

# IX.A.

## Connecticut State Board of Education Hartford

**To Be Proposed:  
September 6, 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 provisional approval to Mitchell College for the period September 6, 2023, to October 31, 2025, until Mitchell College's fall 2024 stipulation visit by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), for the purpose of certifying graduates from Mitchell College in the following area and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action:

<b><u>Program</u></b>	<b><u>Grades</u></b>	<b><u>Certification</u></b>	<b><u>Program Type</u></b>
Early Childhood	Nursery-Grade 3	Initial	Undergraduate

Approved by a vote of \_\_\_\_ this sixth day of September, 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:** September 6, 2023

**Subject:** Continuing Approval of Mitchell College Educator Preparation Programs

**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 fall 2022, Mitchell 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 Mitchell College based on the fall 2022 visit, including the Commissioner's recommendation for continuing approval.

**History/Background**

Mitchell College, founded in 1938, is a coeducational, residential institution of higher education that grants both associate and baccalaureate degrees. Serving mostly students from the greater New London, Connecticut, area, students also come to Mitchell from 24 other states, the District of Columbia, and four other countries. Current enrollment statistics show a student body consisting of 778 students, with 85 percent (661) of these students being of full-time status. Mitchell is currently accredited by the New England Association of School and Colleges (NEASC) and approved by the SBE to offer one educator preparation program at the baccalaureate, initial preparation level, which is the early childhood education (Nursery-Grade 3) certification (#113).

Mitchell College hosted its first CAEP accreditation visit during fall 2022. The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) received the CAEP Action Report pertaining to the fall 2022 accreditation visit on May 17, 2023. As indicated in the report, (action report) CAEP has granted Mitchell College accreditation with stipulations for initial programs for two years. Mitchell College received one stipulation and must demonstrate that all stipulations have been corrected within two years to continue accreditation. Stipulations describe serious deficiencies in meeting CAEP standards and must be brought into compliance. Additionally, thirteen areas for improvement (AFIs) were identified for initial programs. AFIs indicate areas which must be improved by the time of the next full 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. The chart below shows the AFIs and stipulations identified for Mitchell College.

Initial Programs:	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
STANDARD R1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	EPP provided limited evidence that candidates were able to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning at the appropriate progression levels. (component R1.1)	Key concepts related to the learner and development were insufficiently addressed in the rubrics and assessments.
	The EPP provided limited evidence that candidates can apply content knowledge and content specific pedagogy. (component R1.2)	There was inconsistent data disaggregation by cycle and/or program.
	The EPP provided limited evidence of candidates modeling and applying technology. (component R1.3)	Evidence provided was not fully aligned to technology standards.
	The EPP provided limited evidence to reflect how candidates demonstrated knowledge of professional responsibility. (component R1.4)	There was inconsistent data disaggregation by cycle and/or program.
STANDARD R2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	The EPP provided insufficient evidence that partners co-constructed mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation, including technology-based collaboration, and shared responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. (component R2.1)	Limited documentation was provided demonstrating collaboration with school partners that informs continuous improvement.
	The EPP provided limited evidence that partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, and support high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrated a positive impact on candidates' development and diverse P-12 student learning and development. (component R2.2)	The State of Connecticut requires that cooperating teachers be TEAM trained; however, there was minimal evidence regarding how clinical educators at the partner schools were prepared or evaluated on EPP assessments.
STANDARD R3: Candidate Quality and Selectivity	The EPP provided limited evidence of goals and progress for recruitment of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations that align with their mission and address local, state, regional, or national needs for	The EPP provided insufficient evidence of a systematic tracking process for gathering information about local, state, and regional needs.

	hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields. (component R3.1)	
	The EPP provided limited evidence of identified benchmarks or transition points to monitor candidate progression. (component R3.2)	Transition points were not clearly defined, measured and analyzed.
STANDARD R4: Satisfaction with Preparation	The EPP provided an insufficient Transition Plan to collect data on the EPP's completers' impact on student learning. (component R4.1)	The EPP presented an insufficient Transition Plan regarding the EPP's effort to determine the effectiveness of their completers.
	The EPP provided limited evidence that employers were satisfied with completer preparation. (component R4.2)	The EPP provided two cycles of data.
	The EPP provided limited evidence that completers were satisfied with their preparation. (component R4.3)	The EPP provided one cycle of data for a survey of completers, and the data presented were difficult to interpret.
STANDARD 5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement	The EPP provided limited evidence of internal and external stakeholder involvement in program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement process. (component R5.3)	Although internal and external stakeholders participate informally, there was limited evidence that stakeholders participate in program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement at a formal level.
	The EPP provided limited evidence of a regular and systematic review of its performance in order to inform modifications and innovations. (component R5.4)	Although the EPP had made changes based on informal discussions with stakeholders, the EPP did not regularly, systematically, and continuously track results over time and document those modifications.
	<b>Stipulations</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
	The EPP provided no evidence of a functioning Quality Assurance System. (component R5.1)	While the EPP provided data, the EPP did not have a functioning system nor document how data entered the system, how data were reported and used in decision making.

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 June 21, 2023, the CSDE Review Committee reviewed the CAEP action report and

recommended provisional approval for the period of September 6, 2023, through October 31, 2025.

**Recommendation and Justification**

I am recommending provisional approval for Mitchell College’s educator preparation programs at the initial level for the period September 6, 2023, through October 31, 2025, due to Mitchell College’s CAEP accreditation with stipulation status. Mitchell College will host a fall 2024 CAEP stipulation visit to conduct a review of the stipulations report and related evidence. The October 31, 2025, state approval deadline allows time for the CSDE to receive the final CAEP Action Report based on the fall 2024 stipulation visit and prepare a report for the SBE.

**Follow-up Activity**

If the SBE grants provisional approval for Mitchell College’s educator preparation programs, the Talent Office will immediately communicate Mitchell Colleges’ approval status with the university leadership. Mitchell College will submit to CAEP a stipulations report and evidence of steps taken by the EPP to address the stipulations and will host a fall 2024 stipulation visit. Additionally, the CSDE Review Committee will annually review the CAEP staff reports to monitor the remediation of Mitchell College’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
Vacant		Higher Education	
2. Catherine O'Callaghan	Western Connecticut State University <a href="mailto:ocallaghanc@wcsu.edu">ocallaghanc@wcsu.edu</a>	Higher Education	June 30, 2023
3. Julie Sochacki	University of Hartford <a href="mailto:SOCHACKI@hartford.edu">SOCHACKI@hartford.edu</a>	Higher Education	June 30, 2023
4. Mel Horton	Sacred Heart University <a href="mailto:hortonm3@sacredheart.edu">hortonm3@sacredheart.edu</a>	Higher Education	March 31, 2025
5. Joseph Bonillo	Waterford Public Schools <a href="mailto:jbonillo@waterfordschools.org">jbonillo@waterfordschools.org</a>	K-12	June 30, 2023
6. Thomas Danehy	Area Cooperative Educational Services <a href="mailto:TDanehy@aces.org">TDanehy@aces.org</a>	K-12	June 30, 2023
7. Vacant		K-12	
8. 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
9. 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
10. Camille Cooper	Yale Child Study Center <a href="mailto:Camille.cooper@yale.edu">Camille.cooper@yale.edu</a>	Community	March 31, 2025
11. Shannon Marimón	ReadyCT <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<sup>1</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Seven years to align with CAEP accreditation cycle

- (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.