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OVERVIEW

This section sets the context for the visit. It should clearly state the mission of the institution. It should also describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses, off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs for professional school personnel.

I. Overview and Conceptual Framework

I.1 Summarize the institution's mission, historical context, and unique characteristics (e.g., land grant, HBCU or religious).

The University of Connecticut (UConn) is a premier public research university. It was founded in 1881. In 1893, the Connecticut State legislature designated what then became the Storrs Agricultural College as the recipient of federal land-grant funding, replacing Yale University. The University has grown into a nationally ranked university with more than 22,595 undergraduate students, 7,879 graduate and professional students, 1,969 full-time faculty members, and 6,474 full time staff members, and 217,000 alumni. U.S. News and World Report ranks the University among the best public universities in New England and as the 19th public university in the country.

The University encompasses 14 Schools and Colleges, offering eight undergraduate degrees in more than 102 majors, 17 graduate degrees in 75 fields of study, and six graduate professional degree programs in Law, Medicine, Dental Medicine, and Pharmacy. The University's research activities advance knowledge in a range of academic disciplines. The Carnegie Foundation classifies the institution as a "Research University (Very High Research Activity)," one of only two public universities in New England holding this distinction.

The University of Connecticut's flagship campus is located on a 4,108-acre setting in Storrs, Connecticut. The University's facilities have been undergoing a huge transformation, thanks to a $2 billion commitment from Connecticut's state legislature. [Exhibit I.1: UCONN 2014 Fact Sheet]

As part of the 1939 reorganization of the University, the School of Education was formally created. The School of Education received a vote of confidence in 1999 when Ray Neag, an alumnus of the University, committed $21 million to the School of Education for faculty and program support and development. Mr. Neag's transformational gift to the School, which now bears his name, was the largest ever given to a school of education nationally, as well as the largest single gift to a public university in New England.

In 2006, UConn Board of Trustees adopted a revised institutional mission statement. The mission states:

The University of Connecticut is dedicated to excellence demonstrated through national and international recognition. As Connecticut's public research university, through freedom of academic inquiry and expression, we create and disseminate knowledge by means of scholarly and creative achievements, graduate and professional education, and outreach. Through our focus on teaching and learning, the University helps every student grow intellectually and become a contributing member of
the state, national, and world communities. Through research, teaching, service, and outreach, we embrace diversity and cultivate leadership, integrity, and engaged citizenship in our students, faculty, staff, and alumni. As our state's flagship public university, and as a land and sea grant institution, we promote the health and well-being of Connecticut's citizens through enhancing the social, economic, cultural, and natural environments of the state and beyond.

The mission of the unit is to develop candidates with strong ethical standards who become educational leaders dedicated to improving education for all children, and by doing so, will strive to improve and enhance the quality of life in the ever-changing society.

In 2013, the unit has begun to update the Neag School of Education Academic Plan [Exhibit I.2] and contributed to the University's new Academic Plan [Exhibit I.3], which was approved by the Board of Trustees in April, 2014.

The University is a land and sea grant, public research university. The Carnegie Foundation has historically classified the University as a "Research I University;" under the new classification system, the University is a "Doctoral/Research University--Extensive," the highest classification of the Carnegie Foundation. The University is fully accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC).

---

I.2 Summarize the professional education unit at your institution, its mission, and its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators.

The "Professional Education Unit" (the "unit" here-and-after) refers to the administrative body at the University "with the responsibility for managing or coordinating all programs offered for the initial and advanced preparation of K-12 school teachers and other school professionals, regardless of where these programs are administratively housed." It refers to the Neag School of Education, which has the responsibility for managing and coordinating the educator preparation programs at the University.

In addition to the faculty at the Neag School, the unit includes content faculty from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Ratcliffe Hicks School of Agriculture, and the School of Fine Arts, and other professional schools.

The unit has been accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) since 1954, one of the first groups of institutions accredited by the organization.

---

I.3 Summarize programs offered at initial and advanced preparation levels (including off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs), status of state approval, national recognition, and if applicable, findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals.

The unit offers the following initial teacher preparation programs:

The Integrated Bachelor's and Master's Program (IB/M—Initial preparation for K-12 school teachers and professionals in elementary and secondary education, including agriculture, English, mathematics, science, social studies, world languages, and special education, see SPA recognition). Music is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).

The Teacher Certification Program for College Graduates (TCPCG—Initial preparation for 7-12 school
teachers in special education and secondary education, including agriculture, English, mathematics, science, social studies, and world languages, see SPA recognition).

The School Speech and Language Pathology Certification Program (Accredited by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association)

The unit also offers an Early Childhood Education Program that does NOT lead to a state initial educator certificate, and is not required for SPA recognition.

The unit offers the following Advanced Other School Personnel Program:

Remedial Reading Teachers and Reading Consultants (IRA Recognized)
UConn Administrator Preparation Program (UCAPP) (ELCC Recognized)
Executive Leadership Program (ELP) (ELCC Recognized)
School Counseling (Accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs)
School Psychology (NASP Recognized)

The unit offers non-certification teacher professional development programs leading to a master's degree or sixth-year diploma in Bilingual Education and Educational Technology. The Bilingual Education program is a federal grant project.

See Exhibit I.4, I.5, I.6, and I.7 for the status of state approval, national recognition, and other national accreditation associations. Exhibits I.8, and I.9 are the University's undergraduate (relevant pages) and graduate catalogs (complete).

I.4 Summarize the basic tenets of the conceptual framework, institutional standards, and candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

The unit achieves its mission by solidifying a strong professional knowledge base, modeling evidence-based professional practice, committing to inquiry, demonstrating leadership, and embracing diversity. The unit has built educational programs grounded in a clearly articulated and carefully designed model of professional preparation in order to inform, assess, and enhance educational theories as they relate to the ongoing improvement of professional practices. The faculty and administration of the unit are dedicated to ensuring that all candidates are provided with a full range of carefully sequenced inquiry experiences that balance theory with practice, research with application, and classroom experiences with clinical practice. Collaboration among public schools, departments within the unit, and university programs are essential to the success of candidates.

In addition to formal coursework, which infuses multicultural and diversity education into the curriculum, the unit requires all candidates to have clinical experiences in diverse settings. Thus, the unit prepares its candidates for the multicultural public school settings in which they are likely to work. Toward this end, faculty and candidates from underrepresented groups are actively recruited by the unit's programs. Finally, all programs in the unit are committed to the integration of technology in educational settings as a means of improving learning and achievement for all students.

The unit has adopted and is committed to various national and state professional standards and practices in all program areas, such as the Connecticut educational standards, Holmes Partnership principles, the National Network for Educational Renewal philosophy, Teachers for a New Era research agendas, the American School Counselor Association's National Model, the lessons learned from the Best Practices for School Counseling in Connecticut, and the principles articulated by the University Council for
Educational Administration. The unit has also incorporated recent research findings in educator preparation, characteristics of educators, diversity, accountability processes, and other pedagogical models. Such commitments are further reinforced by on-going programmatic assessment and evaluation, including feedback from current and past candidates, practitioners in the field, and faculty at other institutions.

The programs in the unit prepare reflective analytical professional educators by engaging them in appropriate learning experiences that range from classroom forums, research projects, leadership assignments, and clinical experiences. Advanced programs foster research and scholarly activities and shape these research activities into clearly discernible lines of inquiry relevant to improvement in the education professions. The programs are designed to produce intellectual leaders, scholars, and practitioners for the education professions. In these roles, the candidates would ultimately contribute to the solution of societal problems.

An important feature of the reflective analytic professional educator is a concern not merely with the use of new knowledge, but with the creation of knowledge. Given the University's status as a major research university, the faculty is considered as an institution of researchers and educators who, with candidates, are devoted to the creation, assessment, and advancement of knowledge, and most importantly, the translation of research into practice. Knowledge creation and translation into practice are both essential and integral components of the unit's mission. Such a mission guides the purposes, processes, and outcomes of the programs, and contributes to the foundation of the unit's conceptual framework.

The conceptual framework [Exhibit I.10] that permeates the unit programs is the development and support of the reflective analytic professional in the field of education. It is defined by three themes: Learning, Leading, and Lighting the Way. These three themes serve as the unifying link that connects the various elements contributing to the mission of the unit. They form a continuous cycle: Learning contributes to leading, and leading contributes to the eventual lighting the way for the field of education by reflective and analytical professionals. More importantly, however, the advanced stage of lighting the way will also inform future learning. Through the conceptual framework, the unit has established a shared vision among all its stakeholders in educator preparation programs to work effectively with P-12 schools. It has provided directions for programs, courses, teaching, learning, research, public and professional service, and unit accountability (through its assessment system). It is based on established and existing research based knowledge, and aligned with national, state, and University standards.

Because the unit recognizes the critical role that technology plays in the development of human knowledge and advancement, it is committed to providing up-to-date technology to its candidates. In return, the candidates are expected to apply appropriate technology in their teaching, learning, and professional activities. In all of the following themes, technology is an implicit requirement as it is embedded in all programs in the unit. Candidate competencies in using technology are demonstrated by their assignments, such as project web design, electronic portfolio, and electronic communications.

The unit's Assessment Plan [Exhibit I.11] cited the policy statement of the NEASC that "[i]n a teaching/learning university, assessment is focused on describing very explicit outcomes expected of the students and adopts reliable and valid procedures for assessing this achievement." The unit embraces this notion of learning and assessment. The unit believes that "assessment is crucial for helping people learn," it "is needed for effective teaching," and "for a quality learning environment."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.5 Exhibits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.5.a Pages from catalogs and other printed documents describing general education, specialty/content studies, and professional studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I.5.b Examples of syllabi for professional education courses
I.5.c Conceptual framework(s)
I.5.d Findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals (e.g., ASHA, NASM, APA, CACREP)
I.5.e Updated institutional, program, and faculty information under institutional work space in AIMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1</td>
<td>UCONN 2014 Fact Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2</td>
<td>Neag School Academic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3</td>
<td>UCONN Academic Plan--April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.5</td>
<td>ASHA Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.6</td>
<td>CACREP Accreditation Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.7</td>
<td>NASM Accreditation Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.8</td>
<td>Undergraduate Catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.9</td>
<td>Graduate Catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.10</td>
<td>Conceptual Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.11</td>
<td>Assessment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.a</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EPSY 4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.b</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EPSY 4015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.c</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EDLR 5015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.d</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EPSY 3010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.e</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EPSY 3110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.f</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EPSY 3230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.g</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EPSY 5195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.h</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EPSY 3125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.i</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EDCI 3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.j</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EDCI 4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.k</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EDCI 4110W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.l</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EDCI 4115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.m</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EDCI 4120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.n</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EDCI 4125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.o</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EDCI 4130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.p</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EDCI 4210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.q</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EDCI 4210W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.r</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EDCI 4215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.s</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EGEN 3100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.t</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EDCI EGEN 3110W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.u</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EGEN 4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12.v</td>
<td>Sample Syllabus EGEN 4100-4210W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachment panel below.
Movement Toward Target

Please indicate the standard(s) on which the unit selected to demonstrate movement toward target:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4: Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6: Governance and Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions**

What do candidate assessment data tell the unit about candidates' meeting professional, state, and institutional standards and their impact on P-12 student learning? For programs not nationally/state reviewed, summarize data from key assessments and discuss these results.

In general, the unit's programs have been submitted for review by the SPA's and the state, or are nationally accredited. For details of assessment scoring rubric, data, and data analysis, see the NCATE AIMS Program Review Section. There are three programs aimed at preparing P-12 educators, which do not lead to state certifications [Exhibit I.4]: Bilingual Education, Early Childhood Education, and Educational Technology. Comprehensive program reports and data for the three programs are in Exhibits 1.1, 1.2 & 1.8. Please note that the Bilingual Education program is a federal grant project. In general, the Bilingual degrees are reserved to prepare researchers, faculty members in higher education, and policy makers. It is not intended as a teacher preparation program.

Based on the data, the unit has affirmed that its candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and have demonstrated the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Key assessments in the SPA, state, and institutional program reports have indicated that close to 100% candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards. Particularly, the unit has excelled in the following aspects: exposure to diversity through coursework, service learning, and varied clinical experiences; engagement of candidates at all levels in professional inquiry to develop a wide array of reflective, analytical, and research skills; subject area preparation for teacher candidates and the development of the dual degree option (i.e., earning a bachelor's degree in both education and the subject area) as evidenced by high Praxis pass rates (99% in 2010-11, 100% 2011-12, and 96% in 2012-13. See Exhibit 1.3 Title II Reports); and by assessment results (see SPA and program reports); focus on the development of professional dispositions that is coordinated with the conceptual framework across all educator preparation curricula.
For the non-state or SPA reviewed program, average key assessment scores in the Early Childhood Education Program (new program which began in 2012, see details in Exhibits 1.1, 1.1.a, and 1.1.b) in 2012-13 and 2013-14 academic years have indicated that candidates have mastery (on a five-point scale) in recognizing the individuality of children (M=4.54); curricular planning (M=4.63); field work (M=3.92); teaching from strengths (M=4.42); and becoming a professional (M=5.00).

For the non-SPA reviewed Educational Technology program [Exhibit 1.2], it is aligned with the ISTE/NCATE NETS-C standards for digital age teachers/coaches, those who have the skills and knowledge to guide and support teachers to wisely integrate technology into their classroom teaching in an increasingly connected and global society. In 2013 the average GPA for admitted students was 3.70 which has held steady for the last few years. The program assessments have indicated almost 100% candidates have met the requirements in content knowledge (consists of an understanding of contemporary hardware and software, Internet and offline computer-based tools used to support classroom instruction); pedagogy (consists of an understanding of instructional design methods, contemporary learning theory, and design research methods that enable the wise and successful integration of technology with classroom instruction); and dispositions (consists of a world view in favor of risk taking, on-the-fly problem solving, instructional design principles, and learning through data-driven decision making based on classroom trials of technology). The key comprehensive assessment is an e-portfolio in Taskstream. Since its inception in 2006, the Two Summers program has had a 90–100% completion rate and all students who submit the e-portfolio achieving at or above goal. As part of the e-portfolio of required program artifacts, the program is researching a year-long game-based approach (called Project Technologia) to several of its standards, and is piloting a card-game based assessment, called Card-tamen, based on the TPACK (see http://www.tpack.org) framework for technology integration. For example, data for the 2012 cohort indicate that 100% candidates obtained digital work and learning skills, 90.3% candidates could identify formative evaluation plans, 94.38% could generate technology integration final reports, 98% could report on five personal technology goals, and 89.6% successfully proposed professional development activities. Three years of data are available in Exhibit 1.2.b.

The Bilingual Education program has met all federal funding requirements (Exhibits 1.8.a-1.8.k).

The unit has engaged in a number of assessment projects:

1. Where are the completers? http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/reports/schoolwide/sepps

2. Educational Expansions, an extensive research project matching pupil data and teacher data to determine the effectiveness of unit’s teacher education graduates compared to non-unit prepared graduates [Exhibits 2.1, 2.1.a, 2.1.b, and 2.1.c]. Data for this study indicate that the unit's graduates had higher performance than non-unit graduates in Connecticut public schools on the state standard mathematics tests (i.e., CMT-4 MAVS) for both 2007-2008 and 2008-2009; and, the differences on the 2008-2009 CMT-4 MAVS between two groups of teachers are statistically significant after controlling for initial differences on the CMT-4 MAVS in 2007-2008. The overall reading performance and other analyses indicate that the unit alumni pupil performance is higher than pupils of other teachers. For example, the overall score for the unit graduates was 32.4 (5.1) compared to Non-unit graduates of 29.8 (6.7). When the unit examined pupil proficiency levels, the proportional analysis results show that only about 8% of pupils with unit alumni teachers scored at the "basic" and "below basic" levels, compared to about 22 percent of pupils with teachers who were not unit graduates. Analyses using vertical scales indicate that students of the unit graduated teachers had higher performance than students of non-unit graduated teachers on the CMT-4 reading performance.

3. The school counseling program is currently working in partnership with the National Office for School Counselor Advocacy (NOSCA) to establish a national model for infusing college counseling into
the pre-service training of school counselors. The model is based on NOSCA's vision that "every student exits high school with the educational preparation and social capital necessary for college success and full participation in a global society." The model is data driven starting with collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data to identify areas of inequity; developing and prioritizing measurable data-driven goals and selecting interventions; designing an implementation plan for each goal; and collecting outcome data as the basis for institutionalizing change through systemic policies, practices and procedures to sustain gains in equity.

The unit's Alumni Survey in 2013 [Exhibits 1.4.a and 1.4.b] indicates that 80% were "Very Satisfied" or "Moderately Satisfied" with their preparation all areas except for two. Areas in which 80% or less reported being moderately or very satisfied included: Effectively use technology (72%) and Understand research in professional journals (74%), and Lead and/or supervise groups of people (79%). The highest satisfaction ratings in preparation (over 86% "Very Satisfied" or "Moderately Satisfied") were given to: collaborate effectively with others (93%), learn on your own, pursue ideas and find necessary information (92%), think analytically and logically (92%), and consider the perspectives of others (91%). The current employment of most respondents (74.8%) was in the field of education. Small percentages of the sample were employed full time in a field other than education (9.21%), were full-time students (4.88%) or were employed part-time in education (4.6%). In addition, the majority (81.6%) indicated they were satisfied with their current employment. Most (81.6%) believed the skills they had obtained while in the program were quite helpful in getting a job.

Alumni were asked open-ended questions to ascertain which experiences they valued most and least, and what, if anything, was missing from their experience while in the program. Of the "most valued experiences" offered, the most frequently noted by school-wide alumni were: the quality, value, and/or availability of clinic experiences; support received from the program and faculty in terms of preparation for the field as well as availability of practical and research opportunities, and the quality of the faculty.

The most recent Employer Survey (2011-12) [Exhibit 1.5] indicated that, when rating satisfaction with the overall quality of the unit, 49 principals "graded" the unit with "B"s or better; 57.7% gave the unit "A"s. As compared to other professional educators of similar experience levels, 74% of respondents rated the graduates in the top 20% or better; 78.6% indicated that unit's graduates stand out in a positive way in the school/district. Responses indicate principals have a generally positive perception of the performance of graduates from the teaching program at the unit. Respondents ranked the unit's graduates highest in the areas of (a) ability to work with a culturally diverse classroom, (b) ability to interpret data to make instructional changes for pupil growth, (c) planning and organizing lessons and activities effectively. In terms of the unit's Teacher Education Program, alumni exhibited specific characteristics, employers rated most highly the characteristics of (a) compassion, caring, and desire to make a positive difference in the world, (b) core belief that all students can learn, (c) respect for the value of diversity and a desire to work with diverse populations.

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

1.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

D Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for
1.2.b Continuous Improvement

D Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
D Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

Section V of all SPA reviewed program reports addresses specific candidate performance data used for program improvements. The following summarizes additional unit activities and specific activities for programs not reviewed by the SPA.

The Teacher Education faculty is engaged in a major review and redesign of its IB/M and TCPCG programs. The faculty seeks to build on and expand the programs' current strengths through revisiting the core principles, competencies, and commitments on which the programs rest in light of the changing needs of Connecticut's students and schools, research on high quality teaching and teacher education, and the increasingly complex regulatory and policy environment in education. During the fall semester 2013, the teacher education faculty engaged in readings and discussions about practice-based teacher education and began a review of the programs' scope and sequence. In January, the teacher education faculty revisited the program competencies established in 2012 to identify the high-leverage practices that all program graduates should be able to enact effectively and responsibly as well-started beginning teachers.

Building on this work and aligned with the unit's and University's Academic Plans, in January 2014, faculty formed working groups to develop proposals around the following: 1) revision of the core programmatic sequence; 2) renewal of school university-partnerships and strengthening of clinical experiences; 3) creation of a STEM certificate; 4) integration of social justice and equity commitment and 5) expansion of international field experiences. During spring semester 2014, the working groups developed these proposals with a focus on identifying key high-leverage practices in each area and how these practices can be taught in courses and clinical placements. The unit invited several scholars and teacher education practitioners to present their research and work and to provide critical feedback on the proposals. These included Professor Mark Windschitl, University of Washington, Professor Jennifer Robinson and Susan Taylor, Montclair State University, and Margaret Lampert and Jesse Solomon of the Boston Teacher Residency. These scholars and practitioners provided insight into practice-based teacher education, school-university partnerships, and equity-focused teacher education. A teacher education Redesign Steering Committee, comprised of faculty and school partners, has been formed to review the working group proposals and to develop a Redesign Implementation Agenda that will be presented to the faculty and school partners for review fall, 2014.

The unit's newly established Early Childhood Education program has already begun its process of examining its candidate assessment data. Data that informs program improvements include student performance on each of the 26 competences aligned within each of the key assessments, program completion data, and community partnership data. Since only two cohorts of students have completed the program since its approval, the first major review of program processes for the purposes of program
improvement is now underway. Faculty are making revisions to key assessments to improve their understandability for students, addressing student needs for supportive and supplemental experiences to ensure their smooth completion of expectations in the program. Qualitative student evaluations of courses (see the appendix for Exhibit 1.1.b) provide feedback about their experiences and are currently being updated to address the key assessment processes. Further, program changes are responsive to the changes in the Connecticut State Department of Education guidelines, such as the transition from the Preschool Assessment Frameworks to the newly issued Early Learning and Development Standards. The unit anticipates that systematic surveys of students will be designed to capture their response to their training experiences. Many unsolicited comments have reinforced the value of the program's emphasis on reflection, observation, and analysis in their transformation of students as they progress through the program. One student wrote about the capstone course, "The most important thing I learned about myself in this class is the power of reflection. Even though we used reflection in many other classes, I think that the meta-reflections have helped me gather my thoughts and positions."

Data for continuous improvement of the Educational Technology program come from three main sources: candidates, faculty, and key stakeholders such as school and district administrators. The most straightforward data the program uses for program review and modification is candidate survey results. The unit seeks direct student input on the quality of the program as well as indirect evidence that activities intended to focus on key NETS-C competencies are viewed by candidates as enhancing their skills in these areas. Since the adoption of the NETS-C competencies and the re-alignment of our program to these objectives, the unit has collected two types of survey data from candidates. The unit has asked students their judgments concerning the quality of the program in a Exit Survey conducted the last day of classes in their second summer. The results of the 2012 survey are attached as Exhibit 1.2.b.

In general, as the state's and New England's premiere research institution, the unit's graduate programs are designed to prepare faculty members for institutions of higher education, researchers, public policy makers, and educators for non-K-12 related organizations. The Bilingual Education program (master's, sixth-year diploma, and Ph.D.) is no exception. However, the program has received a special professional development grant from the U.S. Department of Education, which provides tuition for K-12 teachers to enhance their skills to work in bilingual classrooms. Because of this trend, the master's degree program and the six-credit professional development program have achieved an enrollment of more than 50% of candidates who are current classroom teachers. This program is not a state-approved planned educator preparation program leading to a state certification. SPA recognition is not appropriate. But the unit believes that it should be included for review at the unit level. See exhibits 1.8.a – 1.8.k for detailed assessments as well as federal agency reports. Please note that this grant project is funded for a specific set of years and the unit's design contemplates a determined number of participant fellows per year from the districts identified as priority districts who are needing support in building capacity among their staff. The program assessments indicate that 100% of the candidates have met the requirements of the inquiry project, and 100% candidates have earned the grade of B or above. The unit is in the process of institutionalizing the K-12 educator based bilingual education program as the result of the successful implementation of this national professional development program. The program will design a set of 6-8 key assessments aligned with national standards, including content knowledge, instructional planning, field experience, and student learning. The unit plans to complete the design phase of the new assessments in the fall of 2014, and begin their first implementation in the Spring of 2015.

The School Speech Pathologist program collects and evaluates data on its effectiveness from multiple sources (e.g., candidates, alumni, faculty, employers, off-site supervisors or preceptors, community members, persons receiving services). The data includes candidates' and graduates' evaluations of courses and clinical education. The program has used the following measures to gauge program successes and has made program improvements based on:

* Program completion rate—students completing the program requirements within the program's
published time frame. Documentation includes the number and percentage of students completing the program within the published timeframe for each of the three most recently completed academic years. If, when averaged over three years, the program's completion rate does not meet or exceed the CAA’s established threshold, the program must provide an explanation and a plan for improving the results.

- Praxis examination pass rate—test-takers from the program who passed the Praxis examination. Documentation includes the number and percentage of test-takers from the program, excluding individuals who graduated more than three years ago, who passed the Praxis examination for each of the three most recently completed academic years; results should be reported only once for test-takers who took the exam multiple times in the same examination reporting period. If, when averaged over 3 years, the program’s pass rate does not meet or exceed the CAA’s established threshold, the program must provide an explanation and a plan for improving the results.

- Employment rate—program graduates employed in the profession or pursuing further education in the profession within one year of graduation. Documentation includes the number and percentage of program graduates who are employed or continuing further education in the profession for each of the three most recently completed academic years. If, when averaged over three years, the program’s employment rate does not meet or exceed the CAA’s established threshold, the program must provide an explanation and a plan for improving the results.

Results of the assessments, including the required student achievement measures, are used to plan and implement program improvements that are consistent with the program's mission and goals [Exhibit 1.6].
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1.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard. [12,000 characters]

Not applicable.
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1.4 Exhibits for Standard 1

| Exhibit 1.4.a | State program review documents and state findings (Some of these documents may be available in AIMS.) |
| Exhibit 1.4.b | Title II reports submitted to the state for the previous three years |
| Exhibit 1.4.c | Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing candidate learning against professional and state standards as well as proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Some of this information may be accessible for nationally recognized programs in AIMS. Cross reference as appropriate.) |
| Exhibit 1.4.d | Aggregate data on key assessments, including proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery.) |
| Exhibit 1.4.e | Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing professional dispositions, including fairness and the belief that all students can learn |
| Exhibit 1.4.f | Aggregate data on key assessments of candidates' professional dispositions (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery.) |
| Exhibit 1.4.g | Examples of candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning |
| Exhibit 1.4.h | Examples of candidates' work (e.g., portfolios at different proficiency levels) from programs across the unit |
| 1.4.i | Aggregate data on follow-up studies of graduates |
| 1.4.j | Aggregate data on employer feedback on graduates |
| 1.4.k | Data collected by state and/or national agencies on performance of educator preparation programs and the effectiveness of their graduates in classrooms and schools, including student achievement data, when available |

| Exhibit 1.1 Early Childhood Education Program Data and Report |
| Exhibit 1.1.a Early Childhood Education Key Assessments |
| Exhibit 1.1.b Early Childhood Education Candidate Assessments |
| Exhibit 1.2 Educational Technology Program Report |
| Exhibit 1.2.a Educational Technology Assessment Data |
| Exhibit 1.2.b Educational Technology Exit Survey Data |
| Exhibit 1.3.a Title II Report 2012-2013 |
| Exhibit 1.3.b Title II Report 2011-2012 (Part A) |
| Exhibit 1.3.b Title II Report 2011-2012 (Part B) |
| Exhibit 1.3.c Title II Report 2010-2011 |
| Exhibit 1.4.a Alumni Survey 2013 Part I |
| Exhibit 1.4.b. Alumni Survey 2013 Part II |
| Exhibit 1.5 Employer Survey |
| Exhibit 1.6 ASHA Accredited School Speech Pathologist Program |
| Exhibit 1.7 State Reviewed Program--Agriculture Education Program Report |
| Exhibit 1.8a Bilingual Education Program Completer Chart |
| Exhibit 1.8b Bilingual Education Annual Report 2009-2010 |
| Exhibit 1.8c Bilingual Education Annual Report 2010-2011 |
| Exhibit 1.8d Bilingual Education Annual Report 2011-2012 |
| Exhibit 1.8e Bilingual Education Cohort Assessment |
| Exhibit 1.8f Bilingual Education GPRA Report 2012 |
| Exhibit 1.8g Bilingual Education Annual Assessment Updates |
| Exhibit 1.8h Bilingual Education Math LEAD 2012 |
| Exhibit 1.8i Bilingual Education NPD 2012 |
| Exhibit 1.8j Bilingual Education NPD 2011 |
| Exhibit 1.8k Bilingual Education LEAD |

See Attachment panel below.

**Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**

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

**2.1 Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**
How does the unit use its assessment system to improve candidate performance, program quality and unit operations?

Since the NCATE re-accreditation site visit in 2002, the unit has made a concerted effort to foster a culture of assessment for learning. 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. Through the unit's Conceptual Framework [Exhibit I.10], the Academic Plan [Exhibit I.2], the third revision of the Assessment Plan [Exhibit I.11], and the program-based signature assessment tools (see SPA reports), the unit has used and developed various resources to enhance its assessment capacity. Specifically, the unit has two areas of outstanding accomplishments. First, the on-going Assessment Colloquia, the Spotlight on Assessment News Brief, and the unit assessment web page have advanced the unit's assessment agenda by bringing in international, national, state, and local field experts to work with its faculty members and to stimulate their thoughts on candidate knowledge and skill gains (see http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/). Such efforts have contributed to the unit's participatory evaluation and assessment process. Second, the unit's candidate information system and TaskStream learning system have contributed to the ease of data management so that the unit can generate systemic data for unit decision making.

As a research intensive institution, the unit faculty members are involved in many research studies on assessment. The greatest involvement is the initiative of Educational Expansion studies [Exhibit 2.1]. The purpose of these studies is to analyze the achievement patterns of PreK-12 pupils of teachers who are graduates of the unit's Teacher Education Program. It is funded by the unit, Carnegie Corporation, and the Annenberg, and Ford Foundations.

The unit is currently investigating if there are significant differences between pupils' performance on the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) when they are instructed by the unit-prepared teachers or by teachers prepared by other institutions. Variables from participating districts will include dependent variables from grades 3-8 pupil performance on the new fourth generation CMT over four years. Independent variables collected include the impact of pupil characteristics such as gender, race/ethnicity, special education, and English language program status. Depending on district interest, variables also include physical fitness results, in-house criteria reference test results, Degrees of Reading Power test results, and course patterns.

Guidance is being provided by the assessment committee. Concurrently, this unit/state partnership will begin establishing a data warehouse so that, in three years, this type of information will be electronically accessible. These efforts will lead to continued knowledge of the impact of the teacher preparation program on pupil achievement.

The unit has devoted much time and significant resources since 2006 on developing, implementing, evaluating, and refining the assessment system. With the involvement of the unit's stakeholders, the unit has been evaluating the capacity and effectiveness of the assessment system. The unit's assessment committee consists of two to five faculty members, two students, and individuals representing the Teacher Education Program (see http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/committees/neag-assessment-committee/). The unit's Assessment Plan [Exhibit I.11] was revised and updated three times in the last eight years by employing a participatory evaluation model using The Standards for Student Evaluation and The Program Evaluation Standards (The Joint Committee for Educational Evaluation, 2008). The unit has incorporated feedback received during monthly departmental and teacher education faculty meetings, clinic/practicum evaluation, and alumni input.

The unit's Assessment Plan reflects the conceptual framework and incorporates candidate proficiencies outlined in professional and state standards. The Assessment Plan recognizes that assessment comprises a necessary part of the learning process and is imperative in the creation of effective teaching and in
fostering a quality learning environment. The system employs multiple measures to monitor candidate progress at key points during the educational journey: admission, mid-program, program completion, and post-graduation components. The Assessment Plan also aligns with the Conceptual Framework (with three thematic components - Learning, Leading, and Lighting the Way). In compliance to state educator preparation program approval regulations [Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, Section 10-145d-9(e)(1)], it is also aligned with the NCATE unit standards and SPA program standards.

The unit has implemented the Assessment Plan by standardizing unit wide efforts, including the collection and analysis of data from program-based program assessments and other appropriate unit survey and evaluation tools, and the review of such results from the unit continuous improvement perspective. The unit provides reports of various assessment-related activities, such as program reports (see NCATE AIMS System SPA Reports), federal Title II data reports (see http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/reports/title-ii/), annual reports [Exhibits 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5] and various assessment and survey reports (see http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/reports/).

The unit regularly examines the validity and utility of the data produced through assessments and makes modifications to keep abreast of changes in assessment technology and in professional standards. The unit has three ways of evaluating the assessment system. Evaluation begins with a review of individual complaints, continues with a review by the assessment committee, and is followed by the completion of the annual program reports.

The first step is the annual review of complaints. Face-to-face meetings with the parties involved are held when complaints are from teachers, clinical supervisors, or mentors about candidates. When faculty members are the subject of complaints, the department leader or Associate Dean meets with the faculty member to address and resolve the issue. More specifically, from policy manuals, candidate manuals, and program publications, potential and current candidates and others learn that the unit reviews candidates' academic performance each semester to determine their continuation in the program. Candidates who do not meet the expectations are not retained in the program.

The second step is the annual review by the assessment committee. Each spring, each member of the assessment committee is asked to rate the assessment system, including aspects of data collection, analysis, evaluation, and the use of data for program improvement. The committee is provided with a summary of the findings. The assessment committee discusses the findings at the first meeting in the fall. The assessment committee meeting agendas and minutes can be found at the unit's assessment website.

The third step is the annual reporting on all programs [Exhibit 2.2]. Beginning the summer of 2009, the unit has implemented an annual program report system. It asks all programs to succinctly summarize data from the four components in the Assessment Plan. This process captures program meetings (or department meetings) where data discussions appear on the agenda. The program coordinators are also asked what changes occurred as part of their exploration on data.

The Assessment Plan incorporates multiple points and methods to examine candidate performance at each component [Exhibit 2.3]. Multi-angulation helps the unit strive for fairness, accuracy, consistency, and freedom of bias. For standardized assessment instruments (e.g., PRAXIS, Connecticut Administrator Test [CAT]) technical manuals produced by the developer are examined. Classroom assessments, including those on the TaskStream e-learning system, are developed according to University policies. Faculty are encouraged to specify University policies, including their procedures regarding equity and fairness in matters of race/ethnicity, gender, special needs, and limited language competence; academic dishonesty; absences; confidentiality; and grading and reporting procedures as part of the syllabus. These are consistent with the APA standards for assessment.

Multiple contributors, such as the assessment committee, and department and program leaders, draft and review each assessment and survey instrument. When necessary, a content validation study and/or a
factor analysis may be conducted to ensure construct validity and reliability properties. Also, predictive validity may be examined. For the Teacher Education Program, student performance on PRAXIS II, content knowledge, lesson designs, student teacher evaluations, Inquiry Projects, and candidate electronic portfolios have become good predictors of candidate success. Good predictors of leadership success include the CAT examination and practicum experience for the UCAPP, and the mastery learning application for the candidates in the ELP. Programs in School Counseling and School Psychology believe practica and internships are among the best predictors. The language and speech pathology program uses the ASHA-endorsed formative and summative assessments for clinic experiences, and for other candidate knowledge and skills.

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

2.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

D Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
D Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
D Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

Not applicable.

2.2.b Continuous Improvement

D Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
D Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

As the unit embraces the paradigm for learning and assessment, the process of continuous improvement is paramount. As such, the unit has embarked on continuous improvement efforts by aligning its Academic Plan [Exhibit I.2] and operations with the University's Academic Plan [Exhibit I.3].

In the last decade, the unit has achieved a high level of excellence. The momentum must be maintained and moved forward. The unit has identified three core areas that define the Assessment Plan to guide its continuous improvement efforts: (1) Equity and Social Justice; (2) STEM Education; and (3) Creativity and Innovation. The unit's Academic Plan acts as a blueprint for building cohesiveness and integration of efforts across all departments in areas of scholarship, grant activity, and program development. Using the framework set forth in the University Academic Plan, the unit's Academic Plan defines a set of goals and objectives that will move the school forward in three interrelated areas. Each area also includes a set of metrics to monitor the yearly progress.
Additionally, the unit has reviewed data and other information to identify strengths and areas needing improvement. This process was initiated in the 2007-2008 academic year, and continues through the present. The process starts with the assessment committee proposing questions related to missions, goals, objectives, and standard alignment. The committee members analyze the information collected as they focus on three overarching questions: What are the unit strengths? What are some areas for improvement? And, how will the unit go about accomplishing this improvement? See meeting agendas and minutes on the unit's assessment website at http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/committees/neag-assessment-committee/committee-work/.

The unit has made improvements in its assessment system so that it could provide regular and comprehensive data on program quality, unit operations, and candidate performance at each stage of programs, extending to post-completion careers. The process of collecting, compiling, aggregating, summarizing, and analyzing data focused on degrees to which candidates perform, qualities of programs, and efficacies of the unit, is of paramount importance. The unit's assessment has made the following improvements:

1. Candidate Performance:

Assessment data from candidates are now based on multiple assessments from internal and external sources that are systematically collected as candidates progress across their programs. Most of the applicant and candidate data are captured in the University-wide PeopleSoft Student Administration System. Candidates use PeopleSoft to access their class schedule, grades, and transcripts. Candidates can use the system to view the course catalog, search for classes, review the University-sponsored student health insurance plan, and view their financial aid packages. Faculty members can use the system to access candidate transcripts and use, at their option, the advisor module to keep notes of their meetings. In addition, the unit-sponsored TaskStream and/or the University-designed HuskyCT e-learning applications are used for classroom performance assessments. The unit began to use TaskStream 10 years ago in the Teacher Education Program and UCAPP. The University recently upgraded its e-learning application so that HuskyCT is now more comprehensive and comparable to TaskStream. Both e-learning tools are frequently used by instructors to post reading materials, administer assessments, and facilitate discussions outside of class. Whenever a candidate or an advisor needs information, data can be extracted from both systems. Additionally, the unit has developed a candidate information system by using Filemaker, comprised of candidate data at each of the five transition points. The unit can generate aggregated candidate data to examine candidates’ performances throughout their respective programs. Candidate performance data are also generated by using program based six to eight signature assessments. Description of these assessments along with data from the last three years have been reported through the NCATE-SPA program report process. See the NCATE AIMS Program Reports for details.

2. Quality of Programs:

The unit can generate data reports from PeopleSoft, the candidate information system, and e-learning systems to aggregate and/or disaggregate candidate performance results. Student teaching, practicum, and internship data of are compiled, aggregated, and/or disaggregated using Filemaker and Checkbox (a seamless survey data collection tool). Many programs also administer alumni and employer surveys using Checkbox. Because this application is web-based, it allows program faculty to enter data and to produce candidate summaries. The application has the ability to compute frequency distributions and charts. Once a report is produced, program leaders may proceed to analyze results and make changes as needed.

Each program can also gather program-specific data. For example, for the Teacher Education Program, program quality is examined through additional information generated from student entry surveys, clinic
and student teacher surveys, internship evaluations, alumni surveys, and exit surveys. See program data reports for each of the transition points at [http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/reports/program-reports/](http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/reports/program-reports/).

The unit incorporates both formative assessments, which includes a cycle for collection and reporting with the diversified tools (some annually, some systematically, and others in a defined cycle), and summative assessments. For formative assessments, annual activities includes, but are not limited to U.S. News & World Report, NEASC Assessment Reports, unit assessment reports, test summary reports (i.e., PRAXIS II and CAT), entry and exit survey reports, alumni report for the Teacher Education Program, and evaluation reports on clinical practices and field experiences. The systematic activities include a survey to alumni and employers. Survey data are analyzed and reported in a three-year interval.

The summative evaluation process was initiated in the 2007-2008 academic year and is compiled in a two-year interval. This report examines longitudinal candidate, program, and unit data. The assessment committee takes the lead in developing evaluation questions and proposing methods. The committee members then analyze the information collected as they focus on three overarching questions:

1. What are the unit strengths?
2. What are the areas for improvement?
3. How will the unit go about accomplishing this improvement?

As indicated above, the unit has regularly and systematically compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and reported publicly for the purpose of improving candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. The unit has developed and tested different information technologies to improve the assessment system.

The unit embraces the continuous improvement model. The unit has collected, shared, analyzed, and more importantly, used data at the course, program, department, and unit levels. Listed below are examples that illustrate the uses of data.

**Highlights of Unit Level Changes:**

- Review of data from alumni surveys, reflective journals, and student teaching evaluations pointed to the need for classroom management in the Teacher Education Program. In 2008, the unit established a course on classroom management, EPSY 3125–Classroom and Behavior Management, which provides a systemic theoretical framework for classroom organization and management to promote active engagement in learning.
- As a result of the recent SPA program review, the unit will archive all program level signature assessments and their data on the unit's assessment website and TaskStream.
- Through alumni survey data and informal interviews, candidates expressed the need to strengthen their ability to support English language learners in classroom settings. The unit developed a faculty learning community to share emerging understandings of the process of language acquisition, the role of language in learning and assessment, cultural awareness and sensitivity, and classroom implications in the areas of planning, instruction, and assessment.

**Highlights of Program Level Changes (see Section V of all SPA reports for detailed program level changes):**

- As a result of signature assessment findings, the special education faculty has initiated an evaluation of whether the current sequence of coursework best supports students' acquisition of content knowledge or whether a revised sequence would better support candidates' development.
- The unit dropped one of the school counseling practica and removed two adjunct professors from the
School Counseling Program based on student evaluations of their courses. The coordinator now makes
more visits to sites as a result of feedback from our surveys of the site supervisors.
• Based on school psychology students’ evaluation of required and elective courses, the unit added an
elective course in language and literacy. The unit has also added courses in positive behavior supports,
and single subject design.
• Primarily due to school psychology student feedback during advisor meetings, candidates now
complete a "Program Timeline" document that outlines all program requirements. It is used as part of the
candidates' annual review of progress by faculty.
• In the Reading/Language Arts Program, assessment data suggest that candidates are acquiring
important understandings and experiences, and the placement of the clinical practicum in an urban center
has helped the faculty and candidates extend understandings.
• The unit redesigned the UCAPP three years ago. Multiple, differentiated assessments encompass both
formal and informal feedback. This data is used to improve course content.

2.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial
and/or advanced program levels under this standard.

Not applicable.

2.4 Exhibits for Standard 2

| 2.4.a | Description of the unit's assessment system including the requirements and key assessments used at transition points |
| 2.4.b | Admission criteria and data from key assessments used for entry to programs |
| 2.4.c | Policies, procedures, and practices for ensuring that key assessments of candidate performance and evaluations of program quality and unit operations are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias |
| 2.4.d | Policies, procedures, and practices for ensuring that data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and used for continuous improvement |
| 2.4.e | Policies, procedures and practices for managing candidate complaints |
| 2.4.f | File of candidate complaints and the unit's responses and resolutions (This information should be available during the onsite visit) |
| 2.4.g | Examples of significant changes made to courses, programs, and the unit in response to data gathered from the assessment system |

Exhibit 2.1 Expansion Studies

Exhibit 2.2 Annual Program Report Template

Exhibit 2.3 Transitional Point Assessments

Other Required Exhibit 2.4.a/c/d Description of Unit Assessment System (also Exhibit I.11)

Other Required Exhibit 2.4.b Common Entry Data and Analysis

Exhibit 2.1.a Expansion Studies Mathematics

Exhibit 2.1.b Expansion Studies Reading

Exhibit 2.1.c Expansion Studies Reading 2

See Attachment panel below.
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 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

How does the unit work with the school partners to deliver field experiences and clinical practice to enable candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn?

One of the unit's program strengths is the breadth and extensiveness of field experiences and clinical placements. The unit and its school partners have designed, implemented, and evaluated field experience and clinical practice in a collaborative fashion. As a result, candidates have developed and demonstrated knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Candidates have been expected to study and practice in settings that include diverse populations, students with exceptionalities, and students of different ages. Candidates are placed in appropriate grade levels and in the subject areas or professional roles. Candidate learning is highly integrated into the clinical settings. The unit has taken a sensitive approach in scheduling, use of time and resource, and support of clinical faculty, which has allowed candidates to participate as educators and learners in school settings. Candidates in the unit's educator preparations programs, in most cases, are engaged in "real world" field activities in the beginning of their studies. Candidates' work in schools is closely monitored and evaluated by the unit's faculty members, clinical supervisors, and mentors. The unit has developed assessment instruments and has begun a program-by-program implementation process. Candidates also evaluate their clinical experiences so that the unit gains insights of the work settings. Candidates have the experience of working with diverse students during their placement experiences and have gained knowledge and skills working with socio-economical, cultural, national, ethnic, racial, and gender differences.

The unit's clinical and field experiences are largely designed on the basis of learning theories, especially the internationally renowned adult learning theories developed by its own faculty member, Professor Barry Sheckley [Exhibit 3.1], which indicate that learners who engage in a structured process of reflecting in learning they acquired from their prior experiences develop more complex solutions to a real-life problem than would a comparable set of students who participate in a lecture-based classroom course.

The unit and its school-based faculty collaborate in designing, implementing, and evaluating the unit's conceptual framework and the school program. The unit has developed a carefully designed sequence of fieldwork experiences for all programs. IB/M teacher candidates complete six semesters of clinic--the equivalent of about 1,200 hours--in six Professional Development School (PDS) districts. TCPCG teacher candidates log a minimum of 660 hours of fieldwork experiences in high school and middle school settings in over 14 different districts. The unit's clinical faculty members communicate with school-based partners to ensure that the unit's various teacher preparation evaluations are delivered collaboratively to assess candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Exhibit 3.2 presents a list of the unit's partner school districts. The Teacher Education Program is guided by the Schools as Clinics Committee [Exhibit 3.3]. Administrators and faculty from the unit and the participating PDS constitute its membership. They provide guidance as to program design, including issues of field experiences. Partnering administrators and school-based faculty rely on access to unit faculty and clinical supervisors.
and on the Program Handbooks [Exhibits 3.4] to guide their efforts for the delivery and evaluation of field work experiences. All school-based faculty working the Teacher Preparation Program receive the related program handbook prior to working with candidates, which explicitly outlines the roles and responsibilities for clinical supervisors. Full-time clinical faculty and part-time University Supervisors are assigned to work at various PDS. The clinical faculty and University Supervisors work closely with each other and with school-based clinical supervisors to ensure that roles and responsibilities associated with clinical supervision are clear and achievable. School-based clinical supervisors working with student teachers need to have successfully completed the state required Teacher Education and Mentoring (TEAM) training prior to supervising a student teacher (see http://www.ctteam.org). Exhibit 3.5 details the clinical experience approach for the unit's teacher education program.

Field experiences within the Reading and Language Arts Program are conducted in public school settings. Candidates work collaboratively with site-based reading specialists and/or special education teachers in a co-teaching capacity providing assessment, instruction, coaching, and/or professional leadership skills as needed. Partners of the unit's Reading and Language Arts Program play a critical role in the professional development of individuals enrolled in the program. Throughout the program's field work and clinical sequence, partnering principals, classroom teachers, reading specialists, and parents facilitate candidate access to children in need of reading and literacy support. This arrangement allows for program delivery to occur within an authentic setting with site-based supervision and evaluation provided, in conjunction with program faculty, by practicing professionals. For the Capstone clinical experience, the site-based co-instructor works collaboratively with University faculty to evaluate candidate performances.

Clinical experiences for the unit's administrator preparation program, UCAPP, follow a two-year internship model, which is cooperatively administered by program faculty and the Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS, see http://cas.casciac.org/). The two-year internship program is designed to give interns approximately 540 hours of productive, firsthand experiences with partnering mentors in the field. For the UCAPP, school-based partners contribute directly to the design of field work experiences for its students. Specifically, the intern, the mentor (a school-based professional), and CAS partners collaboratively develop a two-year plan for each student. Periodic meetings are held between the intern, the mentor, and the University-based clinical supervisor in order to monitor program delivery and to evaluate student progress. The mentor completes the annual evaluation at the end of year one and two.

Fieldwork for the superintendent preparation program, the ELP, consists of a 230-hour internship. The internship is cooperatively administered by the Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS, see http://www.capss.org) and the faculty. Candidates in the ELP are assigned a CAPSS internship mentor and program coordinator. Those individuals provide direction, support, and evaluation to the intern in cooperation with program faculty. Internship experiences with Connecticut public school superintendents provide candidates with the opportunity to observe and analyze theory applied to practice at the executive level of superintendent. Partnering personnel complete a variety of assessments by facilitating practicum-related experiences (which are woven into course grades), and by facilitating candidate completion of the culminating project, which is captured in the program's electronic portfolio.

The unit's School Psychology Program has developed its clinical practicum and internship experiences in accordance with APA and NASP guidelines. During the practicum, candidates experience a minimum of 400 hours. The internship in school psychology involves approximately 1500 hours of sequential supervised experiences relevant to the practice of school psychology. Both practicum and internship supervision are provided on-site. Site-based partners are appropriately credentialed personnel, including certified school psychologists, and/or licensed psychologists who regularly meet and work with University-based program faculty to ensure appropriate implementation and supervision.
The School Counseling Program typically offers its practicum experiences within a network of 12 to 13 school districts. It places an emphasis on working with urban public school districts. Internship experiences involve a minimum of 600 hours (to meet CACREP standards) up to 1500 hours (to meet Connecticut Certification standards) and all interns are supervised on-site by certified school counselors with at least two years post certification experience. The school counseling program is currently working in partnership with the National Office for School Counselor Advocacy (NOSCA) to establish a national model for infusing college counseling into the pre-service training of school counselors. The model is based on NOSCA’s vision that "every student exits high school with the educational preparation and social capital necessary for college success and full participation in a global society." The model is data driven starting with collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data to identify areas of inequity; developing and prioritizing measurable data-driven goals and selecting interventions; designing an implementation plan for each goal; and collecting outcome data as the basis for institutionalizing change through systemic policies, practices and procedures to sustain gains in equity.

The School Psychology and School Counseling programs rely heavily on their school-based partners with regard to the delivery and evaluation of clinical experiences for their students. Specifically, in the School Psychology Program practicum and internship experiences, students are continuously supervised and evaluated (twice) on-site by appropriately credentialed personnel. School Counseling interns are under close and continual supervision and are evaluated two times during the internship by the partnering, site-based supervisors.

See specific links in Exhibit 3.6 for aggregated data reports for each program during each academic year on their candidate clinical and field experience assessments.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

3.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

D Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
D Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
D Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

During the 2010 NCATE accreditation process, it was determined by the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board that the unit had reached the target level of performance on this standard.

3.2.b Continuous Improvement

D Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of
candidate performance and program quality.

Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

The unit's initial and advanced educator preparation programs use various formative and summative evaluation methods during clinical placements and field experiences to ensure that the clinical faculty members provide regular and continuous support for its candidates. The unit collects individual candidate performance data from these evaluation methods. Further, some programs also require candidates to evaluate their clinical supervisors to provide unit information on the future training of school-based supervisors. The unit also uses surveys to gauge candidates' opinions of their clinical placements and field experiences during their programs. Exhibit 3.6 contains summaries of data generated from these evaluation methods across programs. The data have indicated that the candidates have achieved high satisfaction from these experiences and have also consistently rated highly the supervision and support that they have received from the clinical supervisors. Specific program-related data summaries are available in the unit's SPA program reports in the NCATE AIMS system.

The unit collects data from multiple assessments to gauge candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions from clinical experiences. The data are summarized in the aggregated reports [See links in Exhibit 3.6 and in the program reports (see NCATE AIMS system for program reports--mostly, Section IV Assessments Four, Five and Six), and the program reports for Educational Technology, Early Childhood, and School Language and Speech Pathology]. Clinical and field experiences are integral program components for the initial and advanced educator preparation. During any given year, the Teacher Education Program enrollment is about 390 candidates. All of them are engaged in one form of clinical practice or another, such as the previously described practicum, student teaching, or internship. Over 99% of them complete the clinical practice. In the Reading and Language Arts Program, 5 to 10 candidates per year (depending on enrollment) are eligible for clinical practice. Nearly 100% complete clinical practice successfully. Similarly, because both the UCAPP and ELP Programs employ a cohort-based approach, nearly 100% of their candidates are eligible and complete clinical practice successfully. The School Psychology Program, on average, has 6 students per year who are eligible for and complete clinical practice. The School Counseling Program, on average has 10 candidates eligible for clinical practice each year. Of those, approximately 95% will complete the clinical practice (internship) in 10 months. According to the data from multiple years (2009-2014), an average over 80% of candidates have demonstrated professionalism and responsibility, and over 78% are ready to transition from candidates to professionals, over 75% exhibit a growing awareness of student needs and instructional strategies. Data from the student teaching assessment indicate that nearly 100% candidates have made either outstanding progress (about 80%) or satisfactory progress (about 20%) in planning, instructing, assessing, and adjusting instructions. Similar patterns have been observed in the categories of professional and ethical practice, reflection, and continuous learning, leadership, and collaboration (see specific data reports in Exhibit 3.6).

Over the years, the unit and its school partners have established a continuous improvement culture through their joint determination for the specific placements of candidates to maximize the learning experience for candidates and P-12 students. The Teacher Education Program has a Director of Clinical Experiences, who coordinates field placements with school-based partners through a Schools as Clinic Committee, established since our last NCATE accreditation visit. Pre-student teaching field experiences are structured so that teacher candidates are placed within urban, suburban, and special education settings. For the student teaching clinical placements and internship experiences, the Director of Clinical Experiences continues to work collaboratively with school-based partners to secure placements within the PDS network and to develop and distribute internship proposals across the PDS network. School partners are required to identify interested and qualified faculty to support teacher candidates at all levels. The Teacher Preparation Program employs several full-time clinical faculty members to manage all aspects of the PDS/Teacher Preparation Program relationship. Clinical faculty work on-site at the
schools and in concert with school-based faculty to support teacher candidates and their collaborating partners through all three phases of field and clinical experiences. On the feedback from the last SPA review, the Teacher Education Program has redesigned its clinical and field experience assessment instruments so that they are not only aligned with Unit’s Conceptual Framework but also with specific field standards. See analysis in Exhibit 3.6 for details and data. The Teacher Education Program is currently undergoing intensive planning for a significant redesign process. One of the key focus is to ensure that it continues to strengthen its clinically-based approach.

The Reading and Language Arts Program will continue to sustain its field experience work on three criteria: 1) its affiliation with the PDS network; 2) its diverse population of children, including a large number of English Language Learners; and 3) appropriately credentialed administration and faculty who are willing to work with children after school hours during the academic year. As indicated in its SPA report to the IRA, candidates have gained valuable insights from these experiences. See data in Assessment No. 4 of the IRA SPA report in the AIMS.

The unit requires candidates in other school professional programs to critique and synthesize theories related to classroom practice based on their own applied research. They are required to design, implement, and evaluate projects related to the appropriate roles. The application of technology is also an element for evaluation.

The Educational Leadership programs have continued to strengthen their collaborative relationship with the CAS and CAPSS. UCAPP matches each candidate with an appropriate mentor administrator. For both the UCAPP and the ELP, every practicum experience is linked to a course. The faculty teaching practicum-related courses work closely with clinical supervisors. Placements reinforce course expectations. Thus resources are shared across both settings at the site and the University. Other examples of resource sharing include free access to the Principal Center and CAPS seminars for both UCAPP and ELP candidates. UCAPP faculty conduct a student assessment designed to ascertain candidate's leadership interests. Data generated from this assessment allow for a purposeful linking between candidates and mentor school leaders. Similarly, through the collaborative relationship with the CAPSS, the ELP is able to identify viable internships placements for its candidates using the identical methodology. See data from the common entrance survey through links in Exhibit 3.5.

The School Psychology Program practicum and internship experiences are developed based on the site support of training objectives and aligned with standards. University-based faculty identify potential practicum and internship sites and contact potential site-based partners to determine the viability of a placement. At least 50 percent of practicum and internship experiences takes place within a regular education setting. Recently the School Psychology program has made significant improvements as a result of its APA accreditation and NASP program review (see Section V of the NASP SPA report). Expertise and resources are shared across settings by University-based faculty, site-based personnel, and candidates attending the School Psychology Program. This is done in an effort to develop the competence of psychological services in schools to include classroom remediation strategies, intervention, and psycho-educational program planning, consultation, supervision, and the provision of in-service training; the evaluation of interventions and program; and conducting of research relative to promoting school psychological practice.

The School Counseling Program offers its practicum and internships experiences within a variety of communities. Partnerships with these districts have been established. School-based supervisors must possess a minimum of a master's degree in school counseling or a related profession and certification as a school counselor with at least two years post certification experiences. The site supervisor conducts two site visits per year. These visits serve as an additional evaluation tool, promote dialogue between stakeholders, and provide the opportunity to identify training needs and emerging problem areas. These data are taken back to the University and explored in depth by program candidates (in the Critical issues
of School Counseling course). The program is CACREP accredited and is currently conducting a review of its data for program improvements and the report will be available for the team to review during the on-site visit.

---

### 3.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.

Not applicable.

---

### 3.4 Exhibits for Standard 3

| 3.4.a | Examples across programs of collaborative activities between unit and P-12 schools to support the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice, including memoranda of understanding |
| 3.4.b | Aggregate data on candidate placement in field experiences and clinical practice (Data should be disaggregated by program and level regardless of location or method of delivery) |
| 3.4.c | Criteria for the selection of clinical faculty, which includes both higher education and P–12 school faculty |
| 3.4.d | Examples of support and evaluation of clinical faculty across programs |
| 3.4.e | Guidelines/ handbooks on field experiences and clinical practice for candidates, and clinical faculty, including support provided by the unit and opportunities for feedback and reflection |
| 3.4.f | Assessment instruments and scoring guides used for and data collected from field experiences and clinical practice for all programs, including use of technology for teaching and learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.) |
| 3.4.g | Aggregate data on candidates entering and exiting from clinical practice for all programs (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.) |

---

**Exhibit 3.1 Adult Learning Theory and Clinical Experiences**

Exhibit 3.2 Partner School Districts Exhibit

3.2.a Placement Data Description Exhibit 3.2.b Placement Data by Subject Fields Exhibit 3.2.c Placement Data by Schools Exhibit 3.3 Schools as Clinics Committee Exhibit 3.4 Program Handbooks Exhibit 3.5 Schools as Clinics Manuscript for The Peabody Journal of Education Exhibit 3.6 Clinical and Field Experience Assessment Data by Programs Exhibit 3.7 School Partnership Memorandum of Agreement (Template) Exhibit 3.8 School Counseling Internship Agreement Exhibit 3.9 School Psychology Internship Agreement Exhibit 3.2.d School Psychology Placement Data Exhibit 3.10 UCAPP Mentor Handbook

See Attachment panel below.
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 Diversity

How does the unit prepare candidates to work effectively with all students, including individuals of different ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and/or geographical area?

The unit's leadership has worked with faculty members to ensure that diversity and multiculturalism are embedded in the daily teaching and learning activities. With the guidance of the unit's Advisory Council on Diversity, the unit has successfully identified priorities in the area of diversity to ensure that its candidates are prepared to work with students from various socio-economic, English language, and special needs backgrounds. In the unit's Academic Plan and Conceptual Framework [Exhibits I.2 & I.11], diversity is a prominent aspect. It advocates for candidates' understanding of how inequitable socio-economic opportunities have contributed to students' educational preparation. Effective the 2012-13 academic year, all unit's faculty search committees have adopted the recommendations of the Advisory Council on Diversity by actively seeking candidates from diverse backgrounds. Each Committee has also consisted of at least one member of the Advisory Council on Diversity. Data have indicated that the unit has successfully increased its faculty (from about 11% in 2006 to 19% in 2014) and candidate diversity (from 11% in 2011 to 14% in 2014). Through the efforts of designing, implementing, and evaluating programs, it has provided enhanced experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. Longitudinal assessments, particularly those from clinical and field experiences, have indicated that candidates can apply proficiencies related to diversity. Data from candidates' clinical and field experience assessments [Exhibit 3.6] across all programs indicate that from 2011-14, nearly 100% candidates have made outstanding progress or satisfactory progress in promoting student's ability to make informed decisions as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society and interdependent world by implementing instruction based on major concepts, modes of inquiry and integrated study. And nearly 100% candidates could differentiate instruction on the diverse needs of students and their special needs.

Candidates in initial and advanced programs are required to develop and demonstrate proficiencies related to diversity that are specified in the unit conceptual framework and in national, state, and institutional standards. Throughout their preparation program activities, such as courses, field experiences, and clinical practices, candidates must demonstrate proficiencies with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity that are specified in the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching and the state draft of the Common Core of Leading. The proficiencies related to diversity are based on well-developed knowledge for diversity and inclusion so that candidates can apply them effectively in schools.

The Connecticut Common Core of Teaching requires that teachers "understand how students learn and develop by ... learning about exceptionality in learning—including learning differences, visual and perceptual differences, socio-economic differences, special physical or mental challenges, and gifted and talented exceptionalities—and challenging students with exceptionality as well as seeking sources of
support within the school." Further, it requires teachers "understand how students differ in their approaches to learning by ... being aware of how student learning is influenced by language, culture, heritage, family and community values and incorporating students' experiences and community resources into instruction"; "learning about and utilizing strategies for building understanding, acceptance, and a positive sense of community into classroom"; and "becoming knowledgeable about language development, including the process of second-language acquisition, and employing strategies to support the learning of students whose first language is not English."

The unit's conceptual framework states that it expects its candidates to "possess interpersonal skills and a complex knowledge base of student diversity" and that candidates "are familiar with effective practices for serving diverse populations in inclusive settings."

The unit prepares professional educators to work in K-12 school settings as educational leaders and advocates for all students. As such, the unit expects its students to meet the needs of a diverse population at all levels. The unit expects its candidates to develop and demonstrate proficiencies in planning, implementing, and assessing learning that is differentiated for learners with exceptional needs; who are from different socio-economic backgrounds; and/or whose first language is not English. The unit expects its candidates to develop proficiencies in becoming leaders in the school and advocates 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. The School Counselor program specifically targets the preparation of candidates working in urban schools with special emphasis on poor and minority youth.

The unit emphasizes issues such as the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classrooms, gender equity, language proficiencies, and multiculturalism in school and society. More importantly, these topics are not taught in isolation from the classroom; candidates have concurrent opportunities to observe and work in a variety of clinical sites in order to confront directly the problems and issues discussed in coursework. These combined activities encourage candidates to examine their own beliefs and attitudes—directly confronting issues such as equity, justice, truth, access to knowledge, and integration. Candidates learn that there are no easy or absolute answers—often a disquieting experience. Because the issues presented in coursework are also evident in their clinical placements, candidates realize the importance of taking risks that may be associated in their confronting. In some instances, this may be general while in others it is quite specific as it relates to students who might otherwise be seen as "different." The unit requires candidates to contextualize teaching and draw effectively on representations from the students' own experiences and cultures. The unit expects candidates to challenge students toward cognitive complexity and engage all students, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities, through instructional conversation.

In the initial teacher preparation programs, candidates are required to take courses addressing exceptionality, and language and cultural diversity in education. Such courses include:

- EPSY 5108/308 Instruction for Students with Special Needs in the Mainstream
- EDCI 5700 – Foundations of Bilingual Education
- EDCI 5715 – Bilingualism and Second Language Acquisition
- EDCI 5720 – Bilingual Education and Biliteracy
- EDCI 5740 – Latinos and U.S. Education
- EDCI 5742 – Sheltered English Instruction for English Language Learners
- EDCI 5750 – Language Diversity and Literacy
- EDCI 5875 – Multicultural Education
- EDCI 5890 – Educational Linguistics
EDCI 5895 – Language Ideology & Education

Further, pedagogical knowledge and skills of working with students from diverse backgrounds by developing a classroom and school climate that value diversity, by incorporating multiple perspectives into teaching, and by demonstrating behaviors consistent with the ideas of fairness and the belief that all students can learn are also embedded in methods courses, such as:

EDCI 5070/392 Methods of Instruction and Evaluation
EDCI 5085/395 Subject Area Methods

At the unit, all candidates, regardless of their area of certification, have experiences that include elementary to secondary school, urban and suburban placement, and work with students with a range of abilities and disabilities. Initially, candidates are placed in settings other than those in which they will ultimately teach. In all, the unit believes that the series of diverse clinical experiences in partnership schools is essential to candidates who become highly skilled, caring, multicultural educators.

Closely related to diversity is the unit's commitment to urban education. Three of the six partnership districts are in culturally diverse urban communities—characterized by many of the usual challenges and problems that face urban schools throughout the country. The unit believes that its involvement in these urban schools benefits its candidates and faculty, as well as the teachers and students with whom it works. One of the encouraging elements of its collaboration has been the strong support that the unit's programs have received from teachers and administrators in these urban school districts. Most importantly, working in an urban district has prepared candidates with skills to work effectively with diverse students.

The unit recognizes that it could improve the diversity of its school-based cooperating teachers, mentors, and supervisors for candidates engaged in various field experience and clinical practices. Over the last 10 years, only 7% of educators in Connecticut have been minorities. According to the State of Connecticut Regulations Section 10-145d-400 (fff), candidates in teacher education programs must be supervised by school-based cooperating teachers who have been officially trained by the Connecticut State Department of Education. The percentage of minority educators meeting this requirement is much lower. Although the unit has increased the number of schools with extremely high minority student enrollment, it has been challenging to ensure the unit's candidates are mentored and supervised by experienced educators with diverse backgrounds.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

4.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

D Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
D Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
D Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

Not applicable.
4.2.b Continuous Improvement

Candidates and faculty regularly review assessment data on candidates' ability to work with all students and develop plans for improving their practice and the unit programs. Assessments of competencies related to diversity issues include: (a) a pre-admission assessment that is intended, in part, to serve as a qualitative assessment of applicants' respect for the worth, uniqueness, and potential for growth and development of all individuals, and their respect for individual and cultural diversity; (b) formal evaluations in courses that are particularly relevant to issues of diversity [Exhibit 5.1]; (c) an electronic portfolio; and (d) the Alumni Survey that provides a self-assessment of the student's competence in issues of cultural and individual diversity.

Formative and summative assessments are conducted regularly to evaluate candidates' performance and their acquisition of knowledge and skills. There are several levels of assessment by which candidates demonstrate their proficiencies related to diversity. On one level there are the final grades they receive in the two courses that specifically address either diversity or exceptionalities. These are EPSY 5316, Cross-Cultural Counseling and EPSY 5108, Instruction for Students with Special Needs in the Mainstream. On another level, their proficiency in these areas is demonstrated in actual school settings during their clinical experiences and evaluated by school-based site supervisors in collaboration with program faculty.

According to the unit's most recent Alumni Survey (2013) results [Exhibits 4.1.a and 4.1.b], which examined statements on diversity, program graduates rated "satisfied" or "very satisfied" on cultural sensitivity (80%) and promoting an understanding of diversity and cultural differences (73%). The two variables that yielded significant differences between importance and satisfaction were understanding people from other racial/ethnic backgrounds (70%), promoting an understanding of diversity and cultural differences (76%), and respecting the value of diversity (81%).

The unit expects its candidates to engage in professional educational experiences with peers from the broad range of diverse groups. The unit actively solicits, values, and promotes participation of candidates from diverse cultures and experiences in classes, field experiences, and clinical practices. The unit expects candidates to reflect on and analyze these experiences in ways that enhance their development and growth. One of the unit goals is to have a student body within its programs that is as diverse as the student bodies typically found in urban schools. As such, we strongly encourage and seriously consider applicants representing diverse groups. At the present time approximately 12% of the candidates in our program are members of racial and ethnic diverse groups, which allows for considerable diversity in each candidate's daily educational interactions and peer interactions. All initial and advanced programs require candidates to complete an inquiry project or a capstone project. Most of these projects are organized and presented by a team of candidates, and they provide more defined and organized opportunities for candidates to interact with each other.

The unit has also obtained a grant from the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) to extend the GlobalEd Project, which is an interdisciplinary project between the Departments of Political Science and Educational Psychology (http://www.globaled.uconn.edu/). The GlobalEd Project was created out of a
need to systematically and scientifically evaluate perceived gender differences in leadership and decision-making styles and values and in approaches to technology. The Project does this by using the approach to conduct international negotiation simulations across each of three years with students in middle school and high school social studies programs. Candidates in the unit's educator preparation programs have the opportunity to be engaged in this project to address the diverse issues of human rights, global environment, international economics, conflict and cooperation, and world health.

The unit's Advisory Council on Diversity includes faculty, staff, students, state education policy makers, practicing teachers, and administrators. The Advisory Council has worked with the unit's leadership to establish goals and objectives related to recruitment and retention of candidates from historically underrepresented groups. In 2013-14 academic year, the Council conducted a cultural competency learning experience evaluation (CCLE) to determine whether and the degree to which a specific professional development experience could serve as a basis for creating a climate conducive to recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty/staff and student group in the Neag School of Education [Exhibit 4.2]. The unit plans to adopt the four recommendations made by this evaluation in the 2014-15 academic year. 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.

In the last 10 years, the unit has stepped up its fund raising efforts. Through the generosity from individuals such as Raymond Neag, the unit has managed to expand its endowment, which allowed the unit to increase its annual scholarship awards from $50,000 to approximately $500,000. The unit has also allocated an annual $50,000 in scholarship from the Neag Endowment to ensure all 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 a $100,000 grant for minority candidate recruitment from the Hearst Foundation [Exhibit 4.3, http://spotlight.education.uconn.edu/2014/celebrating-diversity-in-teacher-education/, and http://spotlight.education.uconn.edu/2012/diversity-outreach-dinner-shows-teaching-needs-and-rewards/ ].

During field experiences and clinical practice, candidates are exposed to issues of cultural and individual diversity with particular emphasis placed on these issues: social and cultural aspects of behavior; individual differences in behavior; human development; professional standards and ethics; effective intervention; and consultation and supervision. They are designed to encourage candidates to interact with exceptional students and students from diverse groups.

The unit ensures that school-based site supervisors provide end-of-the-semester evaluations pertinent to their respective supervisee's knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions [Exhibit 4.4]. In addition, program faculty members assigned to supervise practica conduct frequent site visits at each candidate's school setting during which they specifically inquire about the candidate's experiences and performances related to working with students from diverse backgrounds.

Teacher education programs require candidates to include in their electronic portfolios artifacts that prompt students to develop and implement multicultural lessons during student teaching and e-portfolio artifacts that prompt students to reflect on their ability to differentiate instruction for exceptional populations. The school administrator and other school personnel preparation programs require candidates to develop and keep current reflective journals; in addition, key experiences such as the leadership knowledge and skills related to diversity must be included in specific journal entries. Candidate work in TaskStream is analyzed in the areas related to applying theories into instructional and administrative practices. Program faculty meet to discuss data from these sources and make appropriate
adjustments and enhancements on an ongoing basis.

Through these experiences, the unit helps candidates confront issues of diversity that affect teaching and student learning. By the time students reach their fieldwork experiences, they are conjointly participating in on-site supervised school settings while also attending on-campus graduate seminars led by faculty members. The on-campus seminars include peers that are also involved in practica/internships at various schools themselves. The seminars allow for both individual and group supervision and include peer and faculty feedback. As such, each candidate receives at least two hours (and usually more) of weekly supervision either on site or on campus throughout the duration of their fieldwork experience. Close communication between on-site school-based supervisors and faculty supervisors provides an excellent form of quality assurance to make sure that candidates are using feedback appropriately in their work with students from diverse groups.

All of the unit's programs provide a structure of the practicum and internship that promotes students' acquisition and application of newly learned skills in the areas of diversity that provides graduated experiences and responsibilities in various settings. Frequent peer and supervisor feedback allow for students to reflect on their skills and the quality of performances with respect to professional practices designed and implemented for children from diverse groups. Depending on the extant skill or experience level, the student moves from an initial role of observer to that of an increasingly active participant in the delivery of school psychological services and participation in educational settings with emphasis on empirically supported practices with sensitivity to individual differences and diversity.

10000 character limit

4.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.

Not applicable.

12000 character limit

4.4 Exhibits for Standard 4

| 4.4.a | Aggregate data on proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to demonstrate through working with students from diverse groups in classrooms and schools, including impact on student learning |
| 4.4.b | Curriculum components and experiences that address diversity proficiencies (This might be a matrix that shows diversity components in required courses.) |
| 4.4.c | Assessment instruments and scoring guides related to candidates meeting diversity proficiencies, including impact on student learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.) |
| 4.4.d | Data table on faculty demographics (see Appendix A for an example) |
| 4.4.e | Data table on candidates demographics (see Appendix B for an example) |
| 4.4.f | Data table on demographics of P-12 students in schools used for clinical practice (see Appendix C for an example) |
| 4.4.g | Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty |
| 4.4.h | Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates |
| 4.4.i | Policies, procedures, and practices that support candidates working with P-12 students from diverse groups |

Exhibit 4.1a Alumni Survey Part 1
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 Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

How does the unit ensure that its professional education faculty contributes to the preparation of effective educators through scholarship, service, teaching, collaboration and assessment of their performance?

In the last decade, the unit has actively recruited and retained an exceptionally talented faculty, who have modeled best professional practices in teaching, scholarship, and service, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance. During the 2012-2013, the unit established two faculty clusters in closing the achievement gap and creativity research, in recognition to the state's greatest educational needs. As other institutions are slowing, or even reversing, the growth of their faculty, the unit embarked on one of the most ambitious faculty hiring plans in the United States. See [http://spotlight.education.uconn.edu/2012/uconn-embarking-on-major-expansion-of-faculty/](http://spotlight.education.uconn.edu/2012/uconn-embarking-on-major-expansion-of-faculty/). The unit has since hired 18 additional tenure/tenure track faculty members, including endowed chairs in social justice, equity, teacher education, and policy research. See [http://spotlight.education.uconn.edu/2013/neag-school-of-education-unleashes-leadership-with-new-hires/](http://spotlight.education.uconn.edu/2013/neag-school-of-education-unleashes-leadership-with-new-hires/). Through legislative, state, and professional organization initiatives, faculty have actively collaborated with colleagues in the field and in P-12 schools. The unit has adhered to the University's policies and procedures to systematically evaluate faculty performance, and has facilitated faculty development. The unit has established high expectations for faculty members in the areas of teaching, research, and service. It has demonstrated a strong support for faculty teaching and professional development activities through the allocations of budget resources. Faculty members have responded to
the unit's expectations and support with an unprecedented excellent records in teaching at the University along with high levels of participation in national grant activities and influential publications in the leading peer-reviewed journals. Twelve of the 42 (29%) University's Teaching Fellows, the highest recognition for excellence in teaching, have been awarded to the unit's faculty members.

The unit expects its professional education faculty to have earned doctorates or acquired exceptional expertise, have contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the levels that they supervise, and are meaningfully engaged in related scholarship. The only professional faculty members who do not hold terminal degrees are the cooperating teachers from professional development schools, and mentors and supervisors for practica in the other school personnel programs.

According to the State of Connecticut Regulations Section 10-145d-400 (fff), candidates in teacher education program must be supervised by school-based cooperating teachers, who have been officially trained by the Connecticut State Department of Education. Because the unit employs the professional development school partner model, not only must its cooperating teachers meet the state training requirements but they also must be assigned to work with unit candidates based on their effective teaching experiences in classrooms. The unit works with the schools to determine the actual assignments.

Mentors and supervisors for other school personnel preparation programs are recommended by principals, superintendents, and partner organizations such as the Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS), and the Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), based on their proven effectiveness in serving in actual roles as a school administrator, counselor, and psychologist, in raising student achievement in schools.

The unit's clinical faculty members are licensed in the field that they teach or supervise, and are master teachers or well recognized for their achievement in the field. One hundred percent of the unit's school-based faculty members are properly certified by the State of Connecticut in the appropriate assignment areas. According to the State of Connecticut Regulations Section 10-145d-401 (a), "No person shall be eligible to serve for a board of education in the position of superintendent, administrator, teacher, special service staff member, or other position for which certificates or permits are issued, unless such person holds a valid Connecticut certificate or permit appropriate for such position, ..." All of the unit's partner schools are required to report their staff assignments and certification areas to the Connecticut State Department of Education on a yearly basis. The State issues sanctions, including fines, if violations are found. Further, as mentioned above, according to the State of Connecticut Regulations Section 10-145d-400 (fff), candidates in teacher education program must be supervised by school-based cooperating teachers, who have been officially trained by the Connecticut State Department of Education. Thus, all of the cooperating teachers have already been vetted by the Connecticut State Department of Education regarding their certification status. The unit also does its due diligence by ensuring the appropriate certification and state training when it works with partner school personnel departments to make determinations of staff assignments with the candidates.

The unit's higher education clinical faculty members are or were appropriately certified educators either in Connecticut or in their home states. In addition, all of them were classroom teachers, principals, and/or superintendents before they joined the unit. Further, by unit definition, in addition to teaching educator preparation program courses, the clinical faculty members spent the majority of their time in the unit's partner schools by working with the candidates and partner school cooperating teachers, mentors, supervisors, and administrators. They have a thorough understanding of students with whom the candidates work, and of the school cultures. More faculty information can be found in the unit's directory at [http://www.education.uconn.edu/directory/](http://www.education.uconn.edu/directory/).

The unit expects faculty teaching to reflect the proficiencies outlined in professional, state, and unit
standards. Department and program faculty members work together to ensure candidate learning outcomes are aligned with the tenets of the conceptual framework, national standards (especially those of the Specialty Program Associations), and current research and development in the fields. Through exercises such as curricular mapping, faculty members identify classroom activities, assignments, and clinical experiences that will contribute to candidates' proficiencies in knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Specific program curricular alignment could be found in the individual Specialty Program Association reports available in the AIMS System, and in professional education course syllabi available in the Overview Section of this report.

The unit expects all professional education faculty to have an in-depth understanding of their fields and be teacher scholars who integrate what is known about their content areas, teaching, and learning in their own instructional practice. They must exhibit intellectual vitality in their sensitivity to critical issues. The unit has a productive research faculty, many of whom are nationally recognized experts in their fields. Reading Recovery, Positive Behaviors Support, and Response to Intervention, to name a few, all have resident faculty members at the unit. Models and theories generated from the data of research projects in these areas have been incorporated in related courses and field experiences. The unit's nationally well-known research in Positive Behavior Support (PBS), Response to Intervention (RTI), and Talent Development and Gifted Education have not only contributed to the unit's own educator preparation programs, but also to the State of Connecticut education policies and practices in the areas of differentiated instruction and competencies required for beginning educators. See http://www.education.uconn.edu/research/.

Various programs use a variety of approaches to encourage candidates' development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions. The teacher education programs have used mediums such as journals, student teaching seminars and evaluations, student work samples, classroom artifacts, and the capstone inquiry projects--electronic portfolios (in TaskStream)--to encourage candidates to document their reflection, thinking process, strategies used in classrooms, and their own behaviors and manners in educational settings. The school administrator preparation programs have used various student assessment tools established through curricular mapping and documented in student TaskStream accounts to encourage candidates' reflection, and leadership-based problem-solving skills. The other school personnel programs have used not only classroom interaction but also the critical practicum and field experiences for candidates to engage in discussions and self explorations on the basis of their actual interactions with students in clinical settings.

Data [Exhibit 5.6] indicate that, in 2012-2013, the unit faculty supervised four University Scholars, 98 honor students, 362 undergraduate student interns, 151 graduate interns, and advised 424 students. One faculty member received the University Teaching Award, served as advisors for nine student organization, 47 created innovative ways of teaching, produced 158 full-length articles in refereed journals, 179 in conference proceedings, 325 conference presentations, and 87 technical reports. Nine members of the faculty served as editor for major journals, and 39 as associate editors, served as reviewers for grants and manuscripts for 179 times, and were invited as speakers for 117 times.

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

5.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level
D Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
D Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
D Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

The unit expects its faculty to incorporate appropriate candidate performance assessments. In general, the unit faculty members measure their instructional effectiveness by applying authentic candidate performance-based assessments designed with valid and reliable rubrics aligned with the unit's conceptual framework, and national and state standards. Specifically, program faculty members work collaboratively with school-based cooperating teachers, mentors, and/or supervisors to align their instructional strategies with the learning needs of candidates. Each program has identified consistent sets of bias-free assessments at various transition points or at the end of certain course learning periods as required by the unit's Assessment Plan and the NCATE SPA program review standards. Such assessments include tests; admission essays; self-reflective papers; lesson plans; inquiry projects; and/or electronic portfolios; which are designed on the basis of faculty collectively established rubrics. Unit faculty examines data from these assessments of candidate performances through multi-angulation to gauge the effectiveness of their instructional strategies. When necessary, program faculty members review trend data from the assessments to make program or course improvements. The specific instructional strategies and assessments are documented in the Specialty Program Association reports available for review in the AIMS Program Report System.

Using technology in instruction has become a culture in the unit. Faculty members have used various instructional technologies to deliver audio, visual, and print materials to candidates. In some cases, there are on-line and on-ground blended methods, Facebook pages, synchronized or asynchronized discussions, and other mediums for faculty and students to interact with each other. The initial and advanced educator preparation programs have subscribed TaskStream services to build assessment instruments based on program-determined rubrics. Candidates have built their electronic portfolios, which include reflection papers, student teaching/field experience videos, inquiry projects, team projects, and other homework assignments. Faculty members have used this medium to provide candidates with feedback. Candidates continue to refine their work until they have reached mastery of the program-determined competencies. These technologies have created a non-threatening and direct interactive faculty-candidate working environment.

The faculty understand assessment technology, use multiple forms of assessments in determining their effectiveness, and use data to improve their practice. The unit faculty members are deeply committed to modeling the best professional practices in teaching. Tenured faculty members are evaluated by the students in all of their classes once a year, while un-tenured faculty members are evaluated every semester. Candidate evaluations of faculty involve 22 items (new, 11 items before 2013), and utilize a five-point (10 point scale before 2013) Likert scale (http://www.oir.uconn.edu/onlineset/onlineset.html). The 22 items evaluated include:

Presentation of Course Material
Organization of Course
Identification of Clear Objectives for the Course
Extent to Which the Course Fulfilled the Identified Objectives
Whether the Course Assignments Were Clear
Extent to Which Instructor Stimulated Interest
Whether the Grading in the Course Was Fair
 Appropriateness of Course Examinations
Accessibility of Instructor
Interest and Concern of Instructor
Preparation of Instructor

Except for a few isolated courses, the majority of the composite mean for these 22 items for faculty members in the Neag School of Education are consistently scored above 4.0 (on a 5-point scale) [Exhibit 5.1].

The commitment of the faculty to teaching excellence is also evident in the work performed by the unit faculty members for other parts of the University. In addition to participation in the University of Connecticut's Institute for Teaching and Learning training sessions for university faculty, a number of unit faculty members have been extensively involved in the training of graduate teaching assistants in other departments of the university, most notably Mathematics and Modern and Classical Languages.

The unit is a Carnegie-classified research extensive institution. In addition to their teaching responsibilities, faculty members in the unit are required to conduct and publish research in the areas of educator preparation, school improvement, student learning, equity in education in American society, international education policies, and student achievement. As researchers, unit faculty are expected to engage in continuing intellectual development and to produce scholarly work that enhances the knowledge base of their discipline. While the primary focus in scholarship is on basic and applied scholarship, instructional development-related contributions (such as the writing of textbooks in faculty member's discipline) are also valued. Faculty members are required to disseminate their research through peer-reviewed journals; books; and regional, national, and international symposia and conferences. Overall, faculty members must be engaged actively in and contribute to their discipline and profession. Simply staying current with the literature or technology is not sufficient. Specific requirements are articulated in the unit's Guideline for Merit, Promotion and Tenure [Exhibits 5.2.a and 5.2.b].

The unit expects its faculty to demonstrate scholarly work related to teaching, learning and their fields of specialization. Their scholarly work reflect the mission of the unit. As a research institution, 100% of the unit's tenure-track or tenured faculty members is engaged in scholarships. The scholarships are related to teaching and learning in a faculty member's field of study. Such activities include the publication of scholarly book or monographs, scholarly books edited, scholarly books assembled, textbooks, manuals, software packages, book chapters, articles in referred and non-referred journals, conference proceedings, technical reports, reviews, performances as conductor, performances in recitals/concerts, and musical arrangements or editions. The faculty members also serve as editors of major journals; organizers of major conferences; major officers in national/international learned societies; member of federal and other national/international peer review committees; reviewers for granting agencies, journals, publishers or other universities; winner of national/international awards, prizes or honorary degrees; fellows of national/international learned societies; keynote speakers; visiting professors at other universities; invited panelists; and consultants to national projects. The unit's annual reports summarize these accomplishments [Exhibits 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5]. Examples of faculty scholarship activities can also be viewed at http://education.uconn.edu/research-highlights. These activities and achievements have demonstrated that the faculty members are actively engaged in inquiry that ranges from knowledge generation to exploration and questioning of the field to evaluating the effectiveness of a teaching approach.

The unit seeks to provide strong leadership to public schools, institutions, and communities throughout the state and nation through research, development, training opportunities, and outreach efforts. The unit expects faculty to actively engage in dialogues about the design and delivery of instructional programs in educator preparation programs and in P-12 schools. Faculty members are heavily involved in research, development, and evaluation projects in public schools throughout the state of Connecticut, and especially so in the professional development schools and partner schools for the IB/M and TCPCG programs. Typically, faculty members involved in teacher education programs spend a minimum of one full day per week in public school settings. Faculty involvement in the public schools includes supervision and mentoring of candidates and interns, including student teachers; providing in-service
development opportunities for school-based personnel; offering university courses on-site in public school settings; evaluation of public school programs; curriculum development activities; collaborative grant-writing with public school personnel; and classroom-based research. Unit faculty also play leadership roles in local, regional, and national professional organizations.

The unit expects its faculty to collaborate regularly with P-12 practitioners and with other colleagues in colleges and universities. They are encouraged to provide leadership in the profession, schools, and professional associations. Faculty members are expected to provide services in the following activities: present in student recruitment programs especially those for minority students; serve on departmental or non-departmentalized committees; serve as administrators; provide clinical, extension or other "expert" services; participate in formal outreach programs for schools and businesses; serve on statewide committees; consult for state and local government agencies, businesses, and institutions; provide voluntary services to service organizations, community groups, federal agencies, and professional organizations.

The unit’s outreach efforts are summarized in the annual reports [Exhibits 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5] and at http://www.education.uconn.edu/research and http://www.oir.uconn.edu/UC_DHE_PerfMeas_Collaborative_Activities_Public_Schools.pdf. Many faculty members serve on the editorial boards of peer-reviewed journals, national organizations such as AERA, NCATE, IRA, etc. From 2012, the unit has engaged in global collaborative planning with colleagues in Egypt, Dominican Republic, Jordan, and the United Arab Emirates. The Harold W. McGraw Jr. Prize in Education honored Professor Joseph S. Renzulli for his work in driving innovations in American schools, and for addressing the need to grant all student access to the knowledge and skills necessary for the 21st century. See Exhibit 5.6 for the full-page award announcement on The New York Times.

The unit conducts systemic and comprehensive evaluation of its faculty. The evaluation includes faculty members' performance in teaching, scholarship, service, and collaboration with the professional community, and leadership in the University and on the national level. Unit faculty members are evaluated by their respective Department Heads on an annual basis. The evaluation includes attention to teaching, research and scholarship, and service. All faculty members meet with their Department Head to identify, on an annual basis, goals and objectives for the upcoming academic year. Included in the faculty evaluation process are teaching evaluations, published research, grant activity, and service to the University, the public schools, and the profession. Promotion and tenure expectations are clear, as are expectations for merit awards [Exhibits 5.1 and 5.2]. All faculty members in the unit are evaluated on the basis of the University's Policy on Faculty Professional Responsibilities (http://policy.uconn.edu) with processes regulated by the AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement (http://www.uconnaaup.org/contracts/aaup-integrated-agreement). For requirements of graduate assistants, see http://tap.uconn.edu.

Overall, the unit's faculty members have consistently performed exceptionally well in their course evaluations. See Exhibits 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, and 5.6. In addition, the unit's faculty has traditionally been known on campus as the best teaching faculty. In the past decade, the University's highest honor for achievement in teaching—"The University Teaching Fellow"—was bestowed upon 12 of the unit's faculty members (see http://itl.uconn.edu/itl-teaching-awards/). In 2007, the University's faculty collective bargaining organization, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) awarded then Associate Dean Professor Thomas C. DeFranco, for his teaching in the field of mathematics and mathematics education. It is rare for a senior administrator to receive such an honor.
D Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
D Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

The unit has established policies and procedures that encourage all faculty members to be continuous learners. All faculty members at the University of Connecticut are expected to engage in on-going professional development. The unit provides numerous on-campus opportunities for such professional development, including faculty and staff retreats, training sessions, guest lectures, technology application workshops, diversity training workshops, and so on. In addition, funding is available for faculty members to attend professional conferences, as well as regional and national professional development activities. Such funding is appropriated to favor junior faculty members, but is available at some level to support all interested faculty. Specifically, as mentioned earlier, faculty professional development needs are addressed first at the department level. Departments work out individual faculty development plans, and the unit supports such needs with allocation of budget for faculty to attend meetings, conferences; and to publish their work.

On the basis of unit and faculty needs, professional development activities are offered in many formats. Faculty members are encouraged to mentor new faculty, providing encouragement and support for developing scholarly work around teaching, inquiry, and service. Faculty members are encouraged to become active participants in their fields with appropriate regional, national, and international organizations by becoming committee and board members. They are encouraged to present research findings and papers at conferences and training workshops, and also to simply attend these learning opportunities. The unit presents a series of colloquia on assessments, including performance assessment (http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/colloquia). All faculty members are required by the state general statutes to participate in diversity and sexual harassment prevention training and ethics and compliance training (http://audit.uconn.edu). Further, for the last three years, the unit has offered and has sponsored the annual New England Region Conference on Multicultural Education. The unit has had the largest delegation at this event. The unit offers on-going training workshops on instructional technology. The monthly faculty meetings are also used to discuss institutional policy matters and how they affect teaching and learning. The University requires all faculty members involved in human subject research to complete regular trainings (see http://research.uconn.edu/irb/citi-training/).

The unit faculty members participate in professional development activities on an on-going basis. Such activities are available on a daily basis. See annual reports [Exhibits 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, and 5.6] for faculty participation in national and regional conferences and training opportunities.

---

5.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.

Not applicable.

---

Exhibit 5.4.a - Data table on qualifications of professional education faculty. This table can be compiled below from data submitted in the Manage Faculty section of AIMS or compiled in Excel,
Word, or another format and uploaded as an exhibit.
FacultyInfo_19814_8622_88402.xls
See Attachment panel below.

5.4 Exhibits for Standard 5

5.4.a Data table on qualifications of professional education faculty (This table can be compiled in the online template from data submitted for national program reviews or compiled in Excel, Word, or another format and uploaded as an exhibit. See Appendix D for an example.)
5.4.b Data table on qualifications of clinical faculty (i.e., P-12 school professionals and professional education faculty responsible for instruction, supervision, and/or assessment of candidates during field experiences and clinical practice)
5.4.c Policies and practices to assure clinical faculty meet unit expectations
5.4.d Policies, expectations, and samples of faculty scholarly activities
5.4.e Summary of faculty service and collaborative activities in schools (e.g., collaborative project with school faculty, teacher professional development, and addressing the needs of low performing schools) and with the professional community (e.g., grants, evaluations, task force participation, provision of professional development, offering courses, etc.)
5.4.f Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty evaluation (including promotion and tenure) and summaries of the results in areas of teaching, scholarship and service
5.4.g Policies, procedures, and practices for professional development and summaries of the results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit 5.1 Faculty Course Evaluation Summary (Special Notice)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 5.3 Unit Annual Report 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 5.4 Unit Annual Report 2011-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 5.5 Unit Annual Report 2012-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 5.6 Unit Annual Report Data Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 5.2.a Policy--Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment for Tenure Track Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 5.2.b Policy--Review for Non-Tenure Track Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachment panel below.

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 Unit Governance and Resources

How do the unit's governance system and resources contribute to adequately preparing candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards?

In the last decade, the unit has excelled in generating a wide range of resources to support its mission of teaching, learning, research, and services. The support has come from the Governor, state legislature, national and regional corporations, enthusiastic and generous donors, and federal and state agencies. Such efforts have made it possible for the unit to recruit and retain faculty members with renowned reputation in their fields; to raise the academic expectations of candidates; to provide faculty, staff, and candidates a state-of-the-art working environment fitted with the latest information technologies; and to
conduct meaningful research and outreach activities in the state's socio-economically disadvantaged schools and communities. Because of the responsible management of resources, the unit has been able to continue to enhance its high-quality programs and services, which have made the unit a socially relevant educational institution in the state. It is evident that 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.

The unit faculty have engaged in discussions with stakeholders across the state to examine various factors contributing to the persistent achievement gap in the state. One of the factors examined is the effect of resources on educational quality in communities. Such discussions have taken place at the unit organized and sponsored annual "Closing the Achievement Gap" conference, faculty research clusters, and the CommPACT School initiatives.

The unit provides the leadership for effectively coordinating educator preparation programs. It has a well-established organizational structure designed to facilitate decision-making at the appropriate levels, while at the same time ensuring adequate opportunities for input and discussion from all involved stakeholders (faculty in the Neag School of Education and in other Schools and Colleges of the University of Connecticut, students, public school colleagues, etc.). The organizational structure [Exhibit 6.1] of the unit clearly delineates authority among the Dean; the Associate Deans; the Director of Teacher Education; the Directors of Assessment; Communications and Financial Affairs; and the department heads. The responsibilities of departments and faculty are clearly defined in the University's Faculty Professional Responsibilities (see http://guide.uconn.edu/personnel-employment/faculty-responsibilities). It is clear that the unit is responsible for the quality of all educator preparation programs at the University. It directly manages and coordinates all programs, and the unit faculty work with colleagues at P-12 partner schools and University faculty members in the content subject areas.

The unit adheres to all policies and procedures instituted by the Connecticut State Department of Education (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/site/default.asp), and the University of Connecticut (http://policy.uconn.edu/). According to the designation of the President of the University, the unit is administered by the Dean of the Neag School of Education, who has the primary responsibility for ensuring that professional education programs are organized, unified, and coordinated. All changes in programs and courses must be approved by the departments in the Neag School of Education, the Neag School of Education Courses and Curricula Committee, the Neag School of Education faculty, and, where appropriate, by the University Senate, Graduate School committees, and the appropriate state agencies and boards. Major responsibility for administering the various academic programs in the unit is given to the department heads, who chair the three departments of which the educator preparation programs reside: Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Leadership, and Educational Psychology. A number of academic programs, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, are housed within each department. Overall direction of the unit is provided by the Dean, who is assisted by the Associate Deans. The legislative body of the unit is the collective faculty, which meets on a monthly basis through regularly scheduled faculty meetings. The Dean's Administrative Council, which includes all department heads and administrative staff, meets on a biweekly basis to discuss confidential matters of policy and operational importance.

In the last decade, the unit's budgets have permitted faculty teaching, scholarship, and service to extend beyond the unit to its P-12 education partners and other programs at the University. Between the 2005-2006 and 2012-2013 academic years, the unit has seen an increase of its annual fiscal resources (actual expenses) from a little under $21 million to over $30 million [Exhibit 6.2]. The personnel costs have ranged from 79% to 83% of the total expenses. In addition to operating and supplies, the majority of the rest of the costs covered faculty professional development activities, including travel and conference registrations. Because personnel costs are dictated by the University's collective bargaining agreements with the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the University of Connecticut
Professional Employee Association (UCPEA), and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), the unit's faculty and staff compensation packages are consistent with all other colleges, schools, and units on campus. According to the data collected by the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) and published annually by The Chronicle of Higher Education, the compensation packages for faculty and administrators at the unit are consistent with or mostly above, similar units at other institutions. In the 2012-2013 academic year, the CUPA-HR data indicate that the average salaries for faculty members in the field of education in a four-year institution of higher education range from $49,406 (instructor) to $89,335 (professor). The average faculty salary at the unit ranged from $54,756 (instructor) to $145,137 (professor). See Exhibit 6.2.

The unit grant and contract expenditures have been steady in the last three years at an average of $11 million [Exhibit 6.4]. Specific grants and contracts are listed in the unit's annual reports [Exhibit 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5].

The unit's budget has supported high-quality work for curriculum, instruction, faculty, clinical work, and scholarship. The unit budget has adequately supported all educator preparation programs. The unit's endowment funds have also been used to support the unit's teaching and scholarship activities. In the last decade, the unit's annual scholarship activities have increased from an average of $10,000 per year to close to an average of $430,721 in the last three years. Even with the downturn of the economy and the reduction of investment returns, the unit continued to fund its regular scholarship activities. See Exhibit 6.5. The responsible fiscal management plans and the generosity of supporters have helped the unit to enhance its program quality in these hard economic times.

The unit's workload policies and practices permit and encourage faculty not only to be engaged in a wide range of professional activities, such as teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, work in schools, and service, but also to professionally contribute on a community, state, regional, national, and international basis. Such policies and practices are formally established. The unit's faculty have adopted a "Faculty Workload Policy," which is available in the Policy and Procedures Manual [Exhibit 6.6]. The faculty workload policy is intended to encourage faculty to participate in a wide variety of teaching, research, and service activities. Specifically, the policy states: "Tenure-track faculty members... are expected to exhibit strong performance in both scholarship and teaching, and to demonstrate superior achievement in at least one of these two areas. In addition, service and outreach contributions are valued and expected of all faculty members. Although individual accomplishments and emphases will vary, all faculty members are expected to contribute to each activity. Merit awards will recognize exceptional accomplishments in all three areas, with contributions to teaching and scholarship being equally valued."

Both the University and the unit are committed to playing a greater role in outreach to the external community. To that end, faculty are encouraged to interact with the educational community and the general public in areas related to their fields of expertise. For examples of faculty research and outreach efforts, see http://www.education.uconn.edu/research/. In addition, faculty involvement with their professional societies and participation in departmental and unit-sponsored activities are important. Faculty involvement is critical to the governance of the unit and the University. Faculty members have served on various unit level committees, such as the Assessment Committee, Advisory Council on Diversity, International Committee, the TNE Advisory Committee, the Graduate School Executive Council, University Senate, the NEASC accreditation committees, the NCAA accreditation committees, Outreach and Public Advocacy Forum, etc. Continuous improvement in all of the unit's activities is dependent upon active faculty participation in the management of the unit and its departments.

The unit supports faculty professional development activities by providing fiscal support for their research, publication, conference attendance, and obligations to professional organizations. Such supports have engaged faculty in dialogue and skill development-related activities to emerging theories and practices, and have promoted intellectual vitality, best teaching practices, and scholarship.
6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

6.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

D Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
D Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
D Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

Not applicable.

6.2.b Continuous Improvement

D Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
D Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

The unit has made every effort to ensure that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling. The University and the unit provide many services to support the academic success for its students. The unit faculty and staff ensure that all candidates are aware of these services during the program admissions processes, program orientations, plan of study meetings, and on-going advising and supervision.

The professional community will continue to participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation through the structures of academic departments, programs, committees, and advisory boards. Programs are normally established by faculty members within various departments, such as the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Leadership, and Educational Psychology. However, some programs, especially the Teacher Education Program, require the participation of faculty members from multiple departments, and from various subject content faculty from other colleges and schools at the University, such as the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The Teacher Education Program has begun a redesign process and it will continue to coordinate the delivery of program and includes all faculty members who are engaged in the program. The UCAPP Program will continue its partnership with the state's Association of School's for program design, delivery, mentoring, and support. Likewise, the Executive Leadership Program will continue its partnership with the state's Association of Public School Superintendents for the same purpose.

The unit has a long tradition of collaboration with other academic units involved in the preparation of professional educators. Colleagues on campus have recognized the unit as a leader in the field of education. The unit will continue to provide role models of effective teaching for faculty members in the
other units at the University. Specifically, the subject content area requirements and delivery are the results of continuous discussions based on candidate assessment data and new national and international research among professional education faculty and content faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, School of Fine Arts, and the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences. Faculty members from the other colleges and schools take strong ownership of the content instructions and have high expectations for the unit's candidates. With the recent generous "Teachers for a New Era (TNE)" grant funding from the Carnegie Corporation of New York (see http://www.tne.uconn.edu), the unit has been able to review the content requirements for teacher candidates and have reached an agreement with the faculty in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The unit's five-year Integrated Bachelor's and Master's degree graduates, if they choose, are now able to graduate with two Bachelor's degrees (one in Education with the state required content major, and one in the subject) along with the final Master's degree (see http://advising.education.uconn.edu/additional-degree-for-teacher-education-students).

Academic Advisors at the unit assist students in creating an educational plan aligned with candidates' academic, personal and career goals, and support candidates in making meaningful choices consistent with those goals. The Academic Advising Center is staffed with professional advisors who provide information and support to current and prospective candidates regarding degree progress, careers in education, admission criteria, transfer course evaluation, University and School policies and procedures, and other issues. In the past few years, several initiatives have supported the unit's goal of increasing candidate diversity in our teacher education programs. These initiatives include: hiring a pre-education advisor for outreach and retention; creating a pre-teaching course: "Inspiring the Urban Educator"; establishing a yearly dinner to celebrate diversity at the unit and provide networking opportunities for candidates of color; collaborative partnerships with university cultural centers, advisors at UConn Storrs and Regional Campuses; and outreach to K-12 schools. In the past five years, student diversity has increased by 3%.

The unit has outstanding facilities and current technologies. The unit is mainly located in Charles B. Gentry Building. It also occupies faculty offices and classroom facilities at the University's branch campuses in Stamford (http://www.stamford.uconn.edu), Waterbury (http://www.waterbury.uconn.edu), and West Hartford (http://www.hartford.uconn.edu). The Gentry Building was expanded and renovated as part of the University's two-billion-dollar campus renewal effort supported by the Governor and the state legislature. The original facilities include individual offices for all faculty members and several grant-related laboratories involving technology, the Reading and Language Arts Center, the Northeastern Educational Policy Center, a microcomputer laboratory, a large, high-tech lecture auditorium, and several other recently completed high-technology classrooms in the building. With the completion of the expansion and renovation project, the Gentry Building added approximately 25,000 square feet of space to its 58,000 square feet. The new and renovated space in Gentry Building includes 89 faculty offices, 13 administrative offices and waiting areas, nine areas for graduate assistants, seven workrooms, six technology laboratories, five conference rooms, four medium-sized classrooms, three seminar rooms, three student study rooms, a large lecture hall, and a faculty lounge. Since the last NCATE accreditation visit, the old part of the Gentry Building has undergone a complete renovation. The unit provides candidates with state-of-art technology support, including a wire less campus communications environment so that candidates have easy access to instructional materials.

Off-campus sites utilized by the unit includes space at various program sites for the Administrator Preparation Program in southeast Connecticut, Farmington, and East Hartford. These sites have provided easy and energy-efficient access for working teachers to continue their studies for preparation as school administrators. All of these off-campus facilities are located in public schools. They are the results of the collaborative relationship between the unit and its school partners. Further, the unit's professional development schools have provided classroom and work space for teacher candidates during their practica, student teaching, and internship periods. The unit is committed to continue such effective collaboration with the school partners.
The unit will continue to fund the improvement of its assessment system, which is used to gauge how well the unit's governance structure and system have functioned in planning, delivering, and evaluating programs. In 2014, the unit restructured the Assessment Office, which now directly reports to the Associate Dean of Research and Assessment. Further, the unit redefined responsibilities of its technology support staff so that there are sufficient staff members who have the expertise in database development and are available to enhance the unit's assessment system. The unit's assessment system draws data from various sources, including: (1) the unit's own Student Information System; (2) the University Registrar's PeopleSoft Management System; (3) the University's Office of Assessment; and (4) candidates' TaskStream portfolios. The unit covers all costs for its own Student Information Systems, the candidates’ access to TaskStream, and the license for Checkbox. The University covers the costs for the PeopleSoft Management System and the Office of Assessment database. For more details, see [http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/](http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/)

---

**6.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review**

Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard.

Not applicable.

---

**6.4 Exhibits for Standard 6**

| 6.4.a | Policies, procedures, and practices for governance and operations of the unit |
| 6.4.b | Organizational chart and/or description of the unit governance structure and its relationship to institutional governance structure |
| 6.4.c | Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate services such as counseling and advising |
| 6.4.d | Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate recruitment and admission, and accessibility to candidates and the education community |
| 6.4.e | Academic calendars, catalogs, unit publications, grading policies, and unit advertising |
| 6.4.f | Unit budget, with provisions for assessment, technology, professional development, and support for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs when applicable |
| 6.4.g | Budgets of comparable units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other campuses |
| 6.4.h | Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty workload and summary of faculty workload |
| 6.4.i | Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates have access to physical and/or virtual classrooms, computer labs, curriculum resources, and library resources that support teaching and learning |
| 6.4.j | Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates access have to distance learning including support services and resources, if applicable |

---

| Exhibit 6.1 Organizational Chart Exhibit |
| 6.2 Unit Expenditures (2005-2013) Exhibit |
| 6.3 Faculty Salary |
| Exhibit 6.4 Grants and Expenditures |
| Exhibit 6.5 Scholarship Expenditures |

See Attachment panel below.
Please click "Next"

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