overall, unit candidates enrolled in an initial teacher preparation program complete a general education curriculum, professional education sequence, major professional coursework, structured and closely supervised field experiences, and student teaching leading to content area endorsement and/or specialization coursework. The courses are linked to the state's teacher education program approval standards in Connecticut, which are aligned with NCATE standards, and the unit's conceptual framework. The candidates' content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn are supported by data from key assessments showing mastery performance of candidates. Assessments include the student profile assignment during their first year, student teaching video assignment, student teaching evaluation, fifth year internship evaluation, and PRAXIS and ACTFL OPI/WPT (for secondary education-world languages, IB/M and secondary education-world languages, TCPCG).

Expectations for candidates' professional dispositions are embedded in the unit's conceptual framework. A thorough assessment of candidates' professional disposition begins at the admissions process and continues throughout the program. They are assessed at different points, including in a number of courses that require candidates to reflect on and analyze their attitudes, behaviors and practices as well as practicum and internship activities. Data show 100 percent of candidates meet the expected professional disposition requirements.

Table 4 in the IR shows a pass rate on the licensing test (PRAXIS II), which is required for program completion, of 100 percent across all initial teacher preparation programs, and 100 percent pass rate in the ACTFL OPI/WPT for candidates in both secondary education-world languages programs (IB/M and TCPCG). Reviews of electronic exhibits, SPA reports and rejoinders as well as SPA national recognition reports across all initial teacher preparation programs confirm that these programs have provided data and evidence to demonstrate candidates' content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

To illustrate, the Integrated Bachelor's and Master's (IB/M) program in mathematics has been cited by NCTM for its willingness to "reinstitute the mathematical modeling course [which] shows a faculty that is open to making changes to strengthen the program. Both the mathematics and the professional programs are strong." The Integrated Bachelor's and Master's (IB/M) program in social studies meets content, pedagogical and disposition standards related to "the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at appropriate school level" for the study of culture and cultural diversity; time, continuity, and change; people, places, and environment; individual development and identity; individuals, groups and institutions; power, authority, and governance; production, distribution, and consumption; and civic ideals and practices with the exceptions of science, technology and society; and global connections, which are "not met." NCSS also cites the cohort model that begins with candidate selection during their undergraduate program and concludes in an MAT degree and state licensure to be an area of strength in the program. ACEI nationally recognizes the Integrated Bachelor's and Master's (IB/M) in meeting content and pedagogical standards in areas of development, learning, and motivation in which candidate are expected to "know, understand, and use the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to development of children and young adolescents to construct learning opportunities that support individual students' development, acquisition of knowledge, and motivation;" reading, writing, and oral language; science, mathematics, and social studies with exceptions of the arts, health education, and physical education, which are "met with conditions." The Integrated Bachelor's and Master's (IB/M) and Teacher Certification Program for College Graduates (TCPCG) in science (7-12) is nationally recognized by NSTA and commended for its implementation of significant program improvements to strengthen the program since its previous program review. The program also shows that candidates have 100 percent pass rate in Praxis II, which is required for

program completion. Multiple assessments and data show evidence that candidates understand the content of NSTA standards and are able to use pedagogy and research to teach science concepts. The Integrated Bachelor and Master's (IB/M) in English (7-12) meets the NCTE standards on candidates' knowledge of content and ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Additional data from the graduate survey report 1994-2006 and employer survey report indicate satisfaction of candidates' content and pedagogical knowledge as well as their ability to create meaningful learning experiences for students, and all point to a positive impact of candidates on student learning. Finally, as evidenced through interviews with IB/M candidates on the main campus and the TCPCG candidates on regional campuses at Waterbury and West Hartford, the candidates articulate their ability to understand the relationship between their respective content, effective teaching, and assessments of student learning.

Advanced Preparation of Teachers and Other School Professionals

The unit offers a single advanced preparation program for teachers, the two-summers educational technology program. It offers advanced programs for other school professionals in reading and language arts, school psychology, two programs in educational leadership, speech and language pathology, and school counselor. Reading and language arts and school psychology are nationally recognized; the two programs in educational leadership are nationally recognized with conditions. Speech and language pathology and the school counselor programs are nationally accredited. It was determined in a discussion with NCATE prior to the visit that the educational technology programs should not be submitted for SPA review.

The SPA report and SPA national recognition report in reading and language arts indicate that the program meets all IRA standards using multiple assessments and two years of data to demonstrate that candidates have a strong knowledge base of the theoretical foundations of reading and writing; they are knowledgeable about research-based professional development. The SPA reviewers' report commends the program's use of the cumulative professional portfolio as "an impressive mechanism to enable each candidate to document what she knows, how she knows it and why it matters. The portfolio not only necessitates the candidate demonstrate content knowledge, but pedagogical skills, application of theory into practice, and connected reflection on and to any field work." Data from eight assessments including the professional knowledge and leadership portfolio, and the professional development initiative also provide evidence of candidates' content knowledge, pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions. Data from the documented study of student learning clearly demonstrate the candidates' effects on P-12 student learning. The SPA report notes that this is one of the strengths of the program in that this expectation is woven throughout the program and evidenced in most of the assessments. Through interviews with candidates and alumni in the program it is evident that the candidates have knowledge, understanding, and application of the standards.

The School Psychology program is nationally recognized. The SPA report and the SPA national recognition report provide evidence of candidates' content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn through candidates' exposure to a full range of activities expected of school psychologists throughout the practicum and internship program. Results of assessments of candidates' practicum and internship program appear to demonstrate the strongest evidence of their knowledge, pedagogy and dispositions. The SPA review notes that the program adequately addresses content which is a program strength. Additionally, candidates have knowledge of information sources and technology to advance their own learning; however, the SPA reviewers did not find evidence of candidates' ability to use the same in providing services to clients or to safeguard or enhance the quality of services. The

program also addresses most of the training domains although concerns have been raised related to assessments for some domains, such as the faculty ratings of school psychology interns and the ratings of their comprehensive master's qualifying examination that appear to be mismatched.

The Administrator Preparation program (UCAPP) and the Executive Leadership program are recognized with conditions. The SPA report and the SPA national recognition report of the UCAPP program suggest that the program's internship component is a strength in that it gives interns firsthand experiences involving many hours onsite and provides interns with time for reflection and provides for mentoring by a field supervisor. Technology is also a key component integral to the program. Candidates use an online program platform in engaging in professional dialogues with colleagues, professors, and their internship and clinical mentors. The SPA report and SPA reviewers' feedback and comments suggest that the hallmark of this program is the "integration of scholarship and research through coursework and the application of course content connected to best practices in district leadership" through the program's internship component. The addendum to the institutional report for NCATE, samples of revised assessment assignments, and interviews with UCAPP and ELP faculty indicate that revisions of assessment assignments and rubrics are in process to ensure that these directly align with the ELCC standards. The programs plan to submit completed samples of revised assessments and rubrics to the SPA for feedback after which the faculty will continue to revise the rest of the assessments and rubrics, ensuring alignment with ELCC standards as part of the rejoinder to SPA report.

Data from the graduate survey report 1994-2006 and employer survey reports indicate that overall, candidates have a thorough understanding of content, pedagogy, assessment of student learning, and dispositions delineated in professional standards.

1.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

There is evidence of a concerted effort across programs to ensure that assessments and rubrics align with professional standards and to continue collecting and analyzing data that can be used at strategic points to further strengthen candidates' understanding of content, pedagogy, assessment of student learning, and dispositions delineated in professional standards.

1.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not applicable for Spring 2010 pilot visits.

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

None

1.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs were cited at the previous visit.	

1.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs were cited at the previous visit.	

1.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

1.6 Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

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?

The Neag School of Education has an assessment system that collects, analyzes, and summarizes data on programs, unit operations and candidate performance. Clarification on the extent to which school partners are involved in the development and refinement of the assessment system was requested by the offsite team. Based on onsite interviews and review of the IR addendum, it is evident that school partners are involved with the development and refinement of the assessment system. Representatives from partner schools are members of subcommittees of the NSOE Assessment System Committee. Also, input from unit surveys completed by partners working with both advanced and initial programs has led to changes in both assessment tools and assessment processes. An additional area of offsite team concern was the degree to which data are shared with school partners. Data are shared between the unit and its partners. For example, the unit shares data with partners involved with various surveys and partners share student performance on mastery test data with the unit.

Unit assessments reflect the three components of the unit's conceptual framework—Learning, Leading, and Lighting the Way. Assessments that focus on content and pedagogical knowledge are aligned with the learning component of the conceptual framework. The leading component is reflected in assessments of candidate dispositions, including assessment items that appear on the alumni and employer surveys. The lighting the way component is evident in assessment of inquiry projects or school improvement programs, for example, as candidates' ability to contribute new knowledge to the profession is assessed.

The five transition points of the assessment system are admissions, entry into clinical practice, exit from clinical practice, program completion, and after program completion. Data are collected from programs at each transition point using both program-based and unit-wide assessments. Assessment tools include course grades, E-portfolios, internship and student teaching evaluations, standardized exams, and

alumni/employer surveys (see Table 6, IR pg 25). It was unclear to the offsite team what if any steps were taken for candidates unable to meet expectations required to move from one transition point to the next. During onsite visit interviews, faculty from initial and advanced programs explained that candidates experiencing difficulty moving to the next step in their program develop remediation plans that are monitored by program directors. Remediation plans are presented in conjunction with counseling and advising of candidates, and for some programs, remediation forms are used to facilitate the process.

The assessment system is evaluated and modified annually, and the unit regularly examines data and makes modifications as needed. The evaluation of the assessment system includes review of individual complaints by clinical supervisors, mentors, and teachers about candidates, and candidates' complaints about teachers. A second component of the annual assessment system review process focuses on ratings of the assessment system by assessment committee members. Data from this survey are summarized and then reviewed by the committee as a whole. Annual program reports completed by all programs in the unit serve as a final component for evaluation of the assessment system. These processes collectively inform the unit regarding how well the system is working and what aspects need revision.

The offsite team also requested clarification on the unit's process for testing the consistency, accuracy, fairness, and bias of assessments. The unit uses a process of multi-angulation to facilitate fairness, accuracy, consistency, and freedom of bias. Included in this process are reviews of technical manuals for standardized exams, use of university policies as a guide for developing classroom assessments and the inclusion of these polices on course syllabi, and contribution to and review of assessment and survey instruments by multiple unit members (e.g., assessment committee and department/program leaders). The unit incorporates processes and studies to ensure construct and predictive validity and reliability of the assessment instruments. In addition, the director of assessment follows guidelines from the Standards for Student Evaluation and the Program Evaluation Standards. The rate of return on surveys was an additional area of concern by the offsite team. The unit reports in the IR addendum that the rate of return on surveys range from 15 percent to 100 percent. They plan to employ a number of strategies to improve the rate for surveys where the responses are low. For example, they plan to conduct program level alumni and employer surveys (as opposed to unit wide surveys) in an effort to improve the response rate. Additional efforts will include "give-a-ways" in an effort to increase the number of returned surveys.

An additional area of concern expressed by the offsite team was the process by which data are shared with faculty and the format these processes take. The unit provides data on the quality of its programs, unit operations, and candidate performance to multiple audiences. The timelines for collecting, analyzing, and reporting assessment data may be annual, systematic, or cyclical. As an example, standardized tests, entry and exit surveys, and clinical and field experience evaluation data are collected, analyzed and reported annually. Other data (e.g., alumni and employer survey data) are collected, analyzed and reported periodically at scheduled intervals (e.g., every three years). Data for cyclical reports (e.g., data required for agencies such as NCATE) are collected, analyzed, and summarized based on cycles for reports required by various organizations.

Program leaders work with the assessment office to generate assessment reports that are needed for program discussions of aggregate candidate performance. Aggregate candidate performance data by program are also posted on the assessment website. The format of data depends on the purpose and audience of the data report requested. Faculty confirmed that they are able to request and access assessment data specific to their programs and that these data are often discussed at monthly program faculty meetings. Data are also posted on an assessment webpage and easily accessible to faculty.

The ways in which information technologies are used to support the assessment system was another area of concern for the offsite team. The unit uses a number of technologies to support the assessment system and based on a demonstration and presentation of unit assessment related technologies, each appears to

contribute to the assessment system in some way. Individual candidate performance data are available to faculty members on PeopleSoft and TaskStream. HuskyCT (the university's version of WebCt) is a course-based technology where faculty may store course information. The unit has recently developed the Student Information System (a system which continues to be refined), which is a single point interface of data from a number of data sources. The Student Information System is a comprehensive database that provides both individual candidate and aggregate data.

An extensive list of data driven changes is presented with the IR addendum. Changes at the course, program, and unit levels are included, along with data driven changes to the assessment system. For example, data from alumni surveys and student teaching evaluations led to changes in a classroom management course required of teacher education candidates. Alumni survey data led to a unit developed professional development effort to improve faculty's understanding of topics important for educating English language learners (ELL). This activity will subsequently lead to course revisions for improved preparation of candidates teaching ELL students. As a final example, the process for collecting cooperating teacher data was changed based on input from a cooperating teacher survey.

2.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The unit has engaged in continuous improvement since the last visit and has engaged in a number of activities to facilitate a "culture of assessment." A newly hired director of assessment led the unit and its partners in the development of a revised assessment plan. The revised plan more closely aligns with the unit's assessment system, and includes an increased emphasis on the assessment of advanced candidates and programs. A process has been developed for field testing and evaluating assessment tools and processes for reliability, validity, and bias before they are formally incorporated as part of the assessment system. The unit consistently seeks to improve the technologies used to support the assessment system. The development of the Student Information System supports the unit's need for a comprehensive database for storing and retrieving data. The unit has engaged processes that allow it to continuously evaluate the capacity and effectiveness of the assessment system.

2.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Steps that the unit has taken to move toward the target level include the use of assessments that extend into the first years of completers' practice (education expansion studies). The unit has engaged a number of strategies to report data publically, through publications such as the News Brief, and the display of aggregate data on an assessment website. Different technologies to improve and support the assessment system are operating, and plans are in place to continuously develop systems to better support assessment efforts. The unit evaluates the capacity and effectiveness of its assessment system based on data collected from candidates, alumni, school partners, and the unit assessment committee. The unit has developed procedures to ensure the validity, reliability, and lack of bias in its assessment procedures and a tool that includes a process for revising assessments if needed. Candidate performance at both the initial and advanced levels are evaluated using multiple program-based and unit-based assessments at multiple points before program completion and as candidates are engaged in professional practice. The unit has a well-defined and organized process of collecting, analyzing, and reporting data. Faculty regularly review data and make data-driven course and overall program changes. The unit uses data to ensure the quality of all programs, unit operations, and candidate performances.

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

Aspects of the collection, analysis, and evaluation of data, the organization and implementation of the assessment system, and use of data for program improvement are being addressed at the target level.

2.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs were cited at the previous visit.	

2.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs were cited at the previous visit.	

2.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None.	

2.6 Recommendation for Standard 2

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

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 in the unit's institutional report, observations by the onsite team, and interviews with unit faculty, school based faculty and candidates support the continuing effort of the unit to design, implement, and evaluate field experience and clinical practice.

The Integrated Bachelor/Master program, hereinafter known as IB/M, is a full-time program, located on the Storrs main campus that prepares candidates in both elementary and secondary areas for initial teacher certification. Candidates graduate with both bachelor's and master's degrees in their major field of study. Candidates begin field experiences in the junior year, do student teaching in the senior year, and work as interns in schools during the master's year. All field experience is accompanied by relevant seminars so that candidates are contemporaneously supported by seminars, school based faculty, and university clinical faculty and university supervisors. The information obtained from the institutional

report was confirmed during the onsite visit and in conversations with IB/M candidates and graduates and school based faculty as well as UConn faculty. In addition, current candidates expressed their enthusiastic appreciation of the ongoing support and interest of the faculty, supporting the candidates in their placements and encouraging them to pursue school based research, often helping them publish results. Candidates in the IB/M program have at least three distinctly different placements; one is in a suburban district and another in an urban district. In addition, candidates have one early placement in an area outside their area of study, either in level (e.g. a secondary candidate in an elementary setting) or subject area (e.g. an English major in a mathematics classroom). As part of their placements, candidates have experience with students with special needs.

The topic or subject for the research done in the intern (Masters) year can be chosen by the intern or the school or district in which the candidate is placed. Some superintendents reported that interns advanced continuing research in the district that the district would not have otherwise been able to afford; other candidates report choosing their own topic either individually or in conjunction with other interns placed in the school or district. In one urban school, interns advanced a longitudinal study begun by a former intern who is now the cooperating teacher for the project in the school.

Candidates from various years detailed discussions with faculty about policies or approaches that they had found frustrating, and candidates from following years indicated that said policies or approaches had been changed based on candidate feedback. This was reflected in other programs as well – that in the face of student discontent, the unit reviewed their practice and made such changes as made sense in the overall structure. The faculty noted that this attitude of reflection and consideration of feedback from participants in various programs was important in their planning.

Candidates in the TCPCG program, who enter the certification masters program with a bachelor's degree either from UConn or another institution, have a more concentrated program. Their first field experience is usually in a summer school program, where UConn asserts they work with a diverse student body -- those who are taking summer courses to get ahead and those who are struggling and "making up" courses at which they have been unsuccessful. Their internship placement occurs in any one of several school systems within a thirty mile radius of their UConn class site, i.e. around Waterbury or around Hartford. Taken together, towns within that area reflect diverse demographic and economic conditions, but any one system may not reflect a range of students. However, UConn asserts in their addendum that all TCPCG candidates have an experience in an urban setting under these guidelines.

The unit selects school based faculty from professional development schools (PDS), trained by State of Connecticut Department of Education cooperating teacher process (through either BEST or TEAM programs). The IB/M handbook details the expectations for all field experiences and for the duties of the cooperating teachers in the schools. One of these duties is to "communicate and collaborate with UConn faculty..." To fulfill this aspect of their service as cooperating teachers, they participate in university based training that is ongoing and delivered by university faculty. Identification as a PDS is limited and school based faculty have monthly meetings with a university faculty member and attend ongoing seminars.

The institutional report included information about the process followed by UCAPP candidates. Through interviews with groups of UCAPP graduates, the team confirmed that process. The UCAPP program for potential principals combines academic research with an ongoing placement with a working principal. The placement continues through the program and both the school principal and a mentor principal assigned by CAS (Connecticut Association of Schools) follow the candidate through the program. Each course taken involves an assignment that has to be worked on in the assigned placement. Graduates reported an ongoing struggle between the practical and research or academic aspects of the program. They noted that many of the adjunct faculty in the program were active or recently retired administrators

in the public schools. Each course is accompanied by assignments that lead to further involvement in the assigned school, as well as reflection and receiving specific feedback. While the placement is ongoing, it is not full time and the candidates tend to be full time employees in other districts. The placement depends on availability rather than the demographics of the school site. Summer hours are completed in conjunction with courses scheduled to run concurrently with the placement. Several candidates mentioned the benefit of having one placement over the course of the program and the opportunity to form supportive relationships that will help throughout one's career. The graduates also spoke of the ongoing supportive contact with university faculty or mentor principals beyond graduation. Many graduates mentioned calling former instructors from the program for advice in the graduates' current jobs and receiving support or advice on issues they face in day to day operations.

The thirteen month Educational Leadership program (ELP) requires two internships as well as ongoing reflection. One internship occurs within the candidate's current district; the other internship is done in another school district. The outside placement has given rise to some disputes and must be agreed to by a candidate's employing district.

School counseling candidates follow the standards and model approved by the American School Counseling Association. Candidates for School Psychologist can follow two pathways: one results in a sixth year, the other in an extended program ((eight years) leading to the Ph.D. Field experiences meet APA and NASP standards and include school experience, possibly in a school related clinic or agency, and an internship involving work with a client and research. School counseling candidates and recent graduates reported in interviews that they found their own placements in schools, which had to support the three domains of the program. They must be supervised by a certified counselor. They are not required to work in both urban and suburban settings. The program emphasis on serving poor minorities guides the placement.

School psychology candidates and recent graduates select from a pool of possible sites. They may complete the experience in either a suburban or urban setting. Both school psychology and school counseling candidates reported they received feedback from school and university personnel. Reviews include taped counseling sessions between candidates and students.

The offsite team raised a question about how school based faculty are chosen and evaluated in their role as cooperating teachers. The university asserts that the teacher evaluation form is used to the extent possible in any particular district, given union concerns over district use of such reports as a part of teacher evaluation. Teacher evaluation is currently a matter of local district decision making within state guidelines. UConn says it is working with the districts to formulate an acceptable document and establish boundaries between cooperating teacher and classroom teacher evaluation. The university does use a variety of surveys with different constituencies for feedback purposes. Some of these surveys have indicated a need for closer and more specific communication between university faculty and school based faculty, particularly around issues of expectations and candidate performance. The monthly meetings and ongoing support provided school based faculty is one way to address these needs.

Data from these surveys and feedback from candidates have indicated needs in several areas. UConn has responded to an expressed need for more classroom management knowledge and skills by establishing a course providing both theory and strategies. Rising needs of students who are English language learners have led to the UConn faculty initiating an internal professional development plan, which includes a week of professional development with leaders in the field and a continuing faculty research group on topics related to language acquisition and the role of language in learning. Other changes to programs, for example in special education and school counseling, reflect the university's response to issues raised in surveys and ongoing conversation.

Integrated field experiences depend on field experiences occurring in conjunction with seminars and with support provided by clinical faculty, tenure track professors, university supervisors and school based faculty. As part of the seminar experience, candidates maintain electronic portfolios based on their work in the schools, with opportunities for structured reflection and feedback from a variety of faculty and school based personnel. The unit uses surveys completed by candidates to measure their satisfaction with the integrated field experiences, and conversations with candidates indicate that they value the continual contact with university based faculty during these experiences. Other surveys collected by the unit include evaluators' comments on candidates' knowledge and skills working with diverse learners. Data related to candidates' contribution to K-12 student learning is an issue many programs struggle with and UConn is not an exception in this area. The education faculty continues to discuss better ways to assess the impact of the candidates on K-12 students' learning. Currently, candidates' impact on student learning is assessed as the candidates compile and maintain their electronic portfolios on Taskstream which is accessible to candidates' instructors. K-12 student learning is documented within the candidates' electronic portfolios which include lesson plans, videos of classroom interaction, student assessment and candidate reflection. Cooperating school personnel report that candidates are observed or are in direct conversation with supervisors over ten times per placement (for the longer, more sustained placements). The SPA report includes reference to the documentation in the electronic portfolios. Interviews with interns based in the schools revealed that they are specific about student learning and strategies that have led to student learning. Several ongoing research projects in the schools in Hartford follow the influence of instructional strategies on mathematical learning and writing development.

Candidates in the educational technology program are practicing classroom teachers. The program involves one week of "live" classroom instruction, followed by online classes and communication for the balance of the candidates' instruction in the summer. During the school year, the educational technology candidates apply technology to support student learning in their classrooms. This integration of technology is documented in Taskstream electronic portfolios, which are evaluated for the role that technology serves student learning needs in supporting student learning, and not for the quality of student learning. This year-long application of learning in the candidate's classroom is called a "practicum," but it is conducted in the teacher's home classroom. UConn reports that these classrooms are located throughout New England and as far away as North Carolina. Both UConn faculty and the educational technology candidates' peers view the work and provide comments in the formative process.

Memoranda of agreement exist for other school professionals programs. UConn reports that memoranda for placements of initial teacher preparation programs do not exist, as arrangements are based on agreements going back some twenty years, but assert that the ongoing contact between UConn clinical faculty in the schools provide the evidence of agreement. Representatives of the partner schools serve on Schools as Clinics Committee, and meet monthly, and also on the Teacher Education Policy Board. UConn, after a review of NCATE standards in this area, has begun to work through the Schools as Clinic Committee on a template of new agreements.

3.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Discussions and interviews with school partners, candidates and graduates from the initial teacher preparation programs and other school professionals programs as well as with a broad range of UConn faculty reveal a culture that integrates continuous feedback and reflection on procedures and programs. If changes are indicated, adjustments may occur in the next cohort (i.e. order of courses in the special education curriculum or the number of practica in the school psychology program) or lead to ongoing professional development among the faculty (i.e. the planned professional development in integrating strategies for English language learners and examining the SIOP method of instruction). Multiple placement opportunities for candidates expose them to different school settings and as the demographics

of those schools change, UConn faculty assist the candidates in responding to diversity in the classroom, particularly in exceptionality, language, ethnicity, and racial makeup.

Placement of clinical faculty in partner school districts allows for facile response to the needs of district. One urban district partnered with UConn changed to a full choice system and went from three comprehensive high schools to thirteen focused high schools of choice; UConn and its candidates had to adjust to the challenges and possibilities created by the district choice. The onsite presence of clinical faculty assisted in the process of adjusting.

UConn, as a research institution, promotes ongoing study and research by its faculty in the School of Education and counts among its faculty many leading educational thinkers. These faculty influence the content of courses and candidates' experiences in the partner schools. Teachers in partner school districts can access the expertise of UConn faculty through planned, ongoing meetings, and professional development opportunities.

3.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Continual improvement is the hallmark of this program. Consultation with and feedback from candidates, school based faculty, graduates from all programs, and UConn faculty is sought out and structures maintained to gather information.

School based faculty are represented on the Schools as Clinics Committee, which meets monthly; they are also on the Teacher Education Policy Board. This committee discusses all aspects the program. UConn provides professional development for school based faculty throughout the year. Several districts report collaborating with UConn on determining research topics for interns placed in the district.

Field experiences are documented in candidates' Taskstream electronic folders, and reflection on all aspects of practice, at all levels of experience, is required as part of the process. Professional dispositions are an aspect of the structured reflections required. During clinical practice, candidates are integrated into the life of the school. Student teachers are in the schools from the beginning of the school year, even if the student teaching placement begins in the spring, in a deliberate effort to keep the student teachers anchored in the year-long climate of the school. Candidates are observed by school based faculty, university supervisors, and clinical faculty multiple times during all placements, but especially in student teaching and internship. During internships (master level), contact with UConn clinical staff is frequent as is contact with school based faculty. Interns often share the progress of their research with school based faculty. Educational technology candidates' work is shared with their professors and peers in Taskstream for formative feedback on using technology to support student learning needs.

Interviews with candidates in all programs demonstrated that candidates evidence knowledge and skills, and in particular dispositions to help all students learn. In interviews candidates and graduates uniformly spoke about student learning affirmatively and with confidence of having made an impact on student learning. In the IB/M program, candidates reported that they have at least one experience in a special education setting so that they understand the impact of student learning needs across the continuum. All candidates for the initial certificate have experience in both suburban and urban settings and address the needs of students with diverse linguistic and learning needs and those who come from diverse racial/ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds.

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

Strengths were described in 3.3.

3.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs were cited at the previous visit.	

3.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs were cited at the previous visit.	

3.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

3.6 Recommendation for Standard 3

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met ▼
Advanced Preparation	Met ▼

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?

The University of Connecticut addresses the importance of diversity in its curriculum, faculty, school based faculty, candidates, and placement of candidates in sites for field experiences at both the initial and advanced levels. Proficiencies related to diversity can be found in the conceptual framework and the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching and the state draft of the Common Core of Leading which is reflective of national, state, and institutional standards. These state standards include understanding the needs of diverse populations of students. The standards emphasize having skills in working with exceptional students, including students who are academically challenged as well as those with gifted and talented exceptionalities; students from diverse socio-economical backgrounds; those with language acquisition issues, as well as diverse cultural backgrounds and they require an understanding of the family and community values that influence each child. It is expected that candidates will be aware of

how student learning is influenced by these factors and have the interpersonal skills to support the learning of students of diverse backgrounds. Further, it is expected that candidates will develop proficiencies in becoming leaders in the schools in which they teach to advocate for educational equity for all students; to examine and understand the complexities of cross-cultural encounters in school settings; to analyze ethical issues in cross-cultural teaching and learning; to develop an awareness and sensitivity to issues in cross-cultural encounters, and to examine theories and skills of cross-cultural teaching, learning, and/or counseling, when appropriate. Unit candidates were validated as assuming leadership roles in buildings in which they were placed through interviews with site based faculty, unit supervisors, and candidates themselves feeling prepared to assume such roles.

The unit emphasizes the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classrooms, gender equity, language proficiencies, and multiculturalism in school and society. Syllabi of required courses found in the electronic exhibits demonstrate the extensive coverage of the wide range of competencies expected of candidates. These competencies are supported through the reflective nature of assignments.

Regardless of candidates' ultimate area of certification, they are provided with clinical experiences that include placements in elementary and secondary school, urban and suburban environments and work with students with a range of abilities and disabilities. Candidates are purposely placed in settings other than those in which they will ultimately teach to support the unit belief that the series of diverse clinical experiences in partnership schools is essential for candidates who become highly skilled, caring, multicultural educators. Interviews with candidates support that this requirement is a valuable component of their preparation to work in any setting. In addition, the exposure to diverse environments they would not ordinarily choose has lead many candidates to discover an interest in and desire to work in an environment not previously considered. Partnerships with local districts called Professional Development Centers allows for intense collaboration between the unit and the local school; three of the partnership districts are in culturally diverse urban communities in which candidates will experience those challenges and issues that typically face urban schools.

There is a regular review of a variety of assessment data by candidates and faculty that focuses on the candidates' ability to work with all students; this review informs the development of plans for improving candidates' practice and unit programs. In addition to grades in coursework and self report survey results, candidates' proficiency in these areas is demonstrated in school settings during their clinical experiences and evaluated by school-based site supervisors in collaboration with program faculty. Interviews with site based faculty and supervisors indicate an inordinate strength in the candidates' preparedness to work with students who represent diversity. Numerous statements were made by site based faculty stressing that unit candidates demonstrate superior competencies and dispositions that make them particularly effective in diverse settings. Through feedback from candidates it was established that there is a need to enhance candidates' ability to work with ELL students. Unit faculty, through the Teachers for a New Era grant, scheduled training to increase their knowledge and skill to instruct candidates in working with ELL students. The training is scheduled for a full week at the end of May 2010. Seeing the need to enhance the candidates' experiences, unit faculty are willing to give of their own time to develop their ability to deliver instruction to accomplish that goal.

In 2006, the unit's diversity plan was approved by the provost, and the unit established a Dean's Advisory Council on Diversity. The council examines unit culture and hiring practices. The Council has provided the unit leadership specific objectives in recruiting a more diverse faculty. There have been some gains which demonstrate a more diverse faculty since that time. At present, the unit faculty is 53 percent female (42 percent in 2002), and 14 percent of the faculty are from underrepresented populations, up from 12 percent in 2002. The diversity plan outlines strategies that indicate significant efforts are being made to recruit additional minority faculty. The unit continues to work toward greater diversity and while the unit indicates it "does not have a 'quota' to meet," efforts are being made during

faculty searches to attract well-qualified candidates who can bring diverse perspectives, backgrounds, and experiences to the institution. The unit is committed to reducing and, wherever possible, eliminating actual and apparent underrepresentation of minorities and women in all areas and programs. In the new academic plan, the unit has established the goal to increase the number and percentage of faculty and staff who are of underrepresented and culturally diverse populations by five to 10 percent by the year 2014.

Many of the unit's faculty members have served as K-12 classroom teachers and/or administrators in schools with diverse students. Two of the nationally recognized urban school reform organizations, Accelerated Schools and Atlas Schools, are housed in the unit. The recently established Institute for Urban School Improvement has expanded the unit's capacity in employing faculty members with extensive knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with students with diverse backgrounds. Numerous examples were given of specific professors who are working in this area and bringing their voices to the unit to benefit candidates. Candidates in the Integrated Bachelor's and Master's initial teacher preparation program have the option of studying in London for one semester They are placed in East London's most socio-economically challenging and diverse schools with children of Britain's recent immigrants from Asia and the Middle East. In the initial and advanced teacher preparation programs, candidates have experiences working with faculty and teachers of diverse backgrounds as they are placed in urban and suburban schools throughout their time in the program. "Closing the achievement gap" has been set as one of the unit's priorities.

The unit has an initiative called CommPACT. The name is a combination that stands for the alliance of Community, Parents, Administrators, Children, and Teachers. This initiative has led to the hiring of two African Americans who are leading experts in urban education. Further, CommPACT is a unique partnership with the American Federation of Teachers – Connecticut, Connecticut Association of Urban School Superintendents, Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents, Connecticut Education Association, Connecticut Federation of School Administrators, and the unit. While remaining accountable to their local districts, schools developed by CommPACT are pre-existing schools that have been granted autonomy in governance, budgeting, and curriculum. Together, the partners work collaboratively with experts in education to support eight schools identified through No Child Left Behind to be struggling. Supports are in place to uniquely encourage and enhance the teaching and learning environments in low achieving schools by employing evidence-based practice in all aspects of school operation, including governance, decision making, and instruction. The NEA Foundation has given the unit a grant to support this endeavor.

Candidates are encouraged to participate in events that the unit co-sponsors with the H. Fred Simons African American Cultural Center, Asian American Cultural Center, Puerto Rican and Latin American Cultural Center, Women's Center, and the Rainbow Center. Candidates also have the opportunity to take diversity-related courses offered by the Institute for African American Studies, the Asian American Studies Institute, and the Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies. Additionally, a program entitled "Dedicated Educators Emphasizing Diversity" (DEED) was created in 2006. The goal of DEED is to have initial program candidates gather to discuss diversity-related books and films, share their learning experiences, and work in high needs schools in order to do special research projects. This is in addition to all required clinical experiences.

Diversity of candidates is not reflective of the geographic area in which the unit is located, but there is substantial representation of underrepresented populations in the candidates enrolled in the unit. Additionally, the unit has also obtained a grant from the U. S. Department of Education (Office of Educational Research and Improvement) with additional support from the Carnegie Corporation of New York's "Teachers for a New Era" grant to launch the GlobalEd Project, which is an interdisciplinary project between the Departments of Political Science and Educational Psychology. The GlobalEd Project

was to scientifically evaluate perceived gender differences in leadership and decision making styles and values and in approaches to technology. This money is targeted to increase diversity in unit candidates. The unit's Advisory Council on Diversity includes faculty, staff, students, state education policy makers, practicing teachers, and administrators. The advisory council and the unit's leadership established goals and objectives related to recruitment and retention of candidates from traditionally underrepresented groups. The 2006 unit diversity plan proposed 12 strategies to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups. Thus far, the unit has worked with its professional development schools to establish a young teachers club and is currently working with the institution's Office of Undergraduate Admissions to ensure a smooth and articulated pathway into teaching once high school students enter the university. The unit has worked with the university's First Year Experience Program to open a section for students interested in becoming educators. The unit has newly hired an employee to work with underrepresented, high poverty high school students to encourage them to pursue a career in education. These students are brought on campus for programs that are designed to show them that attending an institution of higher education is an achievable goal. The retention rate of minority candidates in the unit is 94 percent compared to 92 percent for the general population.

The unit has expanded its endowment showing an increase in its annual scholarship awards from $50,000 to approximately $500,000. The unit has also allocated an annual sum of $50,000 from the Neag Endowment to help ensure candidates from diverse backgrounds will have the necessary financial support to enter the unit or to continue their candidate status until they successfully complete the programs. The unit also received grant money for minority candidate recruitment from the Hearst Foundation ($100,000) and the Carnegie Corporation of New York ($5 million). The unit worked with its colleagues at the School of Arts and Sciences to design and implement a diversity minor so that students who are interested in becoming educators can be exposed to issues of diversity during their general education study period

Candidates have extensive opportunities to reflect on their practice as it applies to issues of diversity that affect teaching and student learning as individuals or with peers and supervisors. Candidates receive at least two hours of supervision each week on site or on campus through their entire field experience. At this time, there is extensive feedback given that helps to hone the candidates' skills in working with students who represent diversity. Combining the seminars with supervision means that candidates are in constant reflection on their practice.

4.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The unit continues the work of recruiting diverse faculty. Their diversity plan has a 12 step outline of activities that are currently under way in order to achieve this goal. Increased funding and partnerships have augmented their ability to create an environment in which candidates are diverse and have expanded opportunities to interact in diverse placements and with diverse faculty.

4.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Candidates in the unit work collaboratively with unit faculty in K-12 classrooms to transform schools and address the achievement gap of students in high-poverty, low-income schools. They are constantly being required to reflect on their performance as individuals and as part of a cohort group. Clinical experiences are designed to be diverse and expose candidates to a wide variety of experiences.

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

Strengths are identified in 4.3.

4.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs were cited at the previous visit.	

4.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs were cited at the previous visit.	

4.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

4.6 Recommendation for Standard 4

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met ▼
Advanced Preparation	Met ▼

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?

Faculty in the unit are highly qualified for the positions they hold and are considered as instructional role models by candidates and recent graduates. According to IR Table 1: Professional Education Faculty, the unit employs 55 faculty members who are full–time university employees; 54 work full-time within the unit and one (the dean of School of Education) is part-time in the unit but full-time in the university, holding joint appointment in the mathematics department in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Eight clinical faculty are included in the unit's full-time faculty. They are full-time instructional faculty and their roles in the IB/M and TCPCG programs are primarily instruction; their job descriptions do not include research expectations although in interviews they reported conducting

research, sometimes in collaboration with tenure track faculty. Some serve in administrative capacities, e.g. as director of school/university practices. They attend faculty meetings, serve on committees, etc., as do tenure track faculty. (see page 40 of the addendum IR for additional information). Thirty-seven part-time employees (adjuncts) and 14 graduate teaching assistants are listed. Some adjuncts teach courses in the initial programs, often in courses that provide the context of schooling for candidates at the junior level. Most adjuncts are assigned to teach in the UCAPP and ELP programs, and for some cohorts they have provided the majority of course instruction. Thirty university supervisors are also employed by the unit.

Faculty in the professional education unit are uniquely qualified for their positions. With the exception of two clinical faculty members, all institution based faculty members hold terminal degrees appropriate for their assignments. Clinical faculty members are licensed in the fields in which they teach or supervise. School-based cooperating teachers must meet Connecticut State Department of Education requirements, which include an official training program for this position. Mentors and supervisors for other school professional programs are recommended by administrators and partner organizations including the Connecticut Association of Schools. Review of Table 11, Faculty Qualification Summary, in the IR appendix, links to faculty vitae on the unit's website (faculty/staff directory), and interviews provide evidence of faculty qualifications. Vitae provided for more than 40 adjunct faculty indicate that they are highly qualified for the positions to which they are assigned. The professional development school model of the initial programs keeps faculty contemporary in their professional experiences.

Faculty members model best professional practices in their instruction, reflecting the conceptual framework and professional and state standards in the goals/objectives of their coursework. Their research informs instruction in areas such as reading recovery, positive behaviors support, and responses to interventions in which unit faculty are acknowledged experts. The conceptual framework themes –- learning, leading, and lighting the way –- provide the basis for reflection, critical thinking, problem solving and professional dispositions to be developed in courses and clinical practice. Technology is a focus for both faculty and candidates. A review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty, candidates and recent graduates confirm that faculty model a variety of instructional strategies and use multiple forms of assessment. Course evaluations provided further evidence of high quality instruction. During interviews it became clear that the faculty model collaborative team work. A process is in place that allows for the analysis of data, including course evaluations and feedback from candidates and school based faculty, and discussions for the purpose of determining what, if any, changes in program or process need to be made to enhance the experience of candidates.

Faculty scholarship meets university expectations at this research extensive institution, where faculty are required to conduct and publish research in areas aligned to the preparation of education professionals, as described in the guidelines for merit, promotion, and tenure (Exhibit 5.2). A review of vitae, annual reports of the unit, and listings of faculty presentations at AERA illustrate the breadth and depth of faculty scholarship. Samples of faculty scholarship available in electronic exhibits and on campus confirm that unit faculty are highly regarded scholars and leaders in their specialty areas. Three faculty members hold endowed chairs and 11 received major grants. Candidates in advanced programs reported that faculty encouraged them to become involved in research and provided extensive support to them in their initial efforts.

Team members confirmed the faculty service, especially that which occurs in public school, community and institutional settings, is an expectation that is being met at a high level. A review of vitae and interviews with faculty and school and community partners demonstrate that faculty are involved in professionally appropriate activities on campus, throughout the state, and in the profession. The presence of teacher education faculty on a weekly basis in public schools demonstrates the unit's commitment to service.

One unique aspect of the unit is the melding of research and service. An action research project is required during candidates' internships in their fifth year. School based faculty indicate an interest in a particular issue to be researched that reflects the needs of the school. A match is then made with a school's and a candidate's interest areas. Partnered with unit faculty, the research is conducted on an ongoing basis and can be handed off to another intern if the project needs to continue for completion. The results are shared with the site, giving the staff valuable information from which they can make data based decisions to direct a course of action. This research gives candidates experience in collaborating with unit faculty and site based faculty to provide service to the community.

Faculty evaluations are systematic and used to improve faculty performance. Candidates evaluate all courses regardless of the category of instructor who is teaching. Evaluations are analyzed and faculty use the results to inform their development. Interventions occur before employment decisions are made. Full-time faculty are evaluated according to university policies on faculty professional responsibilities; the process is conducted in accordance with the AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement. Clinical faculty, who are expected to participate in program design and assessment, to attend program faculty meetings, and engage in activities in support of the program and its candidates, are evaluated on an annual basis by department chairs. Adjunct faculty are evaluated by candidates in courses. The unit makes efforts to remediate the performance of adjuncts, but will not retain those who do not meet high expectations for instruction. The strong financial support for faculty development, discussed in the off-site report in Standard 6, is documented in the IR (both Standards 5 and 6), attachments and the electronic exhibits.

Onsite team members focused on evidence needs and questions cited in the off-site report in the following areas in their review of exhibits and interviews with faculty and administrators: (1) perceptions of faculty evaluations and professional development; (2) samples of scholarly work; (3) acculturation of part-time faculty into the work of the unit and evaluation of their work; and (4) faculty evaluation processes and use of the resulting data. As indicated above, the team verified that faculty, including part-time faculty are evaluated in a systematic way according to university and unit policies. Part-time faculty play important roles in planning, implementation, and assessment of the unit's programs. Of special note is the work of eight clinical faculty members who teach methods courses, conduct research, and publish their findings. They are evaluated on an annual basis by department heads. It is important to note that, in interviews with candidates and school based faculty, the dedication and availability of unit faculty was repeatedly cited as exemplary and a reason for the success of the candidates in the unit programs.

5.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Not applicable.

5.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

The on-site team concurs with the off-site report that cites the following areas in which the unit is moving toward target levels:

With the exception of two clinical faculty, all 92 who teach in the program have terminal degrees. The weekly work of teacher education faculty in professional development schools demonstrates target level in contemporary professional experiences for faculty in this program.

Faculty, in meeting university standards for merit, promotion and tenure, are producing scholarly work related to teaching and learning, aligned to the conceptual framework and national and state standards.

Unit systematic and comprehensive evaluation procedures, based upon university and AAUP policies, demonstrate movement toward target in element 5e.

Unit budgets, discussed in Standard 6, provide financial support for the target level in element 5f because the unit has policies and practices that encourage all professional education faculty to be continuous learners.

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

Scholarship demonstrated by faculty in obtaining external funding and publishing results of research is exemplary.

5.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs were cited at the previous visit.	

5.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs were cited at the previous visit.	

5.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

5.6 Recommendation for Standard 5

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

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 Neag School of Education (NSOE) is designated as the professional education unit with responsibility for all initial and advanced preparation programs, including Speech and Language Pathology, located in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. It is administered by the NSOE dean who has responsibility for ensuring that professional education programs are organized, unified and coordinated, according to the teacher education governance structure chart. Candidates at Storrs and regional campuses at Stamford, Waterbury, and West Hartford have access to advising and counseling; accurate materials for recruitment, admission and retention are available on line and in print. Despite a downturn in state funding, the unit has maintained, and in some instances enhanced, its programs and support for faculty through a combination of a generous donation by a university alumnus, a robust grants and contracts program, and foundation funds. The 20-year investment program of $2.3 billion in the university's infrastructure has enhanced the physical plant and resulted in state-of-the-art technology for unit activities on the Storrs campus and at the regional sites. The Gentry Building, which houses NSOE administration, faculty offices, and classrooms was recently expanded with a $20 million addition and a $10 renovation to existing facilities.

The onsite team validated the institutional report and confirmed its findings via interviews with candidates, recent graduates, school partners, unit faculty and administrators. It reviewed the addendum to the IR, including additional evidence in links and attachments in answering questions raised by the offsite team in its report. A team member visited campuses at Waterbury and West Hartford prior to the onsite visit to assess resources (technology and library).

The team focused on areas in which the offsite team had questions that required additional evidence to answer: (1) Policies on organization and governance, including those structures to facilitate coordination with faculty in other colleges, and the groups who oversee the professional preparation programs; (2) information about faculty who teach in the TCPCG program at the regional campus sites and in the ELP and UCAPP programs; (3) procedures for providing accurate and up-to-date information and advising for candidates, especially in the two approaches to initial certification; (4) unit budgets for assessment, technology ,and professional development and budgets of comparable units; (5) summary of faculty workloads; and (6) adequacy of facilities, including those at regional campuses.

1. The addendum IR, new exhibits, and interviews with faculty and administrators from the NSOE and other colleges involved in the preparation of teachers, the Teacher Education Policy Board and other school partners clarified the off-site team's questions related to organization and governance. According to the addendum to the IR (page 41), the teacher education faculty, including content faculty in arts and sciences, agriculture, and fine arts (music) function as one program faculty to oversee the two initial programs – IB/M and TCPGG; they meet monthly.The programs are governed by the Teacher Education Policy Board and the director of teacher education, currently the associate dean in NSOE.The director of teacher education is a position with a five-year appointment. Members of the board include nine NSOE faculty and administrators, two public school representatives, and two candidates. Board members who were interviewed described procedures by which changes are made to the initial programs and the board's relationship to the teacher education faculty group. The other school professional programs are governed by program faculty within their respective departments – the UCAPP and ELP by the faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership and managed by a program director, and the school counseling and school psychology programs by faculty in the Department of Educational Psychology. Candidates in the Speech and Language Pathology program, housed in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, are recommended for certification to the Connecticut State Department of Education by the NSOE. Candidates in the master's program are admitted to the Speech Language Pathology graduate program and apply to the NSOE for admission in order to take 12 semester hours in professional

education, three semester hours in special education and six credits of student teaching; all courses have prefixes from the NSOE. Communication between the program and the NSOE appears to be limited, with state regulations, rather than coordination and collaboration, dictating the relationship.

2. The unit employs clinical faculty and adjunct faculty, in roles defined in Standard 5.1. Clinical faculty interviewed by the team described their assignments as teaching in the initial programs, working with IB/M and TCPCG candidates in schools, and coordinating activities between the NSOE and school partners. Some also supervise student teachers; one holds the position of director of school university practices. Clinical faculty teach the majority of courses at the Waterbury and West Hartford campuses during the fall and spring semesters; summer courses are usually taught by faculty who teach on the Storrs campus.

Information about adjunct faculty teaching in the UCAPP and ELP programs is found in the addendum in 5.5 (3). According to the addendum to the IR (page 42, 6.5 [3]), the faculty in the UCAPP and ELP programs on regional campuses are both tenure/tenure-track and clinical faculty members. However, candidates and recent graduates stated in interviews that approximately 80% of courses for some cohorts were taught by adjuncts; NSOE administrators confirmed that several faculty members from the department retired within a short period of time and that some recent hires had left the department, accounting for those numbers for a brief time period. Graduates characterized the instruction provided by adjuncts as timely, relevant, and applicable to their new positions. Adjuncts reported that they met with full-time faculty regularly; when several sections of a course are taught by adjuncts, they meet as a group with faculty to ensure continuity of instruction across the sections. Although the number of adjunct faculty is high, their qualifications and the unit's coordination of their instruction enhance the educational experience for candidates.

3. The accuracy and consistency of information provided to candidates, found on the university website and in publications, was verified in interviews. Candidates on the Storrs campus and regional campuses reported that advising was accurate and allowed them to complete their programs in a timely fashion. Unit policies on student services were described by advisors and administrators in interviews. Advisors and faculty work on candidate remediation plans, as described in Standard 2.1 of this report.

4. Unit budgets for assessment, technology, and professional development and budgets of comparable units, i.e., those with clinical experiences (nursing, pharmacy and social work) were available to the team during the on-site visit. The budget for preparation of an education professional, on a per capita basis, is considerably larger than that of nursing and comparable to that of social work. However, pharmacy is funded at a much higher level. The NSOE budget increased by more than $7 million over the last four year period, attributed to increased grant activity and the addition of a program in the NSOE but outside the unit.

5. Summary of faculty workloads, a required document for pilot visits under the continuous improvement guidelines, was not included in the addendum or new exhibits. The document provided onsite indicated that full-time faculty in Curriculum and Instruction (tenured, tenure track, and clinical) taught 46 courses for an average of 2.5 courses in fall and 42 courses for an average of 2.3 in spring semester 2009-2010. Adjunct faculty teaching in this department averaged 1.1 and 1.0 courses over the same time period. Full-time faculty in Educational Administration averaged 1.0 course in fall (six courses total) and .83 (five courses) total in spring, with adjunct faculty averaging 1.0 courses each semester; adjuncts taught a total of 26 courses in 2009-2010. Full-time educational psychology faculty taught a total of 113 courses, with averages of 2.03 and 1.7 for the two semesters.

6. Team members found that facilities, including library facilities and holdings at regional campuses, and technology available for program faculty and candidates at the four campuses supported faculty and

candidate work. A team member visited the regional campuses at Waterbury and West Hartford; team members toured NSOE and the Baddidge Library at Storrs and interviewed the area head of university libraries and director of technology.

6.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The unit received a five-year "Teachers for a New Era" grant for $5 million from the Carnegie Corporation that allowed it to review the content requirements for teacher candidates. The grant, which currently continues with less funding annually, has led to collaborations between the NSOE and College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, whose deans have agreed to fund the initiatives after grant money is discontinued.

The unit has been exceptionally successful in securing funding from grants and foundations to improve its programs, provide research opportunities and expand its interactions with school partners. It generated an average of $54 million over the last three years from grants and contracts.
State funding from a 20-year program to invest in infrastructure has provided the unit with resources to improve facilities and technology to strengthen candidate performance and programs.

6.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

The on-site team concurred with the offsite team's finding that the unit's ability to generate external funds has been exemplary and has supported its candidates, programs, faculty and their professional development opportunities.

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

The unit's budget allocations – state funding augmented by grants and foundation support – permit faculty teaching, scholarship and service that extend to the professional development school partners.

6.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs were cited at the previous visit.	

6.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs were cited at the previous visit.	

6.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale

None	

6.6 Recommendation for Standard 6

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met ▼
Advanced Preparation	Met ▼

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

Documents Reviewed

Persons Interviewed

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

NCATE_All_sign_in_sheets_-_final.doc
Exhibits List

See **Attachments** panel below.

(Optional) State Addendum: