The unit would like to express its appreciation to the Board of Examiners (BOE\textsuperscript{1}) team’s careful review of its Institutional Report (IR) and the associated exhibits. The unit also wishes to express its apology that, due to the launch of its new website in the Fall of 2014, many of the links embedded in the IR for the assessment reports were accidentally disconnected, which may have caused some confusion for the BOE team during the offsite preparation and review.

The following addendum to the IR is prepared as a response to the BOE Offsite Feedback Report, received on December 22, 2014. The unit also understands that qualitative data will be gathered by the BOE onsite team through interviews with faculty, staff, candidates, graduates, and school partners. This document and all of the exhibits can be found on the unit’s NCATE accreditation website at ncate.education.uconn.edu.

**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.

1.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

(1) Examples of candidate work (e.g., Taskstream portfolios) were not available in order to determine candidate performance and impact on P-12 student learning.

*Rationale*:

Although mentioned as evidence of impact on P-12 student learning, these documents were not accessible.

*Unit Response*:

The BOE Team will have access to candidate portfolios during the site visit. We have included several assignments and evaluation rubrics to demonstrate the types of candidate

\textsuperscript{1} The “BOE” refers to the joint NCATE-State of Connecticut review team.
work on the thumb drives that will be provided to the BOE Team during the site visit.

1.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) What types of work samples and portfolios are candidates producing as part of their enrollment in unit programs?

*Unit Response:*

Different programs require different work samples and portfolios. Specifically:

**Teacher Certification Program** - All candidates in the initial teacher certification program are required to maintain an electronic portfolio of work samples in Taskstream. These include artifacts created in program courses (e.g., a student teaching video and reflection; learning technology and professional presence on social media work; a case study of student with an IEP; a philosophy statement; curriculum unit plans; master’s inquiry project paper. All candidates also maintain portfolios that they develop with the individual, subject-specific advisors. The guidelines for these can be accessed, by advisor, at the following link: [http://teachered.education.uconn.edu/programs/ibm/current-students/portfolio-guidelines/](http://teachered.education.uconn.edu/programs/ibm/current-students/portfolio-guidelines/).

The portfolio reflects a teacher candidate’s development and growth over time in his/her teacher preparation program. Teacher candidates collect artifacts and work on assignments that lead to the professional portfolio that serves as one part of the comprehensive exam. The portfolio reflects beliefs as well as showcases a teacher candidate’s ability to practice. Advisors engage in conference sessions to discuss the portfolio to ensure it accurately demonstrates the candidate’s time in the program while also serving as a tool to showcase to future employers. While each subject area program’s portfolio requirements are slightly different in some ways, common strands and artifacts in the portfolio include a resume, evidence of academic background/content knowledge, evidence of professional experience/competence (e.g., student teaching evaluation), lesson plans, assessments and student learning samples, and reflective statements.

The portfolio also includes professional artifacts such as copies of professional letters of recommendation, students’ master’s year internship inquiry, awards, and honors. Beginning in 2014-2015, faculty began piloting a new assignment that requires teacher candidates to assess and document their impact on student learning. For this assignment, teacher candidates engaged in their student teaching practicum design and teach a three-to-five-day lesson sequence, and administer a pre- and post-assessment to gauge student learning. In addition, teacher candidates select three students of varying performance levels and collect all work samples that these students produce over the course of the sequence. Teacher candidates analyze the data and work samples to determine the impact of their instruction on students’ learning and to identify adaptations for future instruction.
University of Connecticut Administrator Preparation Program (UCAPP) - All UCAPP students maintain a Taskstream electronic portfolio consisting of artifacts from course assignments, practicum projects, personal reflections, and group discussions. The portfolio reflects the aspiring school leader’s development and growth over time in the program.

Executive Leadership Program (ELP) - The Executive Leadership Program does not use Taskstream. They keep an electronic portfolio for each ELP participant that includes the standards-based assignments with feedback and grading for each of the seven core program assessments. Each instructor has a file with the core assessments associated with the courses they teach. Each assessment is administered in one of the five ELP courses, and scored using its own ELP assessment rubric. The curriculum is designed to be a mastery curriculum, therefore, each participant’s assignment is reviewed using the rubric. Participants are given assignment and often course grades on either “Met Standard” (A) or Incomplete. Many participants take multiple attempts to reach the “Mastery Standard” and complete the course.

Three student portfolios are available on the NCATE thumbdrive (see Addendum Exhibits 1.5.1.a - 1.5.1.c).

School Counseling - All candidates complete a portfolio project. Students work in small groups to brainstorm a comprehensive developmental school counseling program. Each team is responsible for submitting their own original plan and must submit a three ring binder containing the following:

- A threefold Counseling Services Brochure
- Public Relations Activity
- Bulletin Board Activity
- Accountability Issues (Data collection, closing the achievement gap, equity-based college and career readiness)
- Calendar Development
- Whole school needs assessment instruments
- Plans and forms for individual counseling, group counseling, classroom guidance activities, and whole-school interventions
- Evaluation instruments.

All candidates also complete an advocacy project. Using the DATA book as a guide, students conduct an evaluation of school data at their on-site location. Candidates prepare and present the document and their data project to the class. This includes pre and post data to evaluate the degree to which students (i.e., pupils) enjoyed the intervention, the degree to which students learned what the school counseling candidate wanted them to learn, and how it made a difference for students.
School Psychology Program - During the 2013-2014 academic year, the faculty of the school psychology program significantly revised the program's goals, objectives, and competencies, as well as the assessments used to evaluate student achievement and program effectiveness. As a result of this effort, the cohort of students entering in fall 2014 was the first to be required to develop pre-internship portfolios. The portfolio consists of work samples completed throughout the program, professional documents, as well as some documents that are created specifically for inclusion in the portfolio. More specifically, portfolios contain: (a) statement of professional goals; (b) curriculum vita; (c) unofficial transcript; (d) projected course sequence; (e) completed program timeline document; (f) student checklist regarding practica requirements; (g) practicum evaluations; (h) self-evaluations; (i) and artifacts that demonstrate knowledge, skills, and competencies outlined by the program. Students begin collecting and creating these items during the first semester in the program, and meet with their faculty advisor at least annually to review the development of their portfolio.

The portfolio provides students with a means for purposeful self-appraisal of professional knowledge, skills, competencies, and dispositions as they progress through the program. The portfolio allows faculty to provide each student with feedback at least annually regarding attainment of competencies and dispositions necessary to be a school psychologist. Through self- and faculty-provided feedback, students will know where they are doing well, and in which areas further experience or skill development may be needed. Finally, the faculty of the school psychology program will use portfolios to assess the effectiveness of our training program. We will summarize and analyze results of portfolio reviews annually and use these data to inform program improvements. More information is available in the Pre-internship Performance-based Assessment Manual (see Addendum Exhibit 1.5.1.d).

Internship portfolios: The internship portfolio allows students to demonstrate their ability to integrate knowledge and professional skills while delivering a range of services to children, families, and schools. This portfolio consists of a minimum of ten artifacts, which are representative of the nature and quality of the work completed during internship and demonstrate students’ competence across the School Psychology Program Objectives and NASP 2010 domains. Six artifacts are considered to be “required” in that these artifacts must be included in each student’s portfolio for the portfolio requirement to be met: (a) evaluation of a prevention or early intervention program, (b) behavior intervention case study (must include intervention effect size data), (c) academic intervention case study (must include intervention effect size data), (d) consultation case study, and (e) two psychoeducational evaluations. Students can then choose the remaining four artifacts they want to include in the portfolio. These artifacts can include reports, presentations, letters, and research papers representative of the unique experiences students have in the internship. An artifact can be counted in more than one objective, however, (a) the portfolio must contain a minimum of ten artifacts and (b) each of the ten program objectives must have at least one artifact aligned with it. The internship portfolio
is submitted for faculty review twice during the internship year. More information is available in the Internship Portfolio Manual (see Addendum Exhibit 1.5.1.e).

(2) What additional data can be provided on the Education Expansions program and its relationship to candidate impact on P-12 student learning?

Unit Response:

The unit has attempted to gather value-added data to demonstrate how the students in classrooms taught by the unit graduates have performed on the state standardized assessments. The State of Connecticut does not have a functional database system on which the unit could rely. The Teachers for the New Era project provided the unit seed funds to conduct a few limited studies (see Exhibits 2.1, 2.1.a., 2.1.b. and 2.1.c of the original Institutional Report). The unit reached out and received collaboration from Connecticut Public School Districts, which have high numbers of unit’s graduates working as teachers. The preliminary results from these studies indicate that the students in classrooms taught by the unit’s graduates have performed significantly better on the Connecticut Mastery Test (in particular, third grade mathematics) than students in classrooms taught by graduates from elsewhere. The unit includes this report to demonstrate that it attempts to go above and beyond the expectations of NCATE legacy standards to assess its graduates’ impact on P-12 student learning.

(3) What is the intention of the Educational Technology and Early Childhood non-certification programs? What are candidates and completers of these programs being prepared to do and where are they being prepared to work?

Unit Response:

As noted in the Offsite Report (see p. 3), and confirmed by Dr. Michelli (Team Chair) and Dr. Toohey (State Consultant) during the pre-visit, the Educational Technology and Early Childhood Education programs are not within the scope of the current review.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

(1) The unit has not provided a minimum of three years of candidate performance data for all of its initial and advanced programs and assessment of unit operations.
Rationale:

Data are available in the SPA Program Reports for the SPA-reviewed programs; however, additional data on all key assessments to total three years are not provided. Some data are provided for non-SPA review programs (Bilingual Education, Early Childhood Education, Educational Technology, and Agriculture); however, three years of data on all key assessments are not provided.

Unit Response:

As noted in the Offsite Report (see p. 3), and confirmed by Dr. Michelli (Team Chair) and Dr. Toohey (State Consultant) during the pre-visit, the Bilingual Education, Early Childhood Education, and Educational Technology programs are not within the scope of the current review.

Data for the Agriculture Education program is available in the Connecticut State Department of Education Educator Preparation Program Approval Program Report (see Exhibit 1.7 of the original Institutional Report). It is consistent with the NCATE SPA format and contains key assessments. This program report was submitted to the State of Connecticut on March 25, 2014.

In addition, we engage our students, cooperating teachers, school partners, alumni, and employers in regular projects to systematically reflect on our programs. These projects include:

- Common Entrance Survey
- Teacher and Student Perspectives of the Clinic Experience
- Internship Report Across Programs
- Common Exit Survey
- Schoolwide Alumni Survey
- Professional Development School Partnership Survey
- Neag School of Education Employer Survey
- Professional Development School Partnership Survey

The corresponding reports can be found at:

http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/reports/program-reports/combined-reports/teacher-ed-2011-2014/

(2) The unit does not regularly and systematically use candidate and graduate performance data to make changes and improvements in some of its initial and advanced programs.
**Rationale:**

Examples of changes made based on data from key assessments are included in the SPA Program Reports. However, examples of changes made based on data from key assessments are not provided for the initial and advanced non-SPA reviewed programs.

**Unit Response:**

As noted in the Offsite Report (see p. 3), and confirmed by Dr. Michelli (Team Chair) and Dr. Toohey (State Consultant) during the pre-visit, the Bilingual Education, Early Childhood Education, and Educational Technology programs are not within the scope of the current review.

Please refer to Section IV: Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program of the Connecticut State Department of Education Educator Preparation Program Approval Program Report (see Exhibit 1.7 of the original Institutional Report) for a discussion of the changes made in the Agriculture Education program.

(3) The unit does not regularly and systematically conduct graduate and employer follow-up surveys.

**Rationale:** The SOE conducts graduate and employer follow-up surveys only at least once every four years.

**Unit Response:**

The unit contends that we have a regular and systematic process to conduct graduate and employer follow-up surveys. The Office of Assessment has developed the Assessment Plan and a schedule for data collection and assessment activities. The all-school graduate (alumni) survey was conducted as planned (in 2008, 2012, and 2014). The all-school employer surveys were conducted, as planned, in 2008 and 2011. The 2014 project was not completed due to changes in the staffing of the Office of Assessment. It will be completed in the fall of 2015.

**2.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit**

(1) How are the Bilingual Education, Early Childhood Education, Educational Technology (programs that do not lead to certification), and Agriculture programs included in the unit’s assessment system?

**Unit Response:**
As noted in the Offsite Report (see p. 3), and confirmed by Dr. Michelli (Team Chair) and Dr. Toohey (State Consultant) during the pre-visit, the Bilingual Education, Early Childhood Education, and Educational Technology programs are not within the scope of the current review.

Although the Agriculture Education program is not reviewed by a SPA, it has the same types of key assessments as a regular SPA-reviewed program. The data are collected, analyzed, and reported in the same manner as the SPA-reviewed programs. Please see Exhibit 1.7 of the original Institutional Report for the Agriculture Education Program Report submitted for review by the State.

(2) What are examples of changes made based on data from key assessments in the Bilingual Education, Early Childhood Education, Educational Technology, and Agriculture programs?

Unit Response:

As noted in the Offsite Report (see p. 3), and confirmed by Dr. Michelli (Team Chair) and Dr. Toohey (State Consultant) during the pre-visit, the Bilingual Education, Early Childhood Education, and Educational Technology programs are not within the scope of the current review.

Please refer to Section IV: Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program of the Connecticut State Department of Education Educator Preparation Program Approval Program Report (see Exhibit 1.7 of the original Institutional Report) for a discussion of the changes made in the Agriculture Education program based on key assessment data.

(3) Where are the three years of data that are required by NCATE on all key assessments for each of the unit’s initial and advanced programs (SPA programs, and non-SPA programs)?

Unit Response:

Data on key assessments are located in the SPA reports that are available through AIMS. Additional unit and program assessment data are available on the Office of Assessment website (see various summarized data reports) at http://assessment.education.uconn.edu.

(4) What is the process that is used to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze the data in the initial and advanced programs? How are these data being used to inform unit level performance and necessary changes? How are faculty members participating in this process?

Unit Response:
The unit’s assessment system provides regular and comprehensive data on program quality, unit operations and candidate performance at each stage of programs, extending into the first years of completers’ practice. The process for collecting, compiling, aggregating, summarizing, and analyzing data focuses on the degree to which candidates perform at standards, the quality of programs, and the efficacies of the unit; all of these criteria are of paramount importance.

The unit's Assessment Plan has addressed candidate performance and program quality in the following ways:

**Candidate Performance** - Assessment data from candidates are based on multiple assessments from internal and external sources. The data are systematically collected as candidates progress through programs. Most of the applicant and candidate data are captured in the University-wide PeopleSoft Student Administration System. Candidates use the system to view the course catalogue, search for classes, and access their transcripts. Faculty use the system to view 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 Husky-CT e-learning applications are used for classroom performance assessment. Both e-learning tools are frequently used by instructors to post reading materials, administer assessments, and facilitate discussion outside of class. Descriptions of these assessments, along with data from the last three years, have been reported through the NCATE-SPA program report process.

**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 are compiled and summarized using Filemaker and Checkbox (a seamless survey data collection tool). Checkbox has the ability to compute frequency distributions and charts. Once a report is produced, program leaders proceed to analyze results and make changes as needed. Each program also gathers program-specific data. For example, for the Teacher Education Program, program quality is examined through additional data collection projects, including student entry surveys, clinic and student teacher surveys, internship evaluations, alumni surveys, and exit surveys. These reports can be found at [http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/reports/program-reports/combined-reports/](http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/reports/program-reports/combined-reports/).

The unit incorporates both formative and summative assessments. Formative assessment includes a cycle for collection and reporting with the diversified tools (some annually, and others in a defined cycle). Annual activities include, but are not limited to, U.S. News & World Report, unit assessment reports, test summary reports (i.e., PRAXIS II and CAT), entry and exit survey reports, and evaluation reports on clinical practices and field experiences. The cyclical activities include surveys to alumni and employers.

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 Neag 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?

The unit assessment committee is currently in the process of reexamining this approach and will finalize its plan on self-assessments in the fall of 2015.

**Data to Inform Performance**: The unit embraces the continuous improvement model. The unit has collected, shared, analyzed, and used data at the course, program, department and unit levels. The unit makes changes based on the data, and systematically studies the effect of the changes to ensure that programs are strengthened without negative consequences. The changes stemming from the review of the data are recorded in the SPA reports. Teacher education faculty have used results of student exit surveys, which indicated students needed more instruction in supporting English Language Learners (ELLs), to infuse sheltered instruction observation protocol (SIOP) strategies across elementary and secondary methods courses. Faculty designed and participated in Project Prepare, a collaborative professional development project in which faculty worked together to build their knowledge of SIOP and integrate it into their courses.

In addition to the exit surveys, throughout the 2013-2014 academic year, the Executive Director of Teacher Education conducted a syllabus and assignment analysis and led teacher education faculty in examining research on teacher education improvement to inform the faculty’s program redesign efforts.

**Faculty involvement**: The Neag School of Education’s Office of Assessment developed a multi-faceted strategy to engage faculty and foster a culture of assessment within the unit. This initiative, called Spotlight on Assessment, promotes participatory involvement through opportunities to serve on committees, to discuss assessment topics at monthly department meetings, to access a rich array of assessment data and information on a dedicated Neag website, and to participate in a series of assessment colloquia (see [http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/colloquia/archive-by-topic/](http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/colloquia/archive-by-topic/)) and conferences ([http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/conferences/](http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/conferences/)). For details, please refer to the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan, 3rd Ed. pp 10-14 in Exhibit I.11 of the original Institutional Report.

The Neag Assessment Committee is at the core of our assessment structure. It is a 25 member team with representation across all levels (students, faculty, staff, administrators)
and units (four departments\(^2\) and the teacher education unit). This group has been chaired by the director of assessment and supports smaller, special interest subcommittees as needed. These subcommittees include: the Teacher Preparation Education group, the Administrator Preparation Education group, the Critical Friends on Clinical Evaluations and Surveys using Checkbox group, the Critical Friends on Assessment Alignment group, the Assessment Advisory Group, and the Fostering Assessment through Technology Group. For more information, please see http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/committees/neag-assessment-committee.

Please also refer to Addendum Exhibit 2.5.4 for detailed program and unit improvements made on the basis of assessment data.

(5) How is candidate performance monitored at each of the components (transition points) in the initial and advanced programs?

_**Unit Response:**_

**Unit-wide** - As discussed under Standard I, the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan (see Exhibit I.11 of the original Institutional Report) outlines our overarching process for monitoring candidate performance in our initial and advanced programs. As noted in Table 1 of the Assessment Plan, we evaluate the candidate at four points in his/her program (at admission, the mid-point of the program, the completion of the program, and post-graduation) using a variety of assessments and performance measures.

---

\(^2\) Four departments became three in 2013 when the Department of Kinesiology moved to another college.
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Teacher Education program - The Executive Director of Teacher Education and Director of Advising review candidates’ transcripts at the end of each semester to monitor candidate performance in clinic placements and coursework. They inform faculty advisors of all performance issues. The Executive Director of Teacher Education, in partnership with the Directors of Advising and School-University Partnerships, meet with clinical faculty twice each month to review candidate performance in clinical placements. Clinic evaluations are reviewed at the end of each semester. In addition, communication with clinic teachers is ongoing throughout the duration of teacher candidates’ time in the school. A university clinical faculty member, with a terminal degree, is assigned as the professional development center (PDC) coordinator for each of the districts where students are assigned. This person, under the leadership of the Executive Director of Teacher Education and Director of School/University Partnerships, serves as the contact with the schools where teacher candidates are placed. In addition, each school appoints a Lead Teacher who works in the partner school. The Lead Teacher monitors and maintains contact with the PDC coordinators to provide feedback on how students are doing in their clinic placements. Close communication is maintained with all faculty advisors and the team works together to determine plans of action to support candidates in improving performance. The Director of Advising also contacts junior level education instructors to
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| Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Assessments by Key Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Components</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mid-program (also called preparation program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program completion (also called clinical, student teacher, internship, practicum experiences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Post graduation (also called follow-up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
inquire about candidate performance each semester and meets with students, if issues arise.

(6) What is the “summative evaluation process” that was initiated in 2007-2008 that occurs every two years? How does it fit into the unit’s procedures for collecting compiling, aggregating, summarizing, and analyzing data on the key assessments in the initial and advanced programs?

*Unit Response:*

The Office of Assessment conducts the unit’s summative evaluation of its assessment efforts once every two years. The unit’s Assessment Committee (see [http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/committees/neag-assessment-committee](http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/committees/neag-assessment-committee) for the reports and committee meeting minutes) reviews its assessment procedures and ensures their alignment with national and state standards. When appropriate, the committee makes improvement to the unit assessment plans. From 2006 to 2012, the unit’s Assessment Plan underwent three revisions. The new unit assessment committee is currently conducting a comprehensive review of the unit assessment efforts and will make recommendations to the faculty in the fall of 2015.

(7) How is each of the information technologies (e.g., Taskstream, PeopleSoft, HuskyCT e-learning, Filemaker, Checkbox) used to maintain the unit’s assessment system?

*Unit Response:*

The unit uses a number of technologies in conjunction with one another to support the needs of the unit’s assessment system. The candidate administration system, PeopleSoft, maintains the majority of candidate records including demographics, program and course enrollment, course grades, degree progress, and advising reports. The unit also has a custom application called SIS (Student Information System) that maintains candidate data particularly relevant to our needs that are not met by PeopleSoft, such as test scores on PRAXIS.

The university’s installation of Blackboard, which is called HuskyCT, contains course data, which may include assignments, instructional documents, candidate artifacts, and grades, for instructors who choose to incorporate HuskyCT. Depending on the particular course, the instructional delivery may be face-to-face, blended, or fully online. The teacher education programs (IB/M and TCPCG) both use Taskstream to facilitate the process of assessing candidate learning. Courses and major assessments used are built into an outline distributed to all candidates. As candidates progress through their program, they upload assignments and other learning artifacts into Taskstream which are graded in the system using rubrics aligned to relevant standards. Taskstream also offers the ability to develop reports run against those artifacts to provide a higher-level summary of candidate and cohort performance.
The Office of Assessment conducts a variety of surveys throughout the year in support of the initial and advanced preparation programs. Prior to 2014, the unit used an electronic system called Checkbox, which allowed for building, distributing, and analysis of online surveys. The University recently purchased a site license for Qualtrics Research Suite, providing the unit with a more flexible and powerful online survey system. As of Spring 2014, the Office of Assessment has transitioned to using Qualtrics for development, distribution, and analysis of online surveys.

The unit will provide a demonstration of these technologies during the site visit.

(8) When are graduate and employer follow-up surveys conducted, what is the process, and who conducts the surveys?

Unit Response:

Alumni Survey - With the assistance of the Neag Assessment Committee and subcommittees, the Office of Assessment conducted a school-wide alumni survey in 2008, 2012, and 2014 (see 2008 - [Link](http://ncate.education.uconn.edu/s/alumni-survey-2008); 2012 - [Link](http://ncate.education.uconn.edu/s/alumni-survey-2011); and 2014 - [Link](http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/reports/schoolwide/survey-results)).

The alumni survey is designed to explore graduates’ satisfaction with multi-faceted aspects of their program, such as course content, diversity, faculty involvement, job readiness, strengths and areas for improvement. The results are used as part of department, program, and accreditation evaluations. It can also accommodate program and/or department-specific questions. For example, the Teacher Education unit surveys alumni every two years and embeds the same questions in the school-wide survey that is administered every four years.

The process for the 2014 project began in the fall of 2012, with the Neag Assessment Committee reviewing and updating the instrument. The Teacher Education Assessment Subcommittee did the same for their respective questions. The committees ensured the alignment with the Neag conceptual framework, which permeates all programs and is defined by three themes (learning, leading, and lighting the way).

In the summer of 2013, we started to construct a database of program graduates from the last five years, 2009 to 2013. Through a combination of efforts, including the UConn Graduate School, UConn Foundation, and exit survey results, we identified 2,139 alumni across the four departments and the Teacher Education unit.

After updating the alumni contact information in the database, the first email went out on December 6, 2013. Announcements about the survey were also posted at various sites by the Neag School of Education Assessment Office. We sent out the second round of emails in December 2013 and two more in January 2014. A total of 371 responses were
received, for a total response rate of 17.3%.

Analyses began in January, with preliminary results shared with the Neag Assessment Committee in the spring. Then, the final results were shared with the Dean and Associate Dean and then to the Neag community at the end of the spring semester of 2014.

**Employer Survey** - The Neag Assessment Committee, subcommittees, and the Office of Assessment also collaborate on the Employer Surveys. The last two school-wide employer surveys were conducted in 2008 (see [http://ncate.education.uconn.edu/s/employer-2008](http://ncate.education.uconn.edu/s/employer-2008)) and 2012 (see [http://ncate.education.uconn.edu/s/employer-2012](http://ncate.education.uconn.edu/s/employer-2012)). We expected to conduct the survey again in 2014, but delayed the project due to staffing changes in the Assessment Office.

For the 2012 project, we distributed the instrument to all 148 superintendents in the state of Connecticut using contact information publicly available on the Connecticut State Department of Education website. We asked each superintendent to reflect on his/her experiences with the Neag alumni who worked as teachers, school counselors, school psychologists, intermediate administrators, and executive administrators in his/her district. More specifically, we inquired about the overall quality of the Neag School of Education, the performance of Neag graduates compared to other professional educators with similar years of experience, and his/her sense of Neag graduates’ commitment to a set of professional dispositions. We received a total of 51 responses, for a response rate of 34.5%.

(9) What is the unit’s plan for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement?

*Unit Response:*

The plan is described in the Assessment Plan. Further, Addendum Exhibit 2.5.4 demonstrates the unit’s strong commitment to continuous improvement through its assessment efforts.

(10) What information from candidate complaint files has been used to make programmatic or unit level changes?

*Unit Response:*

The unit has a system for effectively maintaining records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions. The unit’s candidate complaint policy, procedures, and resolutions are in compliance with the University’s policies and guidelines. In most cases, we aim to reach a resolution working with the student and his/her professor/advisor. As needed, the process will then involve the department head, then dean’s office, and finally university administration. In the last five years, we have received approximately five student
complaints. All of the concerns were resolved at the professor/advisor or the department level and did not require programmatic or unit level changes.

The policies and procedures are outlined in the University’s Graduate Catalog (see [http://gradcatalog.uconn.edu/guidelines-for-grad-study/complaint-resolution-policy/](http://gradcatalog.uconn.edu/guidelines-for-grad-study/complaint-resolution-policy/)) and the Undergraduate Catalog (see [http://catalog.uconn.edu/entire-pdf-file/](http://catalog.uconn.edu/entire-pdf-file/)). Undergraduate candidates may also contact the Dean of Students Office at ([http://dos.uconn.edu/](http://dos.uconn.edu/)).

In 2013, the university established the Ombuds Office, as a confidential, neutral resource for staff, faculty, and graduate students to express concerns, identify options to address workplace conflicts, facilitate productive communication, and surface responsible concerns regarding university policies and practices. Dr. Jim Wohl serves as the UConn Ombuds. For more information, please visit [http://ombuds.uconn.edu/](http://ombuds.uconn.edu/).

(11) What are the admission criteria and data from key assessments used for entry into program(s)?

**Unit Response:**

**Teacher Education** - For teacher preparation programs, the admissions criteria are clearly outlined in the program information sheets attached with each SPA report. The admissions data are summarized by cohort years on the assessment website.

Admission to the unit is competitive. Enrollment in each program is limited. Up to fifteen of the most qualified applicants in each teaching program are admitted annually with the exception of forty in Elementary Education and twenty in Comprehensive Special Education.

After completing at least three semesters students annually apply before January 15 to be considered for admission for the following fall semester. Students must complete at least 54 appropriate credits to be eligible for admission for the fall semester. Successful applicants generally have completed sufficient appropriate credits to be eligible for consideration, have applied by the annual deadline of January 15, have completed Connecticut’s essential skills testing requirement, have participated in successful interviews with faculty, have accumulated sufficient experience working with children, have written acceptable essays, and have earned the most competitive cumulative grade point averages. Although the minimum admission standards of the Connecticut State Board of Education include at least a “B-” average for all undergraduate courses, teacher education programs offered by the Neag School of Education are generally more competitive. The link to the various pieces of the application is [http://teachered.education.uconn.edu/programs/ibm/future-students/how-to-apply/](http://teachered.education.uconn.edu/programs/ibm/future-students/how-to-apply/).

**School Psychology** – The admissions requirements include letters of recommendation, personal essay, interview, GRE scores, and undergraduate (and if applicable) graduate
Executive Leadership Program - ELP is not a Graduate School degree granting program so the admission criteria are based on the Connecticut State Education Department requirements for applying for the Superintendent of Schools certification endorsement (093) and additional criteria that the Department established based on research-based criteria for effective performance as a district leader. The Executive Leadership Program criteria for acceptance are included in the program brochure and the ELP Criteria for Admission memo that we provide each prospective applicant as part of the admission review process (see Addendum Exhibits 2.5.11.a - 2.5.11.c).

UCAPP - As a professional preparation program, admission to UCAPP is guided by certification requirements for the 092 Intermediate Administrator credential defined by the State of Connecticut. Specifically, candidates must have earned a master's from a regionally accredited institution. Additionally, candidates must have 50 months of teaching experience when they apply for certification, so we will allow individuals with at least three years of teaching service in a public school to apply to our two-year program.

Admission decisions are informed by three standardized assessments: a personal statement of interest, recommendations from four references (a district administrator, a campus administrator, and two professional colleagues), and an interview. Data from these screening assessments is considered holistically for each candidate.

School Counseling – Admissions requirements include letters of recommendation, personal statement, interview, GRE scores, and GPA (see Addendum Exhibit 2.5.11.d - School Counseling Admissions).

(12) What data are gathered on unit operations and how are these data used to inform changes at the unit level?

Unit Response:

The following are recent examples. The Dean’s Administrative Council serves as a primary governing body for the Neag School. Prior to July 1, 2014, the Administrative Council included the dean, the dean’s executive assistant, the associate dean, and department heads. On July 1, the dean’s office was significantly restructured. After a national search for a dean failed, Professor Richard Schwab, who served as dean from 1997 to 2009, was asked to serve a two-year appointment. In addition, the associate dean returned to the faculty. The assistant dean received a new appointment in the Office of the Provost, and the assessment director departed the University. The new leadership team conducted informal interviews with dean’s office staff, key faculty, and other campus administrators to determine how best to restructure the dean’s office. The information was discussed by the new core leadership team, Dean Schwab, and two incoming associate deans. The former assistant dean and assessment director were strategically replaced with...
two associate deans. The needs of the school had changed over the past several years, as grant productivity increased. Thus a new Office of Research was created, led by a new associate dean for research. The other associate dean for academic affairs took over accreditation and certification. (Please see Neag School of Education - Office of the Dean organizational chart - below.)

The second recent example is the combination of advising and certification. In the past, the assistant dean served as the unit’s certification officer. Advising was conducted by a separate office. Although the assistant dean and the director of advising work closely to ensure that the plan of study for each individual candidate is aligned with the state certification regulations, there have been occasional instances that candidates deviated from the certification requirements. Prior to his departure from the unit, the former assistant dean recommended the combination of responsibilities of advising and certification into one senior staff level. This change was instituted for the 2014-2015 academic year.
While the unit’s programs have received national attention, the unit realized that 21st century skills include global competencies of candidates. The unit’s faculty believe curriculum needs further improvement. Data from AACTE’s Global Diversity Committee and Global Teacher Education (http://www.globalteachereducation.org/) have helped the faculty to begin its internationalization of the curriculum (e.g., collaborative research with Germany (Baden-Wurtenberg), Australia (University of Melbourne), England (University of Nottingham). The unit has received the support from the University’s Global Affairs Office. Links to Universitas 21 FINE group, and the Study in London and Nottingham programs.

The unit is committed to a diverse educator workforce. However, the unit’s minority candidate percentage is lower than that of the University. In the fall of 2014, the unit employed two additional academic advisors who will be focused on recruitment, advising, and candidate support.

(13) What systems are in place to ensure that the assessment director, who is also a faculty member, has the necessary time and resources to complete all assessment related duties?

_Unit Response:_

We wish to clarify the former assessment director’s role and responsibilities. She had a gratis appointment in the Department of Educational Psychology, which did not include any teaching or research duties. Rather, 100% of her effort was directed to the operation of the assessment office. In addition to the full-time director, the office was staffed by approximately five graduate assistants each year.

In fall of 2014, the assessment unit for the Neag School underwent substantial transformation. Dean Schwab re-envisioned the leadership structure, which included resource allocations for assessment. Specifically, Dean Schwab split the associate dean responsibilities from a single full-time into two full-time positions (academic affairs, research & data operations). The newly created position of the Associate Dean for Research assumed oversight of data, assessment, and evaluation activities for the Neag School. The prior director of assessment accepted a position at another university, and that leadership position was re-created as an institutional data analyst. The institutional data analyst position is a full-time staff with responsibilities involving independent management of day-to-day administration of data and analyses that inform academic planning, program review, graduate success, and resource allocation. We successfully filled this position in December of 2014 (Dr. Kate Boland), and continue to work on fulfilling the established assessment plan as well as working to efficiently and systematically organize the assessment unit efforts.

Dr. Boland is a direct report to the Associate Dean for Research; however, she also
interacts closely and regularly with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs to inform decisions regarding programming. Dr. Boland continues to be assisted by graduate students assigned to her supervision, and works closely with resources available through the technology staff (including a database programmer and an academic assistant/web programmer under the direction of the Associate Dean for Research) as well as the director of advising and certification officer (under the direction of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs).

Taken together, the leadership team works collaboratively regarding all work within the Neag School. Assessment initiatives and directions undertaken by Dr. Boland within the assessment office continue to be driven through formative input and feedback from the Neag Assessment Committee given our school-wide philosophy that each person has ownership in assessment as we strive for a model of excellence, embracing and promoting a culture characterized by evidence-based decisions.

(14) Where are the official letters indicating that the School Counseling, School Speech and Language Pathology, and Music programs are accredited by CACREP, ASHA, and NASM respectively?

Unit Response:

These materials are available in the original Institutional Report, under Standard I. Please see Exhibit I.5, which contains the letter from ASHA regarding School Speech and Language Pathology; Exhibit I.6, which contains the letter from CACREP regarding School Counseling; and Exhibit I.7, which contains the letter from NASM regarding the Music programs.

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.

3.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

No areas of concern are cited for this standard at this time.

3.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Is there evidence of expected and actual cooperating teacher credentials and any related cooperating teacher orientation materials?

Unit Response:
The Connecticut State Department of Education requires that all cooperating teachers who work with student teachers must hold a professional-level license and be TEAM (Teacher Education and Mentoring Training) trained (see link to state TEAM training: http://www.ctteam.org/?page_id=799). TEAM training is a state-designed and administered three-day program. All cooperating teachers who work with student teachers in our initial certification programs are TEAM trained. The programs work with the Professional Development Centers (PDCs) or partner districts and schools to assist qualified teachers in becoming TEAM trained to ensure an adequate supply of qualified cooperating teachers.

Program directors hold orientation sessions during the fall semester in each PDC for all cooperating teachers and university supervisors. They also hold orientation sessions that bring together cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and student teachers. Cooperating teachers and university supervisors receive orientation packets during these sessions. These materials will be available at the on-site visit.

(2) Is there evidence of expected and actual credentials required for university supervisors and any related orientation and/or training?

Unit Response:

University Supervisors must have at least five years of successful teaching experience. They must submit a résumé and philosophy of education statement to the Director of School-University Partnerships prior to being called for an interview. If hired subsequent to a successful interview, supervisors must attend the orientation workshops offered to cooperating teachers and student teachers. Additionally, they attend a professional development session prior to the commencement of student teaching.

(3) Is there data on the placements used, their characteristics, and candidate performance available that is disaggregated by site since some programs are offered through more than one campus?

Unit Response:

All the data on placements are in Exhibits 3.2.a-d in the original Institutional Report. In addition, data on candidate performance is disaggregated by campus in the SPA reports.

(4) Does exhibit 3.2.d provide the current data on school psychology placements?

Unit Response:

Exhibit 3.2.d in the original Institutional Report was mislabeled. Please see Addendum Exhibit 3.5.4.
(5) How can the student teaching and internship handbooks used by public school faculty to guide practice in the various clinical experiences be accessed? The only advanced program handbook that would open using links in Exhibit 3.4 Program Handbooks (internally titled 3.3) was the speech pathology handbook.

Unit Response:

Handbooks and relevant forms for clinical supervisors and cooperating teachers can be accessed through the TCPCG and IB/M program sites on the Neag School of Education’s website. The IB/M Handbook is made accessible to public school partners in several ways. It is online at the following link: http://ncate.education.uconn.edu/s/handbook-ibm.

In September of the academic year, EGEN 3100 seminar leaders send emails to clinic teachers, with whom Juniors are placed, in an effort to introduce themselves and to introduce the basic tenets of the program. The IB/M handbook is attached to those introductory emails.

Later in the fall, the Director of School-University Partnerships conducts annual orientation meetings with cooperating teachers and university supervisors using the student teaching (Senior) section of the handbook as a premise for discussing roles and responsibilities of teacher candidates, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors; outlining student teaching timelines; and explaining codes of conduct and professional behavior.

When Professional Development Coordinators meet with internship supervisors in the spring prior to the start of fall internships, they share the handbook link and use the master’s year portion of the handbook as a way to elucidate the various components of the internship experience for fifth-year students.

The handbook is annually sent to Schools as Clinics Committee members (this committee oversees school partnerships) as a way to keep stakeholders informed of any changes and to remind them of program protocols.

Lead Teachers/Site Coordinators meet approximately four times each year to discuss various components of the teacher preparation program in relation to clinical practices and very often the IB/M Handbook, or portions thereof, are used as a basis for discussion and/or reform.

At all of the annual student orientations (Junior, Senior, and Fifth-Year), the handbook link is on the PowerPoint and students are encouraged to access and review it in order to be informed of expectations and protocols.

To view all current handbooks, please refer to Revised Exhibit 3.4 in the original
(6) Is there evidence available to document examples across programs (disaggregated by site as appropriate) that provides evidence of collaborative activities between unit and P-12 schools to support the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice?

Unit Response:

Since the 2007 report, the IB/M Director of School-University Partnerships has convened two groups, the Schools as Clinics and the Lead Teacher groups, to facilitate collaboration between faculty and P-12 schools to support the design, implementation and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practices. The Schools as Clinics group is composed of superintendents, principals, and central office administrators who work directly with clinical placements in the PDCs. It meets one to two times a semester. The faculty and members of the Schools as Clinics worked together to create a Memorandum of Agreement (see Exhibit 3.7 in the original Institutional Report) to assist in ensuring the quality of the clinical placements within the partner districts. The work of the Schools as Clinics committee is further documented in Exhibit 3.5 in the original Institutional Report.

The Director of School/University Partnerships also created a Lead Teacher position and group. The Lead Teacher is a TEAM trained teacher in each partnership school who serves as a liaison between the program and the teachers working with candidates in their schools. The Director of School-University Partnerships, Executive Director of Teacher Education, and clinical faculty meet with the Lead Teachers two times each semester to assess the clinical placements and identify ways to strengthen connections between candidate field experiences and coursework.

Both the Schools as Clinics and Lead Teacher groups have been actively involved in co-creating the Professional Practices observational tool that university supervisors and cooperating teachers use to observe and support student teachers. They have also been actively involved in the current planning for the redesign of the program. This includes reading and discussing relevant research on practice-based teacher education, contributing to, reviewing and responding to all redesign proposals developed by faculty, and participating in a two-day redesign conference in March 2014. Representatives from the Schools as Clinics and Lead Teacher groups serving on the Teacher Education Redesign Steering Committee met in summer and fall, 2014. The Committee reviewed and revised the Core Practices document which identifies 19 teaching practices that the program expects all graduates to be able to enact competently to support student learning. The Lead Teachers reviewed and revised the document, which the faculty approved in October 2014. Team Teachers and administrators evaluate candidate performance in their
respective clinical placements each semester.

(7) Is there evidence that the placement process for individual candidates ensures diversity of placements? How does the program ensure that all initial and advanced candidates will be in contact with the diversity of learners cited in the IR?

Unit Response:

The Director of School-University Partnerships works with clinical faculty to secure all clinical placements. Together, these faculty members review individual candidate placement history each semester to ensure that all candidates have clinical placements across urban, suburban and ethnically and economically diverse communities. Exhibit 3.2 in the original Institutional Report identifies the distribution of placements across the partnership schools for 2010 – 2014. This chart shows that there were a total of 774 clinical placements in three districts that enroll a majority White, and relatively affluent student population (Glastonbury, Willington, and Mansfield which includes Regional 19). There were a total of 997 clinical placements in five districts (Windsor, Hartford, Manchester, East Hartford, and Windham) that enroll a racially, linguistically, and economically diverse student population. Candidates must rotate between these two groups of districts from clinical experiences, student teaching, and internship placements to ensure that all of them have had experiences working with diverse students in the schools. Exhibits 4.4.a through 4.4.g in the original Institutional Report provide the demographics for the partnership districts.

(8) What are the standards for entry to and exit from the various clinical experiences? For example, the e-portfolio is required to enter student teaching---how is it evaluated? What are the standards? Same for exit of student teaching ---what is the required minimum standard? Providing all clinical practice assessment instruments and scoring guides, especially for portfolios, reflection, etc. as well as information on entry and exit standards would help clarify this.

Unit Response:

Initial certification candidates must review and sign The Teacher Education Continuation Policy (http://teachered.education.uconn.edu/teachered/assets/File/IBM%20Program/Policies/2008_TE_CONTINUATION_POLICY.pdf) and the Neag School of Education Program Standards for Professionalism and Appropriate Intern Conduct policies (see Addendum Exhibit 3.5.8) prior to their entry into initial clinical experiences. These policies specify the standards for performance in courses and in clinical placements that students must meet at each stage of their program.

Various capstone assignments from each of the three semesters prior to student teaching are considered for entry into student teaching and are represented in the e-portfolio. The
standards for entry into student teaching include: passing of Praxis I or Praxis Core; completion of Subject Area Coursework with a B- or better in all courses; completion of Education Coursework with a B- or better in all courses; submission of Approved Plan of Study and favorable evaluations from supervising teachers in clinical settings.

Supervising teachers in clinical settings evaluate candidate performance in all clinical placements each semester using the junior, senior, and internship evaluation guides and student teaching evaluations. Candidates must receive a rating of consistently meeting or exceeding expectations on their evaluations to proceed in the program, including clinical placements. Candidates must earn a grade of B- or better in student teaching in order to exit student teaching successfully. Samples of all clinical evaluations forms can be viewed on the teacher evaluation website at http://teachered.education.uconn.edu/programs/ibm/clinical-experience/clinical-evaluations/ and the corresponding reports are available at http://assessment.education.uconn.edu/reports/program-reports/.

(9) What role do P-12 clinical educators play in the evaluation of performance in clinical experiences? How are clinical faculty themselves being evaluated?

*Unit Response:*

The clinical faculty teach EGEN seminars attached to candidates’ clinical placements. In this role, they work with the Director of School-University Partnerships to ensure that all clinical evaluations of candidates are submitted. The clinical faculty role affords the faculty ongoing communication with school-based cooperating teachers and clinical supervisors to identify any performance issues that might arise with candidates. In addition, we have created a Lead Teacher role in each school to work closely with clinical faculty to monitor and intervene in any performance problems. See response to 3.5.6 above.

The clinical faculty in the initial certification program are members of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. They are reviewed annually under the same process of annual review for tenured faculty. Further, they are eligible for promotion as well.

**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-__
4.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

(1) The unit has not provided evidence of diverse field experiences for all programs, as well as coursework and assessments for all, addressing diversity.

**Rationale:**

Discussion focuses on the initial preparation programs. Clarity is needed for the programs at the advanced levels, though the School Counseling program is minimally addressed.

**Unit Response:**

The following is additional information for the advance level programs:

**Executive Leadership Program** - Each of the five Executive Leadership Program required courses has specific course objectives and related course activities specifically designed to provide all participants a leadership value platform, understandings and skills in support of district leadership work related to serving diverse populations. Examples: The first ELP course, EDLR 6301-District Leadership for Systemic Improvement, begins with a presentation from an urban and suburban superintendent. Both are asked to facilitate a discussion of engaging and serving diverse populations. The second course, EDLR 6303-Data Driven Decision-Making for District Improvement and Policy Development, includes a full session on talent management to increasing minority representation in the workforce through recruitment and retention. This segment also includes the theoretical basis and research support for workforce diversity. Also, major learning emphases in this course are the measurement of internal and external achievement gaps, equity among minority and low income students, and strategies to close the achievement gap in diverse populations of students, including those in urban areas. In the required course, EDLR 6302-School District Policy, Politics and Governance, specific course objectives and learning activities address the challenges of equity in school finance and program development at the State and district level. Participants also engage with State policy-makers in an analysis and discussion of the race, class, and achievement court cases in CT (e.g., *Sheff v. O’Neill*).

A primary pedagogy for the entire program is the case study method. The cases used in each course come from the Harvard Business School’s Public Education Leadership Project (PELP), and each case is situated in a large urban district. A central theme in each case relates to the special challenges and opportunities presented by diverse students and communities.

Finally, each participant participates in a full year internship with a mentor superintendent. The internship requirement includes participation in five “Best Practices in District
Leadership Seminar.” In addition to purposely structuring each seminar so that participants serving their internship in urban, suburban, and rural settings share the district leadership challenges that they are observing and analyzing, at least two district leadership teams, including the superintendent, present to the ELP cohort on the challenges of district politics and policy, talent development and management, and using information for strategic planning. Addressing diversity challenges is one design principle for each of these seminars.

**School Counseling program** - All UConn School Counseling students are required by one core program course (Counseling: Advanced Practice EPSY 5315) to conduct individual counseling with one student at Renzulli Academy in Hartford, CT. Renzulli Academy consists of a 98% student population which is racially diverse, and more than 95% of the students qualify for free and/or reduce-priced lunch.

All UConn School Counseling students have the opportunity to conduct classroom guidance lessons and assist student high school students with college readiness activities, including SAT preparation and college application preparation, at Bassick High School in Bridgeport, CT. Bassick High School consist of a 95% student population which is racially diverse, and more than 95% of the students qualify for free and/or reduce-priced lunch.

The 2013-2014 UConn School Counseling internship students conducted their internships in schools that ranged from 12-70% non-white students, with an average of 35%. All entering master’s level students’ program of study is organized around a cohort group. First year, first semester full-time students are required to take the following four courses: (1) Professional Orientation to School Counseling, (2) Human Growth and Development, (3) Counseling: Theories and Practice, and (4) Cross Cultural Counseling. In regards to the program’s mission primarily on eliminating educational disparities, faculty members coordinate the curriculum so that cultural competence is integrated across all classes. For example, during the first semester students learn in the Human Growth and Development course to identify how race, class, sex, ethnicity, and sexual orientation shape human development over the lifespan. Further human growth and development learning includes how privilege and oppression operate within the context of the socialization process in the United States. The aforementioned course experience sets an excellent conceptual foundation for cultural competency development in the remaining program courses in students plan of study.

In the Cross Cultural Counseling class, students gain cultural knowledge, awareness and skills to function as culturally competent counselors. One critical area in the Cross Cultural course, as shown by research (Constantine, 2010), is that while counseling programs do a good job of instilling cultural knowledge, they do not do well in the awareness component of cultural competence. It is in the cultural awareness that the UConn Program excels beyond the national trend, and this is due in part to the foundation set in Human Growth and Development – students quickly gain cognitive schemas for their personal role within
the social-political dynamics of White Privilege and Oppression that contributes to the maintaining of human disparities among groups. For example, when school counseling students disaggregate school data, the analysis might show that while 70% of the students are in AP courses, only 3% of these are students of color. By further examining this situation the school counselors find that due to school policy and practices regarding course recommendations, students of color are disproportionately excluded from AP courses. Thus, during the difficult experiential part of the course where students are required to look within themselves and seek to gain critical-consciousness (Freire, 1976), UConn students are able to move through this process with courage and purpose.

The remaining two classes in the first semester continue to help students build upon their growing cultural competence. For example, in the Professional Orientation in School Counseling class, students get an overview of their role and function as school counselors. At this time students learn how they will operationalize their school counseling programs with a focus on identifying and working in collaboration with other professionals to address inequities in the school setting. In the Counseling Theories and Practice course, students learn skills for how to conduct individual counseling. This is followed by how to apply major Counseling Theories in the context of individual counseling. In this course, students apply their use all areas of their cultural competence (knowledge, skills, and awareness) to critique the relevancy of Western based theories within a cross-cultural context. Due to the cognitive schema sift and critical consciousness students can engage in the process of these two courses unencumbered by emotional interference.

Documentation and evidence that the Counseling Program is successful regarding human diversity is assessed by the Program/Neag Five-Phase Assessment. First, upon entry into the Masters’ Degree Counseling Program, new students complete the Entrance survey. Based on the 2012-2013 entering cohort data, UConn School Counseling students enter with a moderate comfort with knowledge in cultural competency. Do Masters level School Counseling students make significant gains in their cultural competence as a result of participating their Program of Study Curricula and field experiences? For the past three years, students have completed the Professional School Counselor Multicultural Competence Checklist (Holcomb-McCoy, 2007). ANOVA pre-test and post-test results for a three-year sample of 60 students who completed the Checklist showed statistically significant changes from pre testing to posttesting across 5 different subscales pertaining to cultural competence. The UConn Counseling faculty are encouraged to see these statistically significant changes in student cultural competence from time of entering the program to end of their first semester. Especially noteworthy is the fact that students gained in the Social Advocacy area. This indicates students gained knowledge, awareness and skills that they perceive will allow them to implement interventions aimed at eradicating educational disparities when they enter their practicum, internship and beyond.

School Psychology program - The primary goals of the School Psychology practica are to train and promote competent practitioners in the field of school psychology who possess a considerable professional knowledge base; skills in implementing evidence-based practice
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designed to promote students' academic and social competencies; and a commitment to research, ethical practice, and continual critical analyses. The practica experience adheres to the scientist-practitioner model that assumes that the practice of school psychology is based on knowledge gained from established methods of scientific inquiry. In addition, the practica is designed to acquaint students with the diversity of theories and practices of school psychology, allowing the student sufficient intellectual freedom to experiment with different delivery systems and various theoretical bases. Such a philosophy encourages and reinforces the student's creativity and intellectual risk taking that are fundamental in the further development of the professional practice of school psychology.

The practicum sequence [12 (Masters) 18 (Doctoral) credits over four semesters (Masters) six semesters (Doctoral)] has been developed in accordance with APA and NASP guidelines. All Masters and Doctoral students experience a minimum of 400 (four hours per week for two academic years in a field-based site) and 600 (four hours per week for three academic years) hours respectively. To reach the hour minimums the student must complete the four hours per week in field based sites in conjunction with course-related practice hours (e.g., IQ testing), and research hours (please note that no more than 25% of the total can come from research). Graduate Assistant hours can be counted towards this minimum as well if they are in the areas of research or practical hours. However, they have to be approved by the practica director. The majority of doctoral students typically log over 600 hours of planned supervised experience of which at least 150 hours are devoted to direct service and at least 50 hours devoted to formally scheduled supervision. The reason for the minimum of 400 hours is to accommodate the Masters students that are on practica no more than two years.

A standardized set of graduated skill experiences and related assignments are required. This includes rotations through elementary and middle/high school settings. This also includes a rotation through diverse settings that are defined as ones that include, but are not limited to, age, color, disability, ethnicity, gender, language, national orientation, educational levels, and socioeconomic status. These various structured activities are designed to provide opportunities to apply skills in learning theory, assessment linked to intervention, consultation and collaboration with families and school personnel, prevention and intervention, and professional and ethical practice. Included in the assignments are various self-reflections on their practices. Further, dynamic problem solving is engaged in to formulate assessment and treatment options.

The practicum experiences are coordinated with specific courses that require a practice component to allow students sufficient opportunities. During the practica, students complete specified practicum-related coursework, as well as enroll in the course EPSY 5092 (or EPSY 6494) Practicum in School Psychology. The practicum is the joint responsibility of school psychology faculty at the University of Connecticut and field, research, or clinic-based supervisors. The practica ensures that students acquire graduated experiences and expertise in the practice of school psychology within a supervised setting that allows for frequent and constructive feedback. Prior to and during the practica
sequence, students will complete at least seven practicum-related courses that have a supervised, direct service component. These courses include:

- EPSY 5403 - Intellectual Assessment
- EPSY 5914 - Seminar in Academic Assessment
- EPSY 5404 - Pupil Behavior: Studies in Clinical Diagnosis
- EPSY 5194 - Counseling in School Psychological Practice
- EPSY 5406 - Consultation Theories and Practice
- EPSY 5194 - Child Psychopathology
- EPSY 5195 - Roles and Functions

**UCAPP program** - Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) and Connecticut leadership standards serve as the foundation for the UCAPP program of study. Specific course objectives, experiences, assignments, and assessments aim to develop the knowledge and skill in our aspiring school leaders to promote excellence and equity for all students and every school community.

Our focus on issues of diversity begins immediately in the first summer of the program. Our aspiring school leaders read and write a reflection on *The Children in Room E4*, a Connecticut-based examination of de facto segregation in public school, before coursework begins in July in order to frame their perspective as future school leaders in the state with the largest racial achievement gap in the U.S. The first course, Administration of Educational Organizations, further emphasizes diversity through school visits in urban, rural and suburban school communities, which are representative of the Connecticut population of schools and students. A core objective of the second course, Contemporary Educational Policy Issues, is driven by ELCC standard six: “Students will understand that engaging students, parents, and other members of the community in advocating for the adoption of improved policies and laws is critical to improving educational opportunities for all students regardless of socioeconomic background, ethnicity, gender, disability, or other individual characters.”

During the first full academic year of the program students take Supervision of Educational Organizations in which they are expected to apply human development theory, proven learning and motivational theories, and concern for diversity to the learning process upon completion of the course. In the next course, Program Evaluation for School Improvement, students conduct a program evaluation and develop a corresponding action plan for school improvement which delineates the action steps to be taken, which stakeholders will be involved, and what resources are needed to address the achievement and/or equity issues identified in the evaluation.

In the second year, students take the Curriculum Laboratory course in which they are assigned to complete a review of the design and implementation of a standards-based curriculum being implemented in a Connecticut school district and to determine whether that curriculum is adequately meeting the needs of diverse learners. The final course, Creating
and Sustaining a Positive School Climate, aims to synthesize the diversity focus throughout the program in a final assessment for which students develop and improvement plan based on

Students conduct an asset-based analysis of the school community where they are placed during the first year of the program. The goal of this practicum assignment is to develop a disposition in our aspiring principals to collaborate with families and other community members, respond to the needs of the community, and utilize community resources.

(2) Policies and procedures regarding the recruitment and selection of candidates and faculty from diverse backgrounds are not included.

Rationale:

Candidates need to work with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools. How this is implemented in terms of the selection of faculty and candidates is not clear.

Unit Response:

The University of Connecticut is committed to fostering diverse and inclusive working and learning environments. UConn’s Office Diversity and Equity is a university resource dedicated to ensuring compliance with the University's non-discrimination policies as well as state and federal laws and regulations related to equal opportunity and affirmative action. As part of this effort, the Office of Diversity and Equity houses important institutional policies and procedures [http://ode.uconn.edu/about/university-policies-and-procedures-administered-by-ode/](http://ode.uconn.edu/about/university-policies-and-procedures-administered-by-ode/). It also makes education and training materials available to the UConn community - [http://ode.uconn.edu/education-and-training/](http://ode.uconn.edu/education-and-training/).

Executive Leadership Program - Program information is sent to all Connecticut superintendents and principals through their respective professional associations. The materials include specific reference to the program’s intent to encourage a diverse program cohort each year. Direct and personal recruiting contacts by ELP faculty to the superintendents and Talent Offices of CT urban school districts is also an annual process. In addition to ELP faculty members, who have served as superintendents in urban and highly diverse settings, each course includes presentations from experienced superintendents and central office personnel. At least one of these “Best Practice” seminars is presented by an urban superintendent and his or her leadership team. ELP faculty make a coordinated effort each semester to be certain that invited superintendent presenters reflect the diversity of CT schools and communities.

Teacher Education - The program has initiated several efforts to enroll diverse students. The dean established an academic advisor I position whose central focus was on the recruitment and retention of diverse students into the teacher preparation program. This
advisor engages in outreach with high schools across the state and organizes campus visits for high school students as well as offering informational sessions at the high schools. The advisor also teaches a Freshman Year Experience course on teaching in urban contexts that helps develop a cohort of early college students interested in issues of diversity and equity in education. The advisor also holds admissions workshops at the Storrs and regional campuses, and works with the Student Support Services (advisors for first-generation college going students and low-income students) and advisors with the university’s Academic Center for Exploratory Students (ACES) program. The advisor organizes an annual Celebrating Diversity in Education dinner which provides opportunities for students of color interested in or currently enrolled in the teacher preparation program to meet and network with educators of color from around the state of Connecticut as well as university faculty and educators committed to issues of equity. Finally, the advisor meets one-on-one with pre-teaching students to support them in succeeding academically, preparing for teacher licensure tests and preparing for the program application process. The advisor continues to meet with students on an individual basis once they are admitted to support student’s success in and through the program. In December 2014, the School hired two academic advisor I’s to strengthen and extend this work with the aim of further supporting the recruitment and retention of students of color into the initial certification program. In 2014, the teacher preparation program was selected by AACTE to be one of ten institutions across the country to participate in AACTE’s only Networked Improvement Community (NIC). The NIC’s main goal is to increase the number of Black and Latino males in teacher education and into teaching. Working together, the institutions will develop a model for institutions across the country.

The program offers several scholarships and support for scholarships for students of color. These include the Hearst Foundation, the Alma Exley Scholarship (http://almaexleyscholarship.org/), the Lou Irvin Scholarship and the state’s Minority Teacher Incentive grant program. Many of our students of color have successfully applied and received these scholarships. We notify students about these scholarships, identify and encourage students to apply on an individual basis, and assist them in compiling any kinds of materials or information they might need to complete these applications.

**UCAPP program** - UCAPP candidate recruitment occurs through two processes. UCAPP, ELP, and other Neag School alumni commonly encourage a significant number of individuals to apply each year. The second form of recruitment consists of information sessions held at sites throughout the state. The announcement for these information sessions is communicated via email to principals who are members of the Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS). Information sessions are also publicized on the UCAPP website. Staff also field and respond to individual inquiries for information.

For UCAPP Preparing Leaders for Urban Schools (PLUS) and Residency programs, potential applicants are nominated by principals or the superintendent of partnering districts. The memorandums of understanding for the PLUS and Residency partnerships explicitly state a strong interest to recruit candidates who reflect the demographics in the
partnering district.

UCAPP course instructors consist of full-time Department of Educational Leadership faculty and current practitioners contracted on a per-course basis to serve as adjunct faculty. Department faculty are selected based on their area(s) of scholarly expertise and their potential contribution as instructors in the various degree and professional preparation programs. Adjunct faculty are selected based on their demonstrated practical knowledge and skill as distinguished scholarly-practitioners.

(3) Policies and procedures regarding the placement of candidates in schools are not included.

Rationale:

Candidates need to work with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools. How this is implemented in terms of the field and clinical experiences is not clear.

Unit Response:

**Executive Leadership Program** - Please see the detailed narratives 4.4(1) and 4.4(2) of this addendum. Course standards-based assessments include assignments that require an understanding of the leadership skills and dispositions necessary to engage and support all children in all types of communities.

**Teacher Education program** - Please see the detailed narrative in 3.5(7) of this addendum.

**School Counseling program** - At the current time, master's level school counseling students are placed schools throughout Connecticut. All school counseling students carry a caseload that is diverse as the school. Diversity is defined in terms of ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, gender-identity, first-generation college, the working poor, and other factors. They are placed in P-12 schools in any combination relevant to the student's career interest. Some may be placed in K-6 schools, 7-12, elementary, middle, or high school. And some combine a middle and high school experience. They are taught to serve students with equity-based practices, assuring that their programs are reaching every student, and not just one segment of society. They do this by creating DATA projects where they collect data prior to and after their classroom guidance, or group counseling activities. All DATA projects are disaggregated by the same diverse variables mentioned earlier, again, to ensure an equity-based practice. Their involvement with higher ed is two-fold. One, obviously, is the faculty member responsible for the practicum or internship course. Per CACREP, practicum and internship students are supervised in group supervision provided by faculty, as well as their on-site supervisors who must have at least two year's of experience (although UConn faculty often place students with more veteran school
counselors). Two, all school counseling students are taught that postsecondary education begins in preschool, so we often see our candidates interacting with higher education even in P-8 placements as they help students understand their options for postsecondary education.

Please refer to Addendum Exhibit 4.4.3 for more information regarding the CACREP requirements.

School Psychology program – Diversity is linked to practical coursework, NASP, and APA competencies. In addition, there are specific practica assignments that address diversity. All assignments are included in the portfolio.

Diverse Setting Requirement: Masters and Doctoral students must spend 4 hours per day for 1 semester in diverse setting. Masters and Doctoral students must spend a minimum of 50 hours over their entire practica experience in a diverse setting. These 50 hours will be counted towards the overall hour minimum, and denoted on their practicum log.

For more information, please refer to the narrative in section 4.4(1) of this addendum.

UCAPP program - All students admitted into UCAPP receive an orientation at which they are informed of their clinical placement options for the two years of the program. Students are encouraged to consider placements to complement their personal and professional backgrounds and broaden their horizons as potential future leaders of schools throughout the state and nation. Ultimately, internship placements are arranged according to student preference for their practicum experience. All requests are supported and facilitated equally, including those for placement in diverse settings.

UCAPP internship assignments for the general cohorts are made collaboratively with our aspiring leaders. The vast majority of those enrolled in the general cohorts do not live or work in racially diverse communities. For practical reasons (distance, time of travel, etc.) these aspiring leaders also tend to prefer to intern in a school near their home or where they work. This results in instances where some enrolled in the general cohorts may have limited exposure to racially and economically diverse populations. This is an issue we have been grappling with, as we are committed to developing administrators who can lead in diverse environments.

In UCAPP PLUS and the Residency, our aspiring leaders intern in the districts where they work. Racial minorities typically constitute the majority of the student population in these districts. Many students in these districts also come from families living in poverty.

4.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) What evidence is available from the Advisory Council on Diversity about actions taken by this council to make recommendations to the unit?
Unit Response:

The report is Exhibit 4.2 of the original Institutional Report. The unit’s diversity council meeting minutes will be provided for review during the onsite visit.

(2) How are candidates including issues of multiculturalism, diversity, exceptionality, and English language learners in their planned lessons?

Unit Response:

Candidates address issues of multiculturalism, diversity, exceptionality, and English language learners in their planned lessons across the program. Candidates are required to identify language objectives as well as learning objectives on their written lesson plans. In addition, the methods courses teach sheltered instruction observation protocol (SIOP) strategies.

For more detailed information, please refer to diversity related item stems in assessments three, four and five in the SPA reports. Overall, above 90% (in many cases 100%) candidates have met the assessment standards in lesson planning, student teaching, and portfolio assessments.

(3) What required courses (by program) focus on diversity issues? Which candidates actually take these diversity courses (is it all or some?) How many diversity courses do candidates take in total?

Unit Response:

Executive Leadership Program - As noted in the narrative in section 4.4(1) of this addendum, diversity-related learning objectives and associated assignments and activities are purposely included in each of the five required program courses. There is not one specific course on diversity.

Teacher Education program - All candidates take two diversity courses as part of the University’s general education requirements. All candidates take at least one language and cultural diversity course at the master’s level. All candidates are required to take a class on exceptionalities, either Exceptionality (EPSY 3110) or Instruction for Students with Special Needs in the Classroom Environment (EPSY 5108). All candidates are introduced to concepts and practices related to multicultural education and culturally responsive teaching in foundational courses, including Introduction to Teaching (EDCI 3000) and Social and Multicultural Foundations of Education (EDCI 5060). In total, all candidates must take at least 5 courses related to diversity. Elementary and secondary teaching candidates also have 9 elective credits during their master’s year. Many of them elect to take diversity related courses to fulfill this requirement. These courses include

**School Counseling program** - The UConn School Counseling Program seeks to integrate diversity into all master degree program of study courses as described in the narrative for section 4.4(1) of this addendum.

**School Psychology program** - Please refer to the NASP SPA report—Assessment 2. Also, Addendum Exhibit 4.5.3 contains a table of diversity courses that have been offered and the course objectives.

**UCAPP program** - Diversity is not the focus of any single UCAPP course, rather it is embedded throughout several courses and clinical experiences. As described in section 4.4(1) of this addendum, all UCAPP courses contain objectives, experiences, assignments, and assessments that aim to develop the knowledge and skill in our aspiring school leaders to promote excellence and equity for all students, including those from diverse populations. All students complete the UCAPP program of study, which consists of 32 credits (20 coursework/12 practicum).

(4) What assessment items focus on addressing diversity proficiencies?

*Unit Response:*

**Executive Leadership Program** - Case study analysis require addressing diversity issues through district leadership. “Race, Class and Achievement—Montgomery County” is one case used in EDLR 6301, which is the introductory course for all participants. The case is discussed and analyzed after a presentation from an urban superintendent. There is an in-class assessment associated with this case.

**Teacher Education program** – Assessments three, four, and five in the SPA reports contain specific elements on diversity.

**School Counseling program** - Please see the detailed narrative in section 4.4(1).

**School Psychology program** -

- Competencies assessed during Internship:
  - Sensitivity to issues of cultural and individual diversity
  - Objective: Diversity in Development and Learning
    - Intern provides effective services (e.g., consultation, direct
intervention, assessment) across stakeholders (e.g., students, families, schools) with diverse characteristics, cultures, and backgrounds across multiple contexts.

■ Intern addresses individual differences, strengths, backgrounds, and needs in the design, implementation, and evaluation of services.
■ Intern applies principles of social justice and a respect for diversity in development and learning when providing professional services that promote effective functioning for individuals, families, and schools with diverse characteristics and across multiple contexts

● Competencies assessed in Practicum:
  ○ Achieves comfortable interactions with staff, students, parents, etc. of different gender, racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups”
  ○ Other School Related Activities as defined by the following:
    ■ Participates in child study team and provides information for the team’s consideration.
    ■ Participates in a multidisciplinary team evaluation meeting and integrates information from other specialists.
    ■ Assists the multidisciplinary team in the generation of educational recommendations.
    ■ Participates in annual review of students enrolled in programs for exceptional children.
    ■ Demonstrates the ability to organize and provide in-service programming to school personnel and/or presentation for parent groups.
  ○ Objective: Diversity in Development and Learning
    ■ Student provides effective services (e.g., consultation, direct intervention, assessment) across stakeholders (e.g., students, families, schools) with diverse characteristics, cultures, and backgrounds across multiple contexts.
    ■ Student addresses individual differences, strengths, backgrounds, and needs in the design, implementation, and evaluation of services.
    ■ Student applies principles of social justice and a respect for diversity in development and learning when providing professional services that promote effective functioning for individuals, families, and schools with diverse characteristics and across multiple contexts

UCAPP program - The following assessments and items address diversity proficiencies in UCAPP.

Policy Issue Analysis: Identify the context and the local implementation of an education policy. Critique shortcomings of the policy initiative, offer supporting evidence for your critique, and synthesize research that can enhance the potential of the policy initiative to meet the needs of diverse learners.
Data Gathering and Analysis: Candidates will begin with AYP/SPI reports for the assigned district and will identify schools who are not meeting AYP/SPI. They will then explore further to identify which groups of students did not achieve AYP/SPI thresholds and in what tested areas those benchmarks were missed. Candidates will look for common needs across schools within a district and will then be provided student-level data from which to make recommendations about the biggest needs in a given district. Subsequent to the identification of chief areas of need, candidates will map an action plan and develop a logic model to address these needs systematically.

Program Evaluation: In this assignment, candidates will organize and analyze existing data to evaluate a program in their placement school and/or district. Candidates identify a program to evaluate through any of the following frames:

- Shared Mission/Vision: Communicated and/or enacted effectively (stakeholder engagement)
- School Culture, Professional Norms, Collegiality and Collaboration
- Equitable access to guaranteed and viable curriculum that is engaging all students in high standards
- Effective instructional delivery and assessment of student learning
- Equity of resource allocation including finances, time, personnel, technology, professional development etc.

School Improvement Plan: The School Improvement plan (8-10 pages) is a key document for articulating our continuous improvement plans for multiple audiences – from staff/faculty to parents and other stakeholders, as well as to central office staff and for supervisory purposes. Candidates use the guide below to plan and make modifications based on specific school needs.

- Introduction
  District mission, goals, and/or theory of action, etc.
  Your leadership philosophy and/or theory of action, etc.
- Data Analysis
  Identify the resources you reviewed in your analysis.
  Identify the processes you employed and the stakeholders you involved.
- Problem Identification
  Identify and describe no more than two significant issues related to student achievement and/or programmatic equity.
  Justify your position by citing findings from your data analysis.
  Diagnose the root(s) of the issue.
- Action Plan
  Delineate the action steps you would take, whom would you involve, and what resources you would need to address your identified achievement and/or equity issues.
  Explain your rationale for each action to be taken.
Monitoring/Evaluation Plan

Identify the processes you will employ to evaluate the effectiveness of the actions taken.
Define the criteria you will use to measure progress and/or success, etc.
Specify timelines, whom you will involve in these processes, etc.

Assessing School Climate and Planning for Improvement: Using processes, activities, and assignments presented in this class, provide a detailed assessment of the climate and culture of the candidates’ school or their mentor school. Using the information candidates have gathered, identify improvement needs and create an improvement plan. This assessment must include a review of student performance data and discussion regarding the relationship of culture to achievement within this school. Consider the effect of school climate on all constituency groups within the school community and include a discussion of the professional culture within the school. Identify the areas in need of improvement as well as those that should be sustained.

(5) Does the unit ensure that all candidates in both initial and advanced programs (including those at branch campuses or offsite locations) have opportunities to interact with diverse P-12 students (including those with exceptionalities and English language learners) and clinical faculty in field experiences and clinical practice? How does the unit ensure this?

Unit Response:

Executive Leadership Program - Please see the detailed narratives in 4.4(1) and 4.4(2) of this addendum.

Teacher Education program - Exhibits 4.4.a – 4.4.g in the original Institutional Report provide information on student demographics in the Partnership Districts. The reports document the diverse environments in the majority of the districts, several of which have high percentages of English Language Learners and students classified as Special Education. As noted above, all candidates must have at least one placement in an urban district that enrolls high numbers of racially and linguistically diverse students. All candidates in the initial certification program must take an Exceptionality (EPSY) course. The course requires that each candidate construct a case study of a student with special needs enrolled in the candidate’s clinical placement site.

School Counseling program - All School Counseling candidates are required by one core program course (Counseling: Advanced Practice EPSY 5315) to conduct individual counseling with one student at Renzulli Academy in Hartford Connecticut. Renzulli Academy consists of a 98% student population which is racially diverse, and more than 95% of the students qualify for free and/or reduce-priced lunch.

All School Counseling candidates have the opportunity to conduct classroom guidance
lessons and assist student high school students with college readiness activities including SAT preparation, and college application preparation at Bassick High School in Bridgeport, CT. Bassick High School consist of a 95% student population who are racially diverse, and more than 95% of the students qualify for free and/or reduced lunch.

The 2013-2014 UConn School Counseling internship students conducted their internships in schools that ranged from 12-70% in students who are diverse by race, with an average of 35%.

**School Psychology program** - This program has a diverse setting requirement. All Masters and Doctoral students must spend four hours per day for one semester in diverse setting. Masters and Doctoral students must spend a minimum of 50 hours over their entire practica experience in a diverse setting. These 50 hours will be counted towards the overall hour minimum, and denoted on their practicum log.

**UCAPP program** – The program requires all of its candidates to be placed in two of the three grade level schools (elementary, middle, and high schools). Further, candidates must incorporate competencies to work with diverse student populations in their school improvement plans and demonstrate such knowledge through their practica settings. The recently launched an urban residency program. All candidates in the residency track are recommended by their principals and superintendents and come from the state’s most high-need schools.

(6) Is data on the diversity of faculty and candidates across all programs disaggregated by program?

*Unit Response:*

Please see Addendum Exhibit 4.5.6.a for student demographic data by department and program. For faculty data, please see Addendum Exhibit 4.5.6.b.

### 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.*

#### 5.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

(1) The unit has not provided sufficient evidence related to the selection of school-based faculty across all initial and advanced programs.
**Rationale:**

The unit states that “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, but evidence of this could not be found. Evidence of the criteria for selecting school-based faculty for other programs (exhibits 5.4.b and 5.4.c) is also not included.

**Unit Response:**

The unit wishes to emphasize that its school-based faculty (full-time clinical faculty and school partners) are licensed in the field that they teach or supervise and are master teachers or other school personnel, or well recognized for their competence in the field.

**Teacher Education program** – As per state requirement, cooperating teachers for student teachers must be TEAM trained by Connecticut's State Department of Education. They must have at least three years of successful teaching experience and hold a CT professional educator's license. They must attend the orientation workshop offered in the fall to each partner district. Please see the detailed narrative in section 3.5(1) of this addendum.

**School Counseling Program** - The School Counseling Program partners with the Connecticut School Counselor Association (CSCA), and the Connecticut Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (CACES). Both professional associations work diligently to ensure practitioners and Connecticut School Counselor Preparation programs are current in addressing the achievement and opportunity gaps among Connecticut public school student groups. As such, the School Counseling participates in the planning and implementation of workshops for practicum supervisors in conjunction with CACES. This has allowed School Counseling Program to identify which supervisors have received training to address student disparities followed by soliciting those supervisors to supervise the unit’s interns. Additionally, the School Counseling Program faculty participate in implementing CSCA’s annual conference, which includes programs to address the student achievement and opportunity gaps, which allows for the identification and securing of supervisors who have the up to date training needed to effectively supervise the unit’s school counseling interns.

The School Counseling Program trains its candidates in effective methods for addressing the achievement and opportunity gaps, and as such, program alum who have demonstrated effectiveness in addressing students disparities volunteer to serve as supervisors for interns. For example, one of our alums, Vanessa Montrori, was recently
honored at the White House as a semi-finalist for the National School Counselor of the Year; a new award started by First Lady Michelle Obama. This award recognizes school counselors who implement programs that have been shown to be exemplary in addressing student disparities; in particular, the college and career readiness gaps among student groups.

**School Psychology program** - School-based supervisors for the practica and internship have a minimum of Masters (and 6th year diplomas), most have NCSP as well. Doctoral level supervisors are usually licensed. The sites used are selected as they agree to fulfill the practica and internship requirements and supervisor credentialing. The student further assesses the sites formally each semester.

In school settings, school psychologists are always certified. See Addendum Exhibit 5.4.1 for a table of current practicum supervisors and their credentials.

**UCAPP program** - Supervisors must have appropriate academic credentials. We seek to identify currently practicing principals who are committed to school improvement and leadership development. Care is given to ensure that the cohort and groups of Professors of Practice are diverse and representative of the employees of their school districts. They should also have demonstrable success in improving student achievement as evidenced by school or district achievement outcomes, including the School Performance Index (SPI). They must demonstrate competence as an instructional leader as evidenced by the performance expectations and elements of the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. The program also seeks administrators with previous experience as a UCAPP mentor substantiated by mentee and clinical supervisor assessments. Mentors should have knowledge of UCAPP and willingness to assume substantial mentoring responsibilities.

To summarize, UCAPP Mentor Selection Criteria include:

- Competence as an instructional leader as demonstrated by school or district achievement outcomes including School Performance Index (SPI).
- Competence as an instructional leader as demonstrated by the performance expectations and elements of the Connecticut School Leadership Standards.
- Previous experience as a UCAPP mentor substantiated by mentee and clinical supervisor assessments.
- Knowledge of UCAPP and willingness to assume substantial mentoring responsibilities.
- Extent and quality of professional service to the Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS).

(2) The unit has not provided evidence of how it supports faculty professional development.

**Rationale:**
Information on professional development for faculty, outside of what was provided in the IR and annual reports, should be provided to show how the unit supports this endeavor. (5.4.g)

Unit Response:

Over the years, the unit has established clear expectations through faculty promotion, tenure, and re-appointment process that not just encourages, rather requires, all professional education faculty to be continuous learners. The unit has organized experienced professional education faculty to mentor new faculty. Through grants, endowment funds, and the regular operating budget, the unit has provided incentives, encouragement, and support for faculty to develop scholarly work around teaching, inquiry, and service.

The unit supports the professional development of faculty in many ways. The Office of Sponsored Program, the Provost Office, the Dean’s Office, and the academic departments make funds available for attendance and participation at professional conferences, regional and national professional development/training sessions, and AACTE leadership seminars. The unit encourages all faculty to attend workshops hosted by UConn’s Institute for Teaching and Learning. The unit’s faculty also engage in lifelong learning through monthly department and program meetings, regular assessment colloquia, and periodic strategic area meetings.

In addition, funds to support travel to domestic or international professional societies directly associated with a faculty member’s research are available to all American Association of University Professors (AAUP) faculty. For more information, please visit http://research.uconn.edu/funding/faculty-travel/.

(3) The unit has not made a complete and strong case for meeting target in standard 5.

Rationale:

Response to 5.2.a lacks detail in the following required components: 1) Summarizing activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance and 2) Discussing plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

Unit Response:

All unit’s professional education faculty are actively engaged in dialogues about the design and delivery of instructional programs in both professional education and P-12 schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with P-12 practitioners and with faculty in other college or university units. They are actively engaged in a community of learners. It is evident that they provide
leadership in the profession, schools, and professional associations at state, national, and international levels.

Research productivity and scholarly influence are a central foundation for the unit. The unit’s research portfolio currently averages around $10 million in annual expenditures, with a mix of federally-funded grant projects and state and local contracts. Faculty actively compete for a diverse range of federal awards through the Institute for Education Sciences (US Department of Education), National Science Foundation, and National Institutes for Health, and are regularly rewarded for the high quality and innovative ideas. Expertise of our researchers is highly sought at state and local levels to advance initiatives and evaluate outcomes. Together, our faculty and departments are highly ranked across national metrics for their research productivity and scholarly influence.

The unit’s new Academic Plan (see Exhibit I.2 of the original Institutional Report) clearly acknowledges the faculty contributions to research and scholarship, and defines clear directions for moving into the future. The strategic areas of focus are organized around the following four themes:

- Equity and Social Justice
- STEM Education
- Creativity and Innovation
- Educator Quality and Effectiveness

To engage in innovative education reform, with substantial impact on students and the systems surrounding them, requires coordinated work over time to simultaneously implement change, study its effectiveness, and share it widely in ways that have lasting impact. The unit has and will continue to accomplish these goals through deepening our transdisciplinary collaborations among educators, policy makers, researchers, and stakeholders across multiple fields to establish the policies, funding streams, and evidence-based practices that will promote achievement of state and national education goals.

The following are some examples. We welcome the opportunity to discuss these initiatives in greater detail during the on-site visit.

- Recently, the entire teacher education faculty have been engaged in a comprehensive redesign of the unit’s teacher preparation programs.
- The unit’s faculty have worked with the state stakeholders, including legislators, professional associations, the state board of education, and public schools to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the state’s pilot of a teacher evaluation system. The unit has made significant recommendations as the state further implements the system. The Evaluation of the Pilot Implementation of Connecticut’s System for
Educator Evaluation and Development report (Addendum Exhibit 5.4.3.a) was recognized as the AERA’s Division L Outstanding Policy Report in 2014.

- As indicated in the responses in Standards Three and Four, there are regular and on-going collaboration between the unit’s faculty and P-12 practitioners in the fields. Further examples also include the unit’s Renzulli Academy in Connecticut public schools (see [http://www.renzulliacademy.com/](http://www.renzulliacademy.com/)), the Reading Recovery collaboration with nation’s public schools and faculty at The Ohio State University ([http://spotlight.education.uconn.edu/2011/neag-schools-reading-recovery-certification-program-wins-1-7-million-dollar-grant/](http://spotlight.education.uconn.edu/2011/neag-schools-reading-recovery-certification-program-wins-1-7-million-dollar-grant/)), and the collaboration with the University of Illinois for the National Science Foundation funded GlobalEd 2 Project (see: [http://www.globaled.uconn.edu/](http://www.globaled.uconn.edu/)). In addition, the unit’s faculty are engaged in various research efforts with their school partners to ensure that their knowledge development and dissemination are relevant to P-12 student learning (see research efforts at: [http://education.uconn.edu/research-units/](http://education.uconn.edu/research-units/)).

Addendum Exhibits 5.4.3.b - 5.4.3.d contain an overview of faculty scholarship, awards, grants, editorships, organization memberships, and public and community service by academic year.

5.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) What information is contained within faculty portfolios, vitae, and other sources that provide evidence of the unit faculty meeting target?

Unit Response:

A review of faculty promotion, tenure, and reappointment portfolio, vitae, and their nationally recognized research efforts clearly demonstrate that the unit’s faculty have an in-depth understanding of their fields and are teacher scholars who, on a daily basis, integrate what is known about their content fields, teaching, and learning in their own instructional practice. The above-mentioned research and projects have exhibited the faculty’s intellectual vitality in their sensitivity to critical issues, such as the state’s persistent achievement gap, P-12 student motivation and learning, and accountability. The unit’s responses to Standard One, as well as assessments designed for all programs, reflect the proficiencies outlined in professional, state, and instructional standards.

Diversity and technology are integrated comprehensively throughout coursework, field experiences, and clinical practices.

As indicated by sections V of the SPA reports and other unit assessments, faculty have...
valued candidates’ learning and have adjusted instruction and curriculum appropriately to enhance candidate learning. They understand assessment technology, use multiple key assessments in determining their effectiveness, and have used data to improve their practice. The unit’s tenure/tenure track faculty is about 7% of the University (85/1179). Five of the unit’s faculty (54 University wide, 9%) have been recognized as the Board of Trustees Distinguished Faculty (see: http://provost.uconn.edu/board-of-trustees-distinguished-professor/), and 12 of the 43 (28%) University recognized Teaching Fellows (for outstanding teaching) are from the unit (see: http://itl.uconn.edu/teaching-fellows-yearbook/). It is evident that the professional education faculty are recognized as outstanding teachers at the University.

All faculty seeking promotion, tenure, or reappointment (PTR) complete the provost’s PTR form annually. The PTR form is used for promotion, tenure, and reappointment of tenure track faculty in all schools/colleges. The form is also be used for the promotion of individuals who are in positions that do not lead to tenure and may be used for the reappointment of individuals who are not in tenure track positions. The form can be found at http://provost.uconn.edu/promotion-tenure-and-reappointment-ptr/iii-the-form/.

The form requires faculty to submit information on their professional experience, education, teaching, scholarship and service. Each faculty member’s dossier is reviewed and evaluated by the department PTR committee, department head, dean’s advisory (unit wide) PTR committee, and the dean.

HuskyDM is the University’s name for its installation of Digital Measures, a software suite designed to capture and report on faculty activity. The system contains a great deal of data and allows for detailed reporting on specified variables. Some examples of information entered into the HuskyDM system include publications, presentations, awards, grants, editorships, organization memberships, and public and community service. HuskyDM also has the functionality for detailed reporting, allowing information on a particular faculty member to be reviewed year-over-year, or information on faculty to be aggregated across department or school.

HuskyDM data will be available on-site.

(2) What information is contained in the faculty course evaluation exhibit 5.1 (5.4.f)?
This exhibit was not accessible.

Unit Response:

University evaluation forms can be found at http://www.oir.uconn.edu/SETfinal.pdf and http://www.oir.uconn.edu/SET_Comment_Sheet.pdf

The faculty evaluation data will be provided during on-site visit as it contains individual faculty confidential information.
(3) What is the evaluation process for performance of ALL faculty members, including full-time, part-time, and adjuncts?

_Unit Response:

All instructors are assessed on a semester basis by department heads using the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) instrument. See [http://www.oir.uconn.edu/onlineset/onlineset.html](http://www.oir.uconn.edu/onlineset/onlineset.html) for more information on the SET instrument and its reporting functions. The SET is required to take place each semester by the University Senate and utilized as a part of the faculty Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment (PTR) process. The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness has the responsibility to carry out this process in conjunction with the guidelines set by the University Senate.

The new survey questions, format, and scoring were completely revised according to best practices. The University Senate voted in favor of the new survey in 2009. The questions were piloted in 2010. In the spring of 2013, the survey system went online.

The SET instrument has three parts, two of which are quantitative. There are quantitative questions concerning the instruction and the course content. The bubble sheet consists of questions with adjacent 5-point scale responses from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. There is a neutral or no opinion response. Two overall questions are also included. One question is for the overall instruction and one for the overall course content. There is a median score for each question based on a 1-5 scale of Poor-Excellent. These are standalone questions and are not the cumulative result of the responses to other questions within the section.

There are also open-ended comment questions, which the Senate has approved. The instructor may then add up to three comment questions of his/her own. Only the instructor receives a copy of the student responses to the comment questions. The second part of the evaluation report is a comment section that is available only to the individual instructor. This group of student responses is available online to the individual instructor only. The reports are available online using a secure sign-on. The surveys or reports available to the instructor are accessed using their secure sign-on NetID and password. In addition, course median scores are provided online to administrators (department heads, deans) using a secure sign-on. Faculty across the Neag School consistently perform well on course evaluations.

(4) What instructional strategies does faculty use to demonstrate target professional practices? How do they integrate diversity and technology into their teaching?

_Unit Response:
As the unit responded in Standard Four of this addendum, the unit’s faculty in all programs have imbedded issues of diversity in their courses and field experiences.

The unit’s faculty continue to be an advocate for the wise and effective integration of technology into the education process. We have built an infrastructure that will support the many research initiatives of our faculty and students. We offer technology resources that include a variety of computer labs located in our Collaborative Technology Center and throughout our buildings, wireless mobile computer labs, and extensive use of the web and the Internet in the courses offered. We have created a technology-rich environment that offers our students opportunities to learn through exploration and experimentation guided by our faculty's use of technologies.

The professional education faculty have earned a reputation at the University of Connecticut, throughout the state, and the nation, as a leader in the integration of technology in education. Our faculty, graduate students, and future teachers continue to reach out into the education community through their research, publications, and modeling of the uses of educational technologies.

We continue to examine and investigate new and emerging technologies to enhance the learning of our students and the students of Connecticut, the nation, and the world (see: http://technology.education.uconn.edu).

All courses at the University of Connecticut have HuskyCT (UConn’s implementation of Blackboard) available for use, and many of our courses are delivered in a blended format, integrating electronic resources into teaching. The HuskyCT system conforms to WCAG 2.0 and Section 508 standards, supporting users with disabilities and ensuring that course content is accessible to everyone. HuskyCT is used for distributing course material in an electronic format, including restricted reserve materials provided through the university’s library system. The system is also used for discussion of materials outside of face-to-face time through discussion boards, private blogs, or collaborative wikis.

Recently, the unit transitioned EPSY 3010, the core teacher education course covering the psychology of teaching and learning as well as the study of the nature of development of children and adolescents, to a fully-online format, in line with the belief that our students should have experience with the benefits and limitations of teaching and learning in an online modality.

The unit will schedule interviews during the onsite visit to address the specifics of these two items.

(5) What evidence exists on the types of interaction and collaboration unit faculty have with the P-12 schools, teachers, and students?

*Unit Response:*
Please see detailed responses in section 5.4(3) of this addendum.

(6) What target level rubrics are specifically being addressed by the unit? How does the evidence specifically support the attainment of target level for this standard?

**Unit Response:**

The unit has aligned its responses in this addendum with target rubrics of 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e, and 5f. Each of the responses above contains specific evidence related to the rubric language.

(7) Where is the most up-to-date list of all unit faculty members (including what campus they are associated with, if applicable)?

**Unit Response:**

For a listing of all Neag tenure-track faculty, visit [http://education.uconn.edu/all-faculty/](http://education.uconn.edu/all-faculty/).

For a listing of adjunct faculty, visit [http://education.uconn.edu/adjunct-faculty](http://education.uconn.edu/adjunct-faculty).

(8) How are faculty involved in research and projects, specifically related to initial and advanced programs?

**Unit Response:**

Please see the responses in section 5.4(3) of this addendum.

---

**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.*

**6.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard**

No areas for concern cited for this standard at this time.

**6.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit**

(1) What is meant by the following statement contained in the IR? ‘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.’

Unit Response:

Neag School of Education students pursuing another degree in one of the University’s other colleges are considered dual degree students. Ordinarily, students must complete an additional 30 credits to qualify for the dual degree. Beginning in spring 2008, the University Senate changed their bylaws to exempt IB/M students from the 30-credit requirement when completing a dual degree in the College of Liberal Arts, School of Fine Arts or the College of Agriculture, Health and Natural Resources. Students must meet all subject area major and general education requirements for the dual degree.

The typical 30-credit requirement includes courses outside of those required for their current major. So a student starting as a business major who wanted to add a CLAS history degree would need 30 credits outside of the business degree/courses.

Currently, we have 48 seniors who are listed as dual degree majors. It is more difficult to count juniors since many have dual degrees listed but are not actually pursuing them.

An example of a dual degree student is Jacqueline Rankin who has a dual degree in mathematics. For the Neag Math major she is required to take MATH 2720W – History of Mathematics; CLAS majors are not required to take this course. For the CLAS Math major, she is required to take MATH 3150 – Analysis I; Neag majors are not required to take this course. CLAS majors must also take related courses and Jacqueline took STAT 2215Q and STAT 3025Q.

(2) What evidence is available to support the claim that the university encourages faculty to engage in a wide range of professional activities in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, work in schools, and service? The cited Policies and Procedures Manual was not attached in evidence.

Unit Response:

Please refer to unit’s responses to this question in sections in Standard Five.

To review the Policies and Procedures manual, which was inadvertently omitted in the original Institutional Report, please see Exhibit 6.6.

(3) What evidence can be provided regarding the “details of the unit assessment efforts and resources”, as cited in the IR?

Unit Response:
As noted in our response to section 2.5(06) of this addendum, the unit will continue to fund the improvement of the 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. 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 Qualtrics Research Suite. For details of the unit assessment efforts and resources, see http://www.education.uconn.edu/assessment/.

(4) Is the following statement from the IR accurate, since Connecticut regulations do not support an Education major? “The unit's five-year Integrated Bachelor's and Master's degree graduates may choose 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.”

Unit Response:

IB/M bachelor’s degree students’ education major includes a subject area major. For example, elementary education students pursue a bachelor’s in elementary education, which includes 49 credits in education courses and a 39-credit subject area major (a 24-credit concentration in English, math, history/geography or science and 15 related credits). English Education majors take 40 credits in education courses and 36 credits in English. These students may choose to pursue a dual degree, but not required to pursue a second major.

(5) What evidence is available to support the claim that candidate have access to student services (advising and counseling) was reported to occur during the program admissions processes, program orientations, plan of study meetings, and on-going advising and supervision?

Unit Response:

Neag has an academic advising website - http://advising.education.uconn.edu/ - which describes the services available to students. The Academic Advisors at the Neag School of
Education assist students in creating an educational plan aligned with students’ academic, personal and career goals, and support students 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 students regarding degree progress, careers in education, admission criteria, transfer course evaluation, university and school policies and procedures, and other issues. The staff is available on a walk-in basis and by appointment.

The advising website contains:
- information on events (including information sessions)
- contact information for advisors: http://advising.education.uconn.edu/people/
- information on program admission process: http://teachered.education.uconn.edu/programs/ibm/future-students/how-to-apply/
- testing information: http://teachered.education.uconn.edu/programs/ibm/current-students/praxis/
- program guidelines: http://teachered.education.uconn.edu/programs/ibm/ibmp/program-guidelines/
- links to important university resources: http://advising.education.uconn.edu/advising-resources/
- career development information: http://advising.education.uconn.edu/teacher-career-development/
- certification information: http://advising.education.uconn.edu/certification-information/

Please see attachments:

Addendum Exhibit 6.5.05.a - IBM 2014 Fall Plan of Study Meetings
Addendum Exhibit 6.5.05.b - IBM Junior Orientation Fall 14
Addendum Exhibit 6.5.05.c - IBM Master’s Orientation Fall 14
Addendum Exhibit 6.5.05.d - IBM Senior Orientation Fall 14
Addendum Exhibit 6.5.05.e - IBM 2014 Advising Sessions
Addendum Exhibit 6.5.05.f - IBM Pre-Teaching Application Workshop Presentation
Addendum Exhibit 6.5.05.g - IBM Pre-Teaching Information Session Flyer
Addendum Exhibit 6.5.05.h - Teacher Ed 2014 Fall Plan of Study Meetings

(6) What are the unit’s policies, procedures, and practices for candidate recruitment and admission? How are these policies and procedures accessible to candidates and the education community?

Unit Response:

Please our responses to in sections 6.5(5) and 6.5(7) of this addendum.
(7) Where are the unit’s academic calendars, catalogs, unit publications, grading policies, and unit advertising posted publicly?

Unit Response:

University Academic Calendar: http://registrar.uconn.edu/academic-calendar/
- Advising Calendar: http://advising.education.uconn.edu/
- Neag School of Education Catalog: http://catalog.uconn.edu/neag-school-of-education
- IB/M Program Guidelines: http://teachered.education.uconn.edu/programs/ibm/ibmp/program-guidelines/
- Unit advertising
  - Admission Information Sessions are posted on the Neag Advising website: http://advising.education.uconn.edu/ and the UConn Academic Center for Exploratory Students website: http://aces.uconn.edu/calendar.html
  - Neag Teacher Education Programs website: http://teachered.education.uconn.edu/programs/ibm/ibmp/overview/

(8) Where are the budget details for the unit?

Unit Response:

Please see Addendum Exhibit 6.5.08 for the Total Budget for FY12-FY14.

(9) How do the budgets of comparable units with clinical components on campus, or similar units at other campuses, compare to the budget for the educational unit?

Unit Response:

Please see Addendum Exhibit 6.5.09 for a comparison of expenditures per student.

(10) What are the unit’s policies, procedures, and practices associated with faculty workload?

Unit Response:

To view the current collective bargaining contract between UConn and the members of our chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), please visit - http://www.uconnaaup.org/contracts/aaup-integrated-agreement/.
To review the workload policies for faculty within the Neag School of Education, please see Exhibit 6.6 in the original Institutional Report.

(11) What are the unit’s 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?

Unit Response:

The Neag School of Education and the University of Connecticut have been strong proponents of the use of information technologies in the teaching and learning process. Our university library system offers access to over 90,000 journals, hundreds of specialized databases, and a large collection of circulating materials. In addition to the vast holdings of the library system, UConn also participates in WorldCat and the Boston Library Consortium, allowing students to borrow materials from other regional and global libraries.

The University of Connecticut has invested a great deal of effort to be a leader in information technologies, offering our students the opportunity to learn from anywhere on or off campus. Our campuses offer secure wireless access from any building, and our VPN service offers students the ability to work anywhere while still having access to campus-restricted resources. Courses taught in a blended or fully-online modality are supported by HuskyCT, the university’s implementation of the Blackboard LMS. Distance learning is also supported through Mediasite (software to enhance remote teaching) and WebEx (software for remote meetings and conferences). Development, implementation, and support of university-wide IT services is handled through our centralized university information technology services (UITS) department, and is overseen by the Vice Provost for Information Technology & CIO.

(12) What are the unit’s policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates have access to distance learning including support services and resources, if applicable?

Unit Response:

The unit currently only offers one course EPSY 3010 in its initial teacher education program in a fully on-line format. The program ensures that all students have access to a functional laptop computer. The unit’s technology office ensures that the information on technology support is up to date and public. See http://technology.education.uconn.edu/.