

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford

TO BE PROPOSED:
November 2, 2016

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Education, pursuant to Section 10-145d-9(g)(3)(A) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, grants full program approval for the period November 2, 2016, through October 31, 2018, with an onsite visit no later than spring 2018, and continuous focused monitoring of the new program by the Connecticut State Department of Education, to the Relay Graduate School of Education, Alternate Route to Certification program, for the purpose of recommending candidates for the Connecticut temporary 90-day teaching certificate in the following endorsement areas:

Program	Grade Level	Program Level	Program Type
Elementary Education	K-6*	Initial	Alternate Route to Certification
Secondary Education:			
English	7-12	Initial	Alternate Route to Certification
Mathematics	7-12	Initial	Alternate Route to Certification
General Science	7-12	Initial	Alternate Route to Certification
Biology	7-12	Initial	Alternate Route to Certification
Chemistry	7-12	Initial	Alternate Route to Certification
Physics	7-12	Initial	Alternate Route to Certification

*Pursuant to Public Act 12-63, amended by Public Act 13-122 (Section 11), on or after July 1, 2017, an endorsement for elementary education will be issued for Grades 1–6 only to in-state graduates.

and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of _____ this second day of November, Two Thousand Sixteen.

Signed: _____
Dianna R. Wentzell, Secretary
State Board of Education

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Dr. Dianna R. Wentzell, Commissioner of Education

DATE: November 2, 2016

SUBJECT: Approval of New Educator Preparation Program: Relay Graduate School of Education Alternate Route to Certification Program

Executive Summary

Introduction

Relay Graduate School of Education (Relay/GSE) is a national, nonprofit institution of higher education that was initially granted a charter by the New York State Board of Regents in 2011. Since its inception, Relay/GSE has expanded to include preparation programs leading to initial teacher certification, master's degrees for teachers and teaching residents, fellowships for experienced principals, and a partnership with Coursera, a provider of online, open-enrollment courses through partnerships with universities and organizations. To date, Relay/GSE has received authorization to operate as an institution of higher education offering teacher licensure programs in Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Louisiana, New Jersey, New York, Tennessee, Texas, and Pennsylvania.

Relay/GSE is seeking approval in Connecticut to offer an alternate route to certification (ARC) program leading to recommendation for the Connecticut temporary 90-day teaching certificate in elementary education and the secondary areas of English language arts, mathematics, and science. If approved, the Relay/GSE ARC program will serve districts across the state. However, its primary focus will be partnerships with Connecticut high need and priority districts to recruit and train minority educators. Relay/GSE reports that they have identified 72 potential program candidates for a first cohort; 52 of whom self-identify as minorities.

All institutions or organizations proposing new educator preparation programs (EPPs) must seek official approval through the Connecticut State Board of Education (SBE). Each institution or organization is required to participate in a Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) evaluation process designed to guide and support new program proposal efforts. The proposal then moves forward to the CSDE Review Committee. The Review Committee is a 12-person, decision-making body that reviews all continuing approval and new program evaluation team findings and makes a recommendation to the Commissioner of Education regarding approval (Attachment A). This report presents a summary of the

Relay/GSE ARC program evaluation and review process and includes the Commissioner of Education’s recommendation.

History/Background

Relay/GSE submitted an initial proposal to the CSDE in February 2016. An evaluation team identified areas for improvement and was unanimous in its decision that the Relay/GSE proposal was not ready to move forward to the CSDE Review Committee. The CSDE new program evaluation process is an iterative process through which institutions and organizations receive targeted and comprehensive feedback regarding evaluation team findings and may submit revised proposals for continued evaluation. Following the initial review, Relay/GSE was immediately able to address some areas for concern identified by the evaluation team, while other areas for concern required program revisions and redesign. Relay/GSE has revised proposal materials three times since the initial evaluation process based on evaluation team feedback. The Relay/GSE proposal submission timeline is outlined below:

Relay/GSE Proposal Submissions	Review and Evaluation Outcome
1 st Proposal Submission: February 2016	Based on a review and evaluation process conducted in April 2016, an evaluation team identified critical areas for improvement and was unanimous in its decision that the Relay/GSE proposal was not ready to move forward to the CSDE Review Committee. An evaluation report, with targeted and comprehensive feedback regarding evaluation findings, was provided to Relay/GSE in May 2016.
2 nd Proposal Submission: June 2016	Based on a review and evaluation process conducted in July 2016, a CSDE evaluation team noted the progress Relay/GSE had made regarding program revisions based on the May 2016 evaluation report. However, the team was unanimous in its decision that the Relay/GSE proposal was not ready to move forward to the CSDE Review Committee due to continued areas of concern identified by the team. An evaluation report with targeted and comprehensive feedback regarding evaluation findings was provided to Relay/GSE in July 2016.
3 rd Proposal Submission: August 2016	Based on a review and evaluation process conducted in September 2016, a CSDE evaluation team noted significant and substantial program revisions based on the July 2016 evaluation report and recommended that the proposal move forward to the Review Committee. An evaluation report with feedback regarding some minor areas for improvement was provided to Relay/GSE in September 2016.
4 th Proposal Submission: October 2016	On October 10, 2016, Relay/GSE submitted revised proposal materials addressing team feedback from the September 2016 evaluation process.
CSDE Review Committee	On October 19, 2016, the CSDE Review Committee unanimously recommended full approval for the Relay/GSE ARC program for the period November 2, 2016, through October 31, 2018, with an onsite visit required no later than spring 2018.

The following is a summary of key areas for concern, including Relay/GSE's response to concerns:

- Area for Concern:
The Relay/GSE program modules lacked sufficient depth and breadth as required by content-specific national standards, Common Core of Teaching (CCT) standards, and other research-based practices and theoretical constructs that undergird professional teaching practice, resulting in a lack of clarity about what training content and what quality of training candidates would receive in the program. Program module revisions and expansion include candidate outcomes, academic literature, and required readings integral to the knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions described by national content standards, CCT standards, and other relevant, research-based practices and theoretical constructs that undergird the professional teaching practice. Additionally, fieldwork and clinical experiences that would allow candidates to develop, apply, and be evaluated on, pedagogical knowledge and skills described by national content and CCT standards had to be developed and sequenced appropriately throughout the program.
- Relay/GSE Response:
Relay/GSE revised program modules and fieldwork and clinical experience to better align with and include competencies described by national content and CCT standards to the satisfaction of the evaluation team.
- Area for Concern:
The Relay/GSE program modules lacked sufficient training regarding assessment literacy as described by national content and CCT standards. Modules indicated that the focus of assessment training was on student achievement data (test data) only and did not include training regarding the development and use of the range of classroom-based assessments.
- Relay/GSE Response:
Relay/GSE revised program modules to better align with and include competencies described by national content and CCT standards regarding candidate training related to assessment literacy to the satisfaction of the evaluation team.
- Area for Concern:
The original Relay/GSE ARC program design and structure did not meet statutory requirements. Based on Connecticut statutes, the Relay/GSE ARC has two design options:
 - Residency program. Program candidates must be employed full-time in a district and assigned as a teacher of record. Both Relay/GSE and the partner district would jointly request a Resident Educator Certificate as provided in C.G.S. 10-145m. Per statutory requirement, candidates must serve under the Resident Educator Certificate full-time while completing the program over one year.

- 90-Day Certificate. Candidates complete the program while working as a non-certified instructor for a school district and, upon completion of the program, may be recommended for a Temporary 90-Day Certificate, pursuant to C.G.S. 10-145b (c).
- Relay/GSE Response:
Relay/GSE revised its ARC program so that candidates may be recommended for a temporary 90-Day Certificate upon program completion. Once a candidate has successfully completed 90 days of teaching, he/she may apply for an initial educator certificate with the district's recommendation.
- Area for Concern:
The Relay/GSE proposal did not meet key, summative assessment requirements for measuring candidate content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Key content knowledge assessments (key assessments 1 and 2) were not accurately described (e.g., Praxis I/Core was identified as a content knowledge measure) or were omitted (e.g., Foundations of Reading test was not included as a state licensure requirement). Additionally, the required GPA transcript analysis process was not included in proposal materials. Regarding the four measures of pedagogical knowledge and skills (key assessments 3-6), candidate performance expectations described in Relay/GSE module assessments and scoring guides did not represent or include candidate performance expectations required by national content and CCT standards. Additionally, assessments provided were all formative assessments, with no summative measures, and consisted mostly of low level performance expectations.
- Relay/GSE Response:
Relay/GSE revised their assessment system to meet the 6 to 8 key, summative assessment requirements to the satisfaction of the evaluation team. For each content area—elementary education, English language arts, mathematics, and science—Relay/GSE developed generic assessments for measuring competencies described by national content and CCT standards that apply to pedagogical practice regardless of content area. Additionally, Relay/GSE developed key assessments for each content area for measuring unique, content-specific competencies described by national content standards.

On October 19, 2016, the CSDE Review Committee reviewed examples of revisions Relay/GSE made to program modules and assessments, along with the evaluation team report. Based on the team report and their review of proposal revisions, in accordance with Connecticut educator preparation regulations (Attachment B), the Review Committee recommended full approval for the Relay/GSE ARC program for the period November 2, 2016, through October 31, 2018, with an on-site visit required no later than spring 2018. Additionally, the Review Committee recommended that the CSDE conduct continuous focused monitoring of the Relay/GSE program to monitor the implementation of the new program.

Recommendation and Justification

I recommend that the Relay/GSE ARC program, in the areas of elementary education and the secondary areas of English language arts, mathematics, and science, be granted full approval for the period November 2, 2016, through October 31, 2018, with an on-site visit required no later than spring 2018. Additionally, I recommend that the CSDE conduct continuous focused monitoring of the Relay/GSE program to monitor the implementation of the new program.

Follow-up Activity

If granted full approval by the SBE for the period November 2, 2016, through October 31, 2018, the Relay/GSE ARC program will host a full, continuing approval visit during spring 2018. Additionally, the CSDE will conduct continuous focused monitoring of the Relay/GSE program until the on-site visit, including the review and evaluation of annual progress reports from Relay/GSE.

Prepared by: _____
Katie Toohey, Ph.D., Program Approval Coordinator
Bureau of Educator Standards and Certification

Reviewed by: _____
Shannon Marimón, Division Director
Bureau of Educator Effectiveness

Approved by: _____
Sarah J. Barzee, Ph.D., Chief Talent Officer
Talent Office

**CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Educator Preparation Program Approval Review Committee**

Educator Preparation Program Representatives	PK-12 Representatives	Community Member Representatives	CSDE Representatives
<p>1. Dr. Helen Abadiano Chair, Reading and Language Arts Department School of Education and Professional Studies Central Connecticut State University (9/2013-9/2016)</p> <p>2. Dr. Hari Koirala Chair, Department of Education School of Education and Professional Studies Eastern Connecticut State University (9/2013-9/2016)</p> <p>3. Dr. Patricia Mulcahy-Ernt Director, Graduate Programs, Literacy/English Education Director, Center for Excellence, Learning and Teaching University of Bridgeport (9/2013-9/2016)</p> <p>4. Retired – Needs to be Filled</p> <p>5. Retired – Needs to be Filled</p>	<p>1. Joseph Bonillo Educator, History/Social Studies Waterford High School Waterford Public Schools (9/2013-9/2016)</p> <p>2. Kenneth Di Pietro Superintendent Plainfield Public Schools (9/2013-9/2016)</p> <p>3. Dr. David Erwin Superintendent Berlin Public Schools (9/2013-9/2016)</p> <p>4. Dr. Erin McGurk Director, Educational Services Ellington Public Schools (9/2013-9/2016)</p> <p>5. Dr. Salvatore Menzo Superintendent Wallingford Public Schools (9/2013-9/2016)</p>	<p>1.A. Bates Lyons President Bates Lyons and Associates Torrington, CT (9/2013-9/2016)</p> <p>2. Retired – Needs to be Filled</p>	<p>Dr. Katie Toohey CSDE</p> <p>Shannon Marimón CSDE</p> <p>Dr. Noah Dion OHE</p>

**Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies for Educator Preparation Program Approval
Section 10-145d-9(g)**

Board Action

After reviewing the recommendation of the Review Committee, the Commissioner shall make one or more recommendations to the Board. Based on the Commissioner's recommendation, the Board shall take one of the following actions.

(1) For programs requesting continuing approval:

- (A) Grant full program approval for five years, or for a period of time to bring the program into alignment with the five year approval cycle. The Board may require that an interim report be submitted to the Department, on a date set by the Board, prior to the end of the approval period.
- (B) Grant provisional approval for a time period not to exceed three years, if substantial non-compliance with current standards is identified. The institution shall submit to the Review Committee, on a date set by the Board, a written report which addresses the professional education unit's progress in meeting the standards which were not fully met. The Board may require an on-site visit in addition to this report.
- (C) Grant probationary approval for a time period not to exceed three years, if significant and far-reaching non-compliance with current standards is identified. The institution shall submit to the Review Committee, on a date set by the Board, a written report which addresses the professional education unit's progress in meeting the standards which were not fully met. The Board shall require an on-site visit in addition to this report.
- (D) Deny approval.

(2) For new programs in institutions which have current approved programs:

- (A) Grant full program approval for a period of time to bring the new program into the five year approval cycle of all other programs offered by the institution. The Board may require that a written report be submitted to the Department, on a date set by the Board, prior to the end of the approval period.
- (B) Grant provisional approval for a time period not to exceed three years, if substantial non-compliance with current standards is identified. The institution shall submit to the Review Committee, on a date set by the Board, a written report which addresses the professional education unit's progress in meeting the standards which were not fully met. The Board may require an on-site visit in addition to this report.

- (C) Grant probationary approval not to exceed three years, if significant and far-reaching non-compliance with current standards is identified. The institution shall submit to the Review Committee, on a date set by the Board, a written report which addresses the professional education unit's progress in meeting the standards which were not fully met. The Board shall require an on-site visit in addition to this report.
- (D) Deny approval.

(3) For new programs starting in institutions without other approved programs:

- (A) Grant program approval for two years. The institution shall submit to the Review Committee, after two semesters of operation, a written report which addresses the professional education unit's progress in implementing the new program. The Board shall require an on-site visit in addition to this report.
- (B) Following the on-site visit after two years of operation, grant full program approval for three years. The Board may require that a written report be submitted to the Department, on a date set by the Board, prior to the end of the approval period.
- (C) Following the on-site visit after two years of operation, grant provisional approval for a time period not to exceed three years, if substantial non-compliance with current standards is identified. The institution shall submit to the Review Committee, on a date set by the Board, a written report which addresses the professional education unit's progress in meeting the standards which were not fully met. The Board may require an on-site visit in addition to this report.
- (D) Following the on-site visit after two years of operation, grant probationary approval for up to three years, if significant and far-reaching non-compliance with current standards is identified. The institution shall submit to the Review Committee, on a date set by the Board, a written report which addresses the professional education unit's progress in meeting the standards which were not fully met. The Board shall require an on-site visit in addition to this report.
- (E) Deny approval.