Self-Study Report

THE UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD

200 Bloomfield Avenue
West Hartford, CT 06117
October 2, 2022 12:00 a.m.

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

CAEP Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation

Form Version: 3.0

CAEP Self-Study Report

I. Standard 6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity

EPP Overview

a. Context and Unique Characteristics

The University of Hartford (UH) was chartered on February 21, 1957, when it merged with three existing schools, the Hartford Art School, the Hartt School of Music, and Hillyer College. As a private institute, the UH is governed by a Board of Regents classified by Carnegie as a Master's-Large University. The UH's footprint covers the confluence of three local communities: Hartford, West Hartford, and Bloomfield. Urban, suburban, and rural communities are located within a 10-mile radius of the UH. This proximity allows its' faculty, staff, and student population to live out the UH's mission statement "committed to community."

Today UH has surpassed the founders' original modest plans for a local university in Hartford. In its sixth decade, the UH has grown to seven schools and colleges offering undergraduate and graduate degrees: 9 Associate Degrees, 142 Bachelor's Degrees, 63 Master's Degrees, 23 Doctoral Degrees (See Evidence 6.1_Academic Degrees). In Fall 2020, UH drew 5,381 undergraduate and graduate students from 49 states and 44 countries https://www.hartford.edu/about/why-uhart/glance.aspx. UH has been continuously accredited since 1961 by the New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE, formerly the Commission for Institutions of Higher Education, New England Association of Schools, and Colleges - See Evidence 6.0_NEASC Letter).

UH has two public schools and a transition academy on its campus. The UH Magnet School (https://uhms.crecschools.org) operates under the supervision of the Capitol Region Education Council (CREC- https://www.crec.org). The school is diverse with 50% of students from an urban setting (Hartford) and 50% coming from the towns/cities in the area. The University High School of Science and Engineering (UHSSE - https://uhsse.org) is under the supervision of the Hartford Public Schools (HPS - https://www.hartfordschools.org/). The total minority enrollment is 75%, and 58% of students are economically disadvantaged. Farmington Valley Transition Academy (FVTA - https://www.simsbury.k12.ct.us/district/special-services/fvta) coaches students between the ages of 18-21. Students attending this academy work on functional, academic, vocational, and adult living skills. Together, these three schools are a visible demonstration of the university's commitment to improving the education of the children in the community. These schools on campus enable our teacher candidates to interact with students in these schools, network with professionals, and build bridges.

b. Description of Organizational Structure

The EPP's organizational structure comprises three of the 7 colleges of UH. It includes programs from the College of Education, Nursing, and Health Professions (ENHP) - Department of Education, College of Arts and Sciences - School Psychology, Secondary English, and Mathematics, and Hartt School of Music - Music Education. The EPP is led by the Dean of the College of Education, Nursing, and Health

Professions who works in collaboration with Deans from other colleges as well as involved faculty and staff. The Department Chair of Education also serves as the Director of the EPP. The EPP is also licensed by the State of Connecticut Office of Higher Education and all Educator Preparation Programs are approved nationally by NCATE and by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) (See Evidence 6.2_EPP Organizational Structure).

c. Vision, Mission, and Goals

As an EPP we have adopted the mission that focuses on providing rigorous academic programs and believe that the support of dedicated faculty and staff leads to student success. Students at the UH are prepared, not only for successful careers, but also for successful lives as contributing citizens in the real world. UH subscribes to a teacher-scholar model and is proud of its teaching excellence, scholarly and creative achievements of its faculty. Close student-faculty relationships are a hallmark of UH, which has a student to faculty ratio of 8:1. Faculty choose to come to UH because teaching is their priority, and students know they can turn to their professors for a deeper understanding of their areas of interest and of life in general. This is a value that is deep rooted in our EPP, and we invest time in building lifelong, meaningful relationships with our candidates.

The EPP has also adopted the core tenets of the UH's mission and vision and believe in providing opportunities for active and deep experiential learning, connecting the classroom to the community and the community to the classroom, ongoing and expanding utilization of evolving technological and pedagogical tools and techniques. Providing an immersive, diverse, and inclusive campus, the EPP fosters an environment that models respect and ethical behavior for all. We make every effort to ensure that our candidates are provided with tools to become skilled and multifaceted professionals to meet the demands of the educational world.

d. EPP's Shared Values and Beliefs for Educator Preparation

The EPP prepares professional educators to develop solid pedagogical, content knowledge, and an understanding of a broad variety of active methodologies. The focus is on providing opportunities to teacher candidates to become educators who are highly competent, deeply knowledgeable in a range of disciplines related to the unique needs of children (e.g., children with disabilities, typically achieving students, students at various grade-levels). They are also trained to provide highly skilled instruction and to collaborate with families, communities, and other educational specialists in learning systems. With the knowledge they have acquired, teacher candidates design, modify, and deliver instruction that meets curricular goals for all students. In terms of self-concept, the EPP prepares confident, versatile, and creative teacher educators to work in a variety of settings. Opportunities are given to educators to practice reflective, creative, critical thinking and make these processes visible to their students. Additionally, educators are trained to foster effective professional relationships with colleagues, parents, and educational stakeholders in surrounding communities to support learning that further encourages their students to be successful. Sensitivity to diversity is a key component for teacher candidates to recognize, understand, and value. They must be able to cater to different learning preferences as well as the diversity of social, economic, and cultural experiences. Our diversity statement emphasizes multicultural and intercultural awareness and

competencies to be demonstrated to program candidates by creating safe learning environments where diversity is respected and celebrated, assumptions are challenged, and new perspectives are generated (See Evidence 6.3 - Diversity Statement).

The EPPs are also based on an overarching framework that defines expectations that teacher candidates must meet to be effective teachers. It is expected that candidates explore, engage, and excel in their learning and clinical experiences and advance on the continuum of professional standards that reflect their growth and development of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Candidates must be a reflective practitioner engaged in evidence-based practices, embrace, and demonstrate the three essential dispositions - professionalism, engagement, and global mindedness throughout the teacher-preparation program, inclusive of clinical experiences. These dispositions are enacted and further measured in the teacher-candidate outcomes (See Evidence 6.4 - Conceptual Framework).

EPP Accreditation Status

Standard 6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity

e. Is the EPP nationally or regionally accredited (e.g., SACSCOC, HLC, MSCHE) at the institutional level?

◉ Yes
○ No

National/Regional Accreditation Documentation

Standard 6: Fiscal and Administrative Capacity

a. If your institution/EPP is nationally or regionally accredited, please upload a PDF copy of the award of accreditation here.

6.0_NEASC Letter.pdf

See **Attachment** panel below.

Table 2. Program Characteristics

a. Complete this table of program characteristics by entering the information requested for every program or program option offered by the EPP. Cross check the list with the programs listed in the EPP's academic catalog, if any, as well as the list of state-approved registered programs, if applicable. The Evaluation Team will reference this list in AIMS during the accreditation review process.
Note: EPP is responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the data imported into this table.

Name of Program/specialty area	Enrollment in current fall cycle	Enrollment in last fall cycle	Degree level	Certificate or licensure level	Method of Delivery	State(s) in which program is approved	Date of state approval(s)	Selected Program Review Option
Secondary English	0	2	Baccalaureate	Initial	In-Person	Connecticut (CT)	May 2016	NCTE
Early Childhood Education Birth - K Graduate	1	2	Master's	Initial	In-Person	Connecticut (CT)	May 2016	NAEYC
Secondary Math	7	4	Baccalaureate	Initial	In-Person	Connecticut (CT)	May 2016	NCTM
School Psychology	37	31	Specialist or C.A.S.	Advanced	In-Person	Connecticut (CT)	May 2016	NASP
Elementary Education - Graduate	0	2	Master's	Initial	In-Person	Connecticut (CT)	May 2016	ACEI

Elementary Education - Undergraduate	13	16	Baccalaureate	Initial	In-Person	Connecticut (CT)	May 2016	ACEI
Early Childhood Education PK-3 Undergraduate	17	14	Baccalaureate	Initial	In-Person	Connecticut (CT)	May 2016	NAEYC
Early Childhood Ed Birth - K Undergraduate	2	2	Baccalaureate	Initial	In-Person	Connecticut (CT)	May 2016	NAEYC
Early Childhood Education PK -3 Graduate	9	4	Master's	Initial	In-Person	Connecticut (CT)	May 2016	NAEYC
Masters in Special Education Initial Certification	15	21	Master's	Initial	Distance Learning;	Connecticut (CT)	May 2016	CAEP
Integrated Elementary and Special Education	67	80	Baccalaureate	Initial	In-Person	Connecticut (CT)		CAEP

NOTE FOR IMPORTING SPECIALTY AREA PROGRAM INFORMATION
Appending: Will add the selected program(s) to the table
Replacing: Will clear out all information currently entered in the table and will repopulate the table with the selected program(s)

Table 3. EPP Characteristics

Complete this table of EPP characteristics in AIMS to provide an expanded profile by which the accreditation process is managed by CAEP staff. This AIMS version of this table, in which the data are actually entered, has drop-down menus by which characteristics are selected and the table is completed.

Control of Institution	Private/Independent
Student Body	Coed
Carnegie Class	Doctoral/Research Universities
Location	Suburban
Teacher Preparation Levels	Currently offering initial teacher preparation programs Currently offering advanced educator preparation programs
EPP Type	Institution of Higher Education: State/Regional
Religious Affiliations	Not applicable
Language of Instruction	English
Institutional Accreditation (Affiliations)	New England Association of Schools and Colleges

Table 4. Qualification Table for EPP-based Clinical Educators

a. The clinical educator (EPP-based clinical faculty & supervisors) qualifications table is completed by providing information for each of the EPP-based clinical educators.

Name	Highest degree earned	Field or specialty area of highest degree	Program Assignment(s)	Teaching assignment or role within the program(s)	P-12 certificates or licensures held	P-12 experiences including teaching or administration dates of engagement in these roles, last five years

If EPP is not using Table 4a, upload the clinical educator qualifications table being used below.

Clinical Educators.xls

See **Attachment** panel below.

Table 5. Capacity Table

a. The capacity table of curricular, fiscal, facility, and administrative and support capacity for quality is used to satisfy requirements of the U.S. Department of Education and is completed by providing data relevant for the

EPP. This chart is an example of a chart that the EPP can complete.

Capacity Dimension	EPP description of metric(s)	EPP data	Title and description of supplemental evidence/documentation of quality for each dimension
Facilities			
Fiscal Support			
Administrative support			

Upload your self-developed capacity table below

Capacity Table.pdf

See **Attachment** panel below.

Table 6. Off Campus, Satellite, Branch

a. The Accreditation Plan is an educator preparation provider's (EPP's) identification of the sites outside of the main campus or administrative headquarters and the programs offered at each site that will be included in the EPP's accreditation review. This information, in combination with the table of program characteristics, is used by CAEP staff and evaluation team lead to plan the site review, including the sites that will be visited by the evaluation team.

Geographic Site(s) administered by the EPP	Program offered at each site	Is the program to be included in accreditation review? (Y or N)	Is the program approved by state in which program is offered? (Y or N or approval not required)	Notes/Comments
Asylum Avenue Campus	None	N	N	N/A
Mort and Irma Handel Performing Arts Center	None	N	N	N/A
University Main Campus	All EPP Programs	Y	Y	N/A

Standard 7: Record of Compliance with Title IV of the Higher Education Act

Are you using CAEP accreditation to access Title IV funds?

○ Yes
◉ No

Title IV Funds

Standard 7: Record of Compliance with Title IV of the Higher Education Act

Please upload documentation.
Please provide a narrative.

We are not using CAEP for Title IV Funding.

II. CAEP Standards and Evidence

This page is intended to be blank

Standard R.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (Initial Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the standard.

1 📎 1.1.1_Title II Data Summary.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content

2 📎 1.1.2 _Key Assessments by Program.xlsx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

3 📎 1.1.3_Proprietary Assessment Data.xlsx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

4 📎 1.1.4_EPP Designed Assessment Data.xlsx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

5 📎 1.1.5_CCT Rubric.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

6 📎 1.1.6_Transition Plan.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

7 📎 2.1.1_DRG List.pdf

R1.4 Professional Responsibility

8 📎 2.1.6_List of Guest Speakers.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

9 📎 2.1.8_SUPAB Meeting Minutes.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

10 📎 2.2.2_Placement Process and Co-construction.pdf

R1.2 Content

11 📎 2.2.4_CT Interview Form.pdf

11	R1.4 Professional Responsibility	
12	📎 2.2.5_ Growth Plan.pdf	
	R1.1 The Learner and Learning R1.2 Content R1.3 Instructional Practice R1.4 Professional Responsibility	
13	📎 2.2.6_Candidates on DSAP.pdf	
	R1.4 Professional Responsibility	
14	📎 2.2.8_ST Orietnation PPT.pdf	
	R1.4 Professional Responsibility	
15	📎 2.2.10_Data Review.pdf	
	R1.1 The Learner and Learning R1.2 Content R1.3 Instructional Practice R1.4 Professional Responsibility	
16	📎 2.3.1_Curriculum Diversity.pdf	
	R1.1 The Learner and Learning R1.2 Content R1.3 Instructional Practice R1.4 Professional Responsibility	
17	📎 2.3.3_Scope and Sequence for Initial Programs.xlsx	
	R1.1 The Learner and Learning R1.2 Content R1.3 Instructional Practice R1.4 Professional Responsibility	
18	📎 2.3.4_Technology Syllabi.pdf	
	R1.1 The Learner and Learning R1.2 Content R1.3 Instructional Practice	
19	📎 2.3.5_Curriculum Technology.pdf	
	R1.1 The Learner and Learning R1.2 Content R1.3 Instructional Practice	
20	📎 2.3.7_Assignment Samples.pdf	

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice

21 📎 3.1.6_Completers Hired.xlsx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

22 📎 3.2.2_Transition Points and Triangulation.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

23 📎 3.3.1_Candidate Dispositions Rubric.pdf

R1.4 Professional Responsibility

24 📎 3.3.2_CCT(SEED) Rubric.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

25 📎 4.1.4_Action Research Project_Introduction and Data.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice

26 📎 4.1.6_TEAM Data.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

27 📎 4.1.10_Course Syllabi.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

28 📎 4.1.13_Candidate End of Program Survey Summary .pdf

R1.2 Content
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

2
9   📎 5.1.1a_Professional Program Application.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

3
0   📎 5.1.1c_Student Teaching Evaluations.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

3
1   📎 5.1.4_Program Effectiveness Measures.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

3
2   📎 5.1.5_One-page Report.xlsx

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

3
3   📎 5.1.10_EDR 444 Updates.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content

3
4   📎 5.4.2_EDF 120 Syllabus.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

3
5   📎 5.4.3_Professional Development Sample.pdf

R1.1 The Learner and Learning
R1.2 Content
R1.3 Instructional Practice
R1.4 Professional Responsibility

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

R.1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

To keep abreast with national and state standards, workforce changes, and feedback

from key stakeholders (candidate, clinical partners, faculty), the EPP decided to closely review its existing curricula across programs. The review revealed that we need to better align our assessment and rubrics to reflect reliable and valid alignment to standards and workforce needs. We have therefore decided to put together a transition plan that will help us engage in continuous improvement and strengthen our programs (See Evidence_1.1.6_Transition Plan).

R.1.1 - Learner and Learning R 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 Content, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibility

The EPP uses both proprietary (Certification Tests, edTPA, Title II) and EPP designed assessments (lesson plan assessment, student teaching evaluation, portfolio, and the Candidate Effect on Student Learning/Teacher inquiry project (CESL/TIP) to assess learner and learning. The data provide information to identify if candidates can apply their knowledge of learner and learning at various progression levels. To keep abreast with national and state standards, workforce changes, and feedback from key stakeholders (candidate, clinical partners, faculty), the EPP closely reviewed its existing curricula across programs. The review revealed that we need to better align our assessment and rubrics to reflect reliable and valid alignment to standards and workforce needs.

The EPP uses the Title II data to reports on the assessments used for teacher certification or licensure by the state. The data include the number of test takers, the number of candidates who passed, the pass rate, the average scaled score, and the minimum passing score for each assessment (See Evidence 1.1.1_Title II data Summary).

Proprietary Assessments

Proprietary measures are used to determine how candidates apply content knowledge, instructional practice, and professional responsibility at appropriate progression levels Following are proprietary assessment data that the EPP collects to ensure candidates meet requirements for program completion and certification (See Evidence 1.1.1_Key Assessment Data by Program).

Certification Tests
Candidates across all programs must successfully complete Connecticut Foundations of Reading and edTPA to be recommended for certification. In addition, candidates in the special education, elementary, and secondary programs must pass Praxis 2 subject specific test while the candidates in the early childhood 113 certification must pass the Early Childhood Test.

Following are the requirements by program -

Early Childhood Test
Data for this proprietary test is available from 2018 - 2021. The pass rate for the three years for a total of 26 candidates was 88%. In the first cycle (2018-2019), 12 candidates took the test, and the overall pass rate was 83%. Data for the first and the third sub-areas indicate that the candidates were slightly below the state mean,

while the second and fourth subareas indicate the candidates were above or at the mean. In the second (2019-2020) and third cycle (2021-2020) there were fewer than 10 candidates that took the test, but data cannot be presented due to a small sample size (See Evidence 1.1.3_Data for Proprietary Tests).

Praxis II Tests (Elementary Education Multiple Subject Area Test (5001); Special Education Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications (5543)

The Elementary Praxis test is divided into four subject areas. The institutional pass rate for the following subject area, Reading and Language Arts, in 2018-2019 is 100%; in 2019-2020 is 97%, and in 2021-2022 is 100%. The pass rate indicates that the candidates' performance in this subject area is at and above the State pass rate. For Mathematics, in 2018-2019 is 97%; in 2019-2020 is 87%, and in 2021-2022 is 96%. The pass rate is comparable to the State pass rate. In Science the pass rate in 2018-2019 is 100%; in 2019-2020 is 93%, and in 2021-2022 is 91%. The pass rate indicates that the candidates' performed at and above the State pass rate. The pass rate for Social Studies in 2018-2019 is 92%; in 2019-2020 is 93%, and in 2021-2022 is 95%. The pass rate is comparable to the State's pass rate. Overall, the candidates performed around the state and national average in responding to questions in respective categories for all the four subject areas.

The Special Education Praxis II results show a pass rate of 100%, 100%, 97% respectively for 2018-2019, 2019-2020, and 2020-2022. The state pass rate is 100%, 98%, 97% for the same years. The candidates' passing rate is at and above the state's pass rate.

The Secondary English and Mathematics Praxis II data could not be aggregated because of low enrollment (See Evidence 1.1.3_Data for Proprietary Tests).

Connecticut Foundations of Reading

The data include all candidates taking tests at any given time in the program. It is not a reflection of where they are at the end of the program. The three cycles of data for Connecticut Foundations of Reading show that the candidates' pass rate is 75%. The pass rate data by programs are as follows: Special Education - 77%; Elementary - 83%; Early Childhood - 60%.

Pass rate data for of completers in 2018-2019 is 95% which is higher than the statewide pass rate of 92. In 2019-2020, there was 15% decline in the pass rate, and it is also 7% lower than the statewide pass rate (87%). In 2020, the pass rate went up to 86%, but the pass rate was still below 1% compared to the statewide pass rate (See Evidence 1.1.3_Data for Proprietary Tests).

edTPA

The edTPA is a performance-based assessment completed by preservice candidates during their student teaching experience. It is designed to measure teacher candidate effectiveness in the classroom by focusing on student learning. Connecticut adopted

this assessment in 2016. Initially, the candidates were required to submit edTPA for scoring, but the cut score was waived. All that is required is for the candidates to obtain a score. In Fall 2022 we will replace the CESL/TIP with edTPA. We are not able to report data for Early Childhood, Secondary English, and Math due to fewer number of candidates doing the edTPA.

Candidates in the Integrated Elementary and Special Education program were approved to complete the Elementary edTPA with mathematics component in preparation for both the elementary and special education certificates.

Overall, the edTPA data show a slight improvement in scores from 2018-2019 to 2019-2020 at the institutional level. Although we did not go above and beyond the state and the national mean, the data show growth in that direction (See Evidence 1.1.3_Data for Proprietary Tests).

The EPP is confident that it is preparing the candidates in the right direction to be effective teachers, and the pass rates for the proprietary tests attest to it.

EPP Created Assessments

Our EPP created assessments measure content knowledge including student teaching evaluation Lesson Plan, CESL/TIP, Portfolio, Dispositions. We will revise the lesson plan and student teaching evaluation to better align the rubrics to state and national standards. The CESL/TIP will be replaced by edTPA.

The assessments also measure candidate engagement in professional learning and their ability to collaborate with other professionals to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and families. These skills are measured in the student teaching evaluation and the evidence is included in the candidate portfolios.

Student Teaching Evaluation: To evaluate our candidates during their culminating clinical experiences, we have used EPP designed rubric using the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching. While the elements of the rubric are similar, they lack reliability and validity. In addition, the rubric did not align with the new CAEP workbook standards. Moving forward we will use the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) adopted CCT rubric to ensure our candidates know the expectations and to be successful first year teachers. The rationale for using the CCT rubric is to ensure that candidates show mastery in essential and critical aspects of a teacher's practice as required by the State even before they start their teaching career.

Student teaching evaluations are completed at midterm and final assessments by the university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and the teacher candidate. Candidates who score below benchmark are provided with additional support and if required a professional growth plan. To meet the end of program requirement, candidates must be at benchmark or above for the final evaluation. We also counsel students who are unable to meet the requirements. Data for Spring and Fall 2021 show that all candidates have met the end of program requirements at benchmark and mastery

levels (See Evidence 1.1.4_EPP Designed Assessment Data).

Lesson Plan: To evaluate candidates' ability to develop a well-organized lesson plan, the EPP uses the EPP designed rubric aligned to national and state standards. However, these rubrics do not have pre-established reliability and validity based on nationally designed performance-based assessments. As such, the EPP proposes to adapt the edTPA rubrics that have pre-established reliability and validity. The lesson plan data are available from Fall 2020 up to Summer 2021; however, we describe here the last data cycle with a plan to transition to new rubric moving forward (See Transition Plan). In this data cycle (Fall 2021), we only had female candidates across all teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate level. Candidates scored at either benchmark or mastery level. We have mentioned that the EPP designed rubric lack in reliability and validity, and this could mean each instructor may be interpreting the rubrics differently and the scores for candidates across program cannot be generalized in the same way. Moreover, other than the special education program, the sample size for other programs is small, and comparison cannot be made across the program by looking at raw data. For example, 11 candidates in the special education program are at benchmark while only 2 candidates in the Early Childhood program are at benchmark. The data also reveal that 48% of the candidates in the Special education program needed explicit instruction on providing accommodation to P-12 students. An important piece of information gathered from the data is that 100% of the candidates across programs were able to plan for a positive and engaging classroom environment and 79% of the candidates scored a mastery on planning the procedures section of the lesson plan

At the graduate level, most of the candidates are in the initial special education certification program. The graduate students are trained to develop lesson plans in the EDH 602, 603 and 605. Generally, these candidates are paraprofessionals or teacher aides who are familiar with lesson procedures in the classrooms, and these factors in addition to well scaffolded scope and sequence of the curriculum contribute to candidates' ability to develop effective lesson plans.

Review of data indicated that we needed to re-examine how lesson planning skills were being measured. We noticed that we needed to capture complexities of what is measured. We also saw the importance of using more than three progression levels to monitor candidate performance. The edTPA rubrics appear to capture these complexities using discrete criteria on the levels candidates are at in developing lessons. Moving forward, we will be adapting the edTPA rubrics to assess lesson plans across programs. The next step will be to share the rubric with clinical partners to get their feedback and make required changes. While the rubric elements are aligned to CAEP and InTASC standards, we plan to confirm validity using LAWSHE method. To obtain a reliability score, we plan to train faculty from all programs (See Evidence 1.1.4_EPP Designed Assessment Data; See Evidence 1.1.5_CCT Rubric).

Candidate Effect on Student Learning (CESL)/Teacher Inquiry Project (TIP): This assignment will be replaced by edTPA, a performance-based assessment with established reliability and validity. CESL and TIP were designed to measure candidates' impact on P-12 student learning. Since edTPA measures the same skills and is completed by all candidates across programs, moving forward we will be using

edTPA data to measure candidate impact on P-12 learners. The State has also adopted edTPA as a requirement for graduation and certification. The CESL data indicate that both the undergraduate and graduate candidates are at benchmark and mastery. All female candidates were at mastery in all the criteria they were evaluated on while 75% (N=3) male candidates were at mastery in analyzing pre- and post-assessments and evaluating instructions. The overall data indicate that candidates are proficient in carrying out action research projects (See Evidence 1.1.4_EPP Designed Assessment Data).

Portfolio
Candidates across our teacher preparation programs are required to complete an e-portfolio. The purpose of the e-portfolio is to provide candidates with the opportunity to organize a goal driven exhibit to showcase their strengths and abilities while providing evidence of growth over time. The e-portfolio promotes self-reflection and critical analysis and serves as a summative assessment that allows candidates to document their accomplishments in the teacher preparation program. It also allows them to integrate knowledge and skills that they have learned across diverse courses and experiences.

Portfolio data are collected twice, once at the end of ½ day student teaching and also at the end of the program. At the formative level candidates are provided with explicit feedback which they are required to incorporate when they submit their portfolio at the end of the program.
The last cycle of formative data was collected in Fall 2020. The data indicate that candidates needed more experience in collaborating with diverse families and community because only 18% were at mastery. At least 23% of the candidates who are at benchmark needed more experience to make instant data-based decisions to modify instruction to meet P-12 students' needs. Another 14% of the candidates needed support to master strategies to maximize instructional time. Overall, 90% of the candidates were at mastery on creating a positive learning environment, planning instruction to cognitively engage P-12 students, engaged in professional learning and collaboration. In addition, 100% of the candidates successfully incorporated technology into their teaching. Candidates were required to make changes to their portfolio and provide evidence of meeting mastery on all elements in Spring 2021. All candidates successfully achieved mastery in all the competencies required of them. The feedback and explicit guidance, and experiences provided to them may have attributed to this outcome by the end of the program when summative data were collected. One candidate struggled to meet the program requirements and was counseled out of the program (See Evidence 1.1.4_EPP Designed Assessment Data).

Context of Learning
Clinical Experiences are an integral part of our teacher preparation programs. Considering the importance of clinical experiences to prepare our candidates, we would like to implement an assessment that will allow our candidates to better understand the context of the diverse classrooms in which they are placed. This assessment is based on the context of the learning section of the summative edTPA assessment. This assessment will be piloted in Summer 2023 with full implementation in Fall 2023 (See Evidence 1.1.6_Transition Plan).

Implicit Bias Training

Moving forward, we will require our candidates to complete the implicit bias training as part of the program curriculum. There will be discussion posts related to this training attached to coursework where data on student understanding will be measured. This assessment will be piloted in Summer 2023 with full implementation in Fall 2023 (See Evidence 1.1.6_Transition Plan).

Dispositions

We have been collecting dispositions data on our candidates for a few years. However, we need to work on streamlining the process so that we can analyze and reflect on the data to make program related decisions. We have put together a revised plan that we will share with clinical partners in Spring 2023, pilot it in Summer 2023, with full implementation in Fall 2023 (See Evidence 1.1.6_Transition Plan).

Program Level Assessments

At the program level, Secondary English, Math, Music Education, and School Psychology programs are recognized by their professional organizations. For all other programs (Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education), we have identified key assessments that assess candidate content knowledge, skills, and dispositions. To be admitted to and progress in the professional program candidates must have and maintain a 3.0 GPA and receive a grade of B or better in all professional level courses. Candidates must also be at mastery and/or benchmark on all key assessment rubric elements to complete the course successfully. Candidates who do not meet these requirements are counselled out of the program. In addition, to the above identified assessments, each program has identified key assessments. For example, Assessment Report, ECE Case Study, Secondary Multicultural English Content Unit Plan (See Evidence 1.1.4_EPP Designed Assessment Data).

Data for these assessments indicate that all candidates score at benchmark or above. Candidates who score below benchmark are provided with additional supports and if required a professional growth plan (See Evidence 2.2.5_Growth Plan). We counsel students who are unable to meet the requirements

To further strengthen our programs and meet the changing demands of the workforce we have put together a transition plan that lists and proposes changes and plans we will be making to our Quality Assurance System (See Evidence 1.1.6_Transition Plan).

Standard R.A.1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (Advanced Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the Standard and answer the following questions for each item.)

1   📎 2.1.8_SUPAB Meeting Minutes.pdf

RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities

2   📎 2.2.5_ Growth Plan.pdf

RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities	
3 📎 3.2.2_Transition Points and Triangulation.pdf	
RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities	
4 📎 5.1.4_Program Effectiveness Measures.pdf	
RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities	
5 📎 A.E.1_Key Assessment Components School Psychology.pdf	
RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities	
6 📎 A.E.3_Practicum & Internship Supervisor Evaluation Surveys and Results School Psychology.pdf	
RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities	
7 📎 A.E.4_Standard A.4 Employer and Completer Survey Results School Psychology.pdf	
RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities	
8 📎 A.E.8_Praxis II School Psychology.pdf	
RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities	
9 📎 A.E.9_Psychological Assessment Rubric and Validation School Psychology.pdf	
RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities	
10 📎 A.E.10 Consultation Case Study School Psychology.pdf	
RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities	
11 📎 A.E.11_The University of Hartford Program Recogniton Report FA19 School Psychology.pdf	
RA1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions RA1.2 Provider Responsibilities	

ii. Analysis Report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

School Psychology M.S. & Sixth Year Certificate

A.1.1 Candidates Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
The knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions of candidates within the school psychology program at the University of Hartford are addressed and assessed in various ways. All six components have been addressed and key assessments have been developed for at least three of the components as indicated in charts provided in Evidence A.E.1_ Key Assessment Components School Psychology.

Data to inform Standard A1.1 are gathered from multiple sources throughout the program. Formative, yearly data are gathered in the form of fieldwork evaluations (completed by site supervisors). Summative evaluations include the Praxis II Examination, Psychological Assessments, and Consultation Case Studies. All evaluations directly correlate to the training standards identified by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). Among those standards are data-based decision making, consultation and collaboration, research and program evaluation, use of technology, and legal, ethical, and professional practice. Data gathered from these evaluations allow us to monitor our candidates' progress in skills central to the field of school psychology.

(Evidence A.E.8 - Key Assessment #1 Praxis II)
(Evidence A.E.3 - Assessment #2 Practicum & Internship Evaluations)
(Evidence A.E.4 - Completer & Employer Satisfaction Survey)

Component #1: Application of Data Literacy

In the School Psychology program, knowledge and skills within component #1 are developed across numerous courses involving the application of data related to psychological assessments (PSY 561, PSY 565, PSY 566, & PSY 567) and numerous courses involving the application of data in academic interventions, counseling, and consultation (PSY 584, PSY 585, PSY 650). The knowledge and skill developed is then applied during practicum experiences and internship. Various course assignments are used to assess the development of knowledge and skills and rubrics are used to assess the application of these during practicum and internship. No key assessment is applied to this component.

Component #2: Use of Research and understanding of qualitative, quantitative, and/or mixed methods research methodologies

In the School Psychology program component #2 is assessed through three different measures which are all key assessments for this program. The knowledge and skills within this component are taught in PSY 582 (Research Methods) and PSY 583 (Introduction to School Psychology) and then applied during the Practicum and Internship. One assessment of these skills is completed within the Field-Based Practicum and Internship Supervisor Evaluations (A.E.3_ Key Assessment #2 Practicum & Internship Evaluations) which include items related to the Professional Standard of Research and Program Evaluation. This component is also assessed using the Praxis II Exam (A.E.8_ Key Assessment #1 Praxis II) which includes a section on Foundations of Service Delivery which includes items related to the Professional Standard of Research and Program Evaluation.

Component #3: Employment of data analysis and evidence to develop supportive school environments

In the School Psychology program, component #3 is assessed through five different measures which are all key assessments for this program. The knowledge and skills within this component are taught across numerous courses in the program related to psychological assessments (PSY 561, PSY 565, PSY 566, & PSY 567) and consultation

(PSY 650). During practicum and internship, the acquired knowledge and skills are applied to various activities including the completion of psychological assessment reports and consultation case study reports. The first key assessment that assesses this component is the Field-Based Practicum and Internship Supervisor Evaluations (A.E.3_ Key Assessment #2 Practicum & Internship Evaluations) which include items related to the Professional Standards of Consultation and Collaboration; Data-Based Decision Making and Accountability; Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills; and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills. This component is also assessed within two sections of the Praxis II Exam (A.E.8_ Key Assessment #1 Praxis II). One section involves Professional Practices which includes items related to the Professional Standards of Data-Based Decision Making and Accountability and Consultation and Collaboration. Another section involves Direct & Indirect Services which includes items related to the Professional Standards of Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills. Finally, this component is assessed using two rubrics applied to practicum and internship requirements including the Psychological Assessment Rubric (A.E.9 Psychological Assessment Rubric and Validation School Psychology) and the Consultation Case Study Rubric (A.E.10_ Consultation Case Study School Psychology).

Component #4: Leading and/or participating in collaborative activities with others such as peers, colleagues, teachers, administrators, community organizations, and parents

In the School Psychology program, component #4 is assessed through three different measures which are all key assessments for this program. The knowledge and skills within this component are taught in PSY 583, PSY 650, and PSY 585 where the candidate's complete readings and case studies related to the active engagement of school psychologists in leading school decision making. During practicum and internship, the acquired knowledge and skills are applied to various activities including the completion of a Systems Level Intervention project during internship which involves the completion of a needs assessment, development of a systems level intervention, and data collection and analysis of the impact of that intervention. The first key assessment applied to this concept is the Practicum and Internship Supervisor Evaluation (A.E.3_ Key Assessment #2 Practicum & Internship Evaluations) which includes items related to the Professional Standards of Consultation & Collaboration, Family-School Collaborative Services, and School-wide Practices to Promote Learning. This component is also assessed using the Praxis II Exam (A.E.8_ Key Assessment #1 Praxis II) which includes a section on Systems-Level Services which includes items related to the Professional Standards of School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning, Preventive and Responsive Services, and Family-School Collaboration Services.

Component #5: Supporting appropriate application of appropriate technology for their field of specialization

In the School Psychology program, for component #5 the application of technology in

school psychology work is incorporated throughout the program. One application of technology unique to school psychology is the use of technology in the administration, scoring, and interpretation of psychological assessments. Ratings on candidates at the end of their first year in the program include an assessment of their ability to use technology appropriately and this is informally monitored during their second year in the program. Finally, candidates in this program are expected to use appropriate technology throughout all Practicum and Internship experiences. No key assessment is applied to this component (see cross cutting themes).

Component #6: Application of professional dispositions, laws and policies, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate to their field of specialization

In the School Psychology program, component #6 is assessed through four different measures which are all key assessments for this program. The knowledge and skills within this component are introduced in PSY 582 Introduction to School Psychology and then applied more specifically in courses throughout the program and candidates are expected to demonstrate appropriate ethical and professional behaviors during all Practicum and Internship experiences. The first assessment applied to this component is the Practicum and Internship Supervisor Evaluation (A.E.3_ Key Assessment #2 Practicum & Internship Evaluations) which includes fifteen Professional Characteristics and 8 Professional Responsibilities items drawn from the school psychology training literature. Second, the Practicum Supervisor Evaluation and the Internship Supervisor Evaluation (A.E.3_ Key Assessment #2 Practicum & Internship Evaluations) both include one section with items related to specific Professional Standards of Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practices. This component is also assessed using the Praxis II Exam (A.E.8_ Key Assessment #1 Praxis II) which includes a section on Foundations which includes items related to the Professional Standard of Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practices.

A.1.2 Provider Responsibilities

The School Psychology program (A.E.11_The University of Hartford Program Recognition Report FA19 School Psychology) is an approved SPA based on standards from the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). There are ten domains within these standards including:

Data-Based Decision Making and Accountability
Consultation and Collaboration
Intervention and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills
Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills
Diversity in Development and Learning
School-wide Practices to Promote Learning
Preventive and Responsive Services
Family-School Collaborative Services
Research and Program Development
Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice

The program was initially approved by NASP in 1999 and was last reviewed in 2019 and received approval for another 7 years. This approval supports the fact that this

program is completely aligned with the NASP 2010 Training Standards.

Specialty Licensure Area Data

Program Review Option (per state partnership agreement)

- ☑ CAEP Program Review with National Recognition (SPA)
- ☑ CAEP Evidence Review of Standard R.1/R.A.1
- ☐ State Program Review (State-selected Standards)

Upload State Program Reports below

Upload other National Accreditation Agency Documentation below (e.g. NASM, CACREP, NASAD)

6.6_NASM Letter.pdf
A.E.11_The University of Hartford Program Recogniton Report FA19 School Psychology.pdf

See **Attachment** panel below.

Standard R.2: Clinical Partnership and Practice (Initial Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.)

1 📎 1.1.1_Title II Data Summary.pdf

R2.3 Clinical Experiences

2 📎 1.1.4_EPP Designed Assessment Data.xlsx

R2.3 Clinical Experiences

3 📎 2.1.1_DRG List.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.3 Clinical Experiences

4 📎 2.1.2_Clinical Office Sturcture & Placement Process.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.2 Clinical Educators

5 📎 2.1.3_MOU Template.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

6 📎 2.1.5_Board of Visitors.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

7 📎 2.1.6_List of Guest Speakers.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.2 Clinical Educators

8 📎 2.1.7_Weaver Event.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

9 📎 2.1.8_SUPAB Meeting Minutes.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

10 📎 2.2.1_Clinical Experiences and Placement Type.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.3 Clinical Experiences

11 📎 2.2.2_Placement Process and Co-construction.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.2 Clinical Educators
R2.3 Clinical Experiences

12 📎 2.2.3_UG and Grad Student Teaching Applications.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.3 Clinical Experiences

13 📎 2.2.4_CT Interview Form.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.2 Clinical Educators
R2.3 Clinical Experiences

14 📎 2.2.5_ Growth Plan.pdf

R2.2 Clinical Educators
R2.3 Clinical Experiences

15 📎 2.2.6_Candidates on DSAP.pdf

R2.3 Clinical Experiences

16 📎 2.2.7_ Clinical Handbook.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.2 Clinical Educators
R2.3 Clinical Experiences

17 📎 2.2.8_ST Orietnation PPT.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.2 Clinical Educators

18 📎 2.2.9_Clinical Resources.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.2 Clinical Educators

19 📎 2.2.10_Data Review.pdf

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
R2.3 Clinical Experiences

2

0	📎 2.2.11_DEIJ Report.pdf
R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation R2.3 Clinical Experiences	
21	📎 2.3.2_Diversity Data in Partner Schools.xlsx
R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation R2.2 Clinical Educators R2.3 Clinical Experiences	
22	📎 2.3.3_Scope and Sequence for Initial Programs.xlsx
R2.3 Clinical Experiences	
23	📎 2.3.4_Technology Syllabi.pdf
R2.3 Clinical Experiences	
24	📎 2.3.5_Curriculum Technology.pdf
R2.3 Clinical Experiences	
25	📎 2.3.6_Scaffolded Support.pdf
R2.3 Clinical Experiences	
26	📎 2.3.7_Assignment Samples.pdf
R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation R2.3 Clinical Experiences	
27	📎 3.1.4_DSAP Policy.pdf
R2.3 Clinical Experiences	
28	📎 3.2.2_Transition Points and Triangulation.pdf
R2.3 Clinical Experiences	
29	📎 4.1.13_Candidate End of Program Survey Summary .pdf
R2.3 Clinical Experiences	
30	📎 5.1.1b_Observation Timeline.pdf
R2.3 Clinical Experiences	
31	📎 5.1.1c_Student Teaching Evaluations.pdf
R2.2 Clinical Educators R2.3 Clinical Experiences	

3
2 📎 5.1.4_Program Effectiveness Measures.pdf

R2.3 Clinical Experiences

3
3 📎 5.4.3_Professional Development Sample.pdf

R2.2 Clinical Educators

ii. Analysis Report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

Clinical Partnerships and Practice
R 2.1 - Clinical Partnerships

Clinical partnerships are an integral part of our teacher preparation programs (TPP). At UH, we have a rich history of placing students from pre-school to high school and transition academies. The partnership enables our candidates to work in a variety of schools in different District Reference Groups (DRGs) identified by CSDE (See Evidence 2.1.1_DRG). UH also has long-lasting agreements with several school districts across Connecticut.

EPP Partnership Documentation
Considering the increasing importance of clinical partnerships, and the need to maintain detailed documentation, the Department of Education (Department) went through an organizational restructuring. Under the current organizational structure, the Clinical Office is under the direct leadership of the Department, supported by three graduate students (See Evidence 2.1.2_Stucture). In 2021, ENHP created a new position titled the Collegiate Director of Clinical Partnerships to facilitate the partnership development process. The Collegiate Director serves as a liaison between clinical partners and the UH's legal department to facilitate the formal contract/MOU process (See Evidence 2.1.3_MOU). All documents are easily accessible on UH's secure electronic storage drive.

Mutually Beneficial Partnerships
To ensure that our partnerships are mutually beneficial, the School University Partnership Advisory Board (SUPAB) was established in 2014. The SUPAB allows us to engage in collaborative discussions, and to work on designing, reviewing, evaluating, revising and aligning our conceptual framework, curriculum, assessments, and rubrics to national and state standards (CAEP, InTASC, CCT). It serves as a platform to share partners' needs (e.g., new program development; program changes to existing programs) or to provide professional development for their teachers and staff. Our partners are also represented in the College Board of Visitors and share program development ideas with us (See Evidence 2.1.8_SUPAB; 2.1.5_BOV).

The EPP benefits from these partnerships because it can recruit teachers and administrators as adjunct faculty and clinical educators to share real life experiences with candidates. Our partners are frequently invited to be guest speakers to share knowledge and experiences with the teacher candidates (See Evidence 2.1.6_Guest Speakers). We organize professional development opportunities (principal panel; mock interviews etc.) and job recruitment events with the support of our partners to ensure that our candidates are career ready.

We also organize admission recruitment events in collaboration with school districts to promote our programs. For example, (1) we provide college admission process information to high school students and their parents (See Evidence 2.1.7_Weaver Event), (2) we invite elementary, middle, and high school students to spend the day with candidates on campus, (3) we are piloting a dual enrollment program with high school students interested in education to take two introductory level education courses as part of their high school curriculum.

School partners also benefit from these partnerships. This is because (1) we provide them with candidates to serve as additional support within the classroom during clinical placements, (2) we also placed our teacher candidates in schools looking for substitute teachers and tutors during the pandemic, (3) we conduct professional development for their faculty.

Co-construction and Collaborative Partnership Process
The EPP hosts quarterly meetings to work in collaboration with partners to facilitate partnerships and make decisions regarding policies, procedures, and clinical placements. During SUPAB meetings, we discuss program curriculum, and co-construct assignments, and assessments that help us better prepare our candidates. Information collected during these meetings is further discussed at program meetings and relevant changes are made to the program curriculum. Every year, the EPP hosts student teaching orientations to support our clinical educators and provide information on clinical placements. We collect formal and informal feedback from partners to engage in continuous program improvement (See Evidence 2.1.8_SUPAB).

R 2.2 - Clinical Educators

Partnership Selection Process and Benefits

All clinical experiences build on each other and are aligned to coursework. The coursework provides candidates with theoretical knowledge of instructional practices to support them in their clinical placements. In their first and second year, candidates complete a total of 48 hours of fieldwork. In junior year candidates are required to complete a minimum of 100 hours of fieldwork and in their culminating student teaching placement (senior year) candidates are required to do a full two-week takeover, which includes all cooperating teacher responsibilities from planning to implementation. Candidates begin their placements by observing the classroom, and then transition to assisting the teacher once they feel comfortable taking over small group activities and implementing individual lesson plans. Culminating student teaching requirements for graduate candidates follows a similar process. However, instead of completing fieldwork hours, graduate candidates complete project-based assignments attached to coursework (See Evidence 2.2.1_Clinical Experience and Placement Type).

Over the years, the EPP has established strong partnerships with local school districts in Connecticut. These partnerships allow us to adopt a selection and placement process for clinical experiences, which is co-constructed between the EPP and P-12

partners. The co-construction process allows us to place candidates in settings that are carefully selected based on certification level and previous experiences. Criteria for selection of mentor teachers is also co-created with partners; one of the most important criteria for selection is their willingness and ability to be a consistently supportive and effective mentors for the teacher candidates. To ensure the selection is co-constructed by the EPP and the districts, the department leadership is in constant communication with district facilitators who facilitate the placement process. The team ensures that the placements meet all program and State requirements, and that the placement is a good match for both the cooperating teacher, and the teacher candidate (See Evidence 2.2.2_Placement Process and Co-construction). The EPP also meets with school principals, team leaders, and cooperating teachers to review the clinical placement requirements and answer any questions prior to confirming placements. We also host orientation events where information is shared with a larger group of clinical educators (cooperating teacher and university supervisors), allowing them to network and support each other.

To be placed in their culminating clinical placements, candidates must apply for the placement (See Evidence 2.2.3_ST Application). The requirements for the applications were co-constructed to ensure that the identified placements meet all program requirements and that our candidates are a good fit for the placement. This is critical because it allows us to ensure that the placement is relevant and meaningful, and our candidates would, under the mentorship of clinical faculty, have a positive impact on P-12 learners. The applications must be reviewed and approved by academic advisors and district facilitators prior to finalizing placements. The determination of where to place candidates is based on their program, previous experiences, preferences, and placement locations.

In addition, the district facilitators must ensure that cooperating teachers have completed the Teacher Education and Mentorship (TEAM) Program to host a teacher candidate (www.ctteam.org). Cooperating teachers must also agree to use the gradual release strategy to support the candidate, work with the Supervisor, and communicate with the EPP as required. If the teacher candidate is unable to successfully take over class responsibilities, then a professional growth plan is put together, and if required, a candidate is removed from the placement and counselled out of the program (See Evidence 2.2.5_Growth Plan).

We collaborate with school districts to approve Durational Shortage Area Permits (DSAP) requests. Should a school district have an open position in a shortage area that cannot be filled by an appropriately certified candidate, they may submit a DSAP request to the certification officer on behalf of a teacher candidate. We then collaborate with the district to approve the request. Providing DSAP opportunities to our graduate teacher candidates can provide a more expansive classroom experience. Also, teacher candidates can progress in their career without quitting their job and meeting student teaching program requirements (See Evidence 2.2.6_DSAP Candidates).

The process of co-selection of clinical partners benefits both the EPP and the Clinical Partners. At the district and building level, the EPP verifies that teachers are trained and evaluated as mentors, they are exceptional in their own teaching practice, and

they are part of our larger community. Although the teacher candidates are placed in a mentorship model, they take on a leadership role in the classroom and schools, and effectively support P-12 instruction. Most teacher candidates take on more responsibility in their classrooms (and sometimes schools). Our candidates take on the role of a teacher assistant, increasing the teacher to student ratio in a classroom. Mentor teachers enjoy the opportunity to collaborate and guide teacher candidates, and they consistently report feeling a sense of pride to be able to "give back to the profession. Mentor teachers are minimally compensated and often come back in later semesters to host another student; these two facts indicate that the mentor teachers are not incentivized through monetary compensation but are satisfied with the arrangement.

Role and Responsibilities of Clinical Educators

The EPP strives to ensure that all clinical educators (University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers) are prepared for their roles and responsibilities to mentor teacher candidates. We have a Handbook for Clinical Experiences that details all policies, procedures, and evaluation criteria regarding clinical experiences. The information included in the handbook aligns with all teacher preparation programs and State requirements. The handbook is reviewed regularly to reflect changes to clinical experiences processes as well as revisions recommended by stakeholders to ensure effective support occurs between clinical educators and teacher candidates (See Evidence 2.2.7). We also provide both in-person and online resources and workshops to support all stakeholders. Training sessions are held at the start of each semester and when required (See Evidence 2.2.8_ST Orientation PPT). We have also created How-to Training Videos to support clinical educators. All resources are made available on a one drive folder to ensure that all stakeholders have continuous access to all materials. The training we conduct includes general information, as well as specific topics as requested (See Evidence 2.2.9 - Clinical Resources).

Partnership Engagement in data informed decision-making

The EPP ensures that we involve our stakeholders in the data informed decision-making process. Every semester, we have two data review meetings: one at midterm, and another at the end of the semester. Our clinical partners are invited to these meetings where we present data from assessments and discuss outcomes. We collect feedback and ideas for the next steps from the team and determine a plan to ensure implementation (See Evidence 2.2.10_Data Review). Due to the pandemic, a small group of faculty members met to review the data. The clinical faculty were involved for all students who were flagged, and they were a part of the decision-making process to support the student in the clinical placement (See Evidence 2.2.5_Growth Plan).

Professional Responsibility and Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Social Justice (DEIJ)

UH defines diversity as race, ethnicity, ability, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, age, abilities, religion, or politics. It has created opportunities and

space for meaningful dialogue using a series of town hall meetings, webinars, meetings about race, antiracism, social justice, and equality on campus (See Evidence 2.2.11_DEIJ Report). This awareness campaign is expected to enhance students' understanding of DEIJ and apply them in their professional setting.

Congruent with UH's definition of DEIJ efforts, the EPP provides teacher candidates with varied clinical placement experiences to ensure they are ready to interact with P-12 students from various socioeconomic backgrounds and abilities. These varied clinical placements both in and around Hartford provide our candidate experience working with students with exceptionalities and those from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups. These experiences also expose our candidates to DEIJ concepts throughout the program to reduce implicit bias in their clinical placements and in their future schools. We also review these concepts in coursework by introducing scenarios on how to support students with different abilities and learning preferences and ensure that they use evidence-based practices to create an inclusive environment in their P-12 classrooms.

R 2.3 - Clinical Experiences

Candidate Preparation and Inclusive Practices

Clinical placements are an integral part of our undergraduate and graduate curriculum. Both course content and clinical experiences ensure that our candidates are prepared to work in diverse settings and with students with different needs (See Evidence 2.3.1_Diversity in Curriculum). We ensure that clinical experiences associated with coursework include placements that expose our candidates to varied locations and P-12 students from different socioeconomic backgrounds and abilities. Certification requirements require that our candidates have clinical experiences in two distinct District Reference Group (DRG). As an EPP, we ensure that our candidates meet the certification requirements (See Evidence 2.3.2_Diversity Partner Schools). Our candidates observe, interact with, and learn from in-service teachers to plan and implement lessons for students from diverse backgrounds and diverse needs. This experience provides a platform for teacher candidates to build their professional capacity and engage in higher levels of interactions with diverse students and their families. All clinical placements require teacher candidates to engage in professional discourse on a regular basis about their practice which includes discussion on diversity and exceptional children. Required course-assignments also encourage candidates to connect coursework to clinical experiences and pay close attention to the needs of diverse students. In addition, The University, College, and Department have provided several training events to students on DEIJ. It is hoped that the teacher candidates will transfer the knowledge acquired from the training to their clinical placement (See Evidence 2.2.11 DEIJ Report).

Candidate outcomes Across Programs

Clinical experiences and their depth, breadth, coherence, and duration across preparation programs are explicitly explained in Standard 2.2. (See Evidence 2.2.1_Clinical Experience and Placement Type). These measures are a combination of proprietary and EPP designed assessments that include edTPA, portfolio, CESL/TIP,

and Student Teaching Evaluations. Data collected for clinical experiences show that the EPP is confident in preparing the candidates in the right direction to be effective teachers. The following are a few improvements that we have made to investigate candidate outcomes

Application of Technology

Our curriculum has a strong focus on technology to ensure that completers can differentiate instruction to meet the unique learning needs of all P-12 students. The scope and sequence of our curriculum allows us to introduce different technologies for our candidate in key courses across the program (See Evidence 2.3.3_Scope and Sequence for Initial Programs). In the early part of the programs, candidates are introduced to concepts of hi-tech, mid-tech, and low-tech technology to ensure they incorporate technology when designing and implementing lessons. We also require our candidates to take one more course that solely focuses on integrating technology in the classroom (CT 243, EDT 663, EDH 605). Candidates become familiar with Microsoft Office 365, Word, PowerPoint, Excel, Google Docs, Smartboard, iPad, coding, apps, including Book Creator, Educreation, Explain Everything, learning management systems (Blackboard, Canvas), assessment systems (Student Learning and Licensure, Goreact), cloud services (one drive, Dropbox, Google Docs) in courses in the program. In these courses, candidates learn about technology that they can use in the classroom and how to integrate technology within their teaching, assessment, data collection, and progress monitoring activities. As part of their coursework, candidates are also required to complete the Apple Teacher and Google Certificate that teaches them the foundational skills on iPad, Mac, and Apple apps, and about Google Edtech tools that candidates can use in their future classrooms (See Evidence 2.3.4 Technology Syllabi). Candidates' knowledge of applications of technology is showcased in an e-portfolio that includes examples of technology use in formal lesson plans, reflections, and in their edTPA portfolio. As technology is quickly changing in most school districts, we continue to communicate with our partners to see how we can best support our candidates, so they are prepared and ready to teach in-person and in remote/hybrid formats.

Impact of Clinical Experiences on Initial Employment

Our programs are a combination of well-planned and sequenced curricula with aligned clinical experiences to effectively prepare candidates for initial employment. The programs provide scaffolded clinical experiences for both undergraduate and graduate students. The undergraduate candidates have several opportunities to learn from their cooperating teachers with an increasing number of hours and responsibilities. Clinical experiences also provide our candidates with multiple opportunities to network with in-service teachers and other professionals providing them with the opportunity to engage in ongoing professional development. Our candidates have additional networking opportunities at events organized by the EPP. We invite guest speakers and host several professional development events including resume and cover letter writing workshops, job application support, mock interviews, principal panel, and alumni night. Some of the events are led by our clinical partners, and the candidates get first-hand information to become successful future educators (See Evidence 2.1.5_Guest Speakers).

Compelling Evidence, Conclusions and Interpretations

Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

We have made significant changes (See Evidence 2.3.5_Program Changes) to our programs based on feedback received from our partners. Some of these changes occurred because of our partners who work with us in different capacities (adjunct faculty, clinical faculty, SUPAB members, members of board of visitors).

We use multiple measures to evaluate the effectiveness of our school partnerships on clinical preparation of our candidates. Through the years, we have developed both formal and informal partnerships with schools and districts located in Connecticut. In academic year 20-21, our candidates were placed in approximately 30 different school districts. This consistency in partnership allows us to implement program requirements with fidelity. Our partners, too, engage actively in mentoring pre-service teachers to apply expected levels of knowledge and skills in the classroom. More importantly, we make continuous program improvements based on feedback received from our partners (See Evidence 2.1.4_SUPAB).

Additionally, we request our partners to work with us as adjuncts and university supervisors to prepare our candidates for the workforce. Fifty percent of our adjuncts teaching professional level courses and 93% of our university supervisors are current teachers and/or administrators. This benefits the partnership because candidates get the opportunity to work directly with individuals from the field and their feedback allows us to keep our program content current and meaningful.

The clinical partners have provided us with information on the needs in the field. One outcome is the masters' degree in Special Education. More programs recommended by our partners are in the pipeline. Our recent collaborative effort with workgroups within CSDE allowed us to offer a dual enrollment program to recruit high school students to take two introductory education classes for college credit. Currently, we have 10 students, and we hope to expand this program to more school districts in Fall 2022. We are also working on developing innovative pathways to certify non-certified staff to meet the needs of identified shortage areas.

Evidence collected during SUPAB meetings and feedback from stakeholders through surveys and focus groups indicate that we make meaningful program changes that benefit our candidates to be successful teachers. Review and analysis of the data indicate that while clinical partnerships are a strength, we need to focus on establishing a robust and systematic system of documenting feedback.

Clinical Educators

The role of clinical educators is critical because candidates often base their decision about continuing a particular track on their first few clinical experiences where they get first-hand authentic experience of working in a classroom as a teacher assistant. The high-level of scaffolded mentorship, and immediate and continuous feedback by

clinical educators help teacher candidates grow into professional educators (See Evidence 2.3.6_Scaffolded Support). A well-knit and collaborative partnership with local schools allows us to work closely to better inform our clinical educators of our requirements and to ensure that our candidates are successful in their endeavor. These partnerships allow us to work directly with mentor teachers and school administrators and ensure that our candidates can successfully complete project-based assignments. Some examples include the Candidate Effect of Student Learning/Student Inquiry Project and designing and implementing Lesson Plans in junior year. Our clinical educators use the gradual release process to support candidates during student teaching which starts with observations, small group instruction to finally taking over the classroom for two full weeks. In addition to these assessments that are common across programs, we have program-based assessments that require candidates to work directly with P-12 students to implement assessments, attend PPT meetings, attending professional development, review and write a sample IEP etc. All of this is possible only because of the involvement and commitment of our clinical educators (See Evidence_2.3.7_Sample Assignments).

Over the years, we have developed comprehensive training sessions for our clinical educators. Based on evidence collected at SUPAB meetings and clinical educator surveys, we are planning to launch a web-based orientation to further ensure that all clinical faculty receive a consistent message of expectations and resources across all programs. The online orientation will be co-constructed by the Program Faculty and Experienced Clinical Educators. Feedback also indicates that we need to review the decision-making process with our partners. Based on this feedback, our next step would be to revive the clinical committee that included program faculty, as well as clinical partners. As a next step, we will also revive the mentor model, where new clinical educators will be assigned a mentor who has experience in the role of a clinical educator and will be able to serve as an additional resource.

The EPP is making every effort to diversify the teacher candidate, faculty, and clinical educator pool. We will continue to work with districts and administrators to achieve this goal. It is anticipated that the department-level training for the teacher candidates will focus on DEIJ. We will ensure that we work with clinical educators to assess transfer of knowledge from coursework to their clinical placement. Currently, we collect formal data only for candidates in their culminating student teaching placement. We are working on designing an evaluation for our fieldwork clinical educators to complete. We plan to implement this during AY 2023- 2024 as a pilot with our juniors and will extend it to pre-professional program coursework.

Clinical Experiences

The EPP partners with P-12 schools to provide candidates with multiple field experiences, including the opportunity to work in diverse settings and students with different learning preferences. Each program offers specific alignment of clinical experiences embedded in courses with progressive outcomes used for partner collaboration or candidate learning opportunities (See Evidence 2.3.3_Scope and Sequence).

Identified clinical experiences highlight the depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration of clinical experiences. Alignment to InTASC and CAEP standards further detail EPP's commitment to ensure that candidates are prepared to support all P-12 students they teach. Through intentional planning and feedback during meetings with stakeholders, the EPP has moved to a more collaborative approach to constructing clinical experiences and will continue to use this model to further enhance the teacher preparation programs.

While assignments found in early clinical experiences are not program key assessments, formative and summative feedback is used to monitor candidate progress across multiple skills, including technology, assessment, and learner differentiation. Impact of teacher candidates on student learning across programs is assessed through several assessments, both proprietary and EPP designed assessment (See Evidence 1.1.2_Key Assessment by Program; 1.1.3_Proprietary Assessment Data; 1.1.4_EPP Designed Rubric Data). Based on these data, the EPP can determine that candidates are able to effectively pre-assess students' prior knowledge, analyze data, and make data-based decisions to design interventions, analyze results to determine their impact of teaching, and reflect on their teaching practice.

The Education Programs were designed to shape the students to get engaged into an efficient learning environment where they meet diverse needs of learners' strengths and interests as a professional educator. The analysis of the end of program survey indicates that, around 97% of the candidates (n=35) had strong opinions that the program has effectively prepared them to assess P-12 student. In addition, 97% (n=32) of our candidates strongly agree that they have strong content knowledge to meet the needs P-12 students including diverse learners (See Evidence 4.1.13_Candidate End of Program Survey).

Standard R.A.2. Clinical Partnership and Practice (Advanced Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.

1 📎 2.2.5_ Growth Plan.pdf

RA2.2 Clinical Experiences

2 📎 2.2.7_ Clinical Handbook.pdf

RA2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
RA2.2 Clinical Experiences

3 📎 2.3.2_Diversity Data in Partner Schools.xlsx

RA2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
RA2.2 Clinical Experiences

4 📎 A.E.3_Practicum & Internship Supervisor Evaluation Surveys and Results School Psychology.pdf

RA2.2 Clinical Experiences

5 📎 A.E.6_School Psychology Advisory Board School Psychology.pdf

RA2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
RA2.2 Clinical Experiences

6   📎 A.E.7_Clinical Partnerships List School Psychology.pdf

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

The School Psychology program (A.E.6_ School Psychology Advisory Board School Psychology) advisory board includes: 2 practicing school psychologists working within the region, 1 director of pupil services working within the region, 1 interim principal, and 1 school psychology adjunct faculty. These advisory board members represent 5 school systems in the region. Three of these members are also alumni from the program. The School Psychology advisory board meets annually during the spring semester. In addition, requests are made to the advisory board for feedback at other times during the year when special needs come up or when program update reports are provided. The advisory board primarily is asked to assist the program in identifying how the program can meet national accreditation standards while at the same time preparing candidates for work as a school psychologist as established by school systems in this region and across the state. The program relies on this board to help identify specific areas of training needs that candidate need as they prepare to enter the local work force.

A.2.2 Clinical Experiences

The School Psychology program includes two practicum experiences that are each one semester long. This is a year-long experience during which candidates complete a minimum of 700 hours in a local school system under the supervision of a school psychologist. Placements for the field-based practicum are within the State of Connecticut and with supervisors that are closely aligned with the program's philosophy regarding training practitioners with comprehensive skill development (A.E.7_Clinical Partnerships List School Psychology). In addition, the program requires one full-year internship in which the SSP candidate is working full-time in a school system under the supervision of a school psychologist within that system. Placement in a school system for internship is within the state and with supervisors that are closely aligned with the program's philosophy regarding training practitioners with comprehensive skill development (A.E.7_Clinical Partnerships List School Psychology) Individual contracts are established between each of the practicum and internship school systems and the university. These contracts outline the specific requirements of the candidates and expectations for the field-supervisors. During field-based practicum, all candidates are expected to complete a minimum of three individual counseling cases, co-lead a group counseling activity, ten assessment cases, five consultation cases (academic and behavioral). During internship, all candidates are expected to complete approximately 20 assessment cases, five to ten counseling cases, 5-10 consultation cases (academic and behavioral), and co-lead at least 2 groups. The university has identified minimal requirements for these activities and then works with the school system in adjusting as needed to meet those requirements.

Standard R.3: Candidate Recruitment, Progression, and Support (Initial Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.

1 📎 1.1.2 _Key Assessments by Program.xlsx

R3.3 Competency at Completion

2 📎 1.1.3_Proprietary Assessment Data.xlsx

R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
R3.3 Competency at Completion

3 📎 1.1.4_EPP Designed Assessment Data.xlsx

R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
R3.3 Competency at Completion

4 📎 1.1.6_Transition Plan.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
R3.3 Competency at Completion

5 📎 2.1.1_DRG List.pdf

R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

6 📎 2.1.3_MOU Template.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment

7 📎 2.1.7_Weaver Event.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment

8 📎 2.1.8_SUPAB Meeting Minutes.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

9 📎 2.2.5_ Growth Plan.pdf

R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

10 📎 2.2.6_Candidates on DSAP.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment

11 📎 2.2.10_Data Review.pdf

R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
R3.3 Competency at Completion

12 📎 2.2.11_DEIJ Report.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment
R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

1 📎 2.3.3_Scope and Sequence for Initial Programs.xlsx

3

R3.3 Competency at Completion

1 4	📎 2.3.6_Scaffolded Support.pdf

R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

1 5	📎 2.3.7_Assignment Samples.pdf

R3.3 Competency at Completion

1 6	📎 3.1.1_Recruitment Events.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment

1 7	📎 3.1.2_Recruitment and Retention Plans.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment

1 8	📎 3.1.3_Recruitment Strategies.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment

1 9	📎 3.1.4_DSAP Policy.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment

2 0	📎 3.1.5_Feeder Schools.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment

2 1	📎 3.1.6_Completers Hired.xlsx

R3.3 Competency at Completion

2 2	📎 3.1.7_Shared Employement Opportunities.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment

2 3	📎 3.1.8_Marketing Updates.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment

2 4	📎 3.1.9_CT Teach Collaboration.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment

2 5	📎 3.1.10_Graduate Admissions Outreach Schedule.pdf.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment

2 6	📎 3.1.11_Race & Ethnicity Data.xlsx

27	📎 3.1.12_Retention Data.xlsx	R3.1 Recruitment
28	📎 3.1.13_Scholarships.pdf	R3.1 Recruitment R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
29	📎 3.2.1_Curriculum Plans UG and Grad.pdf	R3.1 Recruitment
30	📎 3.2.2_Transition Points and Triangulation.pdf	R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
31	📎 3.2.3_ Appeal Process.pdf	R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression R3.3 Competency at Completion
32	📎 3.3.1_Candidate Dispositions Rubric.pdf	R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
33	📎 3.3.2_CCT(SEED) Rubric.pdf	R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression R3.3 Competency at Completion
34	📎 3.3.3_ Alumni Relations Survey.pdf	R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression R3.3 Competency at Completion
35	📎 3.3.4_Employment Status by Demographic Groups.xlsx	R3.3 Competency at Completion
36	📎 5.1.1b_Observation Timeline.pdf	R3.3 Competency at Completion
37	📎 5.1.1c_Student Teaching Evaluations.pdf	R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
38	📎 5.1.3c_Oakhill Mou.pdf	R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression R3.3 Competency at Completion

3 9	R3.1 Recruitment 📎 5.1.4_Program Effectiveness Measures.pdf

	R3.1 Recruitment R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression R3.3 Competency at Completion
4 0	📎 5.1.5_One-page Report.xlsx

	R3.2 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
4 1	📎 5.2.1_Rubric Characteristics.pdf

	R3.3 Competency at Completion
4 2	📎 5.4.1_Graduate Enrollment Tracking.pdf

R3.1 Recruitment

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

Needs Assessment and Planning for Recruitment
Alignment of recruitment strategies and EPP mission
Central to the UH's mission is the belief that the challenge and rigor of academic programs, and the support of dedicated faculty and staff lead to student success. Considering this mission, candidates are prepared for successful careers within local and global communities. UH rigorously carries out recruitment and retention activities and events at the University, College, and Department levels to target interested candidates.

One mission for recruitment is to organize strategic recruitment events, such as campus tours, opportunities to attend classes, open houses, shadow college students, and meet with individual faculty and administration. The recruitment team (Marketing Communications Manager, Manager of College Admission, and Director for Recruitment and Retention) collaborates to promote the EPP via social (Instagram, Spotify, Facebook) and print media (brochure, postcard, viewbooks). The website includes explicit and updated information on issues of diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice as they relate to all programs. The website is also linked to Teach CT website for greater visibility (See Evidence 3.1.1_Recruitment Events; See Evidence 3.1.2_Recruitment and Retention Plans). In line with UH's mission, existing academic and non-academic buildings have been upgraded and constructed and equipped with technology-rich facilities. It is projected that the current improvements will help to recruit more candidates.

UH's mission is to provide affordable and equitable education. The university offers a range of scholarship programs focusing on academics, talent, Hartford scholars, Bloomfield scholars, graduate assistantships, etc. A 10% tuition discount is also offered to partners (e.g., school districts and agencies). UH has multiple needs-based scholarships for eligible students, and hosts scholarship competitions for accepted students annually (See Evidence 3.1.3_Recruitment Strategies).

To enhance the recruitment strategy related to the mission of providing meaningful clinical experiences as early as first year, the EPP has adopted a unique model that attracts potential candidates. To facilitate this MOU process, a collegiate director of clinical experiences was hired to serve as a liaison between clinical partners and the legal department (See Evidence 2.1.3_ MOU Template).

Meeting Employer Needs

The EPP undertakes numerous initiatives to meet the needs of the employers by selecting and preparing high quality candidates. The EPP has taken several steps to focus its' marketing and recruitment strategies to meet employer needs. The EPP evaluates the employment needs and current shortage areas to continuously improve its programs to stay current and relevant. To meet the needs of the employers, we make every effort to provide our candidates with multiple clinical placements (varied by location, classroom type, grade levels etc.) and vary their experiences to become well-rounded educators. To meet employer needs, candidates are prepared to be career ready. The EPP provides professional development opportunities on job application processes, such as writing a resume, cover letter, teaching philosophy, interviewing skills, participating in principal panels, and mock interviews, etc. We also provide teacher candidates with the opportunity to engage with families, collaborate and network with professionals to ensure they meet the needs of the employers. These experiences ensure that our candidates are highly qualified to fill the current need and become successful educators (See Evidence 2.1.7_Weaver Event).

To serve employer needs, we collaborate with Teach CT to recruit diverse candidates. We now have 38% diverse candidates across all our programs. Also, enrolling non-certified staff from Oak Hill School meets the needs of its employer. The EPP offers the dual enrollment program to high school students to take college level courses and enter the workforce sooner to meet employer needs. The graduate program offers innovative and asynchronous online programs that afford working adults to complete the certification. While some are already working in schools supporting the educators, the EPP encourages interested candidates to get hired on Durational Shortage Area Permit (DSAP) while still in the program (See Evidence 3.1.4_DSAP Policy; See Evidence 2.2.6_Candidates on DSAP). The employers' benefit from the EPP's support to fill the shortage area as the need arises.

The marketing team identifies the top feeder regional high schools (e.g., Berlin, Bristol, East Harford, Newington, and the Academy of Science and Innovation in New Britain) in Connecticut, and the Admissions counselors from the University Admissions Team visit these schools to recruit eligible candidates to enroll in the teacher preparation programs (See Evidence 3.1.5_ Feeder Schools and Evidence 3.1.6_ Completers Hired). Potential candidates are given a briefing on the college and the programs. At these events, brochures with contact information are distributed to potential candidates to allow them to consider the programs offered at the EPP. In today's digital world, and during the pandemic, it is easier to reach out to target audience through digital advertising such as social media pages and apps. These efforts have currently been impacted by COVID, and we are looking for diverse ways of recruiting high school students.

The EPP receives feedback during SUPAB meetings that are taken into consideration

when faculty meet to make data-based program improvement decisions to meet employer needs. Clinical Partners update the EPP regarding employment opportunities which the EPP shares with current students and recent alumni (Evidence 3.1.7_Shared Employment Opportunities).

We recruit highly qualified candidates to enroll in the professional program with a minimum cutoff point of a 3.0 GPA to be eligible for program completion and licensure. Next, we provide clinical experience starting from the first year all the way to the senior year (for our undergraduate students), project-based assignments, and 14 weeks of student teaching experience (for our graduate students). This model prepares our teacher candidates well to meet the needs of the employers.

Recruiting Diverse Candidates
Advertising: Several effective strategies for recruiting diverse students into the EPP include: 1) advertising our programs on social media representing diverse candidates (e.g., Facebook, Instagram, twitter, Spotify, radio etc.); 2) send program flyers that have diverse candidate representation to school districts and teacher clubs (high school students who are interested in becoming teachers); 3) communicating with school counsellors to intentionally target diverse candidates interested in education (See Evidence 3.1.8_Marketing Updates).

Events: The EPP, in collaboration with the admissions office, organizes online and in-person events to recruit an increasingly diverse and strong pool of candidates (e.g., open houses, orientation, spring visit days, and accepted students' day). The EPP involves student ambassadors and alumni in recruitment events. The marketing team collaborates with top feeder high schools with diverse population. We also send out flyers to partner schools, and to schools with teacher clubs, to encourage teachers, and other non-certified school staff interested in enrolling in teacher preparation programs. Due to COVID, we use virtual strategies to recruit interested candidates (https://www.hartford.edu/admission/visit/virtual/default.aspx) (Evidence 3.1.9_Teach CT Collaboration1; 3.1.5_Feeder Schools; 2.1.7_Weaver Event)

Admissions: Since the transition to SLATE, the EPP can efficiently track recruitment data for diverse candidates, including candidates' progress from inquiry to acceptance and/or refusal (See Evidence 3.1.10_Graduate Admissions Outreach Schedule). This effective communication allows us to make informed marketing plans. There is an upward trend to recruit and retain diverse students for both the undergraduate and graduate programs (See Evidence 3.1.11_Race and Ethnicity Data).

Recent recruitment efforts include working with local school districts to offer a dual enrollment program for high school students and offer innovative pathways to allow non-certified staff to become certified teachers. We work with community colleges to streamline the transfer of credits process. Teach CT, our collaborator, helps to market our programs to candidates ranging from high school students to non-certified staff like paraprofessionals. Teach CT has reported that 38% of our applicant pool were identified as people of color (See Evidence 3.1.12_Retention Data).

Scholarships: UH's new strategic plan is its commitment to mindfully recruit high quality, diverse students, as reflected in the vision statement of ENHP. To empower

candidates from varied backgrounds and interests, the EPP provides scholarships for candidates with high academic success. Some scholarships and grant funding opportunities we highlight to promote our programs to diverse students include: The Hartford Scholars, Minority Teacher Incentive, Grant, BlackExcel.org, Hispanic Scholarship Fund, Hispanic College Fund, United Negro College Fund, and Diversity Jobs Scholarship (See Evidence 3.1.13_Scholarships).

Progress Monitoring Academic and Non-Academic Factors
Professional Program and Coursework
The EPP uses multiple measures to monitor and support candidate academic progress, quality, and progression from admission to the professional program to program completion and licensure. To be admitted into the professional program in the junior year for the undergraduates, candidates must demonstrate high academic ability and must have and maintain a cumulative 3.0 GPA. Candidates must receive a grade of B or better in all identified education classes. Those who fail must repeat a teacher education course to meet this requirement. Candidates' GPA and course grades are monitored by academic advisors throughout the program. Academic advisors discuss alternatives to teacher education and potential consequences (i.e., being ineligible for licensure) with candidates if the GPA drops below a 3.0. Individual course grade and overall GPA requirements are one method used to ensure candidates are developing and appropriately mastering content and pedagogical content knowledge. In addition, the culminating student teaching evaluation is administered at multiple points. Candidates who are rated as falling below the "proficient" level on any of the elements of the evaluation receive individualized feedback and may be required to complete additional activities or the entire clinical experience.

Dispositions
Candidate dispositions inventory is used to measure candidate dispositions in all education courses. The rubric is completed by the instructor as well as the candidates. When candidates fail to meet the requirements, the EPP and stakeholders collaborate to provide required support and a growth plan. Unfortunately, we have not been able to collect data on dispositions with fidelity and will be revising the process. Currently, clinical educators do not complete the rubric, but in Spring 2023, they will be required to complete either the same rubric, or a condensed version of the rubric (See Evidence Standard 1.1.6_Transition Plan). The change will allow us to collect reliable and valid data that can be triangulated (instructors, clinical mentors, and candidates).

Data Review
Data review meetings are an integral part of our programs because they allow us to collaborate with our partners to make data-based decisions for continuous improvement. At these meetings, the group review candidates' progress using academic and non-academic data and determines program continuation (See Evidence 2.2.5_Growth plan).

Graduation and Certification
In addition to course instructors and academic advisors, the collegiate manager of student services and data monitors candidates' academic progress towards program

completion and ensures that candidates have met all program requirements. Candidates must graduate from the program and complete all testing requirements before applying for certification. The EPP's certification officer is responsible for ensuring that candidates have all required documentation before recommending them for certification to CSDE.

Monitoring Progression from Admission through Completion

Candidates' progress in each transition point is monitored regularly to ensure academic success and to maintain the integrity of the academic programs. The EPP has a systematic advisement structure in place to support and track candidate's progress. In the first year, candidates are advised by staff in the Center for Student Success (CSS). A primary faculty advisor is assigned to candidates in the sophomore years through completion. Graduate students are assigned faculty advisors as soon as they are admitted into the program. Advisors work in collaboration with candidates to develop a plan of study through graduation and monitor candidates' progress at each advisement session to ensure they stay on track. The Collegiate Manager of Student Services and Data also monitors student progress by maintaining updated program evaluations which are now located in degree works. To streamline the advising and mentorship process the university has adopted Compass and Degree Works to monitor student progress, mentor, and stay connected with their support networks as and when required (See Evidence 3.2.1_Curriculum Plans UG and Grad).

As evidenced in the Quality Assurance system, there are six main progress monitoring points that candidates are expected to meet. Candidates must complete these transition points in a sequence and successfully meet the requirements to complete the program (See Evidence 3.2.2_Transition Points).

Complaints and Appeals Process

The EPP has adopted a multi-tiered scaffolded approach to support all candidates. Candidates can complain or appeal an instructor's decision in a course, a grade on a course assessment (quiz, test, paper, project) or the overall final course grade. Appeals may only be made on the grounds of alleged unjust action on the part of the instructor.

The EPP collects both verbal and email complaints from candidates. The typical process to make a complaint is to first contact the instructor, followed by the academic advisor, and the department chair. If the problem cannot be resolved at the department level, candidates can reach out to the associate dean and the dean. If candidates are not satisfied with the resolution for academic issues, they may appeal to the academic standing committee (Evidence 3.2.3_ Academic Appeal Process).

Culturally Responsive Support Mechanisms

Candidates' academic achievements and overall professional dispositions are monitored at various points in the program using multiple measures to ensure intervention can take place as needed at any time during a candidate's program progression. Throughout the program, candidates are regularly mentored by their instructors and academic advisors. Mentors (instructors and academic advisors) ensure that the efforts are culturally responsive and meet the needs of all candidates.

For example, we are required to place students in different District Reference Groups which requires candidates to be in urban and suburban placements (See Evidence 2.1.1_DRG). All clinical experiences are attached to coursework so that candidates can seek advice from their clinical teachers, course instructors, and peers. This clinical placement setup provides candidates with a cultural experience that is vastly different from their own. Mentors model and share evidence-based strategies for effective communication with P-12 students. If candidates struggle with engaging P-12 students, the EPP will provide support and suggestions to differentiate the lessons. Candidates are encouraged to share information about fieldwork classroom culture they observe and engage a discussion with the course instructor on what they would adopt and what they would differently. We monitor candidates closely to quickly provide support when they struggle in their clinical placements. Connections are made in the coursework between the curriculum and the social communities so that candidates can relate and feel confident to draw from their experiences.

Instructors also provide differentiated support for all candidates. These supports include working with candidates in whole group, small group, and individualized settings. The content covered in the curriculum is built on or connected to candidates' prior knowledge from their personal experience being in the classroom or experiences gained from their fieldwork placements. Moreover, our faculty members are from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and they bring in their experiences into the classroom. Candidates have the support of their clinical educators who provide immediate feedback based on observations. We put in place professional growth plans for candidates who need additional support. These plans are designed with input from candidates and other stakeholders. This collaboration allows us to provide individualized and culturally responsive support to our candidates.

Candidate Readiness to Move into the Profession
The EPP licensure programs aim to prepare effective educators with a deep understanding of critical concepts, content knowledge, principles, skills, and dispositions. These skills are essential to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career- ready standards. To that end, candidates are provided with exposure to diversity and opportunities to develop proficiencies associated with the design and implementation of college- and career ready standards. All program coursework and clinical experiences enrich candidates' exposure to specific content and pedagogical knowledge in the licensure areas. For example, candidates in the elementary and special education programs are prompted through assignments to develop an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) (EDH 420, EDH 601, EDH 611) and candidates in the early childhood program learn about the (Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) (EDY 334) to reflect on the role of early childhood special education. Instructional strategies acquired from the courses in turn support P-12 students' critical thinking, collaboration, and communication skills. The EPP Candidate Disposition Inventory and InTASC alignment tables further detail course and clinical assignments (Evidence 3.3.1_Disposition Rubric). Readings and experiences are aligned to the EPP's commitment to ensure that candidates are prepared to support access for all P-12 students for college and career readiness.

Our programs use the adapted version of Connecticut's System for Educator

Evaluation and Development (SEED) CCT rubric to evaluate candidates' performance and practice during their student teaching observations. The rationale for using the adapted CCT rubric is to ensure that candidates show mastery in essential and critical aspects of a teacher's practice as required by the state (See Evidence_3.3.2_Rubric). However, moving forward, we will be using the CCT rubric to ensure our candidates are better prepared to be successful first year teachers.

Multiple Sources of Evidence to Triangulate Preparation for Certification
The EPP prepares and monitors candidate progress for certification using multiple sources of evidence. These sources include both proprietary and EPP designed assessments. Systematic progress monitoring allows us to triangulate data to ensure that our candidates are prepared to apply for certification. When applying for certification, we ensure that candidates have met all program requirements, passed all certification tests, and completed edTPA requirements. For example, if candidates do not have a 3.0 GPA or have not received a B or better on required coursework they cannot be recommended for certification.

Academic Areas: We measure candidate content knowledge across multiple courses and assignments. In addition to program assessments that measure content knowledge across programs we have program-based assessments that help us ensure that our candidates are prepared to meet certification requirements. The data for academic content is triangulated between 1) Proprietary Assessment 2) EPP Assessments; and Program-Based Key Assessments.

For clinical experiences data on student teaching evaluations are triangulated first by the number of times the assessment is completed (midterms and final) and second by different evaluations (cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and candidates) (See Evidence 3.3.2_Transition Point and Triangulation).

Another example of triangulation would be across assessments. This would include data from candidate effect on student learning/inquiry project, student teaching evaluations, and edTPA. We also triangulate data including the following assessments - student teaching evaluations, edTPA, and certification tests.

Non-academic areas: we can triangulate data for dispositions across for data collected across coursework - preprofessional program, professional program, and end of program. We also triangulate data for disposition across individuals - university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and teacher candidate. In addition to triangulating academic and non-academic data, we also triangulate data at each of the six progress monitoring points. This allows us to ensure that our candidates are making progress towards getting certified to become successful educators (See Evidence 3.2.2_Tranisition Points and Triangulation).

Candidate Impact on diverse P-12 Student Learning and Development
During culminating half-day and/or full day clinical experiences (candidates are formally evaluated on how they impact diverse P-12 learners. These evaluations are completed by cooperating teachers, university supervisors, as well as the candidates to determine the impact that their day-to-day teaching has on their P-12 students. Data for Spring and Fall 2021 show that all candidates have met the end of program

requirements at benchmark and mastery levels. This shows that both cooperating teachers and university supervisors believe that our candidates are having a positive impact in P-12 Student Learning and Development (See Evidence 1.1.4_EPP Designed Rubric Data).

Another way to measure candidate impact on P-12 candidates is edTPA, a performance-based assessment, that directly measures the impact the candidates have on their students. The edTPA assesses candidates on their ability to plan, assess, and instruct P-12 students effectively. Overall, the edTPA data show a slight improvement in scores from 2018-2019 to 2019-2020 at the institutional level. Although we did not go above and beyond the state and the national mean, the data show growth in that direction (See Evidence 1.1.3_Proprietary Assessment Data).

Candidate impact is also measured at the program level by EPP designed key assessments. Some assessments that directly measure impact on student learning are the candidate effect on student learning (CESL for candidates in Elementary, Special Education, and Secondary Programs) and Teacher Inquiry Project (for candidates in the early childhood program). The CESL data indicate that both the undergraduate and graduate candidates are at benchmark and mastery. All female candidates were at mastery in all the criteria they were evaluated on while 75% (N=3) male candidates were at mastery in analyzing pre- and post- assessments and evaluating instruction. The overall data indicate that candidates are proficient in carrying out action research projects.

Overall data for assessments discussed indicate that our candidates are proficient in effective teaching and have a positive impact on diverse P-12 student learning and development.

Candidates' Critical Dispositions Commitment to Growth in Cultural Awareness and Reflection on Bias and Equitable Practices
Important to the success of the candidates are positive dispositions in the following areas: ethical behavior, professional behavior, commitment to collaboration, appreciation of diversity, and commitment to professional growth. Although we have not explicitly collected data on candidates' commitment to cultural awareness and their reflection on bias and equitable practices, discussion on these elements have always been part of classroom conversation in the courses candidates take. Candidates are encouraged to share their cultural experiences during class discussions to benefit everyone in the classroom. Moreover, faculty members are also from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and they bring in their experiences into the classroom. Evaluating these elements is a recent idea, and we have in the pipeline to use the CCT and the edTPA rubrics to evaluate the candidates. Future candidates will be required to participate in implicit bias training and obtain a certification as proof of participation.

Admission and Completion
The EPP disaggregates the completion data for the Title II report each year as required by federal law. EPP data is analyzed across demographic groups and is available on CSDE Data Dashboard (https://secure-edsight.ct.gov/SASLogon/login). The EPP has taken the charge of diversifying our candidate pool and included it in our

marketing and recruitment plan, and we have increased our student teaching placement diversification by placing students in different DRG groups (e.g., urban, suburban) different grade levels (elementary, middle, high), and different classrooms (included classrooms, self-contained classrooms, resource rooms, transition academies) to ensure candidates are exposed to different demographic groups and settings.

The EPP collaborates with the Office of Development and Alumni Relations (IA), to send out a survey to program completers from the past five years. Candidates who responded to the survey were invited to participate in the focus group. At this focus group, the department leadership asked completers a series of related questions as found in the survey: the completer's background, the completer's professional aspirations, the completers views and opinions on the professional program, the completer's options on what could be improved or changed in the professional program, and lastly the completer's opinions on their ability to be effective teachers based on going through our professional program. The data from this survey were helpful in providing feedback on program improvement (See Evidence 3.3.3_Alumni Relations Survey).

Connecticut State Department of Education has begun to collect and share completer data with EPPs through a software interface called the Data dashboard. Within this dashboard are two data sources, completers employed in their first year of teaching and employed in their second year of teaching (See Evidence 3.3.4_ Employment Status by Demographic Groups). In future, the EPP hopes to capture more demographic information and refocus the department survey questions.

Lessons Learned and Data Based Decisions

Recruitment
The EPP adopts a variety of strategies to recruit and retain candidates. We work closely with the admissions offices both at the undergraduate and graduate level. Declining enrollment has been a. nationwide trend in teacher preparation programs and our data indicates the same. However, in the last few years we have made numerous changes to program offerings (online master's in special education; dual enrollment program, 4+1 programs) as well strategies to market our programs (Teach CT, Ed Rising, Oakhill). As a university, our focus has also been on retention and as indicated above we have seen some increase in retention rates including retention rates of diverse students.

Monitoring and Supporting Candidates
The EPP has a strong and well scaffolded system in place to monitor and support candidates. Monitoring candidate progress begins by the candidates themselves as we teach them how to be reflective practitioners. The next level of support is provided by instructors, advisors, other program faculty, clinical educators, and the department leadership. Outside of the department, our candidates are supported by the dean's office and other university offices (access ability services, counselling, and psychology services, reading and writing center, center for student success, etc.) and committees (academic standing committee). Our candidates are made aware of these supports from the very beginning and encouraged to reach out as and when required.

Competency and Completion
The EPP prepares candidates for certification using multiple sources of evidence. First, candidates need to earn a minimum B in all professional courses and have a 3.0 GPA. Second, candidates need to complete practicum and student teaching and meet the professional dispositions requirement. To be eligible for a teaching certificate, candidates for all teacher preparation programs must complete and pass the edTPA, a subject-specific teacher performance assessment completed during student teaching. Additionally, candidates must pass all applicable subject area tests (Praxis II, Early Childhood Education Test, and the CT Foundations of Reading). Academic performance, student teaching, edTPA, professional exams (Praxis 11 and Foundations of Reading) are the ways in which the EPP triangulates candidates' preparation for program completion and certification. Data from these assessments also guides us on what we should continue doing and what needs to be revised to best prepare our candidates.

Standard R.A.3 Candidate Quality and Selectivity (Advanced Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.

1   📎 2.1.3_MOU Template.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment

2   📎 2.1.8_SUPAB Meeting Minutes.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment
RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

3   📎 2.2.5_ Growth Plan.pdf

RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

4   📎 2.2.11_DEIJ Report.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment
RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

5   📎 2.3.6_Scaffolded Support.pdf

RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

6   📎 3.1.1_Recruitment Events.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment

7   📎 3.1.2_Recruitment and Retention Plans.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment

8   📎 3.1.3_Recruitment Strategies.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment

9   📎 3.1.12_Retention Data.xlsx

RA3.1 Recruitment
RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

1   📎 3.1.13_Scholarships.pdf

0	RA3.1 Recruitment

1 1	📎 3.2.2_Transition Points and Triangulation.pdf

RA3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
RA3.4 Competency at Completion

1 2	📎 3.2.3_ Appeal Process.pdf

RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression

1 3	📎 5.1.4_Program Effectiveness Measures.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment
RA3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
RA3.4 Competency at Completion

1 4	📎 5.2.1_Rubric Characteristics.pdf

RA3.4 Competency at Completion

1 5	📎 5.4.1_Graduate Enrollment Tracking.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment

1 6	📎 A.E.3_Practicum & Internship Supervisor Evaluation Surveys and Results School Psychology.pdf

RA3.4 Competency at Completion

1 7	📎 A.E.8_Praxis II School Psychology.pdf

RA3.4 Competency at Completion

1 8	📎 A.E.5_Admission and Recruitment Evidence School Psychology.pdf

RA3.1 Recruitment
RA3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
RA3.3 Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression
RA3.4 Competency at Completion

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates to Meet Employment Needs

Candidates within the School Psychology program (A.E.5_Admission and Recruitment Evidence School Psychology) are primarily white and female which is reflective of the

current national data on school psychologists. Several candidates within the program have identified as being a sexual minority and many of the candidates are often first-generation college students. The program has approximately 40-50 applicants each year. The diversity of those applicants has increased in the past 3 years, and this has resulted in an increase of diversity in admitted candidates. The majority of admitted candidates from underrepresented groups have been local undergraduates from the University of Hartford and surrounding universities within the state. It is important to note that the University of Hartford has a robust diverse community of undergraduate students. As a result of ongoing program level discussion regarding recruitment needs, the School Psychology program promotes the field of school psychology within the University of Hartford undergraduate community, advertises at area state universities and sends out letters to colleagues that teach and advise undergraduate students in the region. In discussing recruitment needs the School Psychology program has taken into consideration the national data regarding school psychology practices:

Significant lack of diversity within the field which is completely out of proportion with the students being served in public schools

Significant shortage in school psychologists nationally

Incorporation of much more school based mental health into school psychology practices

A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully

Applicants to the School Psychology program must have completed an undergraduate degree in psychology or a related field. Admission requirements include a university transcript, three letters of recommendation, and a letter of intent. The GRE requirement was waived due to COVID but will be reinstated for Fall 2023 admission (More information can be found in A.E.5_Admission and Recruitment Evidence School Psychology).

A.3.3 Selectivity During Preparation

The School Psychology program has a structured process in place to ensure that candidates are provided the support needed to be successful. The program is guided by graduate school requirements which includes maintenance of a 3.0 GPA and program requirement of no more than 2 grades of below a B during the course of the program. The program provides individual candidate advising each semester where candidates are given guidance regarding their movement through the program. The School Psychology program has established performance criteria for entrance into practicum and internship.

A.3.4 Selection at Completion

The School Psychology program's graduation criteria include GPA, passing of the Comprehensive Examination, satisfactory completion of all internship requirements, and passing of Praxis II exam at national level. The program director is responsible for monitoring candidate progress through the program with support from practicum and internship supervisors.

Standard R.4: Program Impact (Initial Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.

1   📎 2.2.5_ Growth Plan.pdf

R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers

2   📎 2.2.10_Data Review.pdf

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness
R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers
R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers

3   📎 3.1.6_Completers Hired.xlsx

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness
R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers

4   📎 3.3.3_ Alumni Relations Survey.pdf

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness
R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers

5   📎 4.1.1_Ten Measure Strategy.pdf

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness
R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers
R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers

6   📎 4.1.3_Completer Focus Group Survey Data.pdf

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness
R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers

7   📎 4.1.4_Action Research Project_Introduction and Data.pdf

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness

8   📎 4.1.5_P-12 Student Survey.pdf

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness

9   📎 4.1.6_TEAM Data.pdf

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness

10   📎 4.1.7_Employer Satisfaction Survey.pdf

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness
R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers

11   📎 4.1.8_Employer Focus Group Questions.pdf

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness
R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers

12   📎 4.1.10_Course Syllabi.pdf

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness

1 3	📎 4.1.11_Completer Focus Group Survey.pdf

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness
R4.3 Satisfaction of Completers

1 4	📎 4.1.12_Department Meeting Minutes and Agendas.pdf

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness

1 5	📎 4.1.13_Candidate End of Program Survey Summary .pdf

R4.1 Completer Effectiveness

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

The EPP uses a variety of tools to measure completer effectiveness including candidate and completer impact on P-12 learning and employer satisfaction and satisfaction. The EPP has adopted a Ten Measure Strategy to demonstrate the impact of candidates and completers on P-12 students (See Evidence 4.1.1_Ten Measure Strategy). Data on all measures included in the strategy are collected regularly and reviewed to make continuous program improvement decision (See Evidence 4.1.2_Data Collection Timeline, Process, Dissemination).

Completer and Impact/Effectiveness on P-12 Student Learning and Development

Candidate/Alumni/Completer Survey

The EPP works in collaboration with the university's Office of Development and Alumni Affairs to send out an EPP designed survey to candidates who have graduated from our programs within the last five years. The purpose of the survey is to collect data on completer satisfaction with knowledge, skills, dispositions obtained as candidates and how those skills directly impact their ability to instruct P-12 students. The alumni survey was piloted in Fall 2020 and implemented again in Spring 2021. In Fall 2020, the survey was sent to 294 alumni, with a response rate of 10% (N=30) while in Spring 2021, the survey was sent to 290 completers, with a response rate of 3.7% (N = 11). The survey was sent out again in Spring 2022 and we are awaiting results.

The qualitative feedback received from the alumni was mixed depending on whether the alumni were in the online or the in-person program. Candidates in the in-person program expressed high levels of satisfaction, while candidates in the online programs felt they needed more support to help them better prepare for the State certification assessments (e.g., Praxis II). They also expressed the need for more experience with tools and strategies to assess P-12 students for special education eligibility. Feedback from candidates from in-person programs suggest that they were noticeably confident and ready to implement the skills and assessment tools they had learned about while in the program. Most alumni felt they were well-versed in designing and implementing lesson plans, modifying lessons as required and differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all students. More importantly, the alumni attributed their success to the preparation that they received as part of the

programs offered by the EPP. They felt they had been prepared to successfully meet the needs of their first teaching position. Some of their descriptions about the EPP focused on the quality of instruction, real-life experiences related to teaching, fieldwork experiences from the very first semester to student teaching experiences that prepared them well to be first-time teachers. Candidates who did not feel adequately prepared to work independently said that they learned new skills from their colleagues and mentors that allowed them to be successful in their positions as first year teachers. Data from the survey are shared with program faculty and partners and are used to make continuous program improvement decisions (See Evidence 3.3.3_Alumni Survey; 4.1.13_Candidate End of Program Survey).

Completer Focus Group Sessions

To further validate completer impact on P-12 student learning and development, the EPP invited 35 completers to participate in focus group discussions. The last focus group was attended by 18 completers (51%) attended a focus group session. Results from this session demonstrated that our completers are confident that the EPP had prepared them to be effective classroom teachers. Completers indicated they felt prepared and received positive feedback from their P-12 mentors. Focus Group data indicated that most of our candidates were satisfied with our programs. For example, 94% of the completers agreed that they obtained knowledge and skills on how to successfully connect to concepts being introduced and to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all learners. Approximately, 83% of the completers felt prepared to use multiple methods of assessment to monitor and evaluate student progress, and 95% of the completers indicated that the program prepared them to create inclusive learning environments (See Evidence 4.1.3_Completer Focus Group Data).

Action Research Project (Completer impact on P-12 Students)

Completers from all programs were invited to participate in an Action Research Project that was designed to measure the direct impact of our completers on their P-12 students. Completers were asked to select a content area, conduct a pre-assessment, design and implement a series of lessons, and conduct post-assessment to evaluate the impact of their instruction on student performance. Five completers (N=5) representing the elementary and integrated elementary and special education participated in this project. Data for the action research project indicated that our completers were having a positive impact on their students (See Evidence. from (See Evidence 4.1.4_Action Research Project Introduction and Data).

P-12 Student Survey

Three completers shared a survey with their P-12 students ranging from kindergarten to second grade to collect feedback on their teaching effectiveness. Completers were allowed to adapt the survey into a grade and age-appropriate format that would work for their students (e.g., circle emojis for kindergarten students). A total of 22 school students responded to the survey.

Survey results indicate that all P-12 students agreed that their teacher had a positive impact on their learning. They were motivated to attend classes and learn new

information from their teachers. They also indicated feeling safe in the classroom because their teacher created a caring environment for them and made time to help them understand their tasks (See Evidence 4.1.5_P-12 Student Survey).

Teacher Education and Mentoring (TEAM) Program

The TEAM program is a professional growth model that incorporates the Connecticut Standards for Professional Learning to assess teacher effectiveness. It provides beginning teachers with multiple opportunities to reflect on their practice, analyze student data and outcomes, and identify areas for growth and improvement for their individual professional learning. Two completers (one elementary education teacher and one special education teacher), with permission from school administrators, shared their TEAM with us. These data were critical because they are a direct indication of completers' teaching effectiveness on student learning. Although we have limited data, our completers have had a positive impact on P-12 learners and their development. Moving forward we will continue to work with partners and completers across programs to collect this information (See Evidence 4.1.6_TEAM Data).

Employer Satisfaction with EPP Preparation

Employer Satisfaction Survey
The EPP sent out a 44-question employer satisfaction survey to the principals/administrators of 10 completers who they had hired. The purpose of the employer satisfaction survey is to find out the impact our completers have on P-12 student learning and to gauge overall employer satisfaction. The response rate for the survey was 61% and the results indicate that the employers agreed unanimously that our completers can differentiate instruction in the areas of content, process, product, or learning environments to meet the needs of all students. Completers can transfer theory to practice by assessing and expanding students' prior knowledge. Additionally, our completers are tech savvy and can create technology-based interactive lessons. More importantly, completers can design learning experiences that integrate culturally relevant content to build on learners' cultural backgrounds and experiences. Completers were also seen as being able to exhibit respect and high expectations for each student and communicate with diverse learners in a fair and respectful manner. In addition, they noted that our completers consistently provide equitable opportunities to meet the diverse needs of the P-12 students by designing learning experiences that integrate culturally relevant content to build on learners' cultural backgrounds and experiences. Based on these data, the EPP believes the completers are successful at contributing to diverse P-12 student learning growth (See Evidence 4.1.7_Employer Satisfaction Survey). Moving forward the survey will be sent to all employers listed on the CT State Department of Education Data Dashboard at the end of every academic year in the Spring.

Employer Focus Group Meetings

Following the employer satisfaction survey as described above, the EPP met with a small group of administrators who would share their experiences and views about our

completers. Three principals were interviewed, and the questions asked at these one-on-one meetings were about completers' impact on student learning and their ability to take on the responsibilities independently without requiring additional training. The principal's report was favorable. However, the principals indicated that our completers required additional support in implementing the IEP process. We have subsequently made changes to our program and have our candidates complete multiple IEPs based on case studies and complete a mock IEP with their cooperating teacher for a student who they are working with in their student teaching placement (EDH 420, EDH 421, and EDH 601) (See Evidence 4.1.8 - Employer Focus Group Questions).

School University Partnership Advisory Board (SUPAB) meetings

The EPP hosts quarterly meetings with its partners to discuss and receive direct feedback on completers' effectiveness on P-12 students from the administrators. The leadership team takes note on the suggestions and recommendations to improve the program. The consensus is that our completers are highly trained and are career ready because of the content and experiences provided in the teacher preparation program (See Evidence 2.1.8_SUPAB Meeting Minutes).

Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) Data Dashboard

The data dashboard is a State sponsored database maintained by the CSDE to provide EPPs with data about their completers. Data include information about certification and employment status of completers. One benefit of the Data Dashboard is we have information on the completers' demographics, current place of work, diversity, etc. (4.1.9_State Data Dashboard).

Completer Satisfaction with EPP Preparation

Completer Satisfaction Survey and Focus Group Meetings

Data on completer satisfaction are collected using the completer satisfaction survey followed by focus group sessions. Data indicate that while teacher candidates strongly like the teacher preparation programs offered by the EPP, there are areas of improvement. One area of improvement is assessment and progress monitoring that mirrors school district requirements. Based on the feedback, we made changes to the curriculum and now candidates learn to create and maintain a gradebook on Excel to collect and monitor student progress. We have also included progress monitoring as a topic in our Screening and Diagnosis class (See Evidence 4.1.10_ Course Syllabi_CT 243, EDH 605, EDT 663, EDH 430).

Overall survey and focus group data indicate that 100% of the completers are prepared to create inclusive learning environments to meet the needs of diverse learners. Approximately 89% of the completers are confident that they can use multiple methods of assessment to monitor and evaluate progress. Additionally, 83% of the completers claim that they are comfortable adapting to real time changes to instruction. They are prepared to design and implement developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences including the use of technology to improve

instruction and advance student learning. About 78% of the completers claim that they can create learning experiences that assure learners' mastery of the content (See Evidence 4.1.11_Completer Focus Group Survey).

Rationale for Measure Selection to Determine Impact

The EPP decided to implement a ten-measure strategy to determine the impact of completers on P-12 learning to allow for data converging across multiple sources. The rationale is to analyze the data to engage in continuous improvement in collaboration with key stakeholders (See Evidence 4.1.1_10 Measure Strategy).

Completer Sample Representation and Efforts to Enlarge Sample Representation Overtime to Determine Impact on P-12 Learners

The EPP uses a variety of tools to measure completer impact on P-12 student learning using the ten-measures strategy presented above. These measures include completer focus groups, action research project and TEAM data. Currently, the sample represents only 50% of all teacher preparation programs (Elementary Education and Special Education). Moving forward we will ensure that we have representation from all programs.

To ensure that we have a representative sample inclusive of licensure areas, the EPP will continue to collaborate with the Office of Development and Alumni affairs to send our surveys to alumni across programs. We will also make sure to stay in communication with alumni through our blackboard site that candidates have access to for a year after they graduate. The office of Development and Alumni Affairs and the EPP collect contact information from the graduating students. We also invite Alumni to department events such as alumni night, advising night, ENHP Day, SUPAB meetings, and professional development events (for example, getting ready for an interview; what you should know about first year teaching). This active involvement will allow us to engage our completers and help us enlarge the sample overtime.

Completers Contribution to Diverse P-12 Student Learning Growth
The EPP ensures completers are effective in contributing to diverse P-12 student learning growth using Employer Satisfaction Survey, Employer Focus group, Alumni Satisfaction Survey, Completer Focus Group as presented as part of the ten-measures strategy.

About 83% of the employers agreed that the completers are able to (1) implement developmentally appropriate instruction that accounts for learners' strengths, interests and needs, (2) demonstrate knowledge about individual differences, (3) communicate with diverse learners in a fair and respectful manner, (4) provide equitable opportunities to meet the diverse needs of learners, (5) design learning experiences that integrate culturally relevant content to build on learners' cultural backgrounds and experiences. More importantly, all employers agreed that 100% of the completers can differentiate instruction in the areas of content, process, product, or learning environment to meet the needs of all students.

R4.2 Satisfaction of Employers and Completers

Instruments and Responses related to criteria in R1

The EPP uses both proprietary (Certification Tests, edTPA, Title II) and EPP designed assessments (lesson plan assessment, student teaching evaluation, portfolio, and the Candidate Effect on Student Learning/Teacher inquiry project (CESL/TIP) to assess learner and learning. The data provide information to identify if candidates can apply their knowledge of learner and learning at various progression levels. To keep abreast with national and state standards, workforce changes, and feedback from key stakeholders (candidate, clinical partners, faculty), the EPP closely reviewed its existing curricula across programs.

The EPP ensures that instruments/methods are designed to elicit responses specific to the criteria in Standard 1 (Learner and learning, content, instructional practice, professional responsibility, and technology) through constant data review meetings. The purpose of the Department and data review meetings that include partners is to bring together key stakeholders to review data and identify program strengths and weaknesses to better prepare our teacher candidates Data review meetings are hosted with faculty, clinical partners and other stakeholders. We also set aside time during monthly department meeting to discuss items that need additional or ongoing attention (See Evidence 4.1.12_Deparment Meeting Minutes and Agendas).

In addition, SUPAB meetings are held quarterly that allow us to regularly check in with our clinical partners and address issues as they come up (See Evidence 2.1.8_SUPAB Meeting). At SUPAB meetings we not only discuss the data and how we can improve the curriculum, but we also engage in discussion about partner needs and how we as an EPP can help. For example, during the pandemic we were able to organize remote tutoring sessions hosted by our candidates for a local middle school because their students needed additional support with schoolwork.

Examining the completers' data we collected, the EPP finds that the current instruments/ methods to elicit responses indicate that to a large extent the EPP meets the teacher preparation program and state requirement for licensure. However, we recognize there is room for improvement and that we need to make the necessary improvement across the programs and even in our collaborative effort with the partners. For example, moving forward to better prepare our candidates we will be using edTPA as a key assessment, and we will also be adopting the CCT Rubric to evaluate candidates in their student teaching placement. These changes will allow us to use assessments with preestablished validity to measure candidate performance. It will also allow our candidates to be better prepared as first year teachers because their employers will be using the same CCT Rubric to observe their teaching.

Program Inclusion in Data Cycles

The data cycles are based on completers year of graduation for all teacher preparation programs. We send surveys, conduct focus groups, host SUPAB meetings on a regular basis to ensure that all programs are included. All our candidates follow a predetermined program plan structure that allows them to enter and graduate from the professional program at the same time. Data are collected systematically and

consistently throughout the program, and the data cycles are based on the year of graduation for all teacher preparation programs. The EPPs QAS allows us to follow a scaffolded process to keep track of our candidates.

Evidence, Conclusion, and Interpretation

Overall, triangulation of evidence suggests that both our completers and employers are satisfied with the preparation of our teacher preparation programs. The State Data Dashboard collects and shares data on EPP quality measures that include data by academic year for 1) completers; 2) certification issuance; 3) employment status year 1; 4) employment status and hard to staff schools; 5) employment status year 2; and 6) employment status year 4. The dashboard allows us to filter data by program, gender, and race and ethnicity.

EPP Quality Measures Data show that there is an increasing number of completers (according to CAEP's definition) certified across all programs. Specifically, in 2018-2019, 81% or 51 completers were certified in their area of specialization. There is also an upward trend in the number of candidates who got employed within a year in Connecticut. There is a possibility that some completers seek employment in other states. In 2018-2019, about 44% or 28 candidates were employed within one year. The second-year employment status also shows the same trend as the first-year status with 89% or 25 candidates still employed in the second year in 2018-2019. The employment status in the fourth year indicates that 100% of the candidates are continued to be employed in 2016-2017, while no completers were no longer employed in 2017-2018. Two possible reasons for no completers to stay hired in their 4th year of employment in Connecticut were: (1) they moved to other states, (2) they decided to quit being a teacher. There is no data available for the academic year 2018-2019. The EPP will continue to monitor these data to determine completer and employment trends (See Evidence 4.1.9_Data from Data Dashboard).

The EPP provides training to candidates at hard-to-staff schools. While we do provide training and encouragement to work at these schools, data indicate opportunities exist to improve preparation for hard-to-staff schools. Data show a small percentage of the completers are hired in the high needs or hard-to-staff school 2016-2017, 2017-2018, 2018-2019). In 2018-2019, 19% or 12 candidates were employed at the hard-to-staff school in Connecticut.

The data that most compellingly demonstrates candidate, completer, and employer, and P-12 student satisfaction are collected using the EPP designed ten measure strategy (See Evidence 4.1.1_10 Measure Strategy). A majority or 94% of the completers are satisfied with the teacher preparation programs and they can effectively translate knowledge they have gained to practice. Feedback from mentor teachers and university supervisors, and completers hired upon graduating also indicate that completers are adequately trained. At least 83% of our completers noted that they are satisfied with the training that they received to use technology in the classroom to and to present instruction in multiple modalities.

The ten-measure strategy is an effective approach to evaluate completer effectiveness in their professional setting. For example, the employer survey provides

an assessment of the completers from an employer perspective. From the survey, we found that the employers are satisfied with the high level of training the completers received that made them successful first year teachers. Over the years, the EPP has received both positive and constructive feedback from completers and partners to engage in continuous program improvement. We will continue to do so by sending out surveys, hosting focus groups, and collaborating with completers and partners to collect feedback.

The data also suggest that our completers successfully gain employment in their area of certification in their formative years. Evidence across measures included in our ten-measure strategy indicate that completers and employers are satisfied with the overall program preparation and that our candidates have a positive impact on the learning of their P-12 students. The EPP faculty, leadership, and clinical partners continue to unpack data to inform continuous program improvements to generate robust data collection on completer effectiveness and impact. Multiple data-driven changes were derived from a review of these data, including the modification of the initial licensure technology course (See Evidence 4.1.10_Course Syllabi) for all teacher preparation programs. In addition, we have developed a transition plan that will allow us to adopt reliable and valid tools to measure candidate performance on program assessments (e.g., Student Teaching Evaluation, Lesson Plan Evaluation). We also have an ongoing pilot effort to observe completers in the classroom to support beginning teachers' effectiveness and impact on teaching and learning. We will hire university supervisors to conduct these observations.

Standard R.A.4. Program Impact (Advanced Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.

1   2.2.5_ Growth Plan.pdf

RA.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

2   3.3.3_ Alumni Relations Survey.pdf

RA.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

3   A.E.4 Employer and Completer Survey Results School Psychology.pdf

RA.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
RA.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
The School Psychology Program developed and began implementing a survey to

measure the satisfaction of employers of graduates. More information is provided in Evidence A.E.4_ Employer and Completer Survey Results School Psychology including three cycles of data.

The rubric used within this measure ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The average ratings obtained indicated overall strong agreement from employers regarding the performance of graduates from the School Psychology program. The average rating on items ranged from 1.00 to 1.25.

A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
The School Psychology Program developed and began implementing a survey to measure the satisfaction of program completers. More information is provided in A.E.4_ Employer and Completer Survey Results School Psychologyincluding three cycles of data.

The rubric used within this measure ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The average ratings obtained indicated overall strong agreement from program completers regarding their satisfaction with the skills acquired throughout their training as well as their sense of being supported throughout their time in the program. The average rating on items ranged from 1.00 to 1.50.

Standards R.5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity (Initial Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.

1 📎 1.1.3_Proprietary Assessment Data.xlsx

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.2 Data Quality
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

2 📎 1.1.4_EPP Designed Assessment Data.xlsx

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.2 Data Quality
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

3 📎 2.1.8_SUPAB Meeting Minutes.pdf

R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

4 📎 2.2.2_Placement Process and Co-construction.pdf

R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

5 📎 2.2.3_UG and Grad Student Teaching Applications.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

6 📎 2.2.4_CT Interview Form.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System	7	📎 2.2.5_ Growth Plan.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System	8	📎 2.2.7_ Clinical Handbook.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System	9	📎 2.2.8_ST Orietnation PPT.pdf
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement	10	📎 2.2.9_Clinical Resources.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality	11	📎 2.2.10_Data Review.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement R5.4 Continuous Improvement	12	📎 3.1.1_Recruitment Events.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement	13	📎 3.1.2_Recruitment and Retention Plans.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement	14	📎 3.1.3_Recruitment Strategies.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement	15	📎 3.1.5_Feeder Schools.pdf
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement	16	📎 3.1.9_CT Teach Collaboration.pdf
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement	17	📎 3.1.12_Retention Data.xlsx
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement	18	📎 3.2.2_Transition Points and Triangulation.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System		

R5.2 Data Quality
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

19 📎 3.2.3_ Appeal Process.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System

20 📎 3.3.1_Candidate Dispositions Rubric.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

21 📎 3.3.2_CCT(SEED) Rubric.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.2 Data Quality
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

22 📎 3.3.3_ Alumni Relations Survey.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

23 📎 4.1.1_Ten Measure Strategy.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.2 Data Quality
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

24 📎 4.1.3_Completer Focus Group Survey Data.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.2 Data Quality

25 📎 4.1.4_Action Research Project_Introduction and Data.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.2 Data Quality
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

26 📎 4.1.5_P-12 Student Survey.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.4 Continuous Improvement

27 📎 4.1.6_TEAM Data.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System

R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
2 8	📎	4.1.7_Employer Satisfaction Survey.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
2 9	📎	4.1.8_Employer Focus Group Questions.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
3 0	📎	4.1.9_State Data Dashboard.xlsx
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
3 1	📎	4.1.11_Completer Focus Group Survey.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
3 2	📎	4.1.12_Department Meeting Minutes and Agendas.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
3 3	📎	5.1.1_Transition Points .pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
3 4	📎	5.1.1a_Professional Program Application.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
3 5	📎	5.1.1b_Observation Timeline.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
3 6	📎	5.1.1c_Student Teaching Evaluations.pdf

R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
3 7	📎	5.1.1d_Program Evaluation.xlsx
R5.1 Quality Assurance System		
3 8	📎	5.1.1e_Gradebook Data.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System		
3 9	📎	5.1.1f_Certification Tests by Program.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System		
4 0	📎	5.1.1g_Certification Application.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System		
4 1	📎	5.1.1h_Transition Points Sample of Two Programs.xlsx
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality		
4 2	📎	5.1.2_QAS Workflow.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality		
4 3	📎	5.1.3_Operations.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality		
4 4	📎	5.1.3a_Assessment and Accreditation Position.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System		
4 5	📎	5.1.3c_Oakhill Mou.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
4 6	📎	5.1.4_Program Effectiveness Measures.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
4 7	📎	5.1.5_One-page Report.xlsx

R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.4 Continuous Improvement	
48	📎 5.1.6_CCT Rubric Psychometrics.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality	
49	📎 5.1.7_edTPA Psychometrics .pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality	
50	📎 5.1.7a_edTPA CAEP Connection .pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality	
51	📎 5.1.7b_edTPA InTASC Connection.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality	
52	📎 5.1.8_Reliability.xlsx
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement R5.4 Continuous Improvement	
53	📎 5.1.9_EPP CAEP Evaluation.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality	
54	📎 5.1.10_EDR 444 Updates.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.4 Continuous Improvement	
55	📎 5.2.1_Rubric Characteristics.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement R5.4 Continuous Improvement	
56	📎 5.2.1a_New Lesson Plan Rubric.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality	

R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
5 7	📎	5.2.1b_New Student Teaching Evaluation.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.2 Data Quality R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
5 8	📎	5.4.1_Graduate Enrollment Tracking.pdf
R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
5 9	📎	5.4.2_EDF 120 Syllabus.pdf
R5.1 Quality Assurance System R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
6 0	📎	5.4.3_Professional Development Sample.pdf
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement R5.4 Continuous Improvement		
6 1	📎	A.E.9_Psychological Assessment Rubric and Validation School Psychology.pdf
R5.2 Data Quality R5.4 Continuous Improvement		

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

Standard R5 Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement

Quality Assurance System: Description, Maintenance, Functioning Evidence
As an EPP we have developed a functioning QAS that provides data output that involves all key stakeholders (faculty, staff, completers, employers, P-12 partners, and administrators across offices and functions) and allows for continuous improvement. The QAS includes multiple components to measure (1) candidate progress, (2) completer effectiveness, (3) candidate, completer and employer satisfaction, and (4) operational efficiency. The QAS incorporates the performance standards of relevant national and state organizations. At the national level, the system is informed by the standards of Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC), and the program level standards of some relevant Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs - NCTE, NCTM) and other nationally recognized program recognition bodies (NASM, NASP). At the State level we align our measures with the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT) standards.

The EPP systematically conducts academic and non-academic screenings for admission and progression within the professional program to foster continuous improvement. The QAS also includes performance-based assessments to evaluate

candidate readiness and completer effectiveness. This compelling evidence is collected at various transition points to ensure that candidates receive feedback at regular intervals, and for the EPP to make systematic and continuous program improvements. The first five transition points occur while candidates are enrolled in the teacher preparation program. The sixth transition point occurs after graduation but before candidates receive certification. All transition points following certification occur after our candidates have obtained teaching positions in their licensure area. Each transition point requires specific data collection to ensure that our programs meet national and state standards. We adopt a similar strategy for our graduate students. The graduate program differs by accepting graduate students directly into the professional program. The EPP has also established a 10-measure strategy to collect data on candidate and completer impact, including outcome data from stakeholders on P-12 student growth (See Evidence 4.1.1_Ten-Measure Strategy). The overall QAS and all its components are reviewed periodically to ensure successful and smooth functioning (See Evidence 5.1.1_Transition Points; Evidence 5.1.1h_Transition Points Visual for Two Programs).

The EPP QAS Workflow illustrates the nature and scope of ongoing data collection and review. It also includes a description of the process and the list of stakeholders who are an integral part of the QAS and instrumental in successful functioning of the established QAS (See Evidence 5.1.2_QAS Workflow).

Component R 5.1 Quality Assurance System

QAS Data Input Analysis, Conclusion, Interpretation

Continuous program improvement is the focus of all functions within the QAS. The goal of the QAS is to provide quality assessment data and results that can be used for actionable program improvement. A set of policies and procedures, as well as committees of key stakeholders and partners, offices, and personnel have been established to ensure quality in admissions, courses, program design, and candidate, and completer performance. The QAS for initial and advanced programs operates on a well-established and evolving framework that includes such as fiscal, operational, academics, and personnel (See Evidence 5.1.3_Operations).

At the EPP, we triangulate data to verify the information we gather across different stakeholders. Using these compelling data, we respond to questions on program, candidate, and completer effectiveness. All stakeholders contribute to the QAS through data input. The data are then used to drive continuous improvement allowing us to meet current workforce demands and train high quality teacher candidates and completers. The EPP QAS Workflow illustrates the nature and scope of the ongoing data collection, analysis, review, and dissemination (See Evidence 5.1.2_QAS Workflow).

The established QAS allows us to not only collect data on overall program effectiveness but also allows us to examine/enquire into individual candidate data. The system also allows us to review data overtime and compare data across programs (See Evidence 5.1.4_Program Effectiveness Measures).

The QAS comprises of multiple components (as described in the evidence 5.1.4_Program Effectiveness). The MAAC is responsible for ensuring that systems are in place for all stakeholders to use. The MAAC leads data review meetings where program faculty and clinical partners review candidate data and make program improvement decisions. These decisions are not solely related to course content but also dispositions and clinical placements (See Evidence 5.1.5_ One-Page Report).

QAS Capability to Combine Evidence and Disaggregate Data from Various Sources
At the EPP, we triangulate data to verify the information we gather across different stakeholders. Using these compelling data, we respond to questions on program, candidate, and completer effectiveness. All stakeholders contribute to the QAS through data input. The data are then used to drive continuous improvement allowing us to meet current workforce demands and train high quality teacher candidates and completers. The EPP QAS Workflow illustrates the nature and scope of the ongoing data collection, analysis, review, and dissemination (See Evidence 5.1.2_QAS Workflow). The established QAS allows us to not only collect data on overall program effectiveness but also allows us to examine individual candidate data. The system allows us to review data overtime and compare data across programs (See Evidence 5.1.4_Program Effectiveness Measures; 1.1.4_EPP Designed Rubric Data).

Faculty, staff, candidates, and stakeholders are instrumental in establishing, monitoring, and maintaining the six-element QAS Framework (as described in Evidence 5.1.1 Transition Points) and therefore can articulate their roles in the system. For example, faculty and clinical partners play an integral part in designing the key assessments that are used to collect candidate effectiveness data. Faculty are also responsible for reporting student concerns on Compass a web-based student success management system that allows us to monitor student progress. Faculty are also responsible for communicating directly with the department so that professional growth plans can be put in place to support candidates throughout the program.

Component R5.2 Data Quality

QAS Evidence: Strengths and Weaknesses from Faculty Perspective

Strengths
The main strength of the QAS is that it is systematic, requires minimal training, and is easily accessible from on-campus and off campus locations. The QAS can gather information in one location allowing individuals from different offices on campus to support students without having to schedule multiple meetings. For example, Compass, Access-Ability Services, Center for Student Success, academic advisors, Dean's Office and provides the support needed to individual students. Authorized faculty and staff can access student progress, add advising notes, raise flags, positively reinforce candidates' progress, and communicate using the one web-based system.

Another tool in the QAS is the Student Learning and Licensure assessment system. It facilitates management of assessment data for individual candidates, aggregates and disaggregates data, and allows for alignment of rubrics to national and state standards. GoReact, another web-based system provides detailed and timely

feedback to teacher candidates by their university supervisor and cooperating teacher. The university recently adopted the Planning and Self Study and moving forward we will be using that system for centralized and flexible assessment and accreditation planning. The university has also adopted DegreeWorks, a web-based degree audit tool, that helps students and advisors monitor progress toward degree completion. The Dean's Office has created a new dedicated position (Collegiate Manager of Student Services and Data) who assists the EPP in accessing data and runs queries and reports from Banner, an integrated information system that consolidates all candidate information.

Challenges
Over the years, the university, college, and the departments have adopted and upgraded several web-based systems (Student Learning and Licensure, Planning and Study, DegreeWorks, SLATE, Compass, GoReact) to facilitate the functioning of the QAS. However, the switch to more sophisticated systems occurred simultaneously giving faculty little time to learn and use the systems effectively. We realize we have too many tools in our QAS that may cause confusion, but they do interact with each other and that streamlines the process of using various tools. The clinical process needs some consolidation that would allow us to bring all components from application to completion of clinical experiences together in one system. We are looking into adopting InPlace, a web-based system that is designed to support all stakeholders (university, school districts, schools, and candidates) in one integrated system to provide a consistent and current view of all placement-related activity.

Procedures to Ensure Data Reliability: Conclusions and Interpretations
The EPP collects data on candidate and program effectiveness based on identified proprietary assessments (edTPA, Praxis II, CT Foundations of Reading, ECE Test) and EPP designed rubrics (lesson plan, portfolio, student teaching evaluations, candidate effect of student learning). The proprietary assessments have pre-established reliability and validity data (See Evidence 5.1.6_CCT Rubric Psychometrics; 5.1.7_edTPA Psychometrics; 5.1.7a _edTPA CAEP Connection; 5.1.7b_edTPA InTASC Connection).

The EPP program faculty collaborated to determine reliability and validity for the EPP designed rubrics. During the meeting, the program faculty evaluated selected assignments using the same rubric. Results of this effort indicated discrepancy in scores depending on the programs the faculty were representing. For example, elementary and special education faculty members did not agree on the definition of technology and the programs departed at this point and decided to calculate reliability for the rubric by individual programs.

All EPP designed rubrics were assessed for inter-rater reliability by each program, but we only have data available for special education courses. Over the years we were not able to keep track of data due to changes in the department-level leadership and program faculty. Moving forward, we will use a centralized system (Planning and Self Study and Student Learning and Licensure) to collect this information using a systematic organized strategy.

Following is the process that was adopted by the special education program faculty.

Three special education faculty individually rated the assignments using the rubrics and compared the scores. The level of acceptable agreement rate between the raters ranged between 66.67 to 100%. After discussing, the raters came to a consensus and the acceptable agreement rate was 100% (See Evidence 5.1.8_Reliability).

To ensure assessment validity, the EPP created rubrics were designed by content experts in collaboration with clinical partners to examine content validity through the alignment of rubric elements to the state and national standards. All rubrics are also aligned to state (CCT) and national standards (InTASC, CAEP).

Meeting and Aligning with CAEP Criteria for Evaluation of Assessments

All EPP created assessments (rubrics and surveys) are evaluated by two raters using the CAEP Rubric Evaluation Tool. The rubrics were first evaluated independently by a clinical partner and then reviewed by program faculty. Results show that in general, the rubrics sufficiently align with CAEP's levels specifically administration and purpose, scoring, data reliability and validity, survey content and quality (See Evidence 5.1.9_EPP CAEP Evaluation).

Data Characteristics (Relevant, Verifiable, Representative, Cumulative, and Actionable)
Our measures are a combination of proprietary measures with pre-established reliability and validity and EPP designed rubrics designed in collaboration with clinical partners. The QAS includes policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that the quality of evidence for EPP measures are relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable (Evidence 5.2.1_ Rubric Characteristics).

Relevant - All EPP rubrics are created by content experts with confirmation of relevance and comprehensiveness by P-12 partners. We ensure that our rubrics are aligned to state (CCT) and national (InTASC, CAEP) standards. The rubrics include three performance levels (Mastery, Benchmark, and Unacceptable) that evaluates candidates' proficiencies.

Verifiable - All rubrics are representative of all aspects that the EPP intends to prepare candidates to be successful teachers. This is done by using proprietary assessments with pre-established reliability and validity. EPP created assessments were evaluated using the CAEP evaluation rubric to ensure that proficiency Level Descriptor are developmental and qualitatively defined by selected criteria associated with measures aligned with standards. We provide explicit training to evaluators who will be assessing our candidates' performance, including how to provide our candidates with formative and immediate feedback. Interrater reliability is calculated for all EPP designed rubrics as mentioned above.

Representative - Data on undergraduate and graduate candidates across all programs are collected using EPP adopted web-based assessment systems. Key assessments on which data are collected are spread across all years spanning from first year to senior year and across coursework completed at the graduate level. For completers, we have put in place a 10-measure strategy that includes surveys, focus groups, and meetings (See Evidence 4.1.1_Ten Measure Strategy). We made all

efforts to include completers from all programs, however for the first attempt, we have 50% representation from our programs (Elementary and Special Education). Moving forward, we will encourage more participation from completers across all programs.

Cumulative - Proprietary assessment data are reviewed regularly. We use these data to conduct comparative analysis for students across programs and years. These data are used to monitor trends to guide continuous program improvements. Data for all key assessments are collected on Student Learning and Licensure and GoReact. They house all data in systems that we have access to overtime for review and to make data-based decisions.

Actionable - The EPP ensures that data collected for proprietary and EPP designed assessments are actionable and are used to make data-based decisions leading to continuous program improvement. For example, when edTPA was implemented as a performance-based task required for graduation and certification, the EPP reviewed the data and made required changes to the curricula to better prepare and evaluate candidates to be successful in meeting all edTPA requirements (See Evidence 5.2.1a_New Lesson Plan Rubric). Additionally, when the State adopted the new CT Foundations of Reading Test, the program faculty ensured that course content and projects were aligned to the knowledge and skills needed to take and successfully pass the CT Foundations of Reading Test (See Evidence 5.1.10_EDR 444 Updates).

Using feedback from the stakeholders on EPP designed assessments, the EPP has made, and continues to make, recommended revisions to the assignments and rubrics. For example, over the past few years, the EPP has made several major changes to our student teaching evaluation rubric. Initially, we added an addendum to meet specific program requirements to our general student teaching evaluation rubric. More recently, we decided to adopt and implement the State designed CCT rubric to evaluate student teaching performance across all programs. The new rubric will be implemented starting in Spring 2023. Additionally, the EPP has made consistent changes to the lesson plan template and rubric to support candidates to master all areas of the rubric. These changes are also based on feedback that we received from partners and to meet current workforce demands (See Evidence 5.2.1a_New Lesson Plan Rubric; 5.2.1b_New ST Evaluation).

Triangulation of Data
The EPP uses a systematic approach for collecting, analyzing, and using data to understand candidate and completer preparation. Using the triangulation approach, we gather both qualitative and quantitative data to measure Candidate Satisfaction, Candidate and Clinical Effectiveness.

Candidate Effectiveness - Data on candidate effectiveness is measured across programs on three measures - edTPA, ½ Day Student Teaching Evaluation, Full-day Student Teaching Evaluation. Data for candidate effectiveness confirms that our candidates meet all program requirements and are performing at benchmark or above on all elements of the evaluations. Candidates who do not meet the requirements are provided with additional supports or counseled out of the program.

Candidate Satisfaction - Candidate satisfaction is measured across multiple data points. For course level satisfaction, we review course evaluations at the end of each semester. The overall program satisfaction is analyzed when candidates respond at the end of program. We hold focus group discussions with both candidates and alumni to elicit candidate satisfaction information. For Alumni survey (See Evidence 4.1.3_Completer Focus Group Survey Data) are analyzed at the time of graduation. Data for candidate satisfaction confirms that our candidates are satisfied with our programs.

Completer satisfaction - Data for completer satisfaction are triangulated across multiple measures including Surveys (Completers, Employers, P-12 Students), Focus Groups (Completers, Employers), Action Research Projects, TEAM Data. These data are similar to candidate satisfaction data where the candidates continue to use the skills that they learned while in the program (Evidence 4.1.3_Completer Focus Group Survey Data; 4.1.7_Employer Satisfaction Survey; 4.1.5_P-12 Student Survey; 4.1.6_TEAM Data; 4.1.4_Action Research Project_Introduction and Data)

Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions - The EPP uses certification tests data (Praxis, CT Foundations of Reading) and specific key assessment data to determine program effectiveness. For example, the lesson plan data can be triangulated across programs to determine candidate preparedness (See Evidence 1.1.4_EPP Designed Assessment Data). Candidate performance data are also triangulated between certification tests and EPP designed assessments (See Evidence 1.1.3_Proprietary Assessment Data).

R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

Evidence of Stakeholder Involvement in Program Design, Evaluation and Data Driven Decision Making for Continuous Improvement

Our stakeholders are an integral part of our EPP and participate regularly in collaborating with us on several levels starting from designing of program/coursework, assignments and rubrics, data collection, evaluation and making data-based decisions for continuous program improvement.
The following outlines institutional participation of stakeholders in evaluating program and completer quality and effectiveness.

Program Level - The EPP is in continuous communication with school partners and what our teacher preparation programs can do to support their P-12 needs. For example, feedback from CSDE partners prompted us to offer an online master's in special education program to support a shortage area. Key assessments and rubrics are also co-constructed during our quarterly SUPAB meetings to ensure our assessments are meaningful and relevant to produce successful teachers. Recently, we piloted a dual enrollment program with 10 students from a local school district to encourage high school students to enroll in teacher preparation programs based on requests made by stakeholders. In addition, we are also working with another district to create pathways that would allow their non-certified staff members to get certified (See Evidence 5.1.3c_Oak Hill MOU).

Course/Assignment Level - At the course level, we collaborate with our partners to design meaningful and relevant assignments and involve them with professional development events. For example, our partners provided training to our candidates on the new IEP process that will be implemented in Fall 2022. Feedback received from our partners who hired our candidates resulted in a change to include data collection and progress monitoring skills in our curriculum. Our adjuncts and clinical educators comprise teachers and/or administrators who provide direct, immediate, and consistent feedback that enables us to make continuous program improvement.

Evaluation and Data Review Meeting - Stakeholders are involved throughout the program reviewing candidates' performance data in fieldwork and student teaching placements. Data review meetings (e.g., discuss, analyze, and disseminate results) are held at mid and end of semester to make data-based changes to our curriculum. Data for key assessments are collected on Student Learning and Licensure, and the process is overseen by the MAAC responsible for ensuring that all stakeholders have access to the data. As for instructors teaching courses with key assessments, at the end of each semester, they submit a one-page summary with data and interpretation. At the data review meetings, faculty and clinical partners review the Student Learning and Licensure data and the one-page summary. At these meetings, the team puts together professional growth plans for candidates who need additional support (See Evidence 2.2.5_Growth Plan; See Evidence 5.1.5_One-Page Report).

Clinical Data - Stakeholders are involved in evaluating clinical experiences (e.g., fieldwork -First year students, Sophomore, and Junior Year) and practicum/student teaching (Senior Year and Last Semester for Graduate Students). Clinical Faculty (University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers) and the Teacher Candidate (Self-Evaluation) review formal data for senior year clinical experiences at the data review meetings as described above. Stakeholders collect data during the mid- and final semester student teaching evaluation to enable us to triangulate data on half-day and full day culminating clinical experiences at the undergraduate and graduate levels. We use discussions from our data review meetings to continuously improve the programs. Moving forward, we would like to collect data from fieldwork teachers. This change will allow us to collect feedback from clinical partners and allow us to strengthen our programs and engage in continuous program improvement.

Stakeholder Involvement in Completer Data Decision Making
Our stakeholders are actively involved in our data-based decision-making process and provide meaningful feedback that allows us to engage in continuous program improvement and better prepare our teacher candidates to be successful teachers and have positive impact on P-12 learners. We selected five measures from the 10-measure strategy as described in Standard 4 that requires partner involvement to evaluate Completer Effectiveness. (See Evidence 4.1.1 Ten Measure Strategy) that includes collecting meaningful and relevant feedback from all stakeholders. These measures are as follows:
P-12 Student Survey of Completer Effectiveness
Teacher Education and Mentoring (TEAM) Program
Employer Satisfaction Survey -
Employer Focus Group Meetings
School University Partnership Advisory Board (SUPAB) meetings

R5.4 Continuous Improvement
Review, Analysis, Interpretation, and Dissemination of Data and Evidence Collected for Continuous Program Development

Admissions and Recruitment Data are shared and reviewed with the Deans and Department Chairs by the undergraduate and graduate admissions offices (See Evidence 5.4.1_Graduate Enrollment Tracking). Adjustments to recruitment and admission processes are informed by these data. Program specific recruitment and retention plans are reviewed and updated by the Director of Recruitment and Retention who works in collaboration with the Collegiate Manager of Marketing and Communication.

Key Assessment Data (proprietary, key assessments, completer and survey data) are disseminated to program faculty and clinical partners every semester at data review meetings. These compelling data allow us to monitor candidates' progress and put support in place that would lead to continuous program improvement.

Certification Data are reviewed by the Manager of Assessment Accreditation and Certification (MAAC) to ensure that candidates have met all requirements (program and testing). Candidates are then recommended to the State for approval. Data about approved completers are available on the State Data dashboard that allows us to collect information about our completers and their progress in obtaining certification. Proprietary test and key assessment scores inform the EPP on improvements that need to be made to the curricula.

Completer Outcome Data are collected to determine completer impact on P-12 learners. Data are collected using surveys, focus groups, and meetings. Effectiveness data are collected using action research projects, and TEAM training data that completers share with us. We have put in place a 10-measure strategy to measure completer effectiveness. These data are used to strengthen our curriculum to better prepare our candidates (See Evidence 4.1.4_ Action Research Project Introduction and Data; 4.1.6_TEAM Data). Moving forward, we will be conducting direct observation of completers using the CCT rubric (See Evidence 3.3.2_ CCT/SEED Rubric). These observations will be conducted by trained University Supervisors.

In our next steps for continuous program improvement, we will be using Watermark's Planning and Self Study system to support transparent data sharing. This will allow us to centralize data collection, review, analysis, and dissemination. The system will also allow us to disaggregate data by candidate demographics (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity) as appropriate, to provide a benchmark to guide interpretations of strengths and areas for continuous improvement.

Program Improvements and Evaluation of Effectiveness

Several professional development events have been piloted as part of program improvement efforts to examine completer effectiveness. For example, we provide both professional development and networking opportunities to the candidates.

Professional development opportunities include creating and using an electronic portfolio, writing a professional resume and cover letter, doing a job search, listening to talks on engaging with family and community, professional ethics, participating in principals panel, mock interviews, and alumni night. During these professional development events, candidates can interact, meet, and network with individuals from their area of expertise and help them determine future goals.

This year (2022), we have invited district representatives to introduce the new IEP document that the state will be adopting in Fall 2022. Our candidates will also be involved in a Poverty Simulation activity, an interprofessional education (IPE) event, to help them engage with other stakeholders and experience real life situations that they may encounter as a teacher. Candidates participating in the IPE event can interact with other professionals (e.g., nurses, occupational therapists, physical therapists etc.) to understand the importance of everyone's perspectives and then determine next steps that would best help to support students in the classroom.

Changes to Curricula and Clinical Experiences for Continuous Program Improvement

Course improvements are ongoing as part of our continuous improvement efforts. For example, when Connecticut adopted edTPA as a required assessment, program faculty from across programs revised the lesson plan template and rubric to ensure that candidates were prepared to implement edTPA in their senior year. Another recent change was related to candidate performance on the Connecticut Foundations of Reading Test. Data over the years indicate that candidates struggle with the written response component of the test. To better prepare our candidates we revised our curriculum to provide them with additional opportunities to practice those skills. We have also made conscious efforts to ensure that our candidates are culturally responsive and reflective practitioners are well-versed in diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice (See Evidence 5.4.2_EDF 120 Syllabus). This experience is provided to candidates using case studies with opportunities to have meaningful discussions within safe classroom environments created by the instructors. Professional development events based on these aspects have also been organized for candidates' benefit (See Evidence 5.4.3_Professional Development Sample). We have made substantial changes to clinical experiences. We assigned fieldwork hours to EDP 340 - Differentiated Instruction to ensure that our candidates had the opportunity to observe teachers differentiating instruction. We also added a video recorded teaching component to the lesson plans candidates developed in PSY 332. Another assignment connected to clin

Standard R.A.5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement and Capacity (Advanced Programs)

i. Evidence/data/tables. Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate component(s) of the Standard.

1 📎 3.1.2_Recruitment and Retention Plans.pdf

RA.5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

2 📎 3.1.3_Recruitment Strategies.pdf

RA.5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

3 📎 3.2.2_Transition Points and Triangulation.pdf

RA.5.2 Data Quality RA.5.4 Continuous Improvement	
4 📎 3.2.3_ Appeal Process.pdf	
RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System	
5 📎 5.1.1_Transition Points .pdf	
RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System RA.5.2 Data Quality RA.5.3 Stakeholder Involvement RA.5.4 Continuous Improvement	
6 📎 5.1.1h_Transition Points Sample of Two Programs.xlsx	
RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System RA.5.2 Data Quality	
7 📎 5.1.4_Program Effectiveness Measures.pdf	
RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System RA.5.2 Data Quality RA.5.3 Stakeholder Involvement RA.5.4 Continuous Improvement	
8 📎 5.1.9_EPP CAEP Evaluation.pdf	
RA.5.1 Quality Assurance System RA.5.2 Data Quality	
9 📎 A.E.3_Practicum & Internship Supervisor Evaluation Surveys and Results School Psychology.pdf	
RA.5.2 Data Quality RA.5.3 Stakeholder Involvement RA.5.4 Continuous Improvement	
10 📎 A.E.6_School Psychology Advisory Board School Psychology.pdf	
RA.5.3 Stakeholder Involvement RA.5.4 Continuous Improvement	
11 📎 A.E.4 Employer and Completer Survey Results School Psychology.pdf	
RA.5.3 Stakeholder Involvement RA.5.4 Continuous Improvement	

ii. Analysis report. Write a narrative that delineates the connection between the evidence and the Standard.

The advanced program Quality Assurance System mirrors the systems in place for initial program. The only additional tool they use that is not used by the initial programs is Qualtrics.

Quality Assurance System: Description, Maintenance, Functioning Evidence

As an EPP we have developed a functioning QAS that provides data output that involves all key stakeholders (faculty, staff, completers, employers, P-12 partners,

and administrators across offices and functions) and allows for continuous improvement. The QAS includes multiple components to measure (1) candidate progress, (2) completer effectiveness, (3) candidate, completer and employer satisfaction, and (4) operational efficiency. The QAS incorporates the performance standards of relevant national and state organizations. At the national level, the system is informed by the standards of Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), and nationally recognized program recognition body (NASP).

The EPP systematically conducts academic and non-academic screenings for admission and progression within the professional program to foster continuous improvement. The QAS also includes performance-based assessments to evaluate candidate readiness and completer effectiveness. These compelling evidence are collected at various transition points to ensure that candidates receive feedback at regular intervals, and for the EPP to make systematic and continuous program improvement.

The EPP QAS Workflow illustrates the nature and scope of ongoing data collection and review. It also includes a description of the process and the list of stakeholders who are an integral part of the QAS and instrumental in successful functioning of the established QAS (See Evidence 5.1.2_QAS Workflow).

Continuous program improvement is the focus of all functions within the QAS. The goal of the QAS is to provide quality assessment data and results that can be used for actionable program improvement. A set of policies and procedures, as well as committees of key stakeholders and partners, offices, and personnel have been established to ensure quality in admissions, courses, program design, and candidate, and completer performance. The QAS for initial and advanced programs operates on a well-established and evolving framework that includes such as fiscal, operational, academics, and personnel (See Evidence 5.1.3_Operations).

The main strength of the QAS is that it is systematic, requires minimal training, and is easily accessible from on-campus and off campus locations. The QAS can gather information in one location allowing individuals from different offices on campus to support students without having to schedule multiple meetings. For example, Compass, a web-based student success management system connects instructors, candidates, Access-Ability Services, Center for Student Success, academic advisors, Dean's Office and provides the support needed to individual students. Authorized faculty and staff can access student progress, add advising notes, raise flags, positively reinforce candidates' progress, and communicate using the one web-based system.

Another tool in the QAS is the Student Learning and Licensure assessment system. It facilitates management of assessment data for individual candidates, aggregates and disaggregates data, and allows for alignment of rubrics to national and state standards. GoReact, another web-based system provides detailed and timely feedback to teacher candidates by their university supervisor and cooperating teacher. The university recently adopted the Planning and Self Study and moving forward we will be using that system for centralized and flexible assessment and accreditation planning. The university has also adopted DegreeWorks, a web-based

degree audit tool, that helps students and advisors monitor progress toward degree completion.

All EPP created assessments (rubrics and surveys) are evaluated by two raters using the CAEP Rubric Evaluation Tool. The rubrics were first evaluated independently by a clinical partner and then reviewed by program faculty. Results show that in general, the rubrics sufficiently align with CAEP's levels specifically administration and purpose, scoring, data reliability and validity, survey content and quality (See Evidence 5.1.9_EPP CAEP Evaluation).

Reliability & Validity of Assessment:

Reliability & Validity of Assessment: The following steps were followed in Fall 2018 in establishing validation for this scoring rubric:

Selection of participants for an Expert Panel:

Notification of need for participants was sent to alumni of the program as well as school psychologists in the region. From that request, 14 individuals agreed to participate. These participants represented school psychologists from several different states, from school districts of different sizes, and at different stages of experience from early career to retired.

This scoring rubric contains 18 items covering the areas of Psychological Assessment Reports identified above.

A Qualtrics Validation survey was developed that included the following:

1. Introduction and directions to the participants
2. Each of the 18 items was included in the survey. The participants were asked to rate each item with one of the following responses:
a) This question is essential
b) This question is useful but not essential
c) This question is not necessary

If the participant rated an item as a 2 or a 3 they were then asked to describe how that item could be improved so as to address more essential information or if the item should just not be included. Responses to this question had to be provided before the participant could move on to the next item.

The last question in the survey allowed the participants to provide additional comments

At the conclusion of the validation survey, the results were analyzed using the Lawshe (1975) Content Validity method:

a) For each item, a Content Validity Ratio (CVR) score was calculated by dividing the number of ratings of 1 (this question is essential) received by the total number of

ratings obtained.

b) A CVR score of .636 was identified as the critical value needed to determine that the item was valid as written. This critical value was established based on the number of responses obtained, which was 11 for this survey, indicating that at least 9 respondents identified this as an acceptable item.

c) All but one of the 18 items for this scoring rubric met the CVR critical value. For some items that met the criteria, there were still a few comments provided.

d) All comments were considered and in some cases, adjustment to items were made.

e) For the 1 item that did not meet the CVR critical value, the updated version based on feedback received, was included in a follow-up Qualtrics Survey that asked to Expert Panel participants to consider items that were changed across all Evaluation Surveys and Assessment Rubrics being validated at this one time and to rate the new item using the same 3 point scale described earlier. Nine raters participated in this follow-up survey and a CRV of 1.0 was obtained and it was determined that this item also met the critical value cut-off.

(The completed Reliability and Validity chart for the assessments can be found in See Evidence A.E.9_Psychological Assessment Rubric and Validation School Psychology; A.E.10 Consultation Case Study School Psychology; A.E.4_Standard A.4 Employer and Completer Survey Results School Psychology; A.E.3_Practicum & Internship Supervisor Evaluation Surveys and Results School Psychology).

Stakeholder Involvement in Completer Data Decision Making

Our stakeholders are actively involved in our data-based decision-making process and provide meaningful feedback that allows us to engage in continuous program improvement and better prepare our candidates to be successful in the field (See Evidence A.E.4_Employer and Completer Survey Results; A.E.6_School Psychology Advisory Board).

Admissions and Recruitment Data are shared and reviewed with the Deans and Department Chairs by the undergraduate and graduate admissions offices (See Evidence 5.4.1_Graduate Enrollment Tracking). Adjustments to recruitment and admission processes are informed by these data. Program specific recruitment and retention plans are reviewed and updated by the Director of Recruitment and Retention who works in collaboration with the Collegiate Manager of Marketing and Communication.

Key Assessment Data (proprietary, key assessments, completer and survey data) are disseminated to program faculty and clinical partners every semester at data review meetings. These compelling data allow us to monitor candidates' progress and put support in place that would lead to continuous program improvement.

Certification Data are reviewed by the Manager of Assessment Accreditation and

Certification (MAAC) to ensure that candidates have met all requirements (program and testing). Candidates are then recommended to the State for approval. Data about approved completers are available on the State Data dashboard that allows us to collect information about our completers and their progress in obtaining certification. Proprietary test and key assessment scores inform the EPP on improvements that need to be made to the curricula.

Completer Outcome Data are collected to determine completer impact. Data are collected using surveys completer and employer surveys. These data are used to strengthen our curriculum to better prepare our candidates. In our next steps for continuous program improvement, we will be using Watermark's Planning and Self Study system to support transparent data sharing. This will allow us to centralize data collection, review, analysis, and dissemination. The system will also allow us to disaggregate data by candidate demographics (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity) as appropriate, to provide a benchmark to guide interpretations of strengths and areas for continuous improvement.

IV. Areas for Improvement (AFIs) from previous accreditation decisions, if any

Previous AFI(s)

(1) [NCATE STD2]The unit's data management system is not fully operational across all programs. [Both]

(2) [NCATE STD4]The unit has not demonstrated good-faith efforts to recruit and maintain professional education faculty members from diverse ethnic/racial groups. [Both]

(3) [NCATE STD6]An inadequate number of support personnel limits the maintenance of the assessment system. [Both]

a. Statement of progress and supporting evidence for removing the AFI(s)

(1) [NCATE STD2]The unit's data management system is not fully operational across all programs. [Both]

As a University we have adopted several systems that would allow us to adopt a quality assurance system that can we effectively implemented across programs. Some examples include the adoption of SLATE which is a comprehensive platform to streamline the admissions and enrollment management. We have also adopted Compass and Degree Works another web based system that has allowed us to streamline the advising and student support systems. The University has also adopted Watermarks Planning and Self-Study and Student Learning and Licensure systems. The teacher preparation programs had been using LiveText and then VIA, but with the University adopting the system, it will help with smooth implementation with fidelity. As an EPP we have also started using One Drive to share information with faculty and clinical partners.

(2) [NCATE STD4]The unit has not demonstrated good-faith efforts to recruit and maintain professional education faculty members from diverse ethnic/racial groups. [Both]

Over the years we have made every effort to recruit and maintain professional education faculty members from diverse ethnic racial groups. Currently, over 35% of

our faculty are from diverse ethnic and racial groups. The University has whole has adopted several efforts to train search committees involved in reviewing and interviewing potential candidates. The same message is shared with the College and Department Leadership.

(3) [NCATE STD6]An inadequate number of support personnel limits the maintenance of the assessment system. [Both]

In 2019 we created a new position for a Co-ordinator of Assessment and Accreditation to oversee the Assessment, Accreditation, and Certification process. In 2020 the position was updated to Manager to Assessment, Accreditation, and Certification - MAAC (See Evidence 5.1.3a). The MAAC is responsible for identifying, establishing, and maintaining smooth functioning of the EPP data management systems

b. Overview of evidence in support of removing the AFI(s)

1 📎 5.1.3a_Assessment and Accreditation Position.pdf

State Standard(s) Evidence

Evidence/data/tables (Upload each item of evidence under the appropriate components of the standard and answer any questions provided by the state.)
No Evidence found.

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the Self-Study Report. You may log out at any time and come back to continue; your report will be saved.

When you are ready to submit the report click "Next" below. This will take you to the submit button on the next page. Once you click on "Submit" you will not be able to make changes to the report and evidence.