

VII.B.

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 probationary approval to the Connecticut Office of Higher Education (OHE) Alternate Route to Certification Program (ARC) for the period September 6, 2023, through October 31, 2025, until OHE ARC's Fall 2024 probationary accreditation site review by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), for the purpose of certifying graduates from OHE ARC in the following areas and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action:

Program	Grade Level	Program Level
Business Education	7-12	Initial
Mathematics	7-12	Initial
English	7-12	Initial
Science:		
Biology	7-12	Initial
Chemistry	7-12	Initial
Earth Science	7-12	Initial
General Science	7-12	Initial
Physics	7-12	Initial
Music Education	PK-12	Initial
Family and Consumer Science	PK-12	Initial
Technology Education	PK-12	Initial
World Languages:		
Mandarin Chinese	7-12	Initial
French	7-12	Initial
German	7-12	Initial
Italian	7-12	Initial
Latin and Classical Humanities	7-12	Initial
Spanish	7-12	Initial
Portuguese	7-12	Initial
Russian	7-12	Initial
Other World Language	7-12	Initial
Elementary World Language		
Mandarin Chinese	K-6	Initial
French	K-6	Initial
German	K-6	Initial
Italian	K-6	Initial

Spanish	K-6	Initial
Portuguese	K-6	Initial
Russian	K-6	Initial
Other World Language	K-6	Initial

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 the Office of Higher Education Alternate Route to Certification 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, The Office of Higher Education (OHE) Alternate Route to Certification (ARC) 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 OHE ARC based on the fall 2022 visit, including the Commissioner's recommendation for continuing approval.

History/Background

The Connecticut Office of Higher Education (OHE) Alternate Route to Certification (ARC) program is a non-credit bearing educator preparation program approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) in November 1987 for the purpose of attracting and recruiting mid-career adults into the teaching profession. Administered by OHE, with direct oversight by the Executive Director of OHE, OHE ARC is charged specifically by state statute with bringing people possessing strong content knowledge and related professional experience into teaching, particularly for content areas deemed as shortage areas by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE). Additionally, OHE ARC is charged with assisting urban areas in recruiting and retaining teachers. OHE ARC is one of the oldest alternate route programs in the nation and, since its inception, has trained over 5,000 teachers.

OHE ARC offers an array of initial certification programs. The specific program areas leading to initial certification offered by OHE ARC are: elementary level K-6 world language; secondary level (7-12) English language arts, mathematics, business, science (biology, chemistry, earth science, general science, and physics), world languages (Mandarin Chinese, French, German, Italian, Latin and Classical Humanities, Spanish, Portuguese, Russian, and Other World Language); and, music, technology education, and family and consumer science, all PK-12.

OHE ARC hosted its first CAEP accreditation visit during fall 2022. The 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 OHE ARC Probationary Accreditation for initial programs for two years and they will be

required to host a probationary accreditation visit no later than fall 2024. Probationary Accreditation is granted for two years when an EPP does not meet one of the CAEP standards. Failure to submit a response to the stipulations within a two-year time frame results in automatic revocation. Failure to correct the condition leading to the stipulation within the specified two-year period results in revocation. OHE ARC did not meet Standard 4 satisfaction with preparation because no data was provided for completer effectiveness and satisfaction of employers and completers. OHE ARC received 4 stipulations and 6 areas for improvement (AFIs) as shown on the chart below. Stipulations describe serious deficiencies in meeting CAEP standards and/or components. 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.

Initial Programs:	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
STANDARD R2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	There was limited evidence that the EPP prepared and evaluated high-quality clinical educators, both provider and school-based. (component R2.2)	The EPP provided limited evidence, one cycle of data, that it evaluated both provider and school-based clinical educators and limited evidence that they utilized evaluation data for program improvement.
	There was limited evidence that the EPP designed and implemented clinical experiences, utilizing various modalities, of sufficient breadth and diversity to ensure candidates demonstrated their developing effectiveness and positive impact on diverse P-12 students' learning and development. (component R2.3)	The EPP provided limited documented evidence, beyond interviews, of ensuring clinical experiences for all candidates in different settings or with diverse P-12 student populations.
STANDARD R3: Candidate Quality and Selectivity	The EPP provided limited evidence for recruitment of candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations that align with their mission. (component R3.1)	The EPP provided limited evidence of goals and progress towards goals in purposeful recruitment of a diverse candidate pool.
STANDARD R4: Satisfaction with Preparation	Stipulations	Rationale
	The EPP did not monitor completer impact on student growth and application of professional skills. (component R3.1)	The EPP did not collect and analyze data on completer impact on student growth and application of professional skills nor provide a CAEP-sufficient Transition Plan.

	The EPP did not demonstrate the extent to which employers were satisfied with the preparation of EPP completers for their assigned responsibilities. (component R4.2)	The EPP had taken initial steps to assess employer satisfaction but has not yet fully implemented a CAEP- sufficient instrument or provided relevant data from other sources.
	The EPP did not demonstrate that program completers perceived their preparation as relevant and effective. (component R4.3)	The EPP provided no evidence that they systematically collect or analyze data on how completers employed in the field perceived the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.
STANDARD R5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement Advanced Programs:	Stipulations	Rationale
	The EPP provided no evidence that the Quality Assurance System relied on relevant and verifiable measures. Additionally, there was limited evidence that the measures are cumulative and actionable measures. (component R5.2)	The EPP did not provide evidence of validity or reliability of EPP-created assessments. Most instruments did not have cumulative data as only one, sometimes two, cycles of data were provided. In addition, the data were not actionable as the EPP provided limited analysis and did not disaggregate data by demographic factors, other than program areas.
	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
	The EPP provided limited evidence of a functioning Quality Assurance System. (component R5.1)	The EPP provided a graphic that illustrates its Quality Assurance System, but there was limited evidence that it was a sustainable system. The QAS had the capability of disaggregating data by licensure area/program, race/ethnicity, and other dimensions identified by the EPP, but the EPP did not disaggregate data other than by licensure area. There was limited input from external stakeholders, but the EPP did use the results of data collection to enhance program elements.
	The EPP provided evidence that they included internal stakeholders but provided no evidence of external stakeholders in program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes. (component R5.3)	The EPP had multiple internal stakeholders for the evaluation of the program, but no external stakeholders were involved in the program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement process.

	<p>The EPP provided limited evidence they regularly, systematically, and continuously assessed performance against its goals, tracked results over time, documented modifications and/or innovations and their effects. (component R5.4)</p>	<p>The EPP provided the Gen-4 Program Improvement Plan 2020-23 that outlined four goals, but the EPP provided limited evidence on their continuous improvement process, including how often the EPP met to discuss continuous improvement (1-cycle of the End of the Year/Professional Development Day) and specific actions the EPP had taken based on the information they had received.</p>
--	--	--

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

Recommendation and Justification

I am recommending probationary approval for OHE ARC’s educator preparation programs at the initial level for the period of September 6, 2023, through October 31, 2025, due to OHE ARC’s CAEP probationary accreditation granted for two years. OHE ARC will host a fall 2024 CAEP probation visit to review the standard that was unmet as well as the four stipulations. The October 31, 2025, state approval deadline allows time for the CSDE to receive the final CAEP Action Report based on the fall 2024 probation visit and prepare a report for the SBE.

Follow-up Activity

If the SBE grants probationary approval for OHE ARC’s educator preparation programs, the Talent Office will immediately communicate OHE ARC’s approval status with the Office of Higher Education leadership. Additionally, OHE ARC will host a CAEP probation visit fall 2024 and the CSDE Review Committee will review OHE ARC’s annual reports to monitor the remediation of OHE ARC’s Areas for Improvement until their probationary visit.

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**

Name	Affiliation	Representation	Term Ending
1. Megan Mackey	Central Connecticut State University mackey@ccsu.edu	Higher Education	March 31, 2025
Vacant		Higher Education	
2. Catherine O'Callaghan	Western Connecticut State University ocallaghanc@wcsu.edu	Higher Education	June 30, 2023
3. Julie Sochacki	University of Hartford SOCHACKI@hartford.edu	Higher Education	June 30, 2023
4. Mel Horton	Sacred Heart University hortonm3@sacredheart.edu	Higher Education	March 31, 2025
5. Joseph Bonillo	Waterford Public Schools jbonillo@waterfordschools.org	K-12	June 30, 2023
6. Thomas Danehy	Area Cooperative Educational Services TDanehy@aces.org	K-12	June 30, 2023
7. Vacant		K-12	
8. Kevin Walston	Danbury Public Schools walstk@danbury.k12.us 203.595.1404 (cell)	K-12	June 30, 2023
9. Paul Whyte	New Haven Public Schools PAUL.WHYTE@new-haven.k12.ct.us	K-12	June 30, 2023
10. Camille Cooper	Yale Child Study Center Camille.cooper@yale.edu	Community	March 31, 2025
11. Shannon Marimón	ReadyCT shannon.marimon@readyct.org	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 five¹ 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.

¹ 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 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.