

IX.B.

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Hartford

TO BE PROPOSED:
March 6, 2019

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Education, pursuant to Section 10-145d-9(f)(1) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, appoints the following individuals to serve on the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) Review Committee for the Approval of Connecticut Educator Preparation Programs from March 6, 2019, through March 2, 2022:

Name	Affiliation	Representation	Term Ending
Megan Mackey	Central Connecticut State University	Higher Education	3/02/2022
Stephanie Storms	Fairfield University	Higher Education	3/02/2022
Michael Livingston	Capitol Region Education Council	Community	3/02/2022
Shannon Marimón	Connecticut Council for Education Reform	Community	3/02/2022

and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of _____ this sixth day of March, Two Thousand Nineteen.

Signed: _____
Dr. 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: March 6, 2019

SUBJECT: Appointments to Educator Preparation Program Review Committee

Executive Summary

Introduction

This report presents for State Board of Education (SBE) consideration four nominees for the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) Review Committee for seats now vacant due to term expirations on January 3, 2019.

History/Background

In accordance with Section 10-145d-9(a) of the Regulations for Educator Preparation Program Approval (Attachment A), the SBE must approve all educator preparation provider (EPP) programs leading to Connecticut educator certification, initially and on a continuing basis thereafter. Additionally, Connecticut regulations require that a CSDE Review Committee consider program evaluation findings and make recommendations to the Commissioner of Education regarding new and continuing program approval.

Review Committee members are appointed by the SBE to serve a three-year term. Due to the significant role of the Review Committee in the educator preparation program approval process, members are selected based on specific criteria:

- committee members must be individuals who are capable of critical but fair and unbiased judgment relative to program approval issues;
- committee members must reflect the ethnic and geographic (urban, suburban and rural) diversity of Connecticut schools and students;
- K-12 committee members must be currently employed as educators in Connecticut public schools and have demonstrated leadership abilities and experience;
- higher education committee members must be currently serving as full-time faculty members in Connecticut educator preparation programs and represent both public and private institutions in Connecticut; and
- community committee members must be familiar with Connecticut education issues and have an expressed interest in serving the Connecticut educational community.

Recommendation and Justification

I recommend that the following four individuals be named to the CSDE Review Committee for the three-year term, March 6, 2019, through March 2, 2022:

Name	Affiliation	Representation	Term Ending
Megan Mackey	Central Connecticut State University	Higher Education	3/02/2022
Stephanie Storms	Fairfield University	Higher Education	3/02/2022
Shannon Marimón	Connecticut Council for Education Reform	Community	3/02/2022
Michael Livingston	Capitol Region Education Council	Community	3/02/2022

The CSDE is very pleased to put forth the nomination of these outstanding professionals. All four have impressive credentials and will bring to the Review Committee unparalleled experience and expertise, as well as contribute to the ethnic and geographic diversity of the committee. Copies of each nominee's full resume or curriculum vitae are attached (Attachments B-E).

Follow-up Activity

If the Board of Education approves these appointments, they will begin their three-year term on March 6, 2019, and serve through March 2, 2022. Prior to the spring 2019 Review Committee meeting, the new members will be required to participate in a training session to orient them to committee work and procedures.

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

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

**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.