

Agenda Book
EPSB Meeting Agenda
EPSB Offices
100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Conference Room A, Frankfort, KY 40601
January 7, 2013

Monday, January 7, 2013

9:00 AM EST **Call to Order**

Roll Call

Open Speak

Approval of Consent Items

- A. Approval of October 15, 2012 EPSB Minutes (**Pages 1-12**)
- B. Approval of November 12, 2012 EPSB Minutes (**Pages 13-14**)
- C. Approval of December 4, 2012 EPSB Minutes (**Pages 15-16**)
- D. Supervisor of Instruction, Asbury University (**Pages 17-20**)
(Ms. Allison Bell)
- E. Environmental Education P-12 Endorsement, Georgetown College (**Pages 21-24**) (Ms. Bell)
- F. Biological Science, Grades 8-12; Chemistry, Grades 8-12; English, Grades 8-12; Mathematics, Grades 8-12; Social Studies, Grades 8-12 (Bachelor's Level), Spalding University (**Pages 25-28**) (Ms. Bell)
- G. Remedial Diversity Training Approval, Jefferson County Teachers Association (**Pages 29-30**) (Ms. Alicia Sneed)

Report of the Acting Executive Director

- A. Report from the Kentucky Department of Education
- B. Report from the Council on Postsecondary Education
- C. Local Educator Assignment Data (LEAD) Report
(Mr. Mike Carr)

Report of the Chair

Appointments

Committee to Ensure an Ethical Educator Workforce

Committee Reports

Board Retreat Committee

Presentation

University of Louisville/JB Atkinson Clinical Experience Model

Information/Discussion Item

Mid-Year Budget Report (**Pages 31-32**) (Mr. Gary Freeland)

Agenda Book

Action Items

- A. Charter for the Committee to Ensure an Ethical Educator Workforce (**Pages 33-36**) (Ms. Sneed)
- B. Thomas More College Accreditation (**Pages 37-48**) (Ms. Bell)
- C. Midway College Accreditation (**Pages 49-52**) (Ms. Bell)
- D. Kentucky Christian University Accreditation (**Pages 53-58**) (Ms. Bell)
- E. Berea College Accreditation (**Pages 59-64**) (Ms. Bell)

Board Comments

Following a motion in open session, it is anticipated that the board will move into closed session as provided by KRS 61.810 (1) (c) and (1) (j).

Certification Review and Revocation: Pending Litigation Review

Following review of pending litigation, the board shall move into open session. All decisions will be made in open session.

Adjournment

Next Regular Meeting:
March 4, 2013
EPSB Offices

Agenda Book

The actions delineated below were taken in open session of the EPSB at the October 15, 2012, meeting. This information is provided in summary form; an official record of the meeting is available in the permanent records of the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB), 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Frankfort, KY 40601

**Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB)
Summary Minutes of the Regular Business Meeting
EPSB Offices, 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor
Frankfort, Kentucky
October 15, 2012**

Consent Item A

Call to Order

Chair Cassandra Webb called the meeting to order at approximately 9:00 a.m. EST.

Roll Call

The following Board members were present during the October 15, 2012, EPSB meeting: Brandy Beardsley, Bradley Bielski, Barbara Boyd, Ellen Blevins, Cathy Gunn, Allen Kennedy, Marie McMillen, Michael Ross, Sandy Sinclair-Curry, Zenaida Smith, Anthony Strong, Tom Stull, Mark Wasicsko, and Cassandra Webb. John DeAtley and Terry Holliday were absent.

Open Speak

There were no requests for Open Speak.

Approval of Consent Items

Chair Cassandra Webb requested that Board members identify any items on the consent agenda which they wished to discuss prior to taking final action. No items were identified.

2012- 043

Motion made by Dr. Bradley Bielski, seconded by Ms. Marie McMillen, to approve the following items on the consent agenda:

Approval of September 17, 2012 EPSB Minutes

Title II Report

Approval of Contract

Vote: *Unanimous*

Report of the Acting Executive Director

Report from the Kentucky Department of Education

The Kentucky Department of Education submitted a written report that was placed in Board members' folders.

Report from the Council on Postsecondary Education

There was no report from the Council on Postsecondary Education.

Agenda Book

New Staff Member Introduction

Dr. Kim Walters-Parker introduced the EPSB's newest staff member, Lauren Graves. Lauren replaces Anthony Campbell as the EPSB's education program consultant in the Division of Educator Preparation.

Report of the Chair

Recognition of Former Board Chair

Chair Webb recognized Dr. Cathy Gunn for her wonderful job as Board chair.

Call for Special Meeting

Chair Webb called a special meeting for Monday, November 12, at 8:30a.m. at the EPSB offices for the purpose of interviewing candidates for the executive director position.

Spring Retreat

Chair Webb formed a spring retreat committee and asked Anthony Strong to serve as chair. Mark Wasicsko and Mike Ross volunteered to serve on the committee. Chair Webb stated the purpose of this retreat will be to review the Board's vision, mission, and work with the new executive director.

Appointments

Reappointments to the Accreditation Audit Committee

Chair Cassandra Webb reappointed the following members to the Accreditation Audit Committee: Susan Compton, Jack Rose, Judi Conrad, Joy Gray, and Zella Wells.

Appointment to the Teachers for Exceptional Children Committee

Chair Webb appointed Kennedy Turner to the Teachers for Exceptional Children Committee.

Reappointment to the Kentucky Advisory Council for Internships

Chair Webb reappointed Meghan Purcell to the Kentucky Advisory Council on Internships.

Committee Reports

Executive Director Search Committee

Executive Director Search Committee chair, Cathy Gunn, announced the Board approved four candidates to interview on November 12. These four candidates are Sheila Wright, Verna Lowe, Jill Ratliff, and Robert Brown. Chair Gunn stated the Board plans to deliberate the afternoon of the interviews and hopes to make an offer to be accepted by all parties the following week. The Board would like the new executive director to have a January start date, but understands that personnel timelines may not make that possible.

Update from the Program and Accreditation Review Committee (PARC)

Dr. Walters-Parker introduced Dr. Manish Sharma, Thomas More College, and Dr. Margaret Moore, Eastern Kentucky University, who serve on PARC and came to give an update to the Board on the progress of the committee. Dr. Moore stated that members of PARC are reviewing current EPSB program approval and state accreditation processes. She said recommended changes will allow approved efficiency in teacher preparation programs without sacrificing the quality of the programs. Dr. Sharma stated the committee is focused on ensuring a transparent

and ongoing process by making university data available online to review by institutions and other organizations. Dr. Walters-Parker stated the committee is looking for this information to be a cost and efficiency savings for accreditation visits. Dr. Cathy Gunn stated that critics of teacher education have been very public with their criticism. This transparent data will help those with incorrect information. Dr. Walters-Parker stated the committee plans to finalize procedures for program approval at the next meeting in November with recommendations near the end of the academic semester.

Information/Discussion Item

Determining Probable Cause Policy Amendment

Ms. Alicia Sneed stated that in 2004, the Board voted to approve the surrender of suspended or revoked certificates, to note the periods of suspension and revocation on certificates when reissued, and to display final and pending actions taken against educator certificates on the EPSB website with access limited to school district administrators. A notation indicating a complaint is pending appears in the Kentucky Educator Certification Inquiry (KECI) that staff uses to display this information. This notation is only viewable by school district superintendents, human resource personnel, and the educator's homepage in KECI.

If an educator's certificate is suspended or revoked upon the resolution of the disciplinary case, the educator surrenders his or her certificate. Upon reinstatement or reissuance of the certificate, the educator is issued a new certificate with the suspension and revocation dates printed on the certificate. At the November 2011 board retreat, the Board instructed staff to continue this practice and to also include this information on KECI.

The 2004 changes to disciplinary practice were not adopted as a policy; therefore, staff drafted an amendment to the Determining Probable Cause to Take Disciplinary Action Procedure incorporating the August 2004 motions and the Board's directives at its November 2011 retreat. This item will be brought back to the Board in January for final action.

Chair Webb stated she wanted to appoint a committee to assist Ms. Sneed on disciplinary issues that are important to the Board. Discussion among the Board ensued. Sandy Sinclair-Curry, Zenaida Smith, and Barbara Boyd volunteered to serve on the committee. The purpose of the committee will be to look at the flagging of pending cases and the disciplinary review flow chart.

Presentation

Chamber of Commerce: Leadership Institute for School Principals (Mr. Dave Adkisson)

Mr. Dave Adkisson gave an overview on the Kentucky Leadership Institute for School Principals. He explained how this institute delivers training to help principals build a high-performance culture, influence others to ensure student success, explore how knowledge of individual strengths and developmental needs can produce positive outcomes for students, schools, and communities, and practice new behaviors for positive results.

Action Item

2013 Legislative Agenda

Acting Executive Director Alicia Sneed proposed that the Board approve the following framework for use when evaluating bills during the 2013 Legislative Session since this is not a

budgetary session and the Board has not approved any recommendations for statutory amendments:

- Support any legislation which further supports the EPSB's mission and goals
- Oppose any attempt to dilute or modify the current authority of the EPSB

2012-044

Motion made by Dr. Cathy Gunn, seconded by Ms. Lorraine Williams, to approve the 2013 Legislative Agenda.

Vote: *Unanimous*

16 KAR 8:030. Continuing Education Option for Certificate Renewal and Rank Change, Final Action

2012-045

Motion made by Ms. Williams, seconded by Ms. Sandy Sinclair-Curry, to approve the amendments to 16 KAR 8:030.

Vote: *Unanimous*

16 KAR 6.010. Examination Prerequisites for Teacher Certification, Final Action

2012-046

Motion made by Dr. Mark Wasicsko, seconded by Mr. Mike Ross, to approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Board Comments

Dr. Mark Wasicsko asked that an asterisk be placed in the Title II report next to universities that require candidates to pass the praxis as a graduation requirement in the summary information on praxis pass rates. He stated that he feels the summary information is misleading the way it is presented.

**DISCIPLINARY MATTERS:
MINUTES OF CASE REVIEW
October 15, 2012**

Motion made by Ms. Lorraine Williams, seconded by Ms. Ellen Blevins, to go into closed session for the purpose of discussing proposed or pending litigation in accordance with KRS 61.810(1)(c) & (j).

Vote: *Unanimous*

Motion made by Ms. Marie McMillen, seconded by Ms. Barbara Boyd, to return to open session.

Vote: *Unanimous*

The following board members concurred with the actions as listed below with the noted exceptions:

Agenda Book

Tom Stull, Cathy Gunn, Allen Kennedy, Barbara Boyd, Brandy Beardsley, Ellen Blevins, Cassandra Webb, Michael Ross, Anthony Strong, Zenaida Smith, Sandra Sinclair-Curry, Lorraine Williams, and Mark Wasicsko.

Attorneys present were Alicia A. Sneed, Cassie Trueblood, Whitney Crowe, Gary Stephens, and Angela Evans.

Initial Case Review

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Decision</u>
1208506	Hear
1207464	Hear (<i>Ms. McMillen recused</i>)
1207431	Defer for training
1207439	Hear
1207399	Hear (<i>Mr. Ross recused</i>)
1207433	Hear
1207468	Hear
1207413	Defer for training
1207425	Admonish
1206322	Hear
1207394	Hear
1108569	Hear
1207401	Hear
1207470	Hear
1208522	Hear
1208480	Hear
1207409	Hear
1207407	Hear
1208472	Dismissed
1207435	Admonish
1207423	Hear
1207429	Hear
1207391	Defer for training
1207419	Defer for training (<i>Mr. Stull dissented</i>)
1207405	Admonish
1208512	Admonish
1012838	Dismissed
1204240	Dismissed
120123	Dismissed

Character/Fitness Review

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Decision</u>
121029	Approve
121098	Approve
11835	Deny

Agenda Book

121094	Approve
121093	Approve
121091	Approve
121121	Approve
121130	Approve
121141	Approve
121076	Deny
121089	Deny
121085	Approve
121087	Deny
121120	Approve
12941	Approve
121124	Approve
121129	Deny
121135	Approve
121136	Deny
121127	Deny
121137	Approve
121034	Deny
121060	Deny
121144	Approve
121146	Approve

Agreed Orders

Case Number

Decision

070226 (Nancye Fields)

Accept Agreed Order which states that Respondent has retired from the education profession and has no plans to return to the classroom. Respondent agrees that she shall not seek, nor accept, any certified position in Kentucky at any point in the future.

Vote: *Unanimous*

1112941 (Carolyn Ford)

Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for using an inappropriate restraint method on an autistic student. An educator has a duty to take reasonable measures to protect the health, safety, and emotional well-being of students. Respondent failed in this duty when she placed her foot on the student's abdomen while the student was having an autistic event. The Board will tolerate no further acts of misconduct by Respondent.

Respondent shall provide to the Board, on or before January 1, 2013, written proof that she has completed a course in Safe Crisis Management. Any expense for this training shall be paid by Respondent.

Agenda Book

Should Respondent fail to comply with the training requirement, her certificate shall be suspended and will remain so until she shows proof that she has completed the requirement.

Vote: *Unanimous*

1203160 (Marian Berryman) Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for failing to take reasonable measures to protect the health, safety, and emotional well-being of students. The Board reminds Respondent that an educator must manage her emotions in the classroom especially when the need arises use physical restraint on a student.

In addition, Respondent shall not seek employment as a certified educator in Kentucky until March 1, 2014. After March 1, 2014, Respondent shall not be employed as a certified educator in a Kentucky school until she has met the following conditions:

1. Respondent shall provide proof that she has completed counseling or training in anger management or stress management, as approved by the Board. Any expense for the counseling or training shall be paid by Respondent; and

2. Respondent shall provide proof that she has completed a professional development or training in classroom management for special education teachers as approved by the Board. Any expense for the training or professional development shall be paid by Respondent. By entering into this agreement, Respondent agrees that should she fail to satisfy the above conditions prior to her re-employment as a certified educator in Kentucky, Respondent's certificate shall be automatically suspended until Respondent provides written proof to the Board that he has completed the conditions.

Respondent is aware if she should have any future violations of KRS 161.120, the Board shall initiate new disciplinary action and seek additional sanctions.

Vote: *Unanimous*

1009487 (Dustin Brown) Accept Agreed Order revoking Respondent's certificate for a period of three (3) years beginning June 13, 2011. Respondent shall neither apply for, nor be issued, a teaching certificate in the Commonwealth of Kentucky during the revocation period. Upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board, Brown shall immediately surrender the original and all copies of his certificate to the EPSB, by delivering or mailing to 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.

Agenda Book

In addition to the standard requirements of the application process, before Respondent shall be reissued any certificate, he must comply with the following:

1. Respondent shall provide written proof to the Board that he has been assessed by a state certified mental health counselor approved by the Board and is competent to fulfill his duties as an educator. Respondent shall provide proof that he has complied with any treatment recommendations proposed by the mental health counselor and shall continue to provide treatment records to the Board until he has been released from treatment by the counselor. Any expense incurred for the assessment or follow-up treatment shall be paid by Respondent.

2. Respondent shall provide written proof to the Board that he has successfully completed twelve (12) hours of ethics training, as approved by the Board, which shall include instruction on appropriate teacher/student boundaries. Any expense incurred for said training shall be paid by Respondent.

3. Respondent shall provide the Board with at least two (2) letters of recommendation stating that Respondent is morally and ethically fit to hold a teaching certificate. Such letters of recommendation must be written by educators who hold valid Kentucky teaching certificates that are currently in good standing. Should Respondent fail to satisfy any or all of these conditions, the Board shall automatically deny any application submitted by Respondent or on his behalf. Upon reissuance of Respondent's certificate, Respondent shall be on permanent probation. Accordingly, Respondent shall receive no disciplinary action involving teacher/student boundaries. "Disciplinary action" is defined as any suspension, termination, or public reprimand issued by any school district in the Commonwealth of Kentucky and upheld, if requested, by either a tribunal and/or arbitration process.

By entering into this Agreed Order, Respondent agrees that should he fail to satisfy the terms of the permanent probation, his certificate shall be automatically permanently revoked.

Vote: *Unanimous*

CF12903 (Ashley Spencer) Accept Agreed Order which states that upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board, Respondent shall be issued a Kentucky teaching certificate upon providing proof that she has met the academic and testing requirements necessary

Agenda Book

for issuance of a certificate, and has completed the following:

1. Respondent shall undergo a comprehensive alcohol/substance abuse assessment by a Kentucky licensed and/or certified chemical dependency counselor, as approved by the Board, and shall present written evidence to the Board that she has complied with the assessment process. Any expense for the assessment and written reports shall be paid by Respondent.

2. Respondent shall submit written proof to the Board that she has completed twelve (12) hours of professional ethics training, as approved by the Board. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by Respondent. Any and all certificates issued to Respondent shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. If Respondent's chemical dependency counselor makes any treatment recommendations, Respondent shall comply with the treatment recommendations. Respondent shall submit quarterly written progress reports from her counselor to the Board until such time as the counselor releases her from treatment. Any expense for the treatment and/or written reports shall be paid by Respondent. Failure to comply with this condition will result in Respondent's certificate being automatically suspended until Respondent is in compliance.

2. Respondent shall not be convicted of nor enter a guilty or no contest plea to any criminal charge(s) involving the use or possession of alcohol. If Respondent is convicted of, or enters a guilty or no contest plea, to any criminal charge involving the use or possession of alcohol, she shall submit this information to the Board, in writing, within thirty (30) days. Failure to comply with this condition will result in Respondent's certificate being automatically suspended pending Board review and disposition.

3. Respondent shall submit a copy of her current criminal record, as prepared by the Administrative Office of the Courts, with any application for renewal of her certification(s) and/or for additional certification(s). Any expense required to satisfy this condition shall be paid by Respondent. Failure to comply with this condition will result in the denial of all applications for renewal and/or additional certification(s) submitted by Respondent or on her behalf.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Agenda Book

1203207 (Earl Barlow) Accept Agreed Order revoking Respondent's certificate. Respondent shall immediately surrender the original and all copies of this certificate to the Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, Third Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601. Respondent shall neither apply for nor be issued a teaching certificate in the Commonwealth of Kentucky for the remainder of his lifetime.

Vote: *Unanimous (Ms. McMillen recused)*

CF12940 (Sandra Hall) Accept Agreed Order which states that upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board, Respondent shall be issued a Kentucky teaching certificate upon providing proof that she has met the academic and testing requirements necessary for issuance of a certificate, and has completed the following:

Respondent shall submit written proof to the Board that she has completed twelve (12) hours of professional ethics training, as approved by the Board. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by Respondent.

Upon issuance, any and all certificates issued to Respondent shall be on probation for a period of five (5) years, and subject to the following condition:

With any application for renewal of her certification(s) and/or for additional certification(s), Respondent shall submit a letter from her substitute coordinator, or similar district level supervisor, stating that there were no issues with Respondent's performance during the previous school year. Any expense required to satisfy this condition shall be paid by Respondent. Failure to comply with this condition will result in the denial of all applications for renewal and/or additional certification(s) submitted by Respondent or on her behalf.

Respondent is aware that should she violate KRS 161.120, the Board shall initiate a new disciplinary action and seek additional sanctions.

Vote: *Unanimous (Dr. Gunn recused)*

CF121048 (Bradley Grier) Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent. Respondent or engaging in dishonest conduct by falsifying an application for teacher certification. Regardless of whether the falsification is intentional or negligent, misrepresenting records of fact relating to one's qualifications or fitness violates the Professional Code of Ethics for Kentucky Certified School Personnel. The Board will not tolerate any further incidents of misconduct by Respondent.

Agenda Book

Respondent shall be issued a Kentucky teaching certificate upon providing proof that he has met the academic and testing requirements necessary for issuance of a certificate; however, any and all certificates issued to Respondent by the Board shall be subject to the following probationary condition:

Within six (6) months of issuance of any teaching certificate to Respondent, Respondent shall undergo a comprehensive substance abuse assessment by a Kentucky licensed and/or certified chemical dependency counselor, as approved by the Board, and shall provide written evidence to the Board that he has complied with the assessment process and has successfully completed any and all treatment recommendations. If Respondent is unable to complete all treatment recommendations within six (6) months of issuance, Respondent shall continue to provide quarterly written progress reports from his chemical dependency counselor until such time as the counselor releases him from further treatment. Any expense for the assessment, treatment and/or written reports shall be paid by Respondent. Failure to comply with this condition will result in Respondent's certificate being automatically suspended until Respondent is in compliance.

In order to maintain or obtain any certificate in the future, Respondent shall comply with the following:

1. Respondent shall not be convicted of nor enter a guilty or no contest plea to any criminal charge(s) other than minor traffic violations. Failure to comply with this condition will result in Respondent's certificate being automatically suspended for further action by the Board.
2. Respondent shall submit a current criminal background check, as prepared by the Administrative Office of the Courts, to the Board with any application for renewal of his certification(s) and/or for additional certification(s). Any expense for the criminal background check shall be paid by Respondent. Failure to comply with this condition will result in the denial of all applications for renewal and/or additional certification(s) submitted by Respondent or on his behalf.

Respondent is aware that should he violate KRS 161.120, the Board shall initiate a new disciplinary action and seek additional sanctions.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Motion made by Dr. Gunn, seconded by Ms. Boyd, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Agenda Book

Meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Next Meeting: January 7, 2012
 9:00 AM
 EPSB Board Room
 Frankfort, Kentucky

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Consent Item D

Action Item:

Asbury University: Supervisor of Instruction

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028; KRS 161.030

16 KAR 5:010

Applicable Goal:

Goal 1: Every approved educator preparation program meets or exceeds all accreditation standards and prepares knowledgeable, capable teachers and administrators who demonstrate effectiveness in helping all students reach educational achievement.

Issue:

Should the EPSB approve the following educator preparation program addition?

ASBURY UNIVERSITY

10.0 INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Supervisor of Instruction P-12

Background:

KRS 161.028 and KRS 161.030 provide for the EPSB to establish curricula for educator preparation programs in Kentucky and approve such programs at institutions of higher education. The Division of Educator Preparation and the Reading Committee evaluated the program review document submitted for approval against performance-based program certification guidelines established by the EPSB. This program proposal meets all the requirements set by the EPSB. The supporting documents for this proposal (program review document which includes the executive summary and letter of support) are available on the secured website.

Groups/Persons Consulted:

Reading Committee

Alternative Actions:

1. Approve the proposed Supervisor of Instruction preparation program addition.
2. Do not approve the proposed Supervisor of Instruction preparation program addition.

Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

The proposed educator preparation program follows the appropriate regulation (16 KAR 5:010) outlining requirements for program approval as established by the EPSB.

Agenda Book

Contact Person:

Dr. Kim Walters-Parker, Director
Division of Educator Preparation
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: Kim.Walters-Parker@ky.gov

Date:

January 7, 2013

Agenda Book

16 KAR 5:010. Standards for accreditation of educator preparation units and approval of programs.

Section 22. Program Approval Action Outside the First or Regular Continuing Accreditation Cycle. (1) Approval of a program shall be through the program process established in Section 11 of this administrative regulation except that a new program not submitted during the regular accreditation cycle or a program substantially revised since submission during the accreditation process shall be submitted for approval by the EPSB prior to admission of a student to the program.

(2) For a new or substantially revised program, the EPSB shall consider a recommendation by staff, including review by the Continuous Assessment Review Committee, Content Program Review Committee, and the Reading Committee.

(3) A recommendation made pursuant to subsection (2) of this section shall be presented to the full EPSB.

(4) Program approval decision options shall be:

(a) Approval, with the next review scheduled during the regular accreditation cycle unless a subsequent substantial revision is made;

(b) Approval with conditions, with a maximum of one (1) year probationary extension for correction of a specified problem to be documented through written materials or through an on-site visit. At the end of the extension, the EPSB shall decide that the documentation supports:

1. Approval; or

2. Denial of approval; or

(c) Denial of approval, indicating that a serious problem exists which jeopardizes the quality of preparation of school personnel.

(5) The EPSB shall order a review of a program if it has cause to believe that the quality of preparation is seriously jeopardized. The review shall be conducted under the criteria and procedures established in the EPSB "Emergency Review of Certification Programs Procedure" policy incorporated by reference. The on-site review shall be conducted by EPSB staff and a Board of Examiners team. The review shall result in a report to which the institution may respond. The review report and institutional response shall be used by the Executive Director of the EPSB as the basis for a recommendation to the full EPSB for:

(a) Approval;

(b) Approval with conditions; or

(c) Denial of approval for the program.

(6) If the EPSB denies approval of a program, the institution shall notify each student currently admitted to that program of the EPSB action. The notice shall include the following information:

(a) A student recommended for certification or advancement in rank within the twelve (12) months immediately following the denial of state approval and who applies to the EPSB within the fifteen (15) months immediately following the denial of state approval shall receive the certification or advancement in rank; and

(b) A student who does not meet the criteria established in paragraph (a) of this subsection shall transfer to a state approved program in order to receive the certificate or advancement in rank.

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Consent Item E

Action Item:

Georgetown College: Environmental Education P-12 Endorsement

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028; KRS 161.030

16 KAR 5:010

Applicable Goal:

Goal 1: Every approved educator preparation program meets or exceeds all accreditation standards and prepares knowledgeable, capable teachers and administrators who demonstrate effectiveness in helping all students reach educational achievement.

Issue:

Should the EPSB approve the following educator preparation program addition?

GEORGETOWN COLLEGE

8.0 ENDORSEMENTS

Environmental Education P-12

Background:

KRS 161.028 and KRS 161.030 provide for the EPSB to establish curricula for educator preparation programs in Kentucky and approve such programs at institutions of higher education. The Division of Educator Preparation and the Reading Committee evaluated the program review document submitted for approval against performance-based program certification guidelines established by the EPSB. This program proposal meets all the requirements set by the EPSB. The supporting documents for this proposal (program review document which includes the executive summary and letter of support) are available on the secured website.

Groups/Persons Consulted:

Reading Committee

Alternative Actions:

1. Approve the proposed Environmental Education Endorsement preparation program addition.
2. Do not approve the proposed Environmental Education Endorsement preparation program addition.

Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

The proposed educator preparation program follows the appropriate regulation (16 KAR 5:010) outlining requirements for program approval as established by the EPSB.

Contact Person:

Dr. Kim Walters-Parker, Director
Division of Educator Preparation
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: Kim.Walters-Parker@ky.gov

Date:

January 7, 2013

Agenda Book

16 KAR 5:010. Standards for accreditation of educator preparation units and approval of programs.

Section 22. Program Approval Action Outside the First or Regular Continuing Accreditation Cycle. (1) Approval of a program shall be through the program process established in Section 11 of this administrative regulation except that a new program not submitted during the regular accreditation cycle or a program substantially revised since submission during the accreditation process shall be submitted for approval by the EPSB prior to admission of a student to the program.

(2) For a new or substantially revised program, the EPSB shall consider a recommendation by staff, including review by the Continuous Assessment Review Committee, Content Program Review Committee, and the Reading Committee.

(3) A recommendation made pursuant to subsection (2) of this section shall be presented to the full EPSB.

(4) Program approval decision options shall be:

(a) Approval, with the next review scheduled during the regular accreditation cycle unless a subsequent substantial revision is made;

(b) Approval with conditions, with a maximum of one (1) year probationary extension for correction of a specified problem to be documented through written materials or through an on-site visit. At the end of the extension, the EPSB shall decide that the documentation supports:

1. Approval; or

2. Denial of approval; or

(c) Denial of approval, indicating that a serious problem exists which jeopardizes the quality of preparation of school personnel.

(5) The EPSB shall order a review of a program if it has cause to believe that the quality of preparation is seriously jeopardized. The review shall be conducted under the criteria and procedures established in the EPSB "Emergency Review of Certification Programs Procedure" policy incorporated by reference. The on-site review shall be conducted by EPSB staff and a Board of Examiners team. The review shall result in a report to which the institution may respond. The review report and institutional response shall be used by the Executive Director of the EPSB as the basis for a recommendation to the full EPSB for:

(a) Approval;

(b) Approval with conditions; or

(c) Denial of approval for the program.

(6) If the EPSB denies approval of a program, the institution shall notify each student currently admitted to that program of the EPSB action. The notice shall include the following information:

(a) A student recommended for certification or advancement in rank within the twelve (12) months immediately following the denial of state approval and who applies to the EPSB within the fifteen (15) months immediately following the denial of state approval shall receive the certification or advancement in rank; and

(b) A student who does not meet the criteria established in paragraph (a) of this subsection shall transfer to a state approved program in order to receive the certificate or advancement in rank.

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Consent Item F

Action Item:

Spalding University: Biological Science, Grades 8-12; Chemistry, Grades 8-12; English, Grades 8-12; Mathematics, Grades 8-12; Social Studies, Grades 8-12 (Bachelor's Level)

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028; KRS 161.030

16 KAR 5:010

Applicable Goal:

Goal 1: Every approved educator preparation program meets or exceeds all accreditation standards and prepares knowledgeable, capable teachers and administrators who demonstrate effectiveness in helping all students reach educational achievement.

Issue:

Should the EPSB approve the following educator preparation program additions?

SPALDING UNIVERSITY

4.0 SECONDARY SCHOOL FOR GRADES 8-12

Biological Science
Chemistry
English

Mathematics
Social Studies

Background:

KRS 161.028 and KRS 161.030 provide for the EPSB to establish curricula for educator preparation programs in Kentucky and approve such programs at institutions of higher education. The Division of Educator Preparation and the Reading Committee evaluated the program review documents submitted for approval against performance-based program certification guidelines established by the EPSB. These program proposals meet all the requirements set by the EPSB. The supporting documents for these proposals (letter of support and the program review documents which include the executive summaries) are available on the secured website.

Groups/Persons Consulted:

Reading Committee

Alternative Actions:

1. Approve the proposed preparation program additions.
2. Do not approve the proposed preparation program additions.

Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

The proposed educator preparation programs follow the appropriate regulation (16 KAR 5:010)

Agenda Book

outlining requirements for program approval as established by the EPSB.

Contact Person:

Dr. Kim Walters-Parker, Director
Division of Educator Preparation
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: Kim.Walters-Parker@ky.gov

Date:

January 7, 2013

Agenda Book

16 KAR 5:010. Standards for accreditation of educator preparation units and approval of programs.

Section 22. Program Approval Action Outside the First or Regular Continuing Accreditation Cycle. (1) Approval of a program shall be through the program process established in Section 11 of this administrative regulation except that a new program not submitted during the regular accreditation cycle or a program substantially revised since submission during the accreditation process shall be submitted for approval by the EPSB prior to admission of a student to the program.

(2) For a new or substantially revised program, the EPSB shall consider a recommendation by staff, including review by the Continuous Assessment Review Committee, Content Program Review Committee, and the Reading Committee.

(3) A recommendation made pursuant to subsection (2) of this section shall be presented to the full EPSB.

(4) Program approval decision options shall be:

(a) Approval, with the next review scheduled during the regular accreditation cycle unless a subsequent substantial revision is made;

(b) Approval with conditions, with a maximum of one (1) year probationary extension for correction of a specified problem to be documented through written materials or through an on-site visit. At the end of the extension, the EPSB shall decide that the documentation supports:

1. Approval; or

2. Denial of approval; or

(c) Denial of approval, indicating that a serious problem exists which jeopardizes the quality of preparation of school personnel.

(5) The EPSB shall order a review of a program if it has cause to believe that the quality of preparation is seriously jeopardized. The review shall be conducted under the criteria and procedures established in the EPSB "Emergency Review of Certification Programs Procedure" policy incorporated by reference. The on-site review shall be conducted by EPSB staff and a Board of Examiners team. The review shall result in a report to which the institution may respond. The review report and institutional response shall be used by the Executive Director of the EPSB as the basis for a recommendation to the full EPSB for:

(a) Approval;

(b) Approval with conditions; or

(c) Denial of approval for the program.

(6) If the EPSB denies approval of a program, the institution shall notify each student currently admitted to that program of the EPSB action. The notice shall include the following information:

(a) A student recommended for certification or advancement in rank within the twelve (12) months immediately following the denial of state approval and who applies to the EPSB within the fifteen (15) months immediately following the denial of state approval shall receive the certification or advancement in rank; and

(b) A student who does not meet the criteria established in paragraph (a) of this subsection shall transfer to a state approved program in order to receive the certificate or advancement in rank.

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Consent Item G

Action Item:

Board approval for Jefferson County Teachers Association (JCTA) to provide remedial diversity training for educators with disciplinary cases before the EPSB.

Applicable Statute:

KRS 161.028, KRS 161.120, KRS 161.175

Applicable Goals:

Goal III: Every credentialed educator exemplifies behaviors that maintain the dignity and integrity of the profession by adhering to established law and EPSB Code of Ethics.

Issue:

Should the Education Professional Standards Board approve JCTA to provide remedial training/professional development for individuals with disciplinary cases before the EPSB?

Background:

Pursuant to its authority under KRS 161.120(1), the EPSB “may . . . impose probationary or supervisory conditions upon . . . any certificates” issued by the agency. In recent years, the EPSB has used this penalty to rehabilitate or remediate educators who are brought before the board for misconduct by ordering the educators to attend specific professional development or training in hopes of preventing further incidents of misconduct. In addition, at the November 19, 2007, board meeting, the EPSB amended its probable cause policy to include “deferral for training,” which will be used as a diversionary option for educators who are brought before the board for minor offenses.

JCTA is requesting Board approval to provide remedial diversity training to educators. Enclosed under separate cover is JCTA’s request to be approved by the Board and the program information for review.

Alternative Actions:

1. Approve JCTA to provide remedial diversity training.
2. Do not approve JCTA to provide remedial training.

Staff Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale

Staff has reviewed JCTA’s submission proposal and found that the program will address the needs of the educators referred to remedial diversity training. In addition, having an additional pre-approved provider for diversity training will assist educators deferred for training or ordered to remedial training to complete this condition in a timely manner.

Contact Person:

Ms. Alicia A. Sneed
Director of Legal Services
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: Alicia.Sneed@ky.gov

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Information/Discussion Item

Information Item:

A report on the year-to-date financial performance of the agency's programs and operations through December 31, 2012

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.017 (1) (c)

Applicable Goal:

Goal 5: The EPSB shall be managed for both effectiveness and efficiency, fully complying with all statutes, regulations, and established federal, state, and agency policies.

Background:

The state fiscal year begins July 1 and ends June 30. This mid-year report of expenditures through December 31, 2012, will be presented at the Board meeting on January 7, 2013.

Groups/Persons Consulted:

None – All information was produced from information maintained in the eMARS financial system and analysis by Gary Freeland.

Contact Person:

Mr. Gary W. Freeland
Analyst Consultant
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: GaryW.Freeland@ky.gov

Date:

January 7, 2013

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Action Item A

Action Item

Charter for the Committee to Ensure an Ethical Educator Workforce (CEEEW)

Applicable Statues and Regulations:

KRS 161.028

KRS 161.120

16 KAR 1:020

16 KAR 1:030

Applicable Goal:

Goal 3: Every credentialed educator exemplifies behaviors that maintain the dignity and integrity of the profession by adhering to established law and EPSB Code of Ethics.

Issue:

Should the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) approve the charter for the Committee to Ensure an Ethical Educator Workforce (CEEEW)?

Background:

KRS 161.028(f) and KRS 161.120 establish the EPSB's authority to discipline members of the education profession for misconduct. This authority was vested in the EPSB to ensure that educators had the ability to protect their profession from potential bad actors in the same fashion as other professions, like attorneys and medical doctors. In addition, since the education profession is entrusted with the care and supervision of children of the Commonwealth, the EPSB has a duty to ensure that any person it certifies is fit to be in a classroom. Although the EPSB has consistently managed to balance its responsibility to ensure the safety of children in schools while protecting the due process rights of its current and future certificate holders, a self-audit of current practices is periodically required to ensure that all policies reflect current best practices.

The EPSB's current processes and procedures surrounding its disciplinary function have not been reviewed in full by the board since the original policies and procedures were developed after the EPSB's creation in 1990. Policies and procedures have been revised as needed, but there has not been a system wide review of the process. The attached charter for CEEEW would create a review committee made up of board members and stakeholders to do a system-wide evaluation of disciplinary adjudications, the character and fitness review process, misconduct reporting procedures, promotion of the Professional Code of Ethics for Kentucky Certified School Personnel, and the collection of data related to the EPSB's disciplinary functions. In addition, the charter requires CEEEW to analyze the current feasibility of implementing the Governor's Taskforce on Education in Kentucky's (TEK) recommendation to require school districts to provide on-going training for all staff.

Alternative Actions:

1. Approve the charter for the Committee to Ensure an Ethical Educator Workforce.

Agenda Book

2. Modify and approve the charter for the Committee to Ensure an Ethical Educator Workforce.
3. Do not approve the charter for the Committee to Ensure an Ethical Educator Workforce.

Staff Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

Although there have not been any specific due process issues or complaints regarding the EPSB's disciplinary processes and procedures, a periodic self-audit of internal and external procedures will ensure that the EPSB is carrying out its statutory duties while protecting the due process rights of its certificate holders.

Contact Person:

Ms. Alicia A. Sneed, Director
Division of Legal Services
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: Alicia.Sneed@ky.gov

Date:

January 7, 2013

CHARTER

The Committee to Ensure an Ethical Educator Workforce (CEEEW)

Purpose

The Committee to Ensure and Ethical Educator Workforce (CEEEW) is established to review current Education Professional Standard Board (EPSB) policies and procedures to ensure that student safety and the community's trust in the profession are preserved while simultaneously protecting the due process rights of applicants for certification and practicing educators.

Membership of the Committee

The committee will include representatives from Kentucky Education Association (KEA), Jefferson County Teachers Association (JCTA), Kentucky Association of School Administrators (KASA), Kentucky Association of School Superintendents (KASS), and current EPSB members.

Scope of Operation

The committee shall remain within statutory boundaries, but it may recommend regulatory, statutory, and policy changes to the EPSB. All committee members are expected to make a time commitment to the work. EPSB staff will provide support to the committee and provide the necessary resources for the committee to complete its work.

Objectives

CEEEW will review all current practices and recommend any necessary changes to ensure that the EPSB's goal that "every credentialed educator exemplifies behaviors that maintain the dignity and integrity of the profession by adhering to established law and EPSB Code of Ethics" is met. CEEEW shall specifically review and make any needed recommendations regarding the following:

- EPSB internal and external procedures regarding educator disciplinary matters;
- Character and fitness review process;
- Promotion of the Professional Code of Ethics for Kentucky Certified Personnel;
- Current reporting requirements for school district superintendents and training strategies to ensure that all superintendents are uniformly complying with their statutory duties to report educator misconduct;
- Feasibility of implementation of the Governor's Taskforce on Education in Kentucky's (TEK) recommendation to require school districts to provide on-going ethics training for all staff; and
- Disciplinary data collection.

Time Frame

CEEEW will be expected to submit a final report and any recommendations to the EPSB by August 31, 2013.

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Action Item B

Action Item:

Thomas More College: Accreditation of the Educator Preparation Unit and Approval of Programs

Applicable Statute or Regulation:

KRS 161.028
16 KAR 5:010

Applicable Goal:

Goal 1: Every approved educator preparation program meets or exceeds all accreditation standards and prepares knowledgeable, capable teachers and administrators who demonstrate effectiveness in helping all students reach educational achievement.

Issue:

Should the EPSB grant first NCATE/state accreditation to the Educator Preparation Unit and approve the initial and advanced level preparation programs at Thomas More College?

Background:

A joint NCATE/state Board of Examiners (BOE) team conducted the on-site evaluation of the Educator Preparation Unit at Thomas More College on March 24 – 28, 2012. The joint BOE team found all standards were met with one new area for improvement. The BOE also reviewed program review documents as part of the on-site visit and found them to be in compliance with program guidelines as established and approved by the EPSB. At its December 6, 2012, meeting, the Accreditation Audit Committee (AAC) met (see attached minutes) and reviewed the accreditation materials including the Institutional Report, the Off-Site BOE Report, the IR Addendum, and the On-Site BOE Report.

The AAC reviewed each area for improvement cited in the BOE Report. As this was the first joint NCATE/state accreditation visit, there were no corrected or continued areas for improvement. The AAC agreed with the findings of the BOE team.

New

Standard 4: Diversity

- 1) Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse candidates.

The AAC voted to agree with the findings of the BOE team as cited in the BOE Report and by NCATE. Pursuant to 16 KAR 5:010, Section 19, the AAC accepts the new area for improvement listed above and recommends: (1) ACCREDITATION and (2) APPROVAL OF THE INITIAL AND ADVANCED LEVEL EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS at Thomas More College.

Groups/Persons Consulted

Content Area Program Reviewers
Continuous Assessment Review Committee

Reading Committee
Joint NCATE/State Board of Examiners Team
Accreditation Audit Committee

Alternative Actions:

Issue One: Unit Accreditation

1. Accept the recommendation of the AAC and grant ACCREDITATION for Thomas More College.
2. Modify the AAC recommendation and grant PROVISIONAL ACCREDITATION for Thomas More College.
3. Do not accept the AAC recommendation and grant DENIAL OF ACCREDITATION for Thomas More College.

Issue Two: Program Approval

1. Accept the recommendation of the AAC and grant APPROVAL for the initial and advanced level educator preparation programs at Thomas More College.
2. Modify the AAC recommendation and grant APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS for the initial and advanced level educator preparation programs at Thomas More College.
3. Do not accept the AAC recommendation and stipulate DENIAL OF APPROVAL for the initial and advanced level educator preparation programs at Thomas More College.

AAC Recommendation:

Issue One: Alternative 1
Issue Two: Alternative 1

Rationale:

The Joint NCATE/State BOE team and AAC followed national and state guidelines for accreditation of educator preparation programs.

Contact Person:

Dr. Kim Walters-Parker, Director
Division of Educator Preparation
(502) 564-5789
E-mail: Kim.Walters-Parker@ky.gov

Date:

January 7, 2013

Accreditation Audit Committee (AAC)

**Education Professional Standards Board
Conference Room A
December 6, 2012**

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:

Judi Conrad, Chair
Susan Compton
Joy Gray
Shirley Nelson
Jack Rose
Tim Watkins
Zella Wells

EPSB Staff Present:

Kim Walters-Parker
Allison Bell
Lauren Graves
Alicia Sneed
Robert Brown
Dianna Carr

The meeting was called to order at 9:00.

Approval of Minutes:

Motion made by Zella Wells, seconded by Joy Gray, to approve the minutes from the previous AAC meeting.

Vote: Approve the motion (Yes: 7-0)

The AAC reviewed the documentation including, but not limited to, the Institutional Report (IR), Board of Examiners (BOE) team report, and the institutional rejoinder, and made recommendations for accreditation and program approval for the following institutions:

KENTUCKY CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

Dr. Tim Crook, Chair of the EPSB Board of Examiners (BOE) team, presented the report on behalf of the team. He provided an overview of the areas for improvement and was complimentary of the faculty and staff of Kentucky Christian University (KCU). He indicated that the team found all standards met with three previous areas for improvement corrected, one continued, and seven new areas for improvement across all standards. He iterated the lack of consistency in availability of the data.

Dr. Karen Ford commented on behalf of the institution. She was complimentary of the team members. She acknowledged the institution's continuing struggle with maintaining a diverse student body. The unit has been addressing the concerns identified by the BOE team since the visit, specifically in the development of leadership activities for candidates to evidence Kentucky Teacher Standard 10.

The committee expressed concern about the number of areas for improvement across all standards and the lack of consistent availability of data demonstrating candidates' proficiencies in the Kentucky Teacher Standards. Dr. Crook indicated the team's concern was around the inconsistent nature of the KTS integration which resulted in inconsistent data on the Kentucky Teacher Standards across the transition points. The committee also expressed concern about the recency and accuracy of the information in the Institutional Report. The committee noted internal inconsistencies within the document which resulted in inconsistent information. The committee discussed the importance of data and the use of data in decision-making and the unit's lack of evidence of a formalized system for data-driven decision making processes. Dr. Crook confirmed there were many inconsistencies and gaps of information and the team lacked sufficient evidence to demonstrate the unit was consistently using data for program improvement. The committee indicated their concern regarding the informal processes for data collection and analysis being used by the unit. The AAC reviewed the findings of the BOE team on the following:

Corrected Areas for Improvement:

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

- 1) A systematic method does not exist to ensure that candidates have quality field experiences.

Standard 4: Diversity

- 1) The unit does not provide opportunities for interaction with a diverse P-12 school faculty.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

- 1) Scholarship by unit faculty is limited.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

- 1) The Teacher Education Committee does not include a P-12 representative.

Continued Areas for Improvement:

Standard 4: Diversity

- 1) The unit does not maintain a diverse student body.

New Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

- 1) The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates demonstrate adequate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

- 1) The unit does not formally analyze and aggregate assessment data for program and unit improvement.
- 2) The unit does not have a formal candidate complaint procedure or a method to document complaint resolutions.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

- 1) Kentucky Teacher Standard 10 is not systematically addressed across all programs.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

- 1) The unit does not systematically and regularly evaluate professional education faculty members.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

- 1) The unit does not effectively engage P-12 teachers and other practicing educators in design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs.
- 2) Faculty workloads do not allow professional education faculty members to be effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, P-12 collaboration, and service.

Following appropriate meeting protocol, the AAC made the following decisions:

- 1) Voted (7-0) that the BOE team followed approved accreditation guidelines when conducting the visit.
- 2) Voted (6-1; Jack Rose dissented) to agree with the corrected areas for improvement cited in the BOE Report.
- 3) Voted (7-0) to agree with the continued areas for improvement cited in the BOE Report.
- 4) Voted (7-0) to agree with the new areas for improvement cited in the BOE Report.
- 5) Voted (7-0) to disagree with the findings of the BOE team that all standards are met. The AAC concluded that the lack of ongoing documentation and lack of presentation of data on a consistent basis indicated that the unit was not meeting the requirements for Standard 2. Therefore, the AAC recommends that Standard 2 is **NOT MET**.

In addition to decisions identified above, the AAC recommends **PROGRAM**

APPROVAL (Vote: 7-0) and **ACCREDITATION WITH CONDITIONS** for Kentucky Christian University (Vote: 7-0).

BEREA COLLEGE

Dr. Verna Lowe, Co-chair of the joint NCATE/State BOE team, presented the report on behalf of the team. She was complimentary of the unit faculty and staff for their hospitality. She provided an overview of the team members and the team's findings. She affirmed the team's thoroughness throughout all the stages of the visit. She described the concerns cited by the team and provided the rationale for each of the team's decisions. She reported the BOE team found Standards 1 and 4 not met, with no corrected areas for improvement, one continued area for improvement in Standard 1, and nine new areas for improvement. She indicated that the team presented concerns to the unit throughout the process (Off-Site BOE Report, Pre-Visit and On-Site Visit). Dr. Lowe indicated the evidence that was provided by the unit did not demonstrate candidates' proficiencies on the Kentucky Teacher Standards, and there was no evidence of analysis of data for program improvement by the unit.

The institution was represented by Dr. Bobby Starnes, Chair of the Education Studies Department, Ms. Heather Brown, Program Data Assistant, and Dr. Chad Berry, Academic Vice President and Dean of the Faculty. Dr. Starnes spoke on behalf of the unit. Dr. Starnes indicated she was appreciative of the "volunteerism" displayed by the committee as demonstrated by the attendance and participation in the process. She referenced the submitted rejoinder and the chair's response to the rejoinder. She indicated she had difficulty in communicating with the team chair, which resulted in continued difficulties throughout the visit. She indicated that the timeline for the visit was not followed by NCATE as reports were provided to the institution after school was not in session. She expressed her disagreement with the team's belief that the unit did not present data and referred to a jump drive that was supplied to the team members. She indicated that faculty felt attacked and misunderstood.

The AAC expressed concern over the unit's presentation of data, the unit's lack of understanding regarding data expectations, adequacy of the data, the analysis of data, and the use of data for program improvement. The AAC reviewed the findings of the BOE team and agreed with the BOE team findings that Standards 2, 3, 5, and 6 were met and Standards 1 and 4 were not met. The committee agreed with the BOE team findings on the continued areas for improvement and the new areas for improvement as indicated below:

Corrected Areas for Improvement: None

Continued Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

- 1) The unit does not ensure consistent professional and pedagogical preparation of secondary candidates.

New Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

- 1) The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates demonstrate adequate pedagogical content knowledge and skills.
- 2) The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates demonstrate adequate professional and pedagogical content knowledge and skills.
- 3) The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, and monitor student progress.
- 4) The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates develop and demonstrate the professional dispositions identified by the unit throughout their respective programs of study.
- 5) The unit lacks sufficient data that indicates progress of candidates through key transition points.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

- 1) The unit does not systematically analyze and evaluate data for program and unit improvement.

Standard 3: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

- 1) Assessment of candidates' performance in pre-student teaching field experiences is not conducted jointly by the candidates, school faculty, and professional education faculty.

Standard 4: Diversity

- 1) Unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidate proficiencies related to diversity are assessed and that the data are used to provide feedback to candidates for improving their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping students from diverse populations to learn.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

- 1) The current governance structure does not provide for effective monitoring of the implementation of the various program and unit assessments and the consistent reporting of candidate performance aligned to program and unit defined outcomes.

Following appropriate meeting protocol, the AAC made the following decisions:

- 1) Voted (7-0) that the BOE team followed approved accreditation guidelines when conducting the visit.
- 2) Voted (7-0) to agree with the continued area for improvement cited in the BOE Report.
- 3) Voted (7-0) to agree with the new areas for improvement cited in the BOE Report.
- 4) Voted (7-0) to agree with the BOE team that all standards are not met (Standards 1 and 4 – Not Met; Standards 2, 3, 5, 6 – Met).

In addition to decisions identified above, the AAC recommends **PROGRAM APPROVAL** (Vote: 7-0) and **ACCREDITATION WITH CONDITIONS** for Berea College (Vote: 7-0).

MIDWAY COLLEGE

Dr. Carol Ryan, Chair of the EPSB BOE team, presented the report on behalf of the team. She provided an overview of the visit, including the team members and the team's findings. She was complimentary of the institution. She indicated that the BOE team found all standards had been met with one corrected area for improvement in Standard 4 and one in Standard 5; no continuing areas for improvement; and one new area for improvement in Standard 2 and two new areas for improvement in Standard 3.

Drs. Bonnie Marshall and Charles Roberts commented on behalf of the institution. Each acknowledged a thorough review by the team and was complimentary of the professionalism of the team members. Dr. Marshall indicated that the unit agreed with the findings of the BOE team. Dr. Roberts indicated that changes have begun to occur and that the unit began implementing new processes and procedures immediately to begin to address the areas (i.e., faculty reviewing data in each division meeting).

The AAC reviewed the findings of the BOE team and agreed with its findings that all standards were met, with following areas for improvement:

Corrected Areas for Improvement:

Standard 4: Diversity

- 1) Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with other candidates from ethnically diverse backgrounds.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

- 1) The unit has inconsistently applied the process of evaluating adjunct faculty.

Continued Areas for Improvement: None

New Areas for Improvement:

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

- 1) While the unit shows evidence that it collects data, the unit does not demonstrate that it analyzes and evaluates data.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

- 1) The unit does not ensure that field experiences are implemented sufficiently to ensure that all candidates develop and demonstrate professional proficiencies.
- 2) The unit does not provide all candidates with sufficient opportunities in their field experiences to develop and demonstrate knowledge and skills to help all students learn.

Following appropriate meeting protocol, the AAC made the following decisions:

- 1) Voted (7-0) that the BOE team followed approved accreditation guidelines when conducting the visit.
- 2) Voted (7-0) to agree with the corrected areas for improvement cited in the BOE Report.
- 3) Voted (7-0) to agree with the new areas for improvement cited in the BOE Report.
- 4) Voted (7-0) to agree with the BOE team that all standards are met.

In addition to decisions identified above, the AAC recommends **PROGRAM APPROVAL** (Vote: 7-0) and **ACCREDITATION** for Midway College (Vote: 7-0).

Due to a personal issue, Dr. Susan Compton had to leave the meeting prior to the Thomas More College presentation.

THOMAS MORE COLLEGE

Bonnie Marshal, Co-chair of the joint NCATE/EPSC Board of Examiners (BOE) team, presented the report on behalf of the team. She provided an overview of the team members, the type of visit (First NCATE/State), and the findings of the team. She was complimentary of the unit's hospitality, efforts, and preparedness by the institution. She indicated that the BOE team found all standards had been met with one area for improvement in Standard 4. As this was a first visit there were no corrected or continued areas for improvement.

Drs. Manish Sharma, Department Chair, Joyce Fortney-Hamberg, Division Chair, and Christy Petroze, Director of Student Teaching, commented on behalf of the institution. Each acknowledged a thorough review by the team and was complimentary of the team members and the accreditation process. Dr. Sharma indicated that the entire college is trying to recruit a more diverse body, and the area for improvement cited by the team

will support the unit's efforts to grow a more diverse candidate population. He indicated that the unit is collaborating with other institutions to provide opportunities for TMC candidates to work with candidates from other institutions. Dr. Hamberg commented on the involvement of the alumni and the partner districts. Dr. Petroze was complimentary of the experience and assured the committee of the unit's commitment and diligence.

The AAC reviewed the findings of the BOE team and agreed with its findings that all standards were met, with following areas for improvement:

Corrected Areas for Improvement: None

Continued Areas for Improvement: None

New Area for Improvement:

Standard 4: Diversity

- 1) Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse candidates.

Following appropriate meeting protocol, the AAC made the following decisions:

- 1) Voted (6-0) that the BOE team followed approved accreditation guidelines when conducting the visit.
- 2) Voted (6-0) to agree with the new areas for improvement cited in the BOE Report.
- 3) Voted (6-0) to agree with the BOE team that all standards are met.

In addition to decisions identified above, the AAC recommends **PROGRAM APPROVAL** (Vote: 6-0) and **ACCREDITATION** for Thomas More College (Vote: 6-0).

BIENNIAL REVIEW

The AAC conducted biennial reviews for four institutions – Eastern Kentucky University, Murray State University, University of the Cumberlands, and University of Louisville. The committee reviewed the institutions' areas for improvement and provided feedback to the institutions after reviewing two years of annual reports (2009-2010 and 2010-2011).

The next meeting date was tentatively set for Friday, June 14, 2013.

Agenda Book

16 KAR 5:010. Standards for accreditation of educator preparation units and approval of programs.

Section 20. Official State Accreditation Action by the Education Professional Standards Board. (1) A recommendation from the Accreditation Audit Committee shall be presented to the full EPSB.

(2) The EPSB shall consider the findings and recommendations of the Accreditation Audit Committee and make a final determination regarding the state accreditation of the educator preparation unit.

(3) Decision options following a first accreditation visit shall be "accreditation", "provisional accreditation", "denial of accreditation", or "revocation of accreditation".

(a) Accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit meets each of the six (6) NCATE standards for unit accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the professional education unit shall be expected to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in the EPSB's action report.

2. The next on-site visit shall be scheduled five (5) years following the semester of the visit.

(b) Provisional accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards. The unit has accredited status but shall satisfy provisions by meeting each previously-unmet standard. EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard or standards within six (6) months of the accreditation decision, or shall schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the provisional accreditation decision was granted. If the EPSB decides to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of the focused visit within two (2) years. Following the focused visit, the EPSB shall decide to:

a. Accredit; or

b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If the unit is accredited, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for five (5) years following the semester of the first accreditation visit.

(c) Denial of accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit does not meet one (1) or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates.

(d) Revocation of accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not sufficiently addressed the unmet standard or standards following a focused visit.

(4) Decision options following a continuing accreditation visit shall be "accreditation", "accreditation with conditions", "accreditation with probation", or "revocation of accreditation".

(a) Accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit meets each of the six (6) NCATE standards for unit accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the professional education unit shall be expected to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in EPSB's action report.

2. The next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester of the visit.

(b) Accreditation with conditions.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards. If the EPSB renders this decision, the unit shall maintain its accredited status, but shall satisfy conditions by meeting previously unmet standards. EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard or standards within six (6) months of the decision to accredit with conditions, or shall schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the accreditation with conditions decision was granted. If the EPSB decides to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of the focused visit within two (2) years. Following the focused visit, the EPSB shall decide to:

a. Continue accreditation; or

b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If the EPSB renders the decision to continue accreditation, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester in which the continuing accreditation visit occurred.

(c) Accreditation with probation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. As a result of the continuing accreditation review, the EPSB has determined that areas for improvement with respect to standards may place an institution's accreditation in jeopardy if left uncorrected. The institution shall schedule an on-site visit within two (2) years of the semester in which the probationary decision was rendered. This visit shall mirror the process for first accreditation. The unit as part of this visit shall address all NCATE standards in effect at the time of the probationary review at the two (2) year point. Following the on-site review, the EPSB shall decide to:

a. Continue accreditation; or

b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If accreditation is continued, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for five (5) years after the semester of the probationary visit.

(d) Revocation of accreditation. Following a comprehensive site visit that occurs as a result of an EPSB decision to accredit with probation or to accredit with conditions, this accreditation decision indicates that the unit does not meet one (1) or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. Accreditation shall be revoked if the unit:

1. No longer meets preconditions to accreditation, such as loss of state approval or regional accreditation;

2. Misrepresents its accreditation status to the public;

3. Falsely reports data or plagiarized information submitted for accreditation purposes; or

4. Fails to submit annual reports or other documents required for accreditation.

Agenda Book

(5) Notification of EPSB action to revoke continuing accreditation or deny first accreditation, including failure to remove conditions, shall include notice that:

(a) The institution shall inform students currently admitted to a certification or rank program of the following:

1. A student recommended for certification or advancement in rank within the twelve (12) months immediately following the denial or revocation of state accreditation and who applies to the EPSB within the fifteen (15) months immediately following the denial or revocation of state accreditation shall receive the certificate or advancement in rank; and

2. A student who does not meet the criteria established in subparagraph 1 of this paragraph shall transfer to a state accredited education preparation unit in order to receive the certificate or advancement in rank; and

(b) An institution for which the EPSB has denied or revoked accreditation shall seek state accreditation through completion of the first accreditation process. The on-site accreditation visit shall be scheduled by the EPSB no earlier than two (2) years following the EPSB action to revoke or deny state accreditation.

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Action Item C

Action Item:

Midway College: Accreditation of the Educator Preparation Unit and Approval of Programs

Applicable Statute or Regulation:

KRS 161.028
16 KAR 5:010

Applicable Goal:

Goal 1: Every approved educator preparation program meets or exceeds all accreditation standards and prepares knowledgeable, capable teachers and administrators who demonstrate effectiveness in helping all students reach educational achievement.

Issue:

Should the EPSB grant continuing accreditation to the Educator Preparation Unit and approve the initial programs at Midway College?

Background:

A state Board of Examiners (BOE) team conducted the on-site evaluation of the Educator Preparation Unit at Midway College on April 22 – 25, 2012. The BOE team found all standards were met with two corrected areas for improvement, no continued areas for improvement, and three new areas for improvement. The BOE also reviewed program review documents as part of the on-site visit and found them to be in compliance with program guidelines as established and approved by the EPSB. At its December 6, 2012, meeting, the Accreditation Audit Committee (AAC) met (see attached minutes) and reviewed the accreditation materials including the Institutional Report, the BOE Report, and the unit's rejoinder.

The AAC reviewed the following areas for improvement cited in the BOE Report:

Corrected

Standard 4: Diversity

- 1) Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with other candidates from ethnically diverse backgrounds.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

- 1) The unit has inconsistently applied the process of evaluating adjunct faculty.

New

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

- 1) While the unit shows evidence that it collects data, the unit does not demonstrate that it analyzes and evaluates data.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

- 1) The unit does not ensure that field experiences are implemented sufficiently to ensure

Agenda Book

that all candidates develop and demonstrate professional proficiencies.

- 2) The unit does not provide all candidates with sufficient opportunities in their field experiences to develop and demonstrate knowledge and skills to help all students learn.

The AAC voted to agree with the findings of the BOE team as cited in the BOE Report. Pursuant to 16 KAR 5:010, Section 19, the AAC accepts all the areas for improvement listed above and recommends: (1) ACCREDITATION and (2) APPROVAL OF THE INITIAL EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS at Midway College.

Groups/Persons Consulted

Content Area Program Reviewers
Continuous Assessment Review Committee
Reading Committee
State Board of Examiners Team
Accreditation Audit Committee

Alternative Actions:

Issue One: Unit Accreditation

1. Accept the recommendation of the AAC and grant ACCREDITATION for Midway College.
2. Modify the AAC recommendation and grant ACCREDITATION WITH CONDITIONS for Midway College.
3. Do not accept the AAC recommendation and grant ACCREDITATION WITH PROBATION for Midway College.

Issue Two: Program Approval

1. Accept the recommendation of the AAC and grant APPROVAL for the initial level educator preparation programs at Midway College.
2. Modify the AAC recommendation and grant APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS for the initial level educator preparation programs at Midway College.
3. Do not accept the AAC recommendation and stipulate DENIAL OF APPROVAL for the initial level educator preparation programs at Midway College.

AAC Recommendation:

Issue One: Alternative 1
Issue Two: Alternative 1

Rationale:

The State BOE team and AAC followed national and state guidelines for accreditation of educator preparation programs.

Contact Person:

Dr. Kim Walters-Parker, Director
Division of Educator Preparation
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: Kim.Walters-Parker@ky.gov

Date:

January 7, 2013

Agenda Book

16 KAR 5:010. Standards for accreditation of educator preparation units and approval of programs.

Section 20. Official State Accreditation Action by the Education Professional Standards Board. (1) A recommendation from the Accreditation Audit Committee shall be presented to the full EPSB.

(2) The EPSB shall consider the findings and recommendations of the Accreditation Audit Committee and make a final determination regarding the state accreditation of the educator preparation unit.

(3) Decision options following a first accreditation visit shall be "accreditation", "provisional accreditation", "denial of accreditation", or "revocation of accreditation".

(a) Accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit meets each of the six (6) NCATE standards for unit accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the professional education unit shall be expected to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in the EPSB's action report.

2. The next on-site visit shall be scheduled five (5) years following the semester of the visit.

(b) Provisional accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards. The unit has accredited status but shall satisfy provisions by meeting each previously-unmet standard. EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard or standards within six (6) months of the accreditation decision, or shall schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the provisional accreditation decision was granted. If the EPSB decides to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of the focused visit within two (2) years. Following the focused visit, the EPSB shall decide to:

a. Accredit; or

b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If the unit is accredited, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for five (5) years following the semester of the first accreditation visit.

(c) Denial of accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit does not meet one (1) or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates.

(d) Revocation of accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not sufficiently addressed the unmet standard or standards following a focused visit.

(4) Decision options following a continuing accreditation visit shall be "accreditation", "accreditation with conditions", "accreditation with probation", or "revocation of accreditation".

(a) Accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit meets each of the six (6) NCATE standards for unit accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the professional education unit shall be expected to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in EPSB's action report.

2. The next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester of the visit.

(b) Accreditation with conditions.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards. If the EPSB renders this decision, the unit shall maintain its accredited status, but shall satisfy conditions by meeting previously unmet standards. EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard or standards within six (6) months of the decision to accredit with conditions, or shall schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the accreditation with conditions decision was granted. If the EPSB decides to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of the focused visit within two (2) years. Following the focused visit, the EPSB shall decide to:

a. Continue accreditation; or

b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If the EPSB renders the decision to continue accreditation, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester in which the continuing accreditation visit occurred.

(c) Accreditation with probation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. As a result of the continuing accreditation review, the EPSB has determined that areas for improvement with respect to standards may place an institution's accreditation in jeopardy if left uncorrected. The institution shall schedule an on-site visit within two (2) years of the semester in which the probationary decision was rendered. This visit shall mirror the process for first accreditation. The unit as part of this visit shall address all NCATE standards in effect at the time of the probationary review at the two (2) year point. Following the on-site review, the EPSB shall decide to:

a. Continue accreditation; or

b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If accreditation is continued, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for five (5) years after the semester of the probationary visit.

(d) Revocation of accreditation. Following a comprehensive site visit that occurs as a result of an EPSB decision to accredit with probation or to accredit with conditions, this accreditation decision indicates that the unit does not meet one (1) or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. Accreditation shall be revoked if the unit:

1. No longer meets preconditions to accreditation, such as loss of state approval or regional accreditation;

2. Misrepresents its accreditation status to the public;

3. Falsely reports data or plagiarized information submitted for accreditation purposes; or

4. Fails to submit annual reports or other documents required for accreditation.

Agenda Book

(5) Notification of EPSB action to revoke continuing accreditation or deny first accreditation, including failure to remove conditions, shall include notice that:

(a) The institution shall inform students currently admitted to a certification or rank program of the following:

1. A student recommended for certification or advancement in rank within the twelve (12) months immediately following the denial or revocation of state accreditation and who applies to the EPSB within the fifteen (15) months immediately following the denial or revocation of state accreditation shall receive the certificate or advancement in rank; and

2. A student who does not meet the criteria established in subparagraph 1 of this paragraph shall transfer to a state accredited education preparation unit in order to receive the certificate or advancement in rank; and

(b) An institution for which the EPSB has denied or revoked accreditation shall seek state accreditation through completion of the first accreditation process. The on-site accreditation visit shall be scheduled by the EPSB no earlier than two (2) years following the EPSB action to revoke or deny state accreditation.

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Action Item D

Action Item:

Kentucky Christian University: Accreditation of the Educator Preparation Unit and Approval of Programs

Applicable Statute or Regulation:

KRS 161.028
16 KAR 5:010

Applicable Goal:

Goal 1: Every approved educator preparation program meets or exceeds all accreditation standards and prepares knowledgeable, capable teachers and administrators who demonstrate effectiveness in helping all students reach educational achievement.

Issue:

Should the EPSB grant continuing accreditation to the Educator Preparation Unit and approve the initial programs at Kentucky Christian University?

Background:

A state Board of Examiners (BOE) team conducted the on-site evaluation of the Educator Preparation Unit at Kentucky Christian University on April 15 – 18, 2012. The BOE team found all standards were met with four corrected areas for improvement, one continued area for improvement, and seven new areas for improvement. The BOE also reviewed program review documents as part of the on-site visit and found them to be in compliance with program guidelines as established and approved by the EPSB. At its December 6, 2012, meeting, the Accreditation Audit Committee (AAC) met (see attached minutes) and reviewed the accreditation materials including the Institutional Report, the BOE Report, and the unit's rejoinder.

The AAC reviewed the following areas for improvement cited in the BOE Report:

Corrected

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

- 1) A systematic method does not exist to ensure that candidates have quality field experiences.

Standard 4: Diversity

- 1) The unit does not provide opportunities for interaction with a diverse P-12 school faculty.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

- 1) Scholarship by unit faculty is limited.

Agenda Book

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

- 1) The Teacher Education Committee does not include a P-12 representative.

Continued

Standard 4: Diversity

- 1) The unit does not maintain a diverse student body.

New

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

- 1) The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates demonstrate adequate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

- 1) The unit does not formally analyze and aggregate assessment data for program and unit improvement.
- 2) The unit does not have a formal candidate complaint procedure or a method to document compliant resolutions.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

- 1) Kentucky Teacher Standard 10 is not systematically addressed across all programs.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

- 1) The unit does not systematically and regularly evaluate professional education faculty members.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

- 1) The unit does not effectively engage P-12 teachers and other practicing educators in design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs.
- 2) Faculty workloads do not allow professional education faculty members to be effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, P-12 collaboration, and service.

The AAC voted to agree with the areas for improvement as cited in the BOE Report; however, the AAC did not agree with the team's findings that all standards are met. The AAC recommends that Standard 2 is not met based on the inconsistent integration of the Kentucky Teacher Standards and the lack of evidence of data-driven decision making processes. Pursuant to 16 KAR 5:010, Section 19, the AAC accepts all the areas for improvement listed above and recommends: (1) ACCREDITATION WITH CONDITIONS and (2) APPROVAL OF THE

INITIAL EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS at Kentucky Christian University.

Groups/Persons Consulted

Content Area Program Reviewers
Continuous Assessment Review Committee
Reading Committee
State Board of Examiners Team
Accreditation Audit Committee

Alternative Actions:

Issue One: Unit Accreditation

1. Accept the recommendation of the AAC and grant ACCREDITATION WITH CONDITIONS for Kentucky Christian University.
2. Modify the AAC recommendation and grant ACCREDITATION for Kentucky Christian University.
3. Do not accept the AAC recommendation and grant ACCREDITATION WITH PROBATION for Kentucky Christian University.

Issue Two: Program Approval

1. Accept the recommendation of the AAC and grant APPROVAL for the initial level educator preparation programs at Kentucky Christian University.
2. Modify the AAC recommendation and grant APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS for the initial level educator preparation programs at Kentucky Christian University.
3. Do not accept the AAC recommendation and stipulate DENIAL OF APPROVAL for the initial level educator preparation programs at Kentucky Christian University.

AAC Recommendation:

Issue One: Alternative 1
Issue Two: Alternative 1

Rationale:

The State BOE team and AAC followed national and state guidelines for accreditation of educator preparation programs.

Contact Person:

Dr. Kim Walters-Parker, Director
Division of Educator Preparation
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: Kim.Walters-Parker@ky.gov

Date:

January 7, 2013

16 KAR 5:010. Standards for accreditation of educator preparation units and approval of programs.

Section 20. Official State Accreditation Action by the Education Professional Standards Board. (1) A recommendation from the Accreditation Audit Committee shall be presented to the full EPSB.

(2) The EPSB shall consider the findings and recommendations of the Accreditation Audit Committee and make a final determination regarding the state accreditation of the educator preparation unit.

(3) Decision options following a first accreditation visit shall be "accreditation", "provisional accreditation", "denial of accreditation", or "revocation of accreditation".

(a) Accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit meets each of the six (6) NCATE standards for unit accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the professional education unit shall be expected to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in the EPSB's action report.

2. The next on-site visit shall be scheduled five (5) years following the semester of the visit.

(b) Provisional accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards. The unit has accredited status but shall satisfy provisions by meeting each previously-unmet standard. EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard or standards within six (6) months of the accreditation decision, or shall schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the provisional accreditation decision was granted. If the EPSB decides to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of the focused visit within two (2) years. Following the focused visit, the EPSB shall decide to:

a. Accredit; or

b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If the unit is accredited, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for five (5) years following the semester of the first accreditation visit.

(c) Denial of accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit does not meet one (1) or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates.

(d) Revocation of accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not sufficiently addressed the unmet standard or standards following a focused visit.

(4) Decision options following a continuing accreditation visit shall be "accreditation", "accreditation with conditions", "accreditation with probation", or "revocation of accreditation".

(a) Accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit meets each of the six (6) NCATE standards for unit accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the professional education unit shall be expected to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in EPSB's action report.

2. The next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester of the visit.

(b) Accreditation with conditions.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards. If the EPSB renders this decision, the unit shall maintain its accredited status, but shall satisfy conditions by meeting previously unmet standards. EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard or standards within six (6) months of the decision to accredit with conditions, or shall schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the accreditation with conditions decision was granted. If the EPSB decides to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of the focused visit within two (2) years. Following the focused visit, the EPSB shall decide to:

a. Continue accreditation; or

b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If the EPSB renders the decision to continue accreditation, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester in which the continuing accreditation visit occurred.

(c) Accreditation with probation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. As a result of the continuing accreditation review, the EPSB has determined that areas for improvement with respect to standards may place an institution's accreditation in jeopardy if left uncorrected. The institution shall schedule an on-site visit within two (2) years of the semester in which the probationary decision was rendered. This visit shall mirror the process for first accreditation. The unit as part of this visit shall address all NCATE standards in effect at the time of the probationary review at the two (2) year point. Following the on-site review, the EPSB shall decide to:

a. Continue accreditation; or

b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If accreditation is continued, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for five (5) years after the semester of the probationary visit.

(d) Revocation of accreditation. Following a comprehensive site visit that occurs as a result of an EPSB decision to accredit with probation or to accredit with conditions, this accreditation decision indicates that the unit does not meet one (1) or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. Accreditation shall be revoked if the unit:

1. No longer meets preconditions to accreditation, such as loss of state approval or regional accreditation;

2. Misrepresents its accreditation status to the public;

3. Falsely reports data or plagiarized information submitted for accreditation purposes; or

4. Fails to submit annual reports or other documents required for accreditation.

Agenda Book

(5) Notification of EPSB action to revoke continuing accreditation or deny first accreditation, including failure to remove conditions, shall include notice that:

(a) The institution shall inform students currently admitted to a certification or rank program of the following:

1. A student recommended for certification or advancement in rank within the twelve (12) months immediately following the denial or revocation of state accreditation and who applies to the EPSB within the fifteen (15) months immediately following the denial or revocation of state accreditation shall receive the certificate or advancement in rank; and

2. A student who does not meet the criteria established in subparagraph 1 of this paragraph shall transfer to a state accredited education preparation unit in order to receive the certificate or advancement in rank; and

(b) An institution for which the EPSB has denied or revoked accreditation shall seek state accreditation through completion of the first accreditation process. The on-site accreditation visit shall be scheduled by the EPSB no earlier than two (2) years following the EPSB action to revoke or deny state accreditation.

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Action Item E

Action Item:

Berea College: Accreditation of the Educator Preparation Unit and Approval of Programs

Applicable Statute or Regulation:

KRS 161.028
16 KAR 5:010

Applicable Goal:

Goal 1: Every approved educator preparation program meets or exceeds all accreditation standards and prepares knowledgeable, capable teachers and administrators who demonstrate effectiveness in helping all students reach educational achievement.

Issue:

Should the EPSB grant continuing accreditation to the Educator Preparation Unit and approve the initial level preparation programs at Berea College?

Background:

A joint NCATE/state Board of Examiners (BOE) team conducted the on-site evaluation of the Educator Preparation Unit at Berea College on March 25 – 27, 2012. The BOE team found Standard 1 and Standard 4 were not met. The team identified no corrected areas for improvement, one continued area for improvement, and nine new areas for improvement. The BOE also reviewed program review documents as part of the on-site visit and found them to be in compliance with program guidelines as established and approved by the EPSB. At its December 6, 2012 meeting, the Accreditation Audit Committee (AAC) met (see attached minutes) and reviewed the accreditation materials including the Institutional Report, the Off-Site BOE Report, the IR Addendum, and the On-Site BOE Report.

The AAC reviewed each area for improvement cited in the BOE Report. There were no corrected areas for improvement, one continued area for improvement and nine new areas for improvement relating to the lack of sufficient evidence to demonstrate meeting all the standards.

Continued

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

- 1) The unit does not ensure consistent professional and pedagogical preparation of secondary candidates.

New

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

- 1) The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates demonstrate adequate pedagogical content knowledge and skills.
- 2) The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates demonstrate adequate professional and pedagogical content knowledge and skills.

Agenda Book

- 3) The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, and monitor student progress.
- 4) The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates develop and demonstrate the professional dispositions identified by the unit throughout their respective programs of study.
- 5) The unit lacks sufficient data that indicates progress of candidates through key transition points.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

- 1) The unit does not systematically analyze and evaluate data for program and unit improvement.

Standard 3: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

- 1) Assessment of candidates' performance in pre-student teaching field experiences is not conducted jointly by the candidates, school faculty, and professional education faculty.

Standard 4: Diversity

- 1) Unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidate proficiencies related to diversity are assessed and that the data are used to provide feedback to candidates for improving their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping students from diverse populations learn.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

- 1) The current governance structure does not provide for effective monitoring of the implementation of the various program and unit assessments and the consistent reporting of candidate performance aligned to program and unit defined outcomes.

The AAC voted to agree with the findings of the BOE team that Standards 2, 3, 4, and 6 are met while Standards 1 and 4 are not met. Pursuant to 16 KAR 5:010, Section 19, the AAC accepts the areas for improvement listed above and recommends: (1) ACCREDITATION WITH CONDITIONS and (2) APPROVAL OF THE INITIAL LEVEL EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS at Berea College.

Groups/Persons Consulted

Content Area Program Reviewers
Continuous Assessment Review Committee
Reading Committee
Joint NCATE/State Board of Examiners Team
Accreditation Audit Committee

Alternative Actions:

Issue One: Unit Accreditation

1. Accept the recommendation of the AAC and grant ACCREDITATION WITH CONDITIONS for Berea College.
2. Modify the AAC recommendation and grant ACCREDITATION for Berea College.
3. Do not accept the AAC recommendation and grant ACCREDITATION WITH PROBATION for Berea College.

Issue Two: Program Approval

1. Accept the recommendation of the AAC and grant APPROVAL for the initial level educator preparation programs at Berea College.
2. Modify the AAC recommendation and grant APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS for the initial educator preparation programs at Berea College.
3. Do not accept the AAC recommendation and stipulate DENIAL OF APPROVAL for the initial level educator preparation programs at Berea College.

AAC Recommendation:

Issue One: Alternative 1

Issue Two: Alternative 1

Rationale:

The Joint NCATE/State BOE team and AAC followed national and state guidelines for accreditation of educator preparation programs.

Contact Person:

Dr. Kim Walters-Parker, Director

Division of Educator Preparation

(502) 564-5789

E-mail: Kim.Walters-Parker@ky.gov

Date:

January 7, 2013

16 KAR 5:010. Standards for accreditation of educator preparation units and approval of programs.

Section 20. Official State Accreditation Action by the Education Professional Standards Board. (1) A recommendation from the Accreditation Audit Committee shall be presented to the full EPSB.

(2) The EPSB shall consider the findings and recommendations of the Accreditation Audit Committee and make a final determination regarding the state accreditation of the educator preparation unit.

(3) Decision options following a first accreditation visit shall be "accreditation", "provisional accreditation", "denial of accreditation", or "revocation of accreditation".

(a) Accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit meets each of the six (6) NCATE standards for unit accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the professional education unit shall be expected to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in the EPSB's action report.

2. The next on-site visit shall be scheduled five (5) years following the semester of the visit.

(b) Provisional accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards. The unit has accredited status but shall satisfy provisions by meeting each previously-unmet standard. EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard or standards within six (6) months of the accreditation decision, or shall schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the provisional accreditation decision was granted. If the EPSB decides to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of the focused visit within two (2) years. Following the focused visit, the EPSB shall decide to:

a. Accredit; or

b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If the unit is accredited, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for five (5) years following the semester of the first accreditation visit.

(c) Denial of accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit does not meet one (1) or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates.

(d) Revocation of accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not sufficiently addressed the unmet standard or standards following a focused visit.

(4) Decision options following a continuing accreditation visit shall be "accreditation", "accreditation with conditions", "accreditation with probation", or "revocation of accreditation".

(a) Accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit meets each of the six (6) NCATE standards for unit accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the professional education unit shall be expected to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in EPSB's action report.

2. The next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester of the visit.

(b) Accreditation with conditions.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards. If the EPSB renders this decision, the unit shall maintain its accredited status, but shall satisfy conditions by meeting previously unmet standards. EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the unmet standard or standards within six (6) months of the decision to accredit with conditions, or shall schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the accreditation with conditions decision was granted. If the EPSB decides to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of the focused visit within two (2) years. Following the focused visit, the EPSB shall decide to:

a. Continue accreditation; or

b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If the EPSB renders the decision to continue accreditation, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester in which the continuing accreditation visit occurred.

(c) Accreditation with probation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. As a result of the continuing accreditation review, the EPSB has determined that areas for improvement with respect to standards may place an institution's accreditation in jeopardy if left uncorrected. The institution shall schedule an on-site visit within two (2) years of the semester in which the probationary decision was rendered. This visit shall mirror the process for first accreditation. The unit as part of this visit shall address all NCATE standards in effect at the time of the probationary review at the two (2) year point. Following the on-site review, the EPSB shall decide to:

a. Continue accreditation; or

b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If accreditation is continued, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for five (5) years after the semester of the probationary visit.

(d) Revocation of accreditation. Following a comprehensive site visit that occurs as a result of an EPSB decision to accredit with probation or to accredit with conditions, this accreditation decision indicates that the unit does not meet one (1) or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. Accreditation shall be revoked if the unit:

1. No longer meets preconditions to accreditation, such as loss of state approval or regional accreditation;

2. Misrepresents its accreditation status to the public;

3. Falsely reports data or plagiarized information submitted for accreditation purposes; or

4. Fails to submit annual reports or other documents required for accreditation.

Agenda Book

(5) Notification of EPSB action to revoke continuing accreditation or deny first accreditation, including failure to remove conditions, shall include notice that:

(a) The institution shall inform students currently admitted to a certification or rank program of the following:

1. A student recommended for certification or advancement in rank within the twelve (12) months immediately following the denial or revocation of state accreditation and who applies to the EPSB within the fifteen (15) months immediately following the denial or revocation of state accreditation shall receive the certificate or advancement in rank; and

2. A student who does not meet the criteria established in subparagraph 1 of this paragraph shall transfer to a state accredited education preparation unit in order to receive the certificate or advancement in rank; and

(b) An institution for which the EPSB has denied or revoked accreditation shall seek state accreditation through completion of the first accreditation process. The on-site accreditation visit shall be scheduled by the EPSB no earlier than two (2) years following the EPSB action to revoke or deny state accreditation.