

# IX.B.

## Connecticut State Board of Education Hartford

**To Be Proposed:  
February 1, 2023**

**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 continuing approval to Albertus Magnus College for the period February 1, 2023, through March 31, 2030, until Albertus Magnus College's 2029 CAEP site visit, for the purpose of certifying graduates from Albertus Magnus College in the following areas and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

<u>Program</u>	<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Program Level</u>	<u>Program Type</u>
Secondary Areas:			
Business	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate
English	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate
History and Social Studies	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate
Mathematics	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate
Biology	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate
Chemistry	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate
General Science	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate
Spanish	7-12	Initial	Undergraduate
Middle Level Areas:			
English	4-8	Initial	Undergraduate
History and Social Studies	4-8	Initial	Undergraduate
Mathematics	4-8	Initial	Undergraduate
General Science	4-8	Initial	Undergraduate
Art	PK-12	Initial	Undergraduate
Alternate Route to Certification:			
Remedial Reading/ Remedial Language Arts	1-12	Advanced	Non-Credit Bearing

Approved by a vote of \_\_\_ this first day of February, Two Thousand Twenty-Three.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Charlene M. Russell-Tucker, Secretary  
State Board of Education

**Connecticut State Board of Education  
Hartford**

**TO:** State Board of Education

**FROM:** Charlene M. Russell-Tucker, Commissioner of Education

**DATE:** February 1, 2023

**SUBJECT:** Continuing Educator Preparation Provider Program Approval: Albertus Magnus College

**Executive Summary**

**Introduction**

Per Connecticut legislation (Special Act No. 16-22) and State Board of Education (SBE) policy, all Connecticut educator preparation providers (EPPs) must become a Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) partner and become nationally accredited through CAEP. Additionally, per the SBE as of October 2021, Connecticut uses accreditation decisions based on CAEP accreditation visits to determine state continuing approval status for Connecticut EPPs. During spring 2022, Albertus Magnus College hosted its first CAEP visit to determine continuing national accreditation and state program approval. This report provides a summary of accreditation findings and the CAEP accreditation decision for Albertus Magnus College's visit.

**History/Background**

Albertus Magnus College (AMC), founded in 1925 by the Dominican Sisters of St. Mary of the Springs (now known as the Dominican Sisters of Peace), is a four-year, private, liberal arts, coeducational, degree-granting college offering more than 50 undergraduate majors, minors and concentrations with preprofessional preparation and six graduate programs in art therapy, education, liberal studies, leadership, and business and management. The AMC student body consists of approximately 600 full-time traditional (day) undergraduates and approximately 800 continuing education and graduate students. AMC has 150 full- and part-time faculty members with a primary focus on teaching, with more than 80 percent holding a Ph.D. or a terminal degree. The AMC student/faculty ratio is roughly 14:1.

The AMC Education unit offers 13 different undergraduate preparation programs leading to Connecticut initial educator licensure in seven different content areas. Secondary preparation programs (Grades 7-12) include business, English Language Arts, history/social studies, mathematics, science (biology, chemistry, general), and world languages (Spanish). Middle level preparation programs (4-8) include English Language Arts, general science, history/social studies, mathematics and world languages (Spanish). The unit offers one PK-12 preparation program in art. In addition to initial preparation programs, the unit offers an advanced certification alternate route program for educators wishing to become certified as remedial reading/remedial language arts teachers and a Master of Science in Education Program.

Albertus Magnus College, hosted its first CAEP accreditation visit during spring 2022. The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) received the CAEP Action Report [Action Report](#) pertaining to the spring 2022 accreditation visit on November 19, 2022. As indicated in the report, CAEP has granted Albertus Magnus College accreditation for both initial and advanced programs for seven years, in

alignment with the CAEP accreditation visit cycle. Additionally, seven areas for improvement (AFIs) were identified for initial certification programs and five areas for improvement (AFIs) were identified for the advanced programs. AFIs indicate areas which must be improved by the time of the next CAEP accreditation visit, with progress reporting relative to remediation of AFIs included as part of the annual reports that EPPs are required to submit to CAEP. Accreditation for seven years is granted if the EPP meets all CAEP Standards and components, even if AFIs are identified in the CAEP Action Report based on the accreditation visit. The chart below shows the AFIs identified for Albertus Magnus College for initial and advanced programs:

Initial Programs:	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
STANDARD 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	The EPP provided an insufficient transition plan for ensuring candidates are able to apply knowledge of the learner and learning at progression levels. (component R1.1)	There were limited details about the core components describing the relationship of the component, timeline, resources, and data quality so that analyses can be conducted along with interpreting trends for program improvement.
	There was limited evidence that candidates understand and can apply InTASC standards 7 and 8 to plan instruction in culturally responsive ways and utilize a variety of instructional strategies, in particular technology. (component R1.3)	The technology assessment did not meet CAEP sufficiency respective to item descriptions and rating scale. A transition plan was not provided to outline how systematic triangulation of data will indicate candidates are able to apply knowledge of diversity and equity in instructional practice and technology for enhancement of P-12 learning.
STANDARD 3: Candidate Recruitment, Progression and Support	The EPP's recruitment plan did not contain a sufficient plan to increase the diversity of the candidate pool or a description of the personnel or resources available to fill any gaps. (component R3.1)	Evidence submitted for component R3.1 was insufficient as the evidence provided focused on examples of recruitment activities and initiatives instead of a well-developed, mission-aligned plan with specific measures and a plan for progress monitoring.
	Evidence submitted indicated the EPP had not yet identified a transition point in the program when a cohort grade point average of 3.0 was achieved and monitored. (component R3.2)	Evidence submitted for component R3.2 was insufficient as the EPP completed a transition plan which is not allowed for this component.
STANDARD R4: Program Impact	The EPP provided limited data to demonstrate completer effectiveness. (component R4.1)	A sufficient transition plan was provided but not an accompanying cycle of data.
	The EPP provided limited data to demonstrate employer satisfaction. (component R4.2)	EPP provided some data on employer satisfaction of completer preparation. The EPP provided a transition plan to conduct employer focus group interviews.

<p><b>STANDARD 5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement</b></p>	<p>The EPP's data collection system provided limited evidence that indicates the data system was used consistently and includes procedures to share information. (component R5.1)</p>	<p>There was a lack of evidence in the reports or during interviews to demonstrate regularly occurring data discussions or retreats internally or across departments.</p>
<p><b>Advanced Programs:</b></p>	<p><b>Areas for Improvement</b></p>	<p><b>Rationale</b></p>
<p><b>STANDARD A1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge</b></p>	<p>The phase-in plan submitted for validating EPP-created assessments did not meet CAEP sufficiency criteria (component A1.1)</p>	<p>The A1.1 phase-in plan relied on a data quality plan using the undergraduate program and was not synergistic with the professional expectations of an advanced program. The plan submitted had limited discussion about how data quality will meet CAEP sufficiency criteria for how the EPP will assure data collection.</p>
<p><b>STANDARD A.3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity</b></p>	<p>The EPP's recruitment plan did not contain a sufficient plan to increase the diversity of the candidate pool or a description of the personnel or resources available to fill any gaps. (component A3.1)</p>	<p>Evidence submitted for component A3.1 was insufficient as the Phase-in plan did not meet CAEP criteria. Evidence provided focused on examples of recruitment activities and initiatives instead of a well-developed, mission-aligned plan with specific measures and a plan for progress monitoring.</p>
	<p>Evidence was not sufficient to demonstrate that at completion, candidates have reached a high standard for content knowledge in the field of specialization, data literacy and research-driven decision making, effective use of collaborative skills, applications of technology, and applications of dispositions, laws, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate for the field of specialization. (component A3.4)</p>	<p>Evidence submitted for A3.4 was insufficient as the EPP-created key assessments do not meet the CAEP Criteria for Evaluation of EPP-Created Assessments as they were missing CAEP alignment as well as reliability and validity information. A separate phase-in plan was not submitted and information in the artifacts does not meet the CAEP sufficiency criterial for Advanced-Level Preparation Phase-In.</p>
<p><b>STANDARD A.5: Program Impact</b></p>	<p>The EPP provided a plan to demonstrate employer satisfaction that did not sufficiently meet the CAEP criteria for a transition plan. (component A4.1)</p>	<p>The EPP provided a phase-in plan to collect employer satisfaction data that did not meet CAEP sufficiency criteria for a plan. Specifically components related to data quality.</p>
	<p>The EPP provided a plan to demonstrate completer satisfaction that did not</p>	<p>The EPP provided a phase-in plan to collect satisfaction data that did not meet the CAEP</p>

	sufficiently meet the CAEP criteria for a transition plan. (component A4.2)	sufficiency criteria for a plan, specifically components related to data quality.
--	---	---

Once CAEP Action Reports are received, the CSDE Review Committee (Attachment A) meets to review the report and makes a recommendation to the Commissioner of Education relative to continuing approval of preparation programs based upon Connecticut educator preparation program approval regulations (Attachment B). On December 9, 2022, the CSDE Review Committee reviewed the CAEP action report and recommended full continuing approval for the period of February 1, 2023, through March 31, 2030, with annual progress monitoring regarding the remediation of AFIs through the review of CAEP annual staff reports.

**RECOMMENDATION/JUSTIFICATION**

I am recommending full continuing approval for Albertus Magnus College’s educator preparation programs at the initial and advanced level for the period February 1, 2023, through March 31, 2030. Based on the CAEP seven year visit cycle, AMC’s next CAEP accreditation visit is scheduled for spring 2029. The March 31, 2030, state approval deadline allows time for the CSDE to receive the final CAEP Action Report based on the spring 2029 visit and prepare a report for the SBE.

**Follow-up Activity**

If the SBE grants full approval for Albertus Magnus College’s educator preparation programs, the Talent Office will immediately communicate AMC’s approval status with the college’s leadership. Additionally, the CSDE Review Committee will annually review the CAEP staff reports to monitor the remediation of AMC’s areas for improvement.

Prepared by: Lauren Tafrate, EPP Program Approval Coordinator, Talent Office

Approved by: Shuana K. Tucker, Ph.D., Chief Talent Officer

**Connecticut State Department of Education  
Educator Preparation Program Approval Review Committee**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Representation</b>	<b>Term Ending</b>
1. Megan Mackey	Central Connecticut State University <a href="mailto:mackey@ccsu.edu">mackey@ccsu.edu</a>	Higher Education	March 31, 2025
2. Tamika La Salle	University of Connecticut <a href="mailto:tamika.la_salle@uconn.edu">tamika.la_salle@uconn.edu</a>	Higher Education	June 30, 2023
3. Catherine O'Callaghan	Western Connecticut State University <a href="mailto:ocallaghanc@wcsu.edu">ocallaghanc@wcsu.edu</a>	Higher Education	June 30, 2023
4. Julie Sochacki	University of Hartford <a href="mailto:SOCHACKI@hartford.edu">SOCHACKI@hartford.edu</a>	Higher Education	June 30, 2023
5. Mel Horton	Sacred Heart University <a href="mailto:hortonm3@sacredheart.edu">hortonm3@sacredheart.edu</a>	Higher Education	March 31, 2025
6. Joseph Bonillo	Waterford Public Schools <a href="mailto:jbonillo@waterfordschools.org">jbonillo@waterfordschools.org</a>	K-12	June 30, 2023
7. Thomas Danehy	Area Cooperative Educational Services <a href="mailto:TDanehy@aces.org">TDanehy@aces.org</a>	K-12	June 30, 2023
8. Sinthia Sone-Moyano	Manchester Public Schools <a href="mailto:sinthias@mpspride.org">sinthias@mpspride.org</a> 860-647-3451	K-12	June 30, 2023
9. Kevin Walston	Danbury Public Schools <a href="mailto:walstk@danbury.k12.us">walstk@danbury.k12.us</a> 203.595.1404 (cell)	K-12	June 30, 2023
10. Paul Whyte	New Haven Public Schools <a href="mailto:PAUL.WHYTE@new-haven.k12.ct.us">PAUL.WHYTE@new-haven.k12.ct.us</a>	K-12	June 30, 2023
11. Camille Cooper	Yale Child Study Center <a href="mailto:Camille.cooper@yale.edu">Camille.cooper@yale.edu</a>	Community	March 31, 2025
12. Shannon Marimón	Connecticut Council for Education Reform <a href="mailto:shannon.marimon@readyct.org">shannon.marimon@readyct.org</a>	Community	March 31, 2025

**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 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.