

IX.A

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)(1)(A) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, grants full approval to the Advanced Alternate Route to Certification for Cross Endorsement in Special Education (AARC) program, administered by the Capitol Region Education Council (CREC), for the period November 2, 2016, through September 30, 2019, 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: Continuing Educator Preparation Program Approval: Advanced Alternate Route to Certification for Cross Endorsement in Special Education

Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION

The Advanced Alternate Route to Certification (AARC) program leading to a cross endorsement in comprehensive special education, administered by the Capitol Region Education Council (CREC), was placed on provisional approval by the State Board of Education (SBE) for the period September 3, 2014, through September 30, 2017, due to evaluation team findings during a spring 2014 continuing approval visit.

This report presents the Commissioner of Education's recommendation regarding continuing approval for the CREC AARC.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT/BACKGROUND

CREC is one of six regional educational service centers established under Connecticut General Statutes in 1966 for the purpose of developing and delivering programs to support education throughout Connecticut. In 2006, CREC was granted approval through the SBE to offer an alternate route to certification program leading to a cross endorsement in comprehensive special education (CREC AARC) for already licensed Connecticut educators. The CREC AARC is a 14-month program that combines classroom study, field-based experiences, and job-embedded training to prepare candidates around initial competencies required of special educators.

Section 10-145d-9(g)(3) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (Attachment A), stipulates a two-year approval period for institutions or organizations seeking first-time approval to operate as an educator preparation program. Consequently, CREC AARC was initially approved for the period March 1, 2007, through September 30, 2009, with a continuing approval visit scheduled for spring 2009.

In spring 2009, the CSDE conducted the mandated continuing approval review of CREC AARC. The visiting team evaluated the extent to which CREC AARC continued to meet National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards (Attachment B). Based on this visit, the SBE granted continuing approval for CREC AARC for a five-year period from September 30, 2009, to September 30, 2014.

In spring 2014, CREC AARC hosted its second mandated continuing approval visit. The visiting team determined that the program continued to meet NCATE standards 4, 5 and 6, but did not meet assessment requirements described under standards 1 and 2. Additionally, a critical Area for Improvement (AFI) was identified under standard 3 relating to assessment.

At a spring 2014 meeting of the CSDE Review Committee, an SBE-appointed committee that makes recommendations to the Commissioner of Education regarding approval of educator preparation programs (Attachment C), CREC AARC presented work they had completed to meet the requirements described by NCATE standards 1, 2 and 3, along with a timeline for implementing all new assessments, data collection, data analysis, and reporting.

The Review Committee recommended provisional approval for the period September 3, 2014, through September 30, 2017, with a report due to the Review Committee no later than spring 2017 detailing the required data analysis and reporting based on newly-created assessments.

In spring 2016, a report was submitted to the Review Committee including all required assessments, data analyses, and data reporting required under NCATE standards 1, 2 and 3. Based on the work accomplished to meet these standards, the Review Committee recommended that the program be granted full continuing approval.

RECOMMENDATION/JUSTIFICATION

Based on the work completed by the CREC AARC to meet NCATE standards 1, 2 and 3, and the recommendation of the CSDE Review Committee, I recommend that CREC AARC be granted full continuing approval for the period November 2, 2016, through September 30, 2019.

FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITY

If granted full continuing approval by the SBE, CREC AARC will host its next continuing approval visit during spring 2019.

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

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

(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 semester 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.

**National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
Professional Standards for the Accreditation of
Schools, Colleges and Departments of Education**

Standard 1 – Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

- Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates
- Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates
- Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates
- Student Learning for Teacher Candidates
- Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals
- Student Learning for Other School Professionals
- Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Standard 2 – Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

- Assessment System
- Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation
- Use of Data for Program Improvement

Standard 3 – Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

- Collaboration between Unit and School Partners
- Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
- Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions to Help All Students Learn.

Standard 4 – Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates and diverse students in P-12 schools.

- Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences
- Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty
- Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates
- Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

Standard 5 – Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

- Qualified Faculty
- Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching
- Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship
- Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service Collaboration
- Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance
- Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Standard 6 – Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

- Unit Leadership and Authority
- Unit Budget
- Personnel
- Unit Facilities

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

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>1. Dr. Helen Abadiano Chair, Reading and Language Arts Department School of Education and Professional Studies Central Connecticut State University (9/2013 to 9/2016)</p> <p>2. Dr. Hari Koirala Chair, Department of Education School of Education and Professional Studies Eastern Connecticut State University (9/2013 to 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 to 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 to 9/2016)</p> <p>2. Kenneth Di Pietro Superintendent Plainfield Public Schools (9/2013 to 9/2016)</p> <p>3. Dr. David Erwin Superintendent Berlin Public Schools (9/2013 to 9/2016)</p> <p>4. Dr. Erin McGurk Director, Educational Services Ellington Public Schools (9/2013 to 9/2016)</p> <p>5. Dr. Salvatore Menzo Superintendent Wallingford Public Schools (9/2013 to 9/2016)</p> | <p>1. A. Bates Lyons President Bates Lyons & Associates Torrington, CT (9/01/2013 to 8/31/2016)</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> |
|--|--|--|--|