

IX.C.

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Hartford

TO BE PROPOSED:

May 1, 2019

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 approval for the period May 1, 2019, through April 30, 2026, to the Capitol Region Education Council (CREC) with annual progress monitoring conducted using program data from the Connecticut Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) Data Dashboard until CREC's Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) 2026 site visit, for the purpose of certifying graduates from CREC in the following certification area:

Program	Grade Level	Program Level	Program Type
Elementary Education	1-6	Initial	Alternate Route to Certification

and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of _____ this first day of May, Two Thousand Nineteen.

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, Interim Commissioner of Education

DATE: May 1, 2019

SUBJECT: Approval of New Educator Preparation Program: Capitol Region Education Council, Alternate Route to Certification Program in Elementary Education

Executive Summary

Introduction

Connecticut educator preparation providers (EPPs) and other organizations proposing new educator preparation programs must seek official approval through the Connecticut State Board of Education (SBE). EPPs are required to participate in a Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) evaluation process designed to guide and support new program proposals. The proposal then moves forward to the CSDE Review Committee (Attachment A), which makes recommendations to the Commissioner of Education regarding new program approval based on evaluation findings. This report presents a summary of evaluation findings for the Capitol Region Education Council (CREC) proposal for an alternate route to certification (ARC) program in elementary education, and includes the Commissioner of Education's recommendation for approval.

History/Background

CREC is one of six Regional Educational Service Centers (RESCs) established under Connecticut General Statute 10-66 a-n, which permits local boards of education to establish a RESC as a "public educational authority" for the purpose of "cooperative action to furnish programs and services." Since 1966, CREC has developed a wide array of cost-effective and high-quality programs and services to meet the educational needs of children and adults in Greater Hartford.

CREC is approved currently through the SBE to offer an ARC program for experienced educators leading to the special education (#165) endorsement. CREC is now seeking SBE approval to offer an ARC residency program for elementary education (endorsement #305) that will specifically focus on recruiting and training candidates of color from the greater Hartford area who hold a Bachelor of Science or Bachelor of Arts degree. Program candidates would serve as residents in CREC schools for a full year under the mentorship of master teachers and serve as the teacher of record the following year while receiving continued mentor support. Candidates would also take coursework during the summer before the residency academic year, during the residency training period (year 1), and during the summer following the residency training.

On January 23, 2019, CREC submitted to the CSDE for review a proposal for an ARC residency program for elementary education. The CSDE review and evaluation of new program proposals is an iterative process, designed to provide comprehensive but targeted feedback to the proposing institution based on evaluation findings to support further program development, if necessary, in these four areas:

- (1) design, scope and sequence, including coursework and fieldwork/clinical experiences;
- (2) candidate assessments, including data collection, analysis, and reporting methods;
- (3) faculty and instructor qualifications; and
- (4) resources to support training of program candidates and program viability.

An initial review of the proposal by the CSDE indicated program deficiencies that needed to be addressed before the proposal could move to an evaluation team for consideration. A second, revised proposal was submitted to the CSDE on February 15, 2019. This second proposal was reviewed by an evaluation team consisting of K-12 and educator preparation program provider (EPP) representation, all trained in accordance with the CSDE review and evaluation process. On March 20, 2019, the evaluation team met to discuss and finalize evaluation findings. Based on evaluation findings, the team unanimously recommended that the proposal move forward to the Review Committee (Attachment A) for consideration, pending addressing areas for improvement identified by the evaluation team. CREC addressed all areas for improvement, and during April 2019, the Review Committee recommended full approval for the CREC elementary education ARC program (Attachment B).

Recommendation and Justification

Based upon the recommendation of the CSDE Review Committee, I recommend that the CREC elementary education ARC program be granted full approval for the period May 1, 2019, through April 30, 2026, with annual progress monitoring conducted using program data from the Connecticut Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) Data Dashboard until CREC's Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) 2026 site visit (Attachment C).

Follow-up Activity

If granted full approval by the SBE, the director of CREC will be notified immediately so that the EPP may start recruiting for the summer 2019 cohort. Additionally, the CSDE will conduct annual progress monitoring of this new program using program data from the Connecticut EPP Data Dashboard.

Prepared by: Katie Moirs, Ph.D., Program Approval Coordinator, Bureau of Educator Effectiveness

Approved by: Christopher M. Todd, Bureau Chief, Talent Office

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

Name	Affiliation	Representation
1. Stephanie Storms	Fairfield University	Higher Education
2. Tamika La Salle	University of Connecticut	Higher Education
3. Catherine O'Callaghan	Western Connecticut State University	Higher Education
4. Julie Sochacki	University of Hartford	Higher Education
5. Megan Mackey	Central Connecticut State University	Higher Education
6. Joseph Bonillo	Waterford Public Schools	K-12
7. Thomas Danehy	Area Cooperative Educational Services	K-12
8. Ana Ortiz	Oxford Public Schools	K-12
9. Shuana Tucker	New Britain Public Schools	K-12
10. Evette Avila	Hartford Public Schools	K-12
11. Michael Livingston	Capitol Region Education Council	Community
12. Shannon Marimon	Connecticut Council for Education Reform	Community

**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.

**Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)
Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools,
Colleges and Departments of Education**

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.

Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.1 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

Provider Responsibilities:

1.2 Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice.

1.3 Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music – NASM).

1.4 Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).

1.5 Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.

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.

Partnerships for Clinical Preparation:

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.

Clinical Educators:

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use

multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.

Clinical Experiences:

2.3 The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.

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.

Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs:

3.1 The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America's P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement:

3.2 The provider meets CAEP minimum criteria or the state's minimum criteria for academic achievement, whichever are higher, and gathers disaggregated data on the enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year.

The CAEP minimum criteria are a grade point average of 3.0 and a group average performance on nationally normed assessments or substantially equivalent state-normed assessments of mathematical, reading and writing achievement in the top 50 percent of those assessed. An EPP may develop and use a valid and reliable substantially equivalent alternative assessment of academic achievement. The 50th percentile standard for writing will be implemented in 2021. Starting in academic year 2016-2017, the CAEP minimum criteria apply to the group average of enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year. The provider determines whether the CAEP minimum criteria will be measured (1) at admissions, OR (2) at some other time prior to candidate completion. In all cases, EPPs must demonstrate academic quality for the group average of each year's enrolled candidates. In addition, EPPs must continuously monitor disaggregated evidence of academic quality for each branch campus (if any), mode of delivery, and individual preparation programs, identifying differences, trends and patterns that should be

addressed under component 3.1, Plan for recruitment of diverse candidates who meet employment needs.

CAEP will work with states and providers to designate, and will periodically publish, appropriate “top 50 percent” proficiency scores on a range of nationally or state normed assessments and other substantially equivalent academic achievement measures, with advice from an expert panel.

Alternative arrangements for meeting the purposes of this component will be approved only under special circumstances and in collaboration with one or more states. The CAEP President will report to the Board and the public annually on actions taken under this provision.

Additional Selectivity Factors:

3.3 Educator preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

Selectivity During Preparation:

3.4 The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates’ advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates’ developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains.

Selection at Completion:

3.5 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development.

3.6 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies. CAEP monitors the development of measures that assess candidates’ success and revises standards in light of new results.

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.

Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development:

4.1 The provider documents, using multiple measures that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. Multiple measures shall include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student-growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the provider.

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness:

4.2 The provider demonstrates, through structured validated observation instruments and/or student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

Satisfaction of Employers:

4.3. The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.

Satisfaction of Completers:

4.4 The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.

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.

Quality and Strategic Evaluation:

5.1 The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards.

5.2 The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

5.3. The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

5.4. Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

5.5. The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.