CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Stefan Pryor, Commissioner of Education

SUBJECT: Update on the Educator Preparation Advisory Council (EPAC)

DATE: November 5, 2014

Executive Summary

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report and the corresponding documents in the appendices provide the Board with an update on progress of the Educator Preparation Advisory Council (EPAC) toward reforming the system of educator preparation through the development of policy and programmatic proposals in the following areas:

- Program Review and Approval;
- Data Reporting and Accountability;
- Certification; and
- Educator Preparation Curriculum Reform.

The strength of EPAC is multifold:

- collaboration and diversity of critical stakeholders engaged in a policy development process, including representation from PK-12 education, higher education, Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE), and other professional organizations;
- continued momentum and support for developing policy and actionable plans for implementation;
- commitment to the urgency of providing "learner ready" teachers and "school ready" leaders to meet the needs of PK-12 students; and
- coherence across many statewide initiatives, including, but not limited to: educator evaluation, the Teacher Education and Mentoring (TEAM) Program, College and Career Ready Standards, and Scientific Research-Based Interventions (SRBI).

HISTORICAL CONTEXT/BACKGROUND INFORMATION

On March 7, 2012, the Board approved a resolution to establish EPAC for the purpose of advising them about developing a system for the approval, regulation and oversight of educator

preparation programs. EPAC members were appointed in accordance with the required representation specified by the Board and were convened on August 3, 2012, for the first time. Since the initial convening of EPAC, membership has changed due to retirements and other reasons. The current list of members is provided in **Appendix A**.

The creation of EPAC and its charge also addresses Special Act 12-3, An Act Concerning Teacher Preparation, which was passed by the Connecticut General Assembly in 2012. See **Appendix B**.

Through ongoing meeting discussions and presentations from national experts and stakeholders, EPAC formulated a series of recommendations which were presented to the Board in April and October 2013. These recommendations outlined six guiding principles as the foundation for the reform of educator preparation in order to achieve the goal of recruiting and preparing the highest quality teachers and school leaders for Connecticut's schools and students. The six guiding principles broadly target reforms needed in the following areas **(see Appendix C).**

1. **Program Entry Standards**
2. **Staffing & Support of Clinical Experiences**
3. **Clinical Experience Requirements**
4. **District-Program Partnerships & Shared Responsibility**
5. **Program Completion & Candidate Assessment Standards**
6. **Program Effectiveness & Accountability**

The EPAC reports to the Board were transmitted to the Connecticut General Assembly as required in Special Act 12-3 on October 11, 2013.

NTEP and CEEDAR Grants

To support the work of EPAC, during the summer of 2013 the CSDE applied for and was awarded two grants. Connecticut was the only state to win both of the following grants:

- The **Network for Transforming Educator Preparation (NTEP)** Grant of $200,000 was awarded by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) to seven states (Connecticut, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts and Washington) to support the work of reform in three major policy areas:
    - Program Approval;
    - Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting; and
    - Licensure/Certification.

  These three reform areas are identified and discussed in CCSSO's task force report called **Our Responsibility, Our Promise**, which has served as a call to action for CCSSO Chiefs, members of the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) and the National Governors Association (NGA). Specifically, the policy actions related to program approval, accountability and data reporting were used to guide the work of EPAC in this last year **(see Appendix D)**.

To lead Connecticut's participation in the NTEP grant, a state leadership team was designated to represent EPAC and the CSDE in meetings with other states. The state NTEP team included three EPAC members and three CSDE members (Elsa Nunez, President of Eastern Connecticut State University; Ken Di Pietro, Superintendent of Plainfield Public Schools; and Nancy Niemi, Chair of Education at University of New Haven). NTEP meetings allowed Connecticut team members opportunities to meet with national experts and other NTEP state colleagues for discussions and idea sharing regarding change models and implementation plans.

To initiate the NTEP grant work, EPAC members participated in the development of Connecticut's "Learner Ready" definition, articulating a concise description of what new teachers are expected to know and be able to do "Day One" upon completion of teacher preparation and entry to the classroom. **See Appendix E** for Connecticut's "Learner Ready" definition.

- The **Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR)** Grant of $200,000, funded by the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), was awarded to five states (Connecticut, California, Florida, Illinois and South Dakota) for intensive technical assistance to support in:
    - reforming teacher and leadership preparation programs to embed evidence-based practices;
    - revising licensure standards to align with reforms in teacher and leadership preparation;
    - refining personnel evaluation systems in teacher and leadership preparation programs; and
    - realigning policy structures and professional learning systems.

A CEEDAR state leadership team, considered a subcommittee of EPAC to work on preparation curriculum reform, was convened in February 2014. It included faculty teams from three pilot institutions (Central Connecticut State University, University of Saint Joseph and Southern Connecticut State University). Through the national CEEDAR center, the CSDE and faculty teams are receiving intensive technical assistance to reform existing curricula to ensure the integration of evidence-based practices into content instruction and field placements for candidates in teacher preparation programs. The focus is to improve the delivery of supports for students with disabilities, English language learners and struggling learners in K-12 schools throughout the state. Revised curricula will be implemented, and impact on teacher candidates and K-12 students measured.

CURRENT EPAC PROGRESS

On December 18, 2013, EPAC met to discuss the work plan for 2014 and 2015 related to educator preparation program approval policy development work in three areas:

- program review;
- data and accountability; and
- assessment development.

In order to accomplish the development work required in each of these areas, EPAC agreed to the formation of three working subcommittees, each tasked with focusing on one of the three key areas and consisting of EPAC members and additional Connecticut educators (teachers, administrators and higher education representatives). These EPAC subcommittees have been meeting and working since February 2014. **See Appendix F** for subcommittee membership.

Subcommittee work has been based on and aligned with EPAC's *Six Guiding Principles for Transformation of Teacher and School Leader Preparation* and focuses upon reform of the program approval system as well as the development of a new data and accountability system:

- **The Data and Accountability Subcommittee** has developed a framework for an accountability system that will provide the quantitative review to complement the qualitative review of educator preparation programs (EPPs) through the state program approval process. It will identify a program (not the institution) as effective, at-risk, or low-performing based on a system of metrics including 14 indicators in the following four categories of accountability:

  Category 1. Program selectivity, entry and completion;

  Category 2. Candidate pre-service performance;

  Category 3. Candidate employment, persistence and in-service performance; and

  Category 4. District Partnership Leadership (institutional level data).

The accountability system will also address requirements in the federal regulations of the Title II Higher Education and Opportunity Act, with which all states must comply, as well as the new annual reporting requirements for national accreditation through the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). **See Appendix G** for the proposed accountability categories and indicators.

In addition to developing a data accountability system, the subcommittee will also advise on the development of a data reporting system that will serve two purposes: (1) provide a robust and rich set of data for public reporting; and (2) provide institutions with program improvement data.

- **The Assessment Development Subcommittee** will consider the design of new measures for use as part of the data and accountability system including:
    - feedback surveys from new teachers and their employers about teacher preparation;
    - student teaching evaluation;
    - pre-service performance assessment; and
    - a measure of IHE/district partnership quality.

- **The Program Review Subcommittee** has been reviewing various strategies for reform of the program review and approval system. After consideration of multiple options, the current proposal includes:
    - adoption of the five CAEP standards **(see Appendix H)**, with additional consideration to be given to additional standards for Connecticut's program approval process;
    - participation in a joint visit process between national CAEP teams and state teams;
    - an independent "focused review" by the state team of programs identified by accountability data as at-risk or low-performing; and
    - a separate report or addendum to the CAEP report outlining the findings of the state team.

Upon release of details on the new CAEP accreditation process in December 2014, the Program Review Subcommittee will advise on final decisions about the state program review process and the partnership agreement with CAEP. The subcommittee will also make recommendations regarding policies to be included in program approval regulations such as:

- definitions;
- minimum admission and exit requirements;
- the approval cycle;
- decision rules that combine qualitative and quantitative data;
- recommendations to the state program approval review committee;
- approval decisions by the Board; and
- procedural requirements by level of approval.

NEXT STEPS

The full EPAC membership will convene in December 2014 for the purpose of providing the group with an update on subcommittee work and soliciting feedback on subcommittee recommendations, with a goal of developing consensus around a set of final recommendations regarding a Connecticut system for educator preparation program approval grounded in the six EPAC principles.

Prepared by:

Georgette Nemr, Education Consultant
Bureau of Educator Standards and Certification

Reviewed by:

Nancy L. Pugliese, J.D., Chief
Bureau of Educator Standards and Certification

Approved by:

Sarah J. Barzee, Ph.D., Chief Talent Officer
Talent Office

Appendix A

Educator Preparation Advisory Committee (EPAC) Co-Chairs and Members

Stefan	Pryor, Co-Chair	Commissioner, State Department of Education
Greg	Gray, Co-Chair	President, Board of Regents for Higher Education
Elsa	Nuñez	Vice President, Board of Regents and President, ECSU
Sarah	Barzee	Chief Talent Officer, CSDE
Karen	Anderson	Senior Associate Provost, Wesleyan University
David	Bosso	2012 CT Teacher of the Year, Berlin High School
Linette	Branham	Director of Policy, Professional Practice, & Research, CEA
Carole	Clifford	Professional Development Coordinator, CT-AFT
Kenneth	DiPietro	Superintendent, Plainfield Public Schools
Sandy	Grande	Chair, Education Department, Connecticut College
Jess	House	Dean, School of Prof. Studies, Western Connecticut State University
Andrew	Lachman	Executive Director, Connecticut Center for School Change
Greg	Little	Dean, Alternate Route to Certification, Office of Higher Education
Gary	Maynard	President, CT Federation of School Administrators
Sal	Menzo	Superintendent, Wallingford Public Schools
Jack	Miller	President, Central Connecticut State University
Karissa	Niehoff	Executive Director, CT Association of Schools
Nancy	Niemi	Chair, Education Department, University of New Haven
Joan	Parris	Program Director of Early Childhood Prog., Norwalk Community College
Nate	Quesnel	Superintendent, East Hartford Public Schools
Frances	Rabinowitz	Interim Superintendent, Bridgeport Public Schools
Robert	Rader	Executive Director, CT Association of Boards of Education
Janet	Robinson	Superintendent, Stratford Public Schools
Larry	Schaefer	Education Associate, CT Association of Public School Superintendents
Richard	Schwab	Dean, Neag School of Education, University of Connecticut
Don	Slater	Chief Operating Officer, Hartford Public Schools
Nate	Snow	Executive Director, Teach for America - Connecticut
Allan	Taylor	Chair, State Board of Education
Danuta	Thibodeau	Executive Director, Education Connection
James	Thompson	Superintendent, Bloomfield Public Schools
Robert	Villanova	Director of the Executive Leadership Program, Neag School of Education University of Connecticut
Jeff	Villar	Executive Director, Connecticut Council for Education Reform
Ajit	Gopalakrishnan	CSDE Staff
Georgette	Nemr	CSDE Staff
Nancy	Pugliese	CSDE Staff
Katie	Toohey	CSDE Staff
Mandy	Turner	CSDE Staff

Appendix B

Substitute Senate Bill No. 384

Special Act No. 12-3

AN ACT CONCERNING TEACHER PREPARATION.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

Section 1. (*Effective July 1, 2012*) The State Board of Education, in consultation with the Board of Regents for Higher Education and The University of Connecticut, shall study issues concerning teacher preparation, including, but not limited to, requiring (1) every student enrolled in a program of teacher preparation leading to a professional certificate to (A) spend a minimum number of hours student teaching, beginning in the student's first year in such program and continuing every year thereafter that such student is enrolled in such program, including, but not limited to, a certain number of hours working with special education and gifted students, and (B) complete coursework concerning parental involvement in a child's education and cultural issues that may affect a student's learning environment, (2) any candidate entering such a program of teacher preparation to possess a minimum cumulative grade point average of 3. 00, (3) any candidate entering such a program of teacher preparation to meet the requirements of the academic program in the subject area in which such student plans to teach, and (4) each institution of higher education offering such a program of teacher preparation to annually provide each candidate in such program with information regarding subject and geographic areas in which a teacher shortage exists, as determined by the Commissioner of Education in accordance with section 10-8b of the general statutes, and encourage each such candidate to take teaching jobs in such subject and geographic areas. Not later than April 1, 2013, the State Board of Education shall report on such study and deliver a comprehensive set of recommendations regarding such issues to the Department of Education, the Board of Regents for Higher Education, The University of Connecticut and, in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a of the general statutes, the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to higher education.

Approved June 15, 2012

Appendix C

EPAC Framework for Reforming Teacher and School Leader Preparation Programs in Connecticut: Six Guiding Principles

Approved by the State Board of Education on October 2, 2013

Principle Title	Teacher Preparation Principle Description	School Leader Preparation Principle Description
1. Program Entry Standards	Connecticut teacher preparation programs must actively recruit, admit, develop and retain only those teacher candidates with strong knowledge, skills and dispositions that are indicative of those expected of teachers for the 21st Century and required to meet the needs of Connecticut students.	Connecticut school leader preparation programs must recruit, admit, and retain only educators who have demonstrated competency and accomplishment in their practice and who are committed to serving as school or district leaders. Prior to admission, prospective school leaders must have strong knowledge, skills and dispositions that are indicative of those expected of school leaders for monitoring, supporting and continuously improving teaching and learning in order to meet the needs of Connecticut students, including but not limited to: • collaboration with stakeholders • shared leadership • professional and inspirational • mentoring and coaching of others • monitoring and supporting continuous improvement of teaching and learning These indicators of school leader skills as well as those described in the Connecticut School Leader Standards will be developed and strengthened throughout the program as the candidate progresses from entry to exit from the program.
2. Staffing & Support of Clinical Experiences	The staffing, structures and program support policies of preparation programs, school districts and CSDE must be coordinated to provide effective clinical experiences that represent the current and future needs of Connecticut's schools and children. Clinical faculty (supervisors) and school based educators have a significant impact on candidate clinical experiences and must themselves be effective educators who understand and apply national and state teaching and student standards to ensure that candidates are provided with the highest quality training and support.	The staffing, structures and program support policies of preparation programs, school districts and CSDE must be coordinated to provide effective clinical experiences that represent the current and future needs of Connecticut's schools and children. Clinical faculty (program supervisors) and school-based leaders who mentor new school leaders have a significant impact on facilitating candidate clinical experiences and must themselves be effective educational leaders who understand and apply national and state instructional, leadership and student standards to ensure that candidates are provided with the highest quality training and support.
3. Clinical Experience Requirements	All candidates must have a sequence of varied, structured, intensive and purposefully supported clinical school experiences that are appropriately staffed by qualified educators to ensure support for success. Experiences must be across the program, coordinated and support the continuum of content and skill development to become an effective educator. *Note: clinical experiences include field experiences, practica and student teaching.*	All school leader candidates must have a sequence of varied, structured, intensive and purposefully supported clinical school experiences that are appropriately staffed by qualified educational leaders to ensure support for success. Experiences must be across the program, coordinated and support the continuum of skill development to become an effective school leader. *Note: clinical experiences include the school leader internship and field experiences.*

Appendix C

EPAC Framework for Reforming Teacher and School Leader Preparation Programs in Connecticut: Six Guiding Principles

Approved by the State Board of Education on October 2, 2013

Principle Title	Teacher Preparation Principle Description	School Leader Preparation Principle Description
4. District-Program Partnerships: Structures & Shared Responsibility	Teacher preparation programs and schools/districts must have well-defined, high-quality, collaborative partnerships to ensure the quality of clinical experiences for teacher candidates while addressing the needs of and benefits to all involved. Teacher preparation programs and school districts will establish partnerships that act strategically to support clinical and school-based training for which they share responsibility, authority, and accountability including program development and implementation.	School leader preparation programs and schools/districts must have well-defined, high-quality, collaborative partnerships to ensure the quality of clinical experiences for school leader candidates while addressing the needs of and benefits to all involved. School leader preparation programs and school districts will establish partnerships that act strategically to support the clinical and school-based training for which they share responsibility, authority, and accountability, including program development and implementation.
5. Program Completion & Candidate Assessment Standards	Candidates will demonstrate competencies aligned with national and state standards by successfully completing rigorous performance-based assessments as part of clinical experiences. All teacher candidates will demonstrate knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to support students' academic and non-academic needs.	School leader candidates will demonstrate competencies aligned with national and state standards by successfully completing rigorous performance-based assessments as part of clinical experiences, including but not limited to: • facilitating school vision and mission to ensure high expectations for student performance. • ensuring achievement of all students through continuous improvement of teaching and learning. • managing organizational systems for a safe and high performing learning environment. • collaborating with families and stakeholders and respecting diversity within the community. • modeling ethical behavior and integrity and promoting educational equity. • advocating for students, families and staff needs. All school leader candidates will demonstrate knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to support the development of effective school-based educators and support students' academic and non-academic needs.
6. Program Effectiveness & Accountability	Preparing a teacher to be successful and effective in the field is the shared responsibility of preparation programs and partner districts. Candidates will have multiple opportunities to provide feedback data on the effectiveness of their training program, clinical experience and supports in order to inform ongoing programmatic improvements. Preparation programs must ultimately be responsible for ensuring completers enter the profession with the knowledge, skills and dispositions to be effective in the classroom. Preparation programs must have access to data about their completers' performance in the classroom and should be held accountable for their programs' effectiveness in preparing teachers to enter and remain in the profession.	Preparing a school leader to be successful and effective in the field is the shared responsibility of preparation programs and partner districts. Candidates will have multiple opportunities to provide feedback data on the effectiveness of their training program, clinical experience and supports in order to inform ongoing programmatic improvements. Preparation programs must ultimately be responsible for ensuring completers enter school leadership roles with the knowledge, skills and dispositions to be effective at the school or district level. Preparation programs must have access to data about their school leaders' performance and should be held accountable for their programs' effectiveness in preparing them to enter and remain in the profession.

Appendix D

10 Recommended Policy Actions from the CCSSO Task Force Report: *Our Responsibility, Our Promise: Transforming Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession*

Licensure

1. States will revise and enforce their licensure standards for teachers and principals to support the teaching of more demanding content aligned to college- and career-readiness and critical thinking skills to a diverse range of students.

2. States will work together to influence the development of innovative licensure performance assessments that are aligned to the revised licensure standards and include multiple measures of educators' ability to perform, including the potential to impact student achievement and growth.

3. States will create multi-tiered licensure systems aligned to a coherent developmental continuum that reflects new performance expectations for educators and their implementation in the learning environment and to assessments that are linked to evidence of student achievement and growth.

4. States will reform current state licensure systems so they are more efficient, have true reciprocity across states, and so that their credentialing structures support effective teaching and leading toward student college- and career-readiness.

Program Approval

5. States will hold preparation programs accountable by exercising the state's authority to determine which programs should operate and recommend candidates for licensure in the state, including establishing a clear and fair performance rating system to guide continuous improvement. States will act to close programs that continually receive the lowest rating and will provide incentives for programs whose ratings indicate exemplary performance.

6. States will adopt and implement rigorous program approval standards to assure that educator preparation programs recruit candidates based on supply and demand data, have highly selective admissions and exit criteria including mastery of content, provide high quality clinical practice throughout a candidate's preparation that includes experiences with the responsibilities of a school year from beginning to end, and that produce quality candidates capable of positively impacting student achievement.

7. States will require alignment of preparation content standards to PK-12 college- and career-ready standards for all licensure areas.

8. States will provide feedback, data, support, and resources to preparation programs to assist them with continuous improvement and to act on any program approval or national accreditation recommendations.

Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting

9. States will develop and support state-level governance structures to guide confidential and secure data collection, analysis, and reporting of PK-20 data and how it informs educator preparation programs, hiring practices, and professional learning. Using stakeholder input, states will address and take appropriate action, individually and collectively, on the need for unique educator identifiers, links to non-traditional preparation providers, and the sharing of candidate data among organizations and across states.

10. States will use data collection, analysis, and reporting of multiple measures for continuous improvement and accountability of preparation programs.

Appendix E

Educator Preparation Advisory Council (EPAC)
DRAFT Learner Ready Definition 1-27-2014

Demonstration of Foundational Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions by Learner-Ready Teachers

Teacher Outcomes

To be ready for the complexity of their work, teachers who enter the profession:

1. Understand the physical, cognitive, social and emotional aspects of child and adolescent growth and development;
2. Value and respect culture and diversity in children and families;
3. Demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed for all children to learn effectively; and
4. Have a disposition to develop all professional qualities more deeply over time;

- Demonstrate deep knowledge of content and how to design instruction and use tools and technology to teach it
- Demonstrate understanding of Common Core Standards in relation to his/her subject matter
- Care about, motivate, and actively engage students in learning
- Create a positive classroom/learning environment
- Value and respect the diverse learning needs and cultural backgrounds of students and their families
- Hold students to high expectations
- Personalize and differentiate learning to ensure appropriate level of challenge
- Collect, interpret and use student learning data to monitor progress and adjust instruction
- Reflect on practice and continuously seek opportunities for professional learning to improve practice
- Communicate and collaborate with colleagues, families and the community to create positive, culturally respectful relationships
- Engage in school improvement initiatives and share responsibility to support learning of all students
- Understand and demonstrate professional, ethical and responsible behavior at all times

Demonstration of Student Outcomes by Learner-Ready Teachers

Student Outcomes

As a result of the work of effective teachers, experiences as learners, and individual effort, students developmentally and systematically grow over time. The teacher newly entering the profession effectively engages students in appropriate learning experiences that support growth and development to these ends.

- Communicate effectively through a variety of mediums including technology and the arts
- Apply content to solve problems and make interdisciplinary, real-world, career and global connections
- Demonstrate well-rounded knowledge and skills across the curriculum in addition to language arts and mathematics
- Participate as an active, informed citizen in a global and technological society
- Think and behave critically and creatively
- Collaborate and work in teams and be prepared to enter the workforce
- Take responsibility for their knowledge and skill development toward the goal of lifelong learning

Appendix F

EPAC Subcommittee Membership

(Includes PK-12 educators and Higher Education Faculty in addition to EPAC members)

EPAC Subcommittee Members		
Program Review	Mike Alfano	CCSU
Program Review	Dorothea Anagnostopoulos	UCONN
Program Review	Kevin Basmadjian	Quinnipiac Univ
Program Review	Carol Clifford	AFT
Program Review	Ken DiPietro	Plainfield Public Schools
Program Review	Nate Snow	TFA
Program Review	Sandy Grande	Conn College
Program Review	Sal Menzo	Wallingford Public Schools
Program Review	Fran Rabinowitz	Hamden Public Schools
Program Review	Larry Schaefer	CAPSS
Program Review	Dani Thibodeau	Education Connection
Program Review	Bob Villanova	UCONN
Program Review	Liz Weeks	New Britain Public Schools
Program Review	Katie Toohey/Mandy Turner	CSDE Staff Coordinating
Data Collection/Reporting/Accountability	Teresa Boyd-Cowles	CSDE
Data Collection/Reporting/Accountability	Jacob Easley	ECSU
Data Collection/Reporting/Accountability	Ajit Gopalikrishna	CSDE
Data Collection/Reporting/Accountability	Jess House	WCSU
Data Collection/Reporting/Accountability	Marijke Kerhahn	UCONN
Data Collection/Reporting/Accountability	Tina Freilicher	UNH
Data Collection/Reporting/Accountability	Elsa Nunez	ECSU/BOR
Data Collection/Reporting/Accountability	Joan Nicoll-Senft	CCSU
Data Collection/Reporting/Accountability	Colleen Palmer	Weston Public Schools
Data Collection/Reporting/Accountability	Georgette Nemr	CSDE Staff Coordinating
Assessment Development	Linette Branham	CEA
Assessment Development	Sharon Cournoyer	Windsor Locks High School
Assessment Development	Ken Daly	Wallingford
Assessment Development	Ann Gruenberg	ECSU Faculty/CABE member
Assessment Development	Nancy Hoffman	CCSU
Assessment Development	Greg Little	OHE ARC
Assessment Development	Gary Maynard	CFSA
Assessment Development	Nancy Niemi	UNH
Assessment Development	Karissa Niehoff	CAS
Assessment Development	Joan Parris	Norwalk Community College
Assessment Development	Katie O'Callaghan	WCSU
Assessment Development	Ed Shank	Cromwell Public Schools
Assessment Development	Jeff Villar	CCER
Assessment Development	Kathleen Whitbread	USJ
Assessment Development	Suzanne Wilson	UCONN
Assessment Development	Georgette Nemr	CSDE Staff Coordinating

Appendix G

EPAC Data Subcommittee
Proposed Accountability Categories and Indicators for Teacher Preparation Programs
DRAFT August 7, 2014

Categories of Accountability for Individual Preparation Programs	Indicators of Accountability
1. Program selectivity, entry and completion	completer/graduation rates (CAEP)
	completers in shortage areas (CAEP)
	diversity of candidates (CAEP)
	admission selectivity criteria and goals
2. Candidate pre-service performance	pass rates by program for external assessments (including Praxis II, ACTFL, Foundations of Reading, CAT, etc.) (CAEP)
	clinical experience and student-teaching evaluations (CAEP)
	pre-service performance assessments (CAEP)
3. Candidate employment, persistence and in-service performance	numbers initial employed in CT schools (of those candidates residing in CT using Dept of Labor data using occupational code) (CAEP)
	employment of completers in hard to staff or high-need schools and subjects
	persistence rate: years in field after 1st and 3rd year of teaching or school leadership/admin/special service (CAEP)
	surveys of candidates 1-3 years from program completion and feedback on readiness for service (identify how many years out of preparation/distance away from completion date and how many/% stay in CT) (CAEP)
	surveys of employers about candidates readiness 1-3 years from program completion (Supt will identify who is to receive these surveys supt or designees) (CAEP)
	summative teacher level educator evaluation data (CAEP)
4. District Partnership Leadership (institutional level data)	surveys of superintendents and deans of education regarding quality of shared responsibility and shared accountability between district and educator preparation partners

Appendix H

COUNCIL FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF EDUCATOR PREPARATION (CAEP) STANDARDS
June 11, 2013

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards. Note: In Standard 1, the subjects of components are "candidates." The specific knowledge and skills described will develop over the course of the preparation program and may be assessed at any point, some near admission, others at key transitions such as entry to clinical experiences and still others near candidate exit as preparation is completed.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice
The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity
The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.

Standard 4: Program Impact
The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement
The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

GLOSSARY

All P-12 students: Defined as children or youth attending P-12 schools including, but not limited to, students with disabilities or exceptionalities, students who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and/or geographic origin.

Candidate: In this report, the term "candidate" refers to individuals preparing for professional education positions.

Clinical Educators: All EPP- and P-12-school-based individuals, including classroom teachers, who assess, support, and develop a candidate's knowledge, skills, or professional dispositions at some stage in the clinical experiences.

Completer: A term to embrace candidates exiting from degree programs and also candidates exiting from other higher education programs or preparation programs conducted by alternative providers that may or may not offer a certificate or degree.

Provider: Educator preparation provider (EPP) – An inclusive term referring to the sponsoring organization for preparation, whether it is an institution of higher education, a district- or state-sponsored program, or an alternative pathway organization.

Partner: Organizations, businesses, community groups, agencies, schools, districts, and/or EPPs specifically involved in designing, implementing, and assessing the clinical experience.

Partnership: Mutually beneficial agreement among various partners in which all participating members engage in and contribute to goals for the preparation of education professionals. This may include examples such as pipeline initiatives, Professional Development Schools, and partner networks.