

III. C.

**CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford**

TO BE PROPOSED:

September 2, 2015

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 the Area Cooperative Educational Services (ACES), Alternate Route to Certification for Teachers of English Language Learners Program (ARCTELL), for the period September 30, 2015, through September 30, 2020, for the purpose of certifying graduates from ARCTELL, and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of _____ this second day of September, Two Thousand Fifteen.

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: September 2, 2015

SUBJECT: Continuing Approval of the Area Cooperative Educational Services, Alternate Route to Certification for Teachers of English Language Learners Program

Executive Summary

Introduction

Connecticut statutes require State Board of Education (SBE) approval of all educator preparation programs leading to Connecticut educator certification. Once approved, programs are required to seek continuing approval every five years based on an on-site visiting team process conducted by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE). Visiting teams consist of Connecticut educators trained in the CSDE visit process.

Although not required by Connecticut, programs may also voluntarily seek national accreditation through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), in addition to continuing program approval through the SBE. If a program is seeking both continuing state program approval and NCATE accreditation, the visit is a joint visit, conducted by NCATE and the CSDE in accordance with the NCATE/Connecticut State Partnership Agreement, with the visiting team consisting of both national and state team members.

Both state program approval and NCATE accreditation require that programs meet the six performance-based NCATE standards (Attachment A), along with Connecticut certification and educator preparation regulations.

Currently approved by the SBE only, the Area Cooperative Educational Services (ACES), Alternate Route to Certification for Teachers of English Language Learners Program (ARCTELL) hosted its mandated state continuing approval visit in spring 2015. This report presents a summary of visiting team findings for the spring 2015 visit, including the Commissioner of Education's recommendation regarding continuing program approval for ARCTELL.

History/Background

ACES is one of six Regional Educational Service Centers (RES-C) established under the Connecticut General Statutes in 1966 for the purpose of developing and delivering educational programs and services to support education in the south central region of Connecticut. ACES serves 25 school districts and meets the educational needs of member districts by acting as both a local education agency (LEA) and as a regional service agency. As an LEA, ACES operates four

special education and four interdistrict magnet schools, all designed to meet the specific needs of the region. As a regional service agency, ACES develops direct services for children, youth and adult, develops and provides professional development and support services to their region, and develops and provides technological, administrative, human resource, and fiscal services necessary to help area agencies meet program goals and objectives. Revenue sources include tuition and fees for services from LEAs, state and federal funds, and private sources, including grant monies and fees for services.

ARCTELL was created as a response to the severe shortage of qualified, certified teachers in TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) and bilingual education in Connecticut. ARCTELL provides an opportunity for selected educators who possess a Connecticut teaching certificate and have teaching experience to acquire the proficiencies necessary to meet state and national standards and Connecticut certification requirements to add the TESOL and bilingual education endorsements to their current Connecticut teaching certification. Across three program phases, candidates participate in 150 hours of classroom instruction, 20 hours of independent professional learning, 130 hours of practicum experiences, and 15 hours of job-embedded assignments.

The SBE initially approved ARCTELL in 2007 for the period September 5, 2007, through September 1, 2010, with a continuing approval visit scheduled for spring 2010. However, although TESOL and bilingual education are consistently designated as shortage areas in Connecticut, ARCTELL was not able to attract a sufficient number of applicants for the program to run until 2012, when it had its first viable cohort. Consequently, the CSDE did not conduct the scheduled on-site, continuing approval visit during spring 2010; rather, during a September 2010 meeting, the SBE granted ARCTELL another five-year approval cycle for the period September 1, 2010, through September 30, 2015.

Since the first 2012 cohort, subsequent cohorts consisting of 15 candidates or more have been administered annually, including district-specific cohorts for Windham Public Schools and Hartford Public Schools. Consequently, the CSDE conducted the mandated, continuing approval visit on May 11, 2015, in accordance with the CSDE on-site visit protocol. The state visiting team determined that ARCTELL is meeting the six NCATE standards with no Areas for Improvement (AFIs) identified:

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
Visiting Team Decision: Met

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
Visiting Team Decision: Met

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
Visiting Team Decision: Met

Standard 4: Diversity
Visiting Team Decision: Met

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
Visiting Team Decision: Met

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources
Visiting Team Decision: Met

Once visits are completed, the CSDE Review Committee (Attachment B) meets to review visiting team findings and make recommendations to the Commissioner of Education relative to continuing approval of preparation programs based upon Connecticut educator preparation program approval regulations (Attachment C). Based upon visiting team findings, the Review Committee met on June 26, 2015, and recommended full continuing approval for ARCTELL for the period September 30, 2015, through September 30, 2020.

Recommendation and Justification

Based upon visiting team findings and the recommendation of the CSDE Program Review Committee, I recommend that ARCTELL be granted full continuing approval for the period September 30, 2015, through September 30, 2020.

Follow-up Activity

If granted full continuing approval by the SBE for a five-year period, ARCTELL will host its next state visit during spring 2020.

Prepared by: _____
Katie Toohey, Ph.D., Program Approval Coordinator
Bureau of Educator Effectiveness and Professional Learning

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

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

Attachment A

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 applicant qualifications, 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
- Unit Resources Including Technology

**CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Educator Preparation Program Approval Review Committee, 2013-2016**

HIGHER EDUCATION REPRESENTATION	K-12 REPRESENTATION	COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION	CSDE/OHE REPRESENTATION (non-voting members)
Dr. Helen Abadiano Chair, Reading and Language Arts Department School of Education and Professional Studies Central Connecticut State University 9/2013-9/2016	Joseph Bonillo Educator, History/Social Studies Clark Lane Middle School Waterford Public Schools 9/2013-9/2016		
Dr. Maureen Fitzpatrick Assistant Professor, Educational Leadership Isabelle Farrington College of Education Sacred Heart State University 9/2013-9/2016	Kenneth DiPietro Superintendent Plainfield Public Schools 9/2013-9/2016		
Dr. Hari Koirala Chair, Department of Education School of Education and Professional Studies Eastern Connecticut State University 9/2013-9/2016	Dr. David Erwin Superintendent Berlin Public Schools 9/2013-9/2016		
Dr. Patricia Mulcahy-Ernt Director, Graduate Programs, Literacy/English Education Director, Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching University of Bridgeport 9/2013-9/2016	Dr. Erin McGurk Director, Education Services Ellington Public Schools 9/2013-9/2016		
Dr. Nancy Niemi Chair, Department of Education University of New Haven 9/2013-9/2016	Dr. Salvatore Menzo Superintendent Wallingford Public Schools 9/2013-9/2016		

**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.