Agenda Book

EPSB Meeting Agenda
EPSB Offices
100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Conference Room A, Frankfort, KY 40601
January 10, 2011

Monday, January 10, 2011

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

Swearing In of New Board Members

Roll Call

Open Speak

Approval of Consent Items

A. October 25, 2010 EPSB Minutes **(Pages 1-24)**

B. Masters of Arts in Education with Teacher Leader Endorsement, Eastern Kentucky University (Mr. Robert Brown; Dr. Kim Walters-Parker) **(Pages 25-28)**

C. Principal Preparation Program, All Grades, Western Kentucky University (Mr. Brown; Dr. Walters-Parker) (**Pages 29-32)**

D. Principal Preparation Program, All Grades, Murray State University (Mr. Brown; Dr. Walters-Parker) (**Pages 33-36)**

E. Master of Science in Teacher Leadership, Brescia University (Mr. Brown; Dr. Walters-Parker) **(Pages 37-42)**

F. 16 KAR 5:040. Request to Waive the Cooperating Teacher Eligibility Requirements, Dr. Cathy Gunn on behalf of Krista Hayslip (Dr. Walters-Parker) **(Pages 43-46)**

Report of the Executive Director

A. Report from the Kentucky Department of Education

B. Report from the Council on Postsecondary Education

C. Senate Bill 1 Update (Ms. Linda Nickel)

D. Local Educator Assignment Data (LEAD) Report (Mr. Mike Carr)

Report of the Chair

Appointment of Committee to Review the Kentucky Teacher Standards

Committee Reports

Presentation

NASDTEC Interstate Agreement (Mr. Carr) **(Pages 47-58)**

Information/Discussion Items

A. Awarded Contracts (Mr. Gary Freeland) **(Pages 59-60)**

B. Mid-Year Budget Report (Mr. Freeland) **(Pages 61-62)**

C. 16 KAR 6:030. Examination Prerequisites for Principal Certification, Amendment, Notice of Intent (Mr. Brown) **(Pages 63-68)**

Action Items

A. Committee to Review the Kentucky Teacher Standards Charter (Mr. Brown; Dr. Walters-Parker) **(Pages 69-72)**

B. 16 KAR 6:010. Written Examination Prerequisites for Teacher Certification, Amendment, Final Action (Mr. Brown) **(Pages 73-98)**

C. 16 KAR 5:010. Standards for Accreditation of Educator Preparation Units and Approval of Programs, Amendment, Final Action (Mr. Brown; Dr. Walters-Parker) **(Pages 99-146)**

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 7, 2011
EPSB Offices

The actions delineated below were taken in open session of the EPSB at the October 25, 2010 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 25, 2010

Call to Order

Chair Lorraine Williams called the meeting to order at approximately 9:00a.m.

Roll Call

The following members were present during the October 25, 2010 EPSB meeting: Frank Cheatham, Michael Dailey, John DeAtley, Cathy Gunn, Sandy Sinclair-Curry, Zenaida Smith, Bobbie Stoess, Tom Stull, Mark Wasicsko, Cassandra Webb, Lorraine Williams, and Cynthia York. Mary Hammons and Lynn May were absent.

Approval of September 20, 2010 EPSB Minutes

Motion made by Ms. Zenaida Smith, seconded by Dr. Frank Cheatham, to approve the minutes of the September 20, 2010 EPSB meeting.

Vote: *11 – Yes*
1 – Abstain (Ms. Cassandra Webb)

Open Speak

There were no requests for Open Speak.

Report of the Executive Director

Report from the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE)

Mr. Michael Dailey reported on the recent work at KDE.

* In March 2011, educators will have an opportunity to complete the anonymous online TELL Kentucky Survey. This survey will determine if educators believe they have positive teaching and learning conditions, which research has shown to be important to student achievement and teacher retention. You may view the survey at www.TellKentucky.org.

Report from the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE)

Mr. John DeAtley reported on the recent work at CPE.

* The Improving Educator Quality Grants review committee recently made its recommendations to CPE. CPE will take action at its next meeting on November 4th and it is anticipated that the new projects will begin on January 1st.

* A draft of the 2010–15 Strategic Agenda will be presented for review and discussion at the joint meeting of the CPE Strategic Agenda Work Group and Institutional Advisory Group on November 4th. The draft includes the most recent version of the mission, vision, and value statements for the postsecondary system, as well as performance metrics and statewide objectives and strategies to guide work in four areas of focus: college readiness, student success, research and economic competitiveness, and efficiency and innovation.

* Staff at CPE is working on professional development of postsecondary faculty on Senate Bill 1. Contracts to provide workshops across the state will be executed soon.

Legislative Agenda

Ms. Alicia Sneed reported that nonessential legislative agenda items should not be brought before the General Assembly during the upcoming legislative session, given the current climate. The only items she recommended be placed on the EPSB's legislative agenda are the following two items: 1) Oppose any attempt to dilute or modify the current authority of the EPSB and 2) Support any legislation which further supports the EPSB's mission and goals.

Five board members will be confirmed during this short session. Due to a recent Supreme Court decision, the confirmation process will be different, but it is uncertain at this time what changes will be made.

Outgoing Board Member

Chair Lorraine Williams commended the work of Becky Sagan and Cynthia York as EPSB board members. Ms. Becky Sagan said she appreciated her time on the board and was thankful she could bring a school board perspective. Cynthia York said she appreciated sharing her knowledge and expertise and being a voice for kids in Kentucky.

Report of the Chair

Committee Reports

KACI Appointments

Chair Lorraine Williams appointed Norma Patrick to the KACI committee.

Appointment to the Master's Redesign Review Committee

Chair Williams appointed Ms. Dessie Bowling to the Master's Redesign Review Committee.

Appointments to the SB1 KTIP Update Committee

Chair Williams appointed the following individuals to the SB1 KTIP Update Committee: Judy Thomas, Janet O'Connell, Richard Roberts, LuAnn Asbury, Peggy Brooks, Bart Flener, Beverly Ennis, Verna Lowe, Cindy Parker, and Dee Jones.

Information/Discussion Items

16 KAR 6:010. Written Examination Prerequisites for Teacher Certification, Amendment, Notice of Intent

Mr. Robert Brown reported to the board the following proposed changes to 16 KAR 6:010:

* Add newly developed *French*, *German*, and *Spanish* World Language and *Business Education* Tests and corresponding passing scores.

* Add *Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (0856)* Test and corresponding passing score.

* Adopt newly developed *Physical Education: Content and Design (0095)* Test and corresponding passing score.

* Add *Teaching Reading (0204)* Test and corresponding passing score for Reading Endorsement.

* Adopt *Reading Specialist (0300)* Test and corresponding passing score for Literacy Endorsement.

* Adopt newly developed Special Education Tests and corresponding passing scores.

* Modify language regarding assessment requirements for applicants of any exceptional children certificate.

Dr. Mark Wasicsko asked questions regarding the cut score framework. The board consensus was for Dr. Rogers to bring a recommendation before the board to create a study group to revisit the cut score framework.

This regulation will be brought back before the board at its January meeting for final approval.

Plan for Possible Mid-Year Reduction to the EPSB

Mr. Freeland reported on a plan for possible mid-year budget reductions, estimated by staff to be 3%. After discussing the impact of future budget reductions on existing programs, staff recommended that mentoring contracts to serve the January 2011 cohort not be issued. All those currently in National Board will continue to receive mentoring through July 30, 2011. This change would affect only those new candidates who enroll after January 1, 2011. The funds not used for mentoring will ensure that the 75% reimbursement for the cost of National Board Certification, which is mandated by statute, is available to successful candidates in 2011.

Because Kentucky has been provided federal subsidies from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in Washington D. C. ($525,000 currently for 2010), the trust fund has been able to provide the 75% reimbursement to the candidate without limiting the number of candidates who may participate. With an increase in the number of teachers seeking National Board Certification, a reduction in federal funds would require the EPSB to consider limiting the number of candidates who receive support through the Incentive Trust Fund.

16 KAR 5:010. Standards for Accreditation of Educator Preparation Units and Approval of Programs, Notice of Intent

Mr. Robert Brown reported on proposed changes to 16 KAR 5:010. The Master's Redesign Review Committee was created by the EPSB to review all redesigned master's programs for approval between May 31, 2008 and December 31, 2010. These programs are not reviewed by the Continuous Assessment Review Committee, Content Program Review Committee, or the Reading Committee.

An amendment to 16 KAR 5:010 will remove the expiration date for the Master's Redesign Review Committee. This ensures that all redesigned master's programs are given the same review and consideration, both for resubmissions of institutions' proposals that were previously denied by the review committee as well as for future master's submissions for rank change.

The proposed regulation will be placed on the January agenda for possible final action.

SB1 KTIP Update Committee

Mr. Robert Brown informed the board about the new SB1 KTIP Update Committee. SB1 requires the Education Professional Standards Board to ensure that each teacher preparation program includes the use of the Common Core Standards in its pre-service education programs and that all teacher interns have experience planning classroom instruction based on the new standards.

EPSB staff met with the Kentucky Advisory Council for Internship (KACI) in August 2010 to discuss this alignment. KACI recommended developing a work group that would review all KTIP documents, ensuring the alignment with the new standards. In addition, the KTIP training materials will be revised to include additional resources and links to the new standards as well as other state initiatives, e.g. Classroom Assessment for Learning.

Information and changes to the documents will be vetted with other constituent groups for additional feedback prior to implementation.

Action Items

2010 Title II Report

2010-071

Motion made by Mr. Michael Dailey, seconded by Dr. Frank Cheatham, to approve the 2008/2009 Title II Report for submission to the United States Department of Education.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Emergency Review of Programs Pursuant to 2008-2009 Title II Report

2010-072

Motion made by Ms. Zenaida Smith, seconded by Ms. Bobbie Stoess, to accept and approve the recommendation of the Executive Director to accept the plans of Eastern Kentucky University: Education of Deaf & Hard of Hearing and Thomas More College: Social Studies: Content Knowledge (0081) with no follow-up action necessary.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Emergency Non-Certified Substitute Program Approval

2010-073

Motion made by Ms. Cynthia York, seconded by Ms. Smith, to approve staff recommendations for the listed districts to continue in the Emergency Non-Certified School Program for the 2010-11 school year.

Vote: *Unanimous*

16 KAR 3:050. Professional Certificate for Instructional Leadership - School Principal, All Grades, Notice of Intent

2010-074

Motion made by Dr. Cheatham, seconded by Ms. Smith, to approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 3:050.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Waivers

16 KAR 5:010. Request to Waive Language Pertaining to the Review of Master's or Planned Fifth Year Non-Degree Programs for Rank II

2010-075

Motion made by Mr. John DeAtley, seconded by Ms. Stoess, to waive language to 16 KAR 5:010 that limits the time of the Master's Redesign Review Committee to December 31, 2010.

Vote: *Unanimous*

16 KAR 6:010. Request to Waive Language Pertaining to the Hearing Impaired (P-12) Certification Assessment Requirement

2010-076

Motion made by Dr. Cathy Gunn, seconded by Dr. Mark Wasicsko, to accept the MTTC Field 062: Hearing Impaired *test in lieu of the Praxis II* Education of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students (0271).

Vote: *Unanimous*

Board Comments

Dr. Wasicsko asked questions pertaining to the Quality Performance Index (QPI) and program completers. Dr. Rogers stated that he will recommend in the spring that the board create a group to develop new measures to reconstitute the QPI. Dr. Wasicsko also said that he would like to see a board presentation on NCATE changes and updates on Next Generation Learning.

DISCIPLINARY MATTERS:
MINUTES OF CASE REVIEW
October 25, 2010

Motion made by Dr. Cathy Gunn, seconded by Ms. Zenaida Smith, 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. Sandra Sinclair-Curry, seconded by Mr. John DeAtley, to return to open session.

Vote: *Unanimous*

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

Frank Cheatham, Lorraine Williams, Tom Stull, Zenaida Smith, Cathy Gunn, Michael Dailey, Sandra Sinclair-Curry, John DeAtley, Cynthia York, Cassandra Webb, Bobbie Stoess, and Mark Wasicsko.

Attorneys present were Alicia A. Sneed, Katie Morgan, Whitney Crowe, and Angela Evans.

INITIAL CASE REVIEW

Case Number	**Decision**
1008466	Defer for proof
1006412	Defer for proof
1007425	Admonish
1007437	Defer for proof
1008478	Hear
1008451	Hear
1008444	Admonish
1008455	Admonish
1008449	Admonish
1008462	Hear
1008481	Hear
1006385	Admonish
1008457	Hear
1005313	Dismiss
1006379	Admonish

Character/Fitness Review

Case Number	Decision
10780	Approve
10777	Approve

10776	Approve
10778	Approve
10785	Approve
10787	Approve
10795	Approve
10782	Approve
10796	Deny
10798	Approve
10797	Approve
10799	Approve
10800	Approve
10622	Deny
10805	Deny
10815	Approve
10808	Approve
10816	Approve

Agreed Orders

Case Number	Decision
1005295 (Joseph Reed)	Accept Agreed Order which states as follows: From the date this order is approved by the Board, Respondent's certificate, and any future endorsements or new areas of certification, shall be subject to the following probationary conditions for a period of two (2) years. 1. By December 31, 2010, 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 present 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 not able to complete all treatment recommendations by December 31, 2010, he shall submit quarterly written progress reports from his chemical dependency counselor until such time as the counselor releases him from treatments. If Respondent has not successfully completed all treatment recommendations by the end of the two (2) year probationary period, Respondent agrees that the probationary period shall be extended and he shall submit quarterly written progress reports from the chemical dependency counselor to the Board until such time as the counselor releases him

from treatment. Any expense for the assessment, treatment and/or reports shall be paid by Respondent.
2. Respondent shall be subject to random drug testing and shall have no positive drug tests during the two (2) year probationary period.
3. Respondent shall not be convicted of any crime involving a controlled substance and/or alcohol.
By entering into this Agreed Order, Respondent agrees that should he fail to satisfy any of these conditions, his certificate shall be automatically suspended for a period of six (6) months. If applicable, at the conclusion of the six (6) month suspension, his certificate shall remain suspended until such time as all of the above conditions are met.
Respondent is aware that should he violate KRS 161.120 either during or following this two year period of probationary conditions, the Board shall initiate new disciplinary action and seek additional sanctions.

Vote: *Unanimous*

06-0362 (Timothy Carver)

Accept Agreed Order suspending Respondent's certificate retroactively for five (5) days beginning June 20, 2006. Respondent shall surrender the original and all copies of his certificate immediately, by first class mail or personal delivery to the Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, Third Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.

Vote: *Unanimous*

0910514 (Amy Wheeler)

Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for engaging in inappropriate physical interactions with a student. A teacher in the Commonwealth of Kentucky has a duty to protect the health, safety, and well-being of students and must remain aware of the line between appropriate and inappropriate physical interaction when disciplining a student. The Board will not tolerate any further incidents of misconduct from Respondent.
Respondent's certificate is expired. Issuance of any future certificate to Respondent, or on her behalf, is expressly conditioned upon Respondent providing, upon application, written proof to the Board that she has completed nine (9) hours of professional

development/training, approved by the Board, in the areas of classroom management and effective discipline techniques. Any expense for this training shall be paid by Respondent.
Should Respondent fail to satisfy this condition, the Board shall automatically deny any application submitted by Respondent or on her behalf.

Vote: *Unanimous*

0911540 (Bruce Humes)

Accept Agreed Order suspending Respondent's certificate for a period of thirty (30) days from the date upon which the Board approves this agreement. During the thirty (30) day suspension period, Respondent shall neither apply for nor be issued a teaching certificate in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Respondent shall surrender the original Certificate and all copies to the EPSB by hand delivering or mailing to 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.
Respondent is currently retired from the teaching profession. Prior to accepting a certified position with any school district in Commonwealth of Kentucky, 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 written 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.
If Respondent fails to complete the mandated assessment prior to returning to the classroom, his certificate shall be automatically suspended for a period of one (1) year. At the conclusion of the one (1) year suspension, reinstatement of Respondent's certificate shall be conditioned upon Respondent providing written proof to the Board that he has completed the above required mental health assessment.
Respondent's certificate shall be subject to the following probationary conditions for a period of two (2) years from the date upon which Respondent

accepts a certified position with any school district in Commonwealth of Kentucky:

1. Prior to the end of the probationary period, Respondent shall provide written proof to the Board that he has successfully completed twelve (12) hours of professional development/training in teacher ethics. Any expense incurred for said training shall be paid by Respondent.

2. For the duration of the probationary period, Respondent shall provide the Board with quarterly reports from his employment supervisor as to his progress.

3. For the duration of the probationary period, Respondent shall receive no disciplinary action. "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 any of these conditions during the probationary period, his certificate shall be automatically suspended for a period of one (1) year. If applicable, at the conclusion of the one (1) year suspension, Respondent's certificate shall remain suspended until such time as the probationary conditions are met.

Respondent is aware that should he violate KRS 161.120, either during or following this two (2) year period of probationary conditions, the Board shall initiate new disciplinary action and seek additional sanctions.

Vote: *Unanimous*

0905287 (Frances Cohn)

Accept Agreed Order suspending Respondent's teaching certificate for a period of forty-five (45) days with forty (40) days of the suspension period to be served retroactively from June 20, 2010 through July 30, 2010. The remaining five (5) days shall be served prospectively from December 18, 2010 through December 22, 2010. Upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board, Respondent shall immediately surrender the original and all copies of her certificate, by personal delivery or first class mail, to the Education Professional Standards

Board, 100 Airport Road, Third Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.

Upon reinstatement, Respondent's teaching certificate shall be on probation for a period of two (2) years, and subject to the following probationary conditions:

1. Respondent shall submit written proof to the Board that she has completed twelve (12) hours of classroom management training, as approved by the Board, by July 30, 2011. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by Respondent. If Respondent fails to satisfy this condition, her certificate shall be automatically suspended until Respondent completes the required training and provides the appropriate written proof to the Board;

2. Respondent shall submit written proof to the Board that she has completed a course in anger management and a course in professional ethics, as approved by the Board, by July 30, 2011. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by Respondent. If Respondent fails to satisfy this condition, her certificate shall be automatically suspended until Respondent completes the required training and provides the appropriate written proof to the Board; and

3. Respondent shall receive no disciplinary action from any school district in which she is employed during the probationary period. "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 the tribunal and/or arbitration process. Should Respondent fail to satisfy this condition, her certificate shall be automatically suspended for a period of up to one (1) year and subject to additional sanctions by the Board pursuant to KRS 161.120.

Vote: *Unanimous*

100255 (Mary Todd)

Accept Agreed Order which states as follows:
Respondent shall neither apply for, nor be issued, any type of Learning and Behavior Disorders teaching certificate, including emergency, probationary, and temporary provisional certificates, until she has completed all educational and assessment requirements necessary for a Masters of Teaching Degree in Special Education.

The Board shall not approve Respondent for any type of alternative certification option.

This agreement is expressly conditioned upon Respondent providing written proof to the Board that she has successfully completed twelve (12) hours of professional development and/or training in classroom management, with an emphasis on appropriate discipline techniques and classroom control, by June 1, 2011. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by Respondent. Should Respondent fail to satisfy this condition, her certificate shall be automatically suspended until she completes the required training and provides the appropriate written proof to the Board.

Further, upon receiving any type of Learning and Behavior Disorders certificate, Respondent's Learning and Behavior Disorders certificates, including but not limited to, a Statement of Eligibility for Learning and Behavior Disorders, a Provisional Internship for Learning and Behavior Disorders and/or a Professional Certificate for Learning and Behavior Disorders, shall be on probation for a period of ten (10) years. During the probationary period, Respondent shall not receive any disciplinary action involving assault, inappropriate classroom management, or improper supervision from any school district in which she is employed. "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 the tribunal and/or arbitration process. Should Respondent fail to satisfy this condition, all of Respondent's Certificate(s) for Learning and Behavior Disorders shall be automatically permanently revoked and subject to additional sanctions by the Board pursuant to KRS 161.120.

Vote: *Unanimous*

0912702 (Erin Pille)

Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for her continued neglect of duty and failure to properly supervise her students. The Board reminds Respondent that she has a duty to take reasonable measures to protect the health, safety, and emotional welfare of her students. As an educator, Respondent must ensure that her students are never placed in potentially dangerous situations.

Habitually arriving late to work, especially when the school day begins with the supervision of students, is simply unacceptable. The Board will not tolerate any further incidents of misconduct from Respondent.

Respondent's teaching certificate shall be on probation for a period of one (1) year from the date the Board approves this Order, and subject to the following probationary conditions:

1. Respondent shall submit written proof to the Board that she has completed six (6) hours of professional ethics and professional courtesy training, as approved by the Board, by the end of the probationary period. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by Respondent. Should Respondent fail to satisfy this condition, her certificate shall be automatically suspended until Respondent completes the required training and provides the appropriate written proof to the Board.

2. During the probationary period, Respondent shall refrain from receiving any disciplinary action involving neglect of duty from any school district in which she is employed. "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 the tribunal and/or arbitration process. Should Respondent fail to satisfy this condition, her certificate shall be automatically suspended for a period of thirty (30) days and subject to additional sanctions by the Board pursuant to KRS 161.120.

Vote: *Unanimous*

1004250 (Vickie Bowles)

Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for failing to use appropriate means of discipline and discourse with students. The Board reminds Respondent that she has a duty to protect the health, safety, and emotional well-being of each and every student in her classroom, and to refrain from subjecting students to embarrassment or disparagement. As an educator, it is Respondent's responsibility to treat students with dignity and respect, and to consistently maintain a positive learning environment for all. The Board will not tolerate any further incidents of misconduct from Respondent.

Respondent's teaching certificate has expired. The issuance of any Kentucky teaching certificate to Respondent, or on her behalf, is expressly conditioned upon Respondent providing at the time of application, in addition to proof of any academic or assessment requirements necessary for certification, the following:

1. Respondent shall provide written proof to the Board that she has completed a course in professional ethics, as approved by the Board. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by Respondent; and

2. Respondent shall provide written proof to the Board that she has completed twelve (12) hours of professional development/training in classroom management, with an emphasis on proper discipline techniques, as approved by the Board. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by Respondent.

If Respondent fails to satisfy the above conditions, the Board shall not issue Respondent any Kentucky teaching certificate.

Vote: *Unanimous*

1004209 (Steve Adams)

Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for subjecting his students to embarrassment and disparagement. Respondent's conduct was insensitive and The Board reminds Respondent than an educator has a duty to take reasonable measures to protect the emotional well-being of students and that his actions in this matter violated that duty. The Board will tolerate no further acts of misconduct from Respondent.

This settlement agreement is expressly conditioned upon Respondent providing written proof to the Board that he completed twelve (12) hours of professional development or training on the Professional Code of Ethics for Kentucky Certified School Personnel by September 1, 2011. The training must be approved by the Board and any expense incurred for said training shall be paid by Respondent.

Respondent agrees that should he fail to satisfy the above conditions, his certificate shall be automatically suspended until he provides written proof to the Board that he has completed the conditions.

Vote: *Unanimous*

08111112 (Regina Wallen)

Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for her use of inappropriate discipline with a student. The Respondent is charged with maintaining the dignity and integrity of the profession and failed in that duty when she engaged in inappropriate discipline involving this student. The Board will tolerate no further misconduct of this nature by the Respondent.

Vote: *The Board unanimously voted to Defer the matter to the January docket.*

08121206 (David Grider)

Accept Agreed suspending Respondent's certificate for a period of one (1) year from the date upon which the Board approves this agreement. Respondent shall neither apply for, nor be issued, a teaching certificate in the Commonwealth of Kentucky during the suspension period. Upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board, Respondent 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.

Vote: *Unanimous*

0912737 (Susan Rose)

Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for using poor professional judgment and excessive force against students. The Board reminds Respondent that, as an educator, she must make every effort to protect the health, welfare, and safety of even the most difficult students in her care and, no matter how difficult the situation, to control her temper and refrain from using inappropriate physical force. The Board will not tolerate any further incidents of misconduct from Respondent.

Prior to accepting any teaching or administrative position, in any capacity, in any school district in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, Respondent shall comply with the following:

1. Respondent shall provide written proof to the Board that she has completed twelve (12) hours of professional development/training in the area of classroom management, with an emphasis on de-escalation strategies and proper discipline techniques, as approved by the Board. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by

Respondent. Should Respondent fail to satisfy this condition, her certificate shall be automatically suspended until she completes the required training and provides the appropriate written proof to the Board.

2. Respondent shall provide written proof to the Board that she has received six (6) hours of anger management training and/or counseling, as approved by the Board. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by Respondent. Should Respondent fail to satisfy this condition, her certificate shall be automatically suspended until she completes the required training and provides the appropriate written proof to the Board.

3. Respondent shall provide written proof to the Board that she has completed six (6) hours of professional ethics training, as approved by the Board. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by Respondent. Should Respondent fail to satisfy this condition, her certificate shall be automatically suspended until she completes the required training and provides the appropriate written proof to the Board.

Vote: *Unanimous*

1007432 (Mary Alcorn)

Accept Agreed Order suspending Respondent's teaching certificate for a period of thirty (30) days from the date the Board approves this Order. Upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board, Respondent shall immediately surrender the original and all copies of her certificate, by personal delivery or first class mail, to the Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, Third Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.

Prior to the reinstatement of Respondent's certificate at the conclusion of the suspension period, Respondent shall provide written proof to the Board that she has been assessed by a state certified mental health counselor, approved by the Board, who certifies that Respondent is competent and fit to fulfill her duties as an educator. Respondent shall also provide written proof that she has complied with all treatment recommendations proposed by the mental health counselor, if any, and shall continue to provide treatment records to the Board until she has been released from treatment by the counselor. Any expense required for the

assessment and/or follow-up treatment shall be paid by Respondent.

Upon reinstatement, Respondent's certificate, including any future endorsements and/or new areas of certification, shall be on probation from a period of ten (10) years from the date the Board approves this Order and subject to the following probationary conditions:

1. Respondent shall submit written proof to the Board that she has completed twelve (12) hours of professional development and/or training on the Professional Code of Ethics for Kentucky Certified School Personnel as approved by the Board, by August 1, 2011. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by the Respondent. Should Respondent fail to satisfy this condition, her certificate shall be automatically suspended until Respondent completes the required training and provides the appropriate written proof to the Board.

2. Respondent shall disclose all criminal convictions, misdemeanors and felonies, including her criminal convictions in Anderson County District Court for Theft by Unlawful Taking, on any and all applications for teaching and/or administrative certificates in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Should Respondent fail to satisfy this condition, her certificate shall be automatically suspended for six (6) months and subject to additional sanctions by the Board pursuant to KRS 161.120.

3. Respondent shall not be convicted of, nor enter a guilty plea or a no contest plea to, any criminal charge or charges other than minor traffic violations during the probationary period. Respondent shall submit a state and federal criminal background report to the Board with any application for renewal of her certificate or additional certification. Any expense for the state and federal criminal background reports shall be paid by Respondent. If Respondent fails to submit the required reports, renewal of her certificate or the additional certification shall be denied. If Respondent is convicted of or enters a guilty plea or a no contest plea to any crime other than minor traffic violations, any and all certificates issued to Respondent shall be automatically suspended for a period of one (1)

	year and subject to additional sanctions by the Board pursuant to KRS 161.120. **Vote:** *Unanimous*
1002109 (Wesley Belt)	Accept Agreed Order suspending Respondent's certificate for a period of six (6) days, with three (3) days of the suspension period to be served retroactively from February 8, 2010 through February 10, 2010. The remaining three (3) days shall be served from the date the Board approves this Order. Upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board, Respondent shall immediately surrender the original and all copies of his certificate, by personal delivery or first class mail, to the Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, Third Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601. Upon reinstatement, Respondent's certificate shall be on probation for a period of three (3) years and subject to the following probationary conditions: 1. Respondent shall submit written proof to the Board that he has completed a professional development/training course in risk management or school bus safety and control, as approved by the Board, by March 1, 2011. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by Respondent. 2. Respondent shall submit written proof to the Board that he has completed twelve (12) hours of professional ethics training, as approved by the Board, by June 1, 2011. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by Respondent. 3. By June 1, 2011, Respondent shall supply to the Board letters of recommendation from two (2) educators, with current Kentucky certification in good standing, in which the educators attest that Respondent is morally and ethically fit to hold a teaching certificate. 4. During the probationary period, Respondent shall not receive any disciplinary action involving assault or conduct unbecoming from any school district in which he is employed. "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 the tribunal and/or arbitration process.

Should Respondent fail to satisfy any of the above conditions, her certificate shall be automatically suspended for a period of sixty (60) days and subject to additional sanctions by the Board pursuant to KRS 161.120.

Vote: *Unanimous*

100293 (Sherrie Lyons)

Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for failing to de-escalate a student conflict. A teacher in the Commonwealth of Kentucky has a duty to protect the health, welfare, and safety of her students. The Board reminds Respondent that, as an educator, she must maintain the dignity and integrity of the teaching profession, and set a positive example for her students. The Board recognizes that students will misbehave and disrupt the classroom; however, certified teachers are expected to handle these situations rationally and judiciously, and not react in a juvenile manner to juvenile behavior. The Board will not tolerate any further incidents of misconduct from Respondent.

Further, upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board, Respondent's teaching certificate shall be on probation for a period of one (1) year and subject to the following probationary conditions:

1. Respondent has submitted written proof to the Board that she completed nine (9) hours of professional development in appropriate classroom management, with an emphasis on de-escalation strategies, as approved by the Board.
2. Respondent has submitted written proof to the Board that she has completed three (3) hours of professional ethics training, as approved by the Board.
3. During the probationary period, Respondent shall receive no disciplinary action involving assault, escalating a conflict with a student, and/or inappropriate discipline techniques from any school district in which she is employed. "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 the tribunal and/or arbitration process. Should Respondent fail to satisfy this condition, her certificate shall be automatically suspended for a period of one (1) year and subject

to additional sanctions by the Board pursuant to KRS 161.120.

Vote: *Unanimous*

0905333 (Arnold Sprague)

Accept Agreed Order permanently revoking Respondent's certificate. Respondent shall neither apply for, nor be issued, a teaching and/or administrative certificate in the Commonwealth of Kentucky at any time in the future. Upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board, Respondent shall immediately surrender the original and all copies of his certificate, by personal delivery or first class mail, to the Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.

Vote: *Unanimous*

08020630 (Danny Dooley)

Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for his neglect of duty and poor professional judgment. The Board reminds Respondent that, as an educator, he has a duty to take reasonable measures to protect the health, safety, and emotional well-being of his students. When an educator fails to properly supervise his students, the students are at risk for both physical and emotional harm. As an educator, Respondent must ensure that his students are never placed in potentially unsafe situations. The Board will not tolerate any further incidents of misconduct from Respondent.

Within twelve (12) months of accepting any teaching or administrative position, in any capacity, in any school district in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, Respondent shall submit written proof to the Board that he has completed twelve (12) hours of professional ethics and courtesy training, and six (6) hours of classroom management training, as approved by the Board. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by Respondent. Should Respondent fail to satisfy this condition, his certificate shall be automatically suspended until he completes the required training and provides the appropriate written proof to the Board.

Upon accepting a teaching or administrative position, in any capacity, in any school district in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, Respondent's certificate shall be on probation for a period of two

(2) years. During the probationary period, Respondent shall not receive any disciplinary action involving time/attendance issues or improper supervision of students from any school district in which he is employed. "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 the tribunal and/or arbitration process. Should Respondent fail to satisfy this condition, his certificate shall be automatically suspended for thirty (30) days and subject to additional sanctions by the Board pursuant to KRS 161.120.

Vote: *Unanimous*

0909506 (Michael Wilson)

Accept Agreed Order suspending Respondent's teaching certificate for a period of two (2) years beginning retroactively on July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2011. Upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board, Respondent shall immediately surrender the original and all copies of his certificate, by personal delivery or first class mail, to the Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, Third Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.

Prior to the reinstatement of Respondent's teaching certificate at the conclusion of the two (2) year suspension period, in addition to any educational requirements, Respondent shall comply with the following:

1. Respondent shall provide written proof to the Board that he has received twelve (12) hours of professional development/training in the areas of professional ethics and teacher/student boundaries, as approved by the Board. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by Respondent; and

2. Respondent shall provide written proof to the Board that he has completed a professional development/training course in Accounting Procedures for Kentucky School Activity Funds, commonly known as "Red Book Training," as approved by the Board. Any expense required for said training shall be paid by Respondent.

Further, upon reinstatement, Respondent's teaching certificate shall be on probation for a period of two (2) years and, during the probationary period,

Respondent shall not receive any disciplinary action involving student/teacher boundaries, an inappropriate relationship with a student, or fiscal mismanagement from any school district in which he is employed. "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 the tribunal and/or arbitration process. Should Respondent fail to satisfy this condition, his certificate shall be automatically suspended for a period of one (1) year and subject to additional sanctions by the Board pursuant to KRS 161.120.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Evaluation of the Executive Director

Dr. Frank Cheatham reviewed the results of the evaluation with the board. He reported that comments from staff and the board were very positive.

Chair Lorraine Williams stated that the board set one major target for Dr. Rogers in 2011 – To collaborate with KDE and CPE to seamlessly communicate with the legislators on what is necessary to ensure that Senate Bill 1 has the intended impact on pre-service and current workforce performance and student learning. The Board would like to hear a report 2 – 3 times during the year.

Dr. Rogers agreed to facilitate the Board's work in 2011 through the following actions:

- Continue to keep the Board abreast of the latest research and trends in education.
- Work towards implementation of the CRACE recommendations.
- Convene a committee or task force to retool the Program Review process, enabling the Board to be more explicit and allow for alternative review options.
- Move to full implementation of the redesigned Master's & Principal Programs as well as reviewing the implementation process for these two programs.
- Review our current Board meeting structure to allow more time for staying abreast of trends and research as well as the training needed to make informed decisions.

Due to the current state budget situation, Dr. Rogers asked the board not to give him a raise. At the next evaluation cycle, the Board will consider an information item to extend Dr. Rogers' contract for two years.

2010-077

Motion made by Ms. Stoess, seconded by Dr. Wasicsko, to accept the satisfactory evaluation of the executive director.

Motion made by Mr. DeAtley, seconded by Dr. Cheatham, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

Next Meeting: January 10, 2011
9:00 AM
EPSB Board Room
Frankfort, Kentucky

KENTUCKY EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE

Consent Item B

Action Item:

Eastern Kentucky University: Master of Arts in Education with Teacher Leader Endorsement

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028; KRS 161.048
16 KAR 5:010, Section 12

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 Eastern Kentucky University Master of Arts in Education with Teacher Leader Endorsement program?

Background:

After several years in discussion and with the assistance of numerous P-16 educators across the state, the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) appointed committees to address how Kentucky could refashion the way institutions educate experienced teachers and school leaders. The Master's Redesign Committee was charged with developing programs for rank change so that they are not only concerned with the transmission of knowledge but also with involvement in the processes by which knowledge is attained. The new programs are envisioned as representing current best practices, focusing on how educators learn while engaging them in intellectual discourse. The redesigned master's is to develop teacher leaders through research-based practices, district partnerships and collaboration, mixed delivery methods, clinical experiences, and job-embedded professional experiences. A representative group of P-12 practitioners, administrators, and education leaders was appointed to serve on the Master's Review Committee.

Eastern Kentucky University has submitted a proposal that addresses all the components required by regulation and the program guidelines. The redesigned program results from a collaborative effort of the teacher leader workgroup and its subcommittees that included faculty from the College of Education, P-12 school district representatives, and faculty from the Arts & Sciences. The program is designed to create a community of learners who are equipped with the expertise and knowledge to be effective leaders. Five required core courses address the primary competencies of teacher leadership, and specific program requirements enhance candidate content knowledge. Courses will be offered in a variety of delivery formats: face-to-face, online, and/or web-assisted. In addition, selected courses within this program will be offered at off-campus sites, which may include the EKU extended campuses at Corbin, Danville, Lancaster, and Manchester.

Eastern Kentucky University responded to concerns and questions posed by the review committee and staff. All concerns have been addressed to the satisfaction of the committee. The executive summary is attached, and the proposal and rejoinder were sent under separate cover.

Groups/Persons Consulted:

Master's Review Committee

Alternative Actions:

1. Approve the Eastern Kentucky University request for the Master of Arts in Education with Teacher Leader Endorsement.
2. Modify and approve the Eastern Kentucky University request for the Master of Arts in Education with Teacher Leader Endorsement.
3. Do not approve the Eastern Kentucky University request for the Master of Arts in Education with Teacher Leader Endorsement.

Committee Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

The Master's Review Committee recommends approval for the Eastern Kentucky University Master of Arts in Education with Teacher Leader Endorsement proposal.

Contact Person:

Mr. Robert L. Brown, Director
Division of Professional Learning and Assessment
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: robertl.brown@ky.gov

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

_____
Executive Director

Date:

January 10, 2011

Eastern Kentucky University College of Education
Master of Arts in Education with Teacher Leader Endorsement
NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION
Introduction

Being true to our heritage as a school of opportunity, EKU provides a climate that supports, challenges, and enriches students aspiring to careers in a diverse society.

-excerpt, EKU's College of Education Mission Statement

Eastern Kentucky University prides itself in serving students from our rich, diverse service region as well as beyond. Adhering to our mission, EKU strives to provide opportunities for candidates completing our redesigned master's program to mentor other professionals and impact student learning to promote success for all. Our candidates will develop their full potential as teacher leaders through coursework and experiences designed to deepen and widen their knowledge, collaborative skills, and job-embedded experiences.

When the idea of creating teacher leader master's programs was first introduced in 2008, the EKU College of Education began by creating a workgroup of stakeholders from the PreK-12 schools in the EKU service region and across the University to study the topic and work towards establishing a quality teacher leader program (membership list in Appendix A). The Master's Redesign Workgroup met regularly as a large group and in subcommittees for discussion, planning and conceptualizing of the EKU Master's of Arts in Education with Teacher Leader Endorsement.

Defining an educational teacher leader as, ―An expert professional who, working with all stakeholders to ensure success for every learner, provides leadership in learning environments,‖ the Workgroup proposed a program that includes a fifteen hour teacher leader core. In addition, each area requires fifteen hours of specialized options designed to strengthen currently held certifications or to add further endorsements. These options offer multiple pathways of enhancing candidates' professional goals. The narrative that follows outlines the key elements of EKU's redesigned Master's of Arts in Education Program with Teacher Leader Endorsement. EKU believes it will support and address our mission while also preparing teachers to become exceptional teacher leaders.

Review of the Literature

One of the first assignments for the Master's Redesign Workgroup was to define the term ―teacher leader‖ for EKU. This definition provided us with a clear and focused vision. To support these efforts, a subcommittee of the Workgroup reviewed of the literature to provide some insight to the teacher as leader. The following pieces of literature were utilized in the development of our vision and, consequently, our definition of teacher leader.

In Project Achieve, Yost, Vogel, and Rosenberg (2008) identified the skills of an effective leader: personal leadership style, understanding of adult learning, mentoring/consultation skills, use of research-based instructional practices, analysis of assessment data, subject area expertise, and professional reflection. With these skills in mind, they developed a six-member instructional leadership team to implement a professional development plan in an urban middle school. The professional development plan included modeling of lessons,

working individually and in small groups with teachers, group planning of lessons, and group planning of workshops for teachers. The team noted significant gains in teachers' knowledge and use of research-based teaching strategies along with increased student achievement as reflected on state tests in reading and mathematics. Another gain noted was a positive change in school culture and teacher efficacy. These improvements were attributed to the leadership team and the support that was provided to the classroom teachers.

Additional research in the area of leadership supported these findings. Darling-Hammond, L., Bransford, J. LePage, P. and Hammerness, K. (2005) reported that professional development must be intensive and sustained. The authors noted that working in professional learning communities is a key way to effect change. Therefore, teacher education programs must include this practice in their teacher preparation programs. In addition, teachers must be schooled to understand the change process before they can constructively contribute to changing school culture. Finally, this learning must take place through collaborative efforts between teacher preparation programs and schools. By establishing these partnerships, educators build relationships and begin to work in tandem to support the learning of all students. Dufour & Baker (1998) concurred and summarized the findings of the aforementioned article in their report which noted that learning communities are an avenue for professional development and support the leadership roles of teachers.

Definition of Teacher Leader

Combining the above findings with additional literature on the definitions of teachers as leaders (Brownlee, 1979; Donaldson, 2007; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001), the EKU Master's Redesign Workgroup developed the following teacher leader definition:

The educational teacher leader is an expert professional who, working with all stakeholders to ensure success for every learner, provides leadership in learning environments.

KENTUCKY EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE

Consent Item C

Action Item:

Western Kentucky University Principal Preparation Program, All Grades

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028; KRS 161.048
16 KAR 3:050

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 Western Kentucky University's request for a Principal Preparation Program, All Grades proposal?

Background:

Given the changing expectations and responsibilities of the principal, it was determined by the Commonwealth Collaborative of School leadership Programs (CCSLP) and the State Action for Education Leadership Programs (SAELP) that the present system of preparation of Kentucky principals was deemed inadequate. With the assistance of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), the groups further decided that Kentucky's principal preparation programs must be built upon the competencies that are identified with being an effective principal - one who can increase student achievement by guiding and supporting teachers while capably managing the school organization.

The 2006 General Assembly passed House Joint Resolution 14 (HJR 14) which instructed the executive director of the EPSB, in cooperation with the president of the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) and the Commissioner of Education, to convene a task force to present recommendations on the redesign of Kentucky's system for preparing and supporting principals. In August 2006 the Education Leadership Redesign (ELR) task force convened with 30 members and met for nearly one year.

The ELR recommendations resulted in changes to 16 KAR 3:050, which became effective October 2008. In March 2009 a seventeen member Principal Review Committee was appointed by the EPSB and charged with evaluating the redesigned programs.

Western Kentucky University's College of Education and Behavioral Sciences is requesting approval of its redesigned principal preparation program. The program proposal is in accordance with the regulation and the program guidelines established by the EPSB. The program was developed collaboratively with administrators representing the Green River Regional Education Cooperative (GRREC). Representatives from WKU met with regional P-12 administrators to engage them in developing the plan and to solicit support in the partnership. Signed agreements were developed collaboratively and included in the program proposal. Courses have been co-designed by district practitioners and university faculty and

are developmentally sequenced with fieldwork. The program proposal includes plans for candidate and program assessment. Anchor assessments allow candidates to demonstrate the ISLLC and TSSA Standards as well as the Dimensions and Functions of School Leaders.

Groups/Persons Consulted:

Principal Review Committee

Alternative Actions:

1. Approve the Western Kentucky University request for the redesigned Principal P-12 preparation program, including the alternative program for principals.
2. Modify and approve the Western Kentucky University request for the redesigned Principal P-12 preparation program.
3. Do not approve the Western Kentucky University request for the redesigned Principal P-12 preparation program.

Committee Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

The Principal Review Committee recommends the Western Kentucky University redesigned Principal P-12 preparation program proposal for approval. The university presented signed agreements with its collaborating partners and responded to concerns and questions posed by the review committee and staff. All concerns have been addressed to the satisfaction of the committee. The proposal and rejoinder were sent under separate cover.

Contact Person:

Mr. Robert L. Brown, Director
Division of Professional Learning and Assessment
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: robertl.brown@ky.gov

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

_____
Executive Director

Date:

January 10, 2011

Western Kentucky University
Department of Educational Administration, Leadership, and Research
Revised Principal Preparation Program

RATIONALE FOR REVISION

Instructional leaders for America's public schools face ever more challenging standards of excellence in the information age of the 21st century. Increasingly, education is seen as fundamental to meeting the needs of the country in the areas of science, technology, the arts and humanities, civic responsibilities, and socio-cultural competence. Both the private business sector and public institutions (higher education, government, non-governmental agencies) demand graduates with high-level capabilities, including writing skills, quantitative understanding, critical thinking, creativity, and problem solving. Perhaps most important are the abilities to learn independently, locate information, assess the validity of often competing knowledge claims, and sift through voluminous data to find the most relevant and accurate facts. Furthermore, these qualities were formerly required only of elite students. Now there is the expectation that essentially all students will attain these skills, and that achievement gaps between various "have" and "have not" groups will be eliminated. The schools of today are utilizing revised curricula, improved teaching techniques, and clearly articulated higher standards to develop this new generation of learners for the new millennium.

The diverse student population being served today necessitates instructional programs appropriate for an increasingly global setting. A multicultural society requires that students of low socio-economic status, diverse ethnic backgrounds, and from under-represented minorities be motivated to achieve at levels commensurate with their more advantaged schoolmates. Increasingly, educational institutions have been charged with meeting these daunting societal goals. School leaders bear the brunt of these responsibilities. The enormity of this vision demands a new paradigm in the preparation of future principals and other instructional leaders: not only a different approach but also sustained professional development. Principals and other educators will be expected to have achieved mastery of specific actions, outcomes, and even dispositions, including the ability to engage in strategic planning, understand curriculum and instruction, utilize diversified assessment measures, analyze multiple types of data, communicate with multicultural populations, create a culture of learning and continuous improvement, establish school-community linkages through business partnerships, organize child and youth services across school and agency lines, and integrate all of these via seamless leadership that empowers all employees and inspires everyone to outcomes for children that can only be achieved through such synergism.

Western Kentucky University's new Professional Certificate for Instructional Leadership-School Principal is designed to meet these particular challenges. The new principal preparation program is grounded in and aligned with statutory authority (KRS 161.027, 161.028, 161.030) and administrative regulation (16 KAR 3:050). Developed by the Department of Educational Administration, Leadership, and Research (EALR), the program is innovative, comprehensive, and collaborative in nature. This design includes management and oversight structures that encourage inter-program, cross-program, and inter-institutional collaboration. WKU has long been recognized as having one of the best

principal preparation programs in the state. The EALR faculty believe the new program will further that reputation, producing graduates of the highest caliber.

Candidates in the new Professional Certificate for Instructional Leadership-School Principal program will focus on knowledge and understanding in three primary areas:

a. improving student achievement
b. leadership
c. fundamentals of curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

This knowledge involves not only instructional leadership focused on high levels of learning for all students but also extends to management skills related to efficiency, accountability, and safety.

The program is standards-based; all graduates will demonstrate mastery of three sets of standards:

a. Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC, 2008
b. Technology Standards for School Administrators, 2001
c. Dispositions, Dimensions, and Functions for School Leaders, EPSB 2008.

Finally, the core principles that underlie the new program are grounded in experience, collaboration, and rigorous selection and assessment. First, all candidates must have certain prerequisite leadership experience and undergo extensive school-based leadership training. Second, the entire program involves collaboration with local school districts from selection of candidates to co-delivery of program content to field experiences that include multicultural settings. But collaboration goes beyond the school-university nexus. To ensure that leaders have sufficient depth and breadth of understanding, the program invokes cross-disciplinary insights about content areas and exposure to programs outside of education. Third, throughout the program, extensive formative and summative assessments will be conducted, with students demonstrating knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to both content and standards.

Western Kentucky University's new preparation program is designed to produce principals and other instructional leaders who have the capability and leadership skills to transform Kentucky's schools in order to meet the challenges of this new century. To achieve these goals, WKU and the school districts will form a partnership for leadership development.

KENTUCKY EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE

Consent Item D

Action Item:

Murray State University Principal Preparation Program, All Grades

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028; KRS 161.048
16 KAR 3:050

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 Murray State University's request for a Principal Preparation Program, All Grades proposal?

Background:

Given the changing expectations and responsibilities of the principal, it was determined by the Commonwealth Collaborative of School leadership Programs (CCSLP) and the State Action for Education Leadership Programs (SAELP) that the present system of preparation of Kentucky principals was deemed inadequate. With the assistance of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), the groups further decided that Kentucky's principal preparation programs must be built upon the competencies that are identified with being an effective principal - one who can increase student achievement by guiding and supporting teachers while capably managing the school organization.

The 2006 General Assembly passed House Joint Resolution 14 (HJR 14) which instructed the executive director of the EPSB, in cooperation with the president of the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) and the Commissioner of Education, to convene a task force to present recommendations on the redesign of Kentucky's system for preparing and supporting principals. In August 2006 the Education Leadership Redesign (ELR) task force convened with 30 members and met for nearly one year.

The ELR recommendations resulted in changes to 16 KAR 3:050, which became effective October 2008. In March 2009 a seventeen member Principal Review Committee was appointed by the EPSB and charged with evaluating the redesigned programs.

Murray State University's College of Education is requesting approval of its redesigned principal preparation program. The unit, partnering with Graves, Marshall, Carlisle, Fulton Independent, and Christian County schools, has developed a regional partnership that is collaborative and field-based. These partners will participate in the admissions/selection procedures, the mechanisms for co-design and co-delivery, and future work to develop and monitor field experiences. The unit, in collaboration with its partners, has created selection rubrics and guidelines and a field experience handbook. In an attempt to be responsive to the needs of its partner districts, the unit has prescribed approximately 40 percent of the field

experiences thus allowing candidates to collaborate with mentors to develop the remaining hours. The unit has expanded its assessment system, providing several progress checks for candidate reflection and program feedback.

Groups/Persons Consulted:

Principal Review Committee

Alternative Actions:

1. Approve the Murray State University request for the redesigned Principal P-12 preparation program including the alternative program for principals.
2. Modify and approve the Murray State University request for the redesigned Principal P-12 preparation program.
3. Do not approve the Murray State University request for the redesigned Principal P-12 preparation program.

Committee Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

The Principal Review Committee recommends the Murray State University redesigned Principal P-12 preparation program proposal for approval. The university presented signed agreements with its collaborating partners and responded to concerns and questions posed by the review committee and staff. All concerns have been addressed to the satisfaction of the committee. The proposal and rejoinder were sent under separate cover.

Contact Person:

Mr. Robert L. Brown, Director
Division of Professional Learning and Assessment
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: robertl.brown@ky.gov

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

_____
Executive Director

Date:

January 10, 2011

Executive Summary

The process of redesign presented many opportunities for reflection on past practices, discussions of current needs and the evaluation of our beliefs as a program faculty at Murray State University. It was determined that as a collaboratively-developed and data-informed program, the process of redesign is never truly over. The structure of field experience guidelines and course syllabi are grounded in the foundation of our national standards and state dimensions. The changing needs of our candidates and districts that emerge through collaboration with our partner districts serve to 'put meat on the bones' of the program.

The development of the Regional Partnership was truly collaborative and field-based. MSU partnered with Graves, Marshall, Carlisle, and Fulton Independent Schools in a 'pilot' cohort and Christian County Public Schools in a 'transition' cohort to test the admissions/selection procedures, mechanisms for co-design, co-delivery and ways of developing and monitoring field-experiences. The program advisory council of 12 administrators from this region served as a focus group for approaches and ideas that emerged from our pilot and transition work. Not everything that was tried worked as planned the first time, or at all. But all efforts informed the redesign and were invaluable. There are several aspects of our submission that we believe present candidates with powerful learning experiences, and are highlighted below.

- *Selection Rubrics and Guidelines*. Co-selection requires structures and protocols within which expectations can be communicated and decisions made. Several revisions were required to accomplish this.
- *Field Experience Handbook*. It was determined that the introduction of more field experiences and mentors into the program necessitated better communication and organizational structures. This handbook provides that assistance.
- *Critical Success Factors*. A concern developed that overly prescriptive field experiences limited the program's responsiveness to district and candidate needs, no matter how well-conceptualized the list of required experiences might be. This was addressed by prescribing approximately 40% of the hours and then allowing candidates to collaborate with mentors to develop the remaining hours using the Critical Success Factors as a guide. This individualized approach also creates flexibility to ensure diverse placements.
- *Assessment System*. The redesigned program assessment system is greatly expanded, providing several progress checks for candidate reflection and program feedback, as well as more and better data for the continuous improvement of our program.

At Murray State University, we are committed to the 'ethical change agent' orientation, and to providing students with the dispositions, knowledge and abilities required to act in this capacity. This is critical, as in the rapidly changing and high accountability environment of today's schools, leaders must be grounded in 'what is best for kids' and have the capacity to lead accordingly. The proposed curriculum, field-experience approach and assessment system were developed with this in mind.

KENTUCKY EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE

Consent Item E

Action Item:

Brescia University: Master of Science in Teacher Leadership

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028; KRS 161.048
16 KAR 5:010, Section 12

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 Brescia University Master of Science in Teacher Leadership?

Background:

After several years in discussion and with the assistance of numerous P-16 educators across the state, the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) appointed committees to address how Kentucky could refashion the way institutions educate experienced teachers and school leaders. The Master's Redesign Committee was charged with developing programs for rank change so that they are not only concerned with the transmission of knowledge but also with involvement in the processes by which knowledge is attained. The new programs are envisioned as representing current best practices, focusing on how educators learn while engaging them in intellectual discourse. The redesigned master's is to develop teacher leaders through research-based practices, district partnerships and collaboration, mixed delivery methods, clinical experiences, and job-embedded professional experiences. A representative group of P-12 practitioners, administrators, and education leaders was appointed to serve on the Master's Review Committee.

Brescia University has submitted a proposal that addresses all the components required by regulation and the program guidelines. The Master of Science in Teacher Leadership reflects the mission of the Ursuline tradition that "leadership is one's ability to empower others, [to] be adaptable and flexible, [to] be able to accept challenges and influence positive changes, as well as [to] be a model of compassion, collaboration, and mutuality." The program is intended to enhance leadership skills required for the challenges of the 21st century in schools/districts. The program emphasizes a practical approach to leadership development that accentuates the servant-leadership model. The redesigned program resulted from a collaborative effort of the university and the Daviess County and Owensboro Catholic Schools systems. The program provides 33 credit hours including a capstone research project presentation. Classes are scheduled in the evening or online once a week for four and half hours. There are 21 hours of required core courses, four of

which make up the endorsement, and 12 hours of electives. The university has established a detailed mentoring opportunity for candidates to demonstrate leadership skills. In addition, Brescia developed a strong collaboration with the Arts and Sciences department to create content specific graduate courses for their candidates in the teacher leader program.

Brescia University responded to concerns and questions posed by the review committee and staff. All concerns have been addressed to the satisfaction of the committee. The executive summary is included in the proposal. The proposal and rejoinder are under separate cover.

Groups/Persons Consulted:

Master's Review Committee

Alternative Actions:

1. Approve the Brescia University request for the Master of Science in Teacher Leadership.
2. Modify and approve the Brescia University request for the Master of Science in Teacher Leadership.
3. Do not approve the Brescia University request for the Master of Science in Teacher Leadership.

Committee Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

The Master's Review Committee recommends approval for the Brescia University Master of Science in Teacher Leadership proposal.

Contact Persons:

Mr. Robert L. Brown, Director
Division of Professional Learning and Assessment
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: robertl.brown@ky.gov

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

_____
Executive Director

Date:

January 10, 2011

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Brescia University

Brescia University is a Catholic, liberal arts institution founded in the Ursuline tradition of personal and social transformation through education. Directed to academic and moral excellence in a student-centered environment, Brescia offers undergraduate and graduate programs that serve students who seek success through rewarding careers and service to others. The Master of Science in Teacher Leadership (MSTL) reflects the mission of the Ursuline tradition that ―leadership is one‘s ability to empower others, [to] be adaptable and flexible, [to] be able to accept challenges and influence positive change, as well as [to] be a model of compassion, collaboration, and mutuality‖ (Ursuline Sisters of Mount Saint Joseph, 2004, p. 1). As teachers are inherent leaders in the classroom environment, the MSTL program is intended to enhance leadership skills required for the challenges in the 21st century in schools/districts. Because of the Catholic tradition, the MSTL program will emphasize a practical approach to leadership development that accentuates the servant-leadership model. Servant leadership promotes the good of the total organization and community (Washington, Sutton, & Feild, 2006). Washington, Sutton, and Feild reported that a servant leader strives to see growth of the organization. The program is therefore designed for classroom teachers who are passionate about making a difference.

Program Design: Brescia University, in collaboration with the Daviess County and the Owensboro Catholic School systems, designed a program that is rigorous and relevant, and which will produce high quality teacher leaders. The program begins with an examination of professional responsibility that builds upon personal mission; it requires that teachers serve students and colleagues by continually monitoring and attempting to improve practice throughout the courses. The following program goals were identified for the Master of Science in Teacher Leadership:

Goal 1: Participants will gain an understanding of skills necessary to assume the role of an instructional teacher leader.

Goal 2: Participants will demonstrate the knowledge and skills to work with students in an inclusive setting by differentiating instruction.

Goal 3: Participants will develop and enhance their leadership skills through coaching/mentoring.

Goal 4: Participants will conduct action research projects aimed at enhancing teaching and learning in K-12 settings.

The MSTL program is intended to help teachers develop an understanding of and instructional skills in assuming teacher leader roles in their schools/districts. On completion of the program, participants will obtain a *Master of Science in Teacher Leadership* and an Endorsement in *Teacher Leader*. The proposed endorsement in Teacher Leader responds to the changes in the Master‘s programs across Kentucky.

This endorsement program will fulfill a need in Kentucky to prepare individuals to serve as teacher leaders in their schools. The MSTL program is therefore designed to provide continuing professional development opportunities for credentialed practicing educators through job-embedded projects and activities.

Program Curriculum: Saint Angel Merici, founder of the Ursulines, envisioned an education that embraces individual differences and promotes the development of the whole person. In this same spirit, the Brescia University Teacher Leader Program will have the following unique attributes:

- The only Catholic University offering the master leader program in western Kentucky
- The presence of a unique faculty support system to model individualized instruction
- A proven ability to generate teachers with sustained and successful careers
- The opportunity to develop teacher leaders skills through coaching /mentoring practica
- Small classes and conducted seminar style with considerable discussions
- Program Flexibility, allowing students to work while pursuing their degree
- Action research as an important tool for discovering what works and what does not in the classroom.

The program provides 33 credit hours including a capstone research project presentation. Participants will obtain Teacher Leader Endorsement on completion of the program. The classes will be scheduled in the evenings or online, Monday through Thursday, in order to accommodate students who are working. Each course meets once a week for four and half hours. Master's level classes average about 5–12 students. The classes will focus on both understanding essential knowledge and developing teacher leader skills. There will be considerable discussion in the classes and opportunities to demonstrate what is learned in school settings. Below are the list of core courses and electives.

Core Courses (21 Credits):

COURSE #	COURSE TITLE	CREDITS
EDL 500	Introduction to Teacher Leadership	3
EDL 570	Master Teacher	3
EDL 580	Education Research Methods	3
EDL 630	Interaction of Classroom Management and Instruction	3
EDL 640	Assessment for Students‘ Learning	3
EDL 650	Effective Practices for Coaching and Mentoring	3
EDL 671	Action Research	3
Documenting Professional Growth 1: ARP Proposal Presentation		0
Documenting Professional Growth 2: ARP Presentation Capstone Project		0

Electives (12 Credits)

EDL 530	Technology for Teacher Leaders	3
EDL 550	Social Issues in Education	3

EDL 600	Leadership Seminar	1
EDL 620	Ethical Issues in Education and Research	3
EDL 655	Multicultural and Diversity Issues in the Curriculum	3
EDL 590	Literature in Middle and High School Classrooms	3
EDL 591	Intro to Literacy Coaching in Middle and High School	3
BIO 501	Advanced Cell Biology	3
MTH 513	Mathematical Models and Methods	3

TOTAL REQUIRED SEMESTER HOURS FOR THE MSTL DEGREE 33

The following 12 credits are required for the Teacher Leader Endorsement

EDL 500	Introduction to Teacher Leadership	3
EDL 640	Assessment for Students‘ Learning	3
EDL 570	Master Teacher	3
EDL 650	Effective Practices for Coaching and Mentoring	3

TOTAL REQUIRED SEMESTER HOURS FOR MSTL ENDORSEMENT ONLY 12

Assessment Plan: Candidates will be assessed upon admission to the program and continuously throughout the program. The plan for assessment is designed to (a) guide decisions about program admission; (b) monitor candidate progression through the program; (c) determine to what degree candidates have acquired the knowledge, skills, and dispositions set forth in the School of Education; (d) identify those candidates who may need planned intervention during their program of study; and (e) identify areas in the education program that need to be improved as reflected in various assessments of candidates. Multiple assessments, both formative and summative, will be used at multiple points during the candidate‘s progression from program entry to program completion. Data will be regularly and systematically be collected, compiled, summarized, analyzed, and reported for the purpose of improving candidate performance. The program identifies several outcome indicators, which are consistent with the mission and goals of the program. The results of candidate assessment will be tied into the evaluation of the program and its operations. The program provides three levels of assessment: entry, midpoint, and exit. In addition, there will be continuous assessment of students and program. Ongoing program review will be the responsibility of the University‘s Academic Program Review Committee (APRC); the School of Education‘s TEAC, made up of representatives of collaborating school;, and the School of Education‘s Graduate Committee.

An assessment grid will be used to track each program goal annually. In addition, the grid will provide the necessary information to harness a feedback loop. The data analysis will be used to make changes or improvements the following academic year. The data report will be shared at the University level within division/school reports and within the School of Education annual fall retreat. At the University level, program modifications are discussed following review of assessment within the Dean‘s Council and the President‘s Cabinet. The School of Education and the MSTL modifications are made at the program level as a result of annual analysis discussed within MSTL Committee meetings

(monthly), within the program fall retreat, and through data analysis and discussions among faculty during weekly Education Faculty meetings.

The design of the MSTL program for Teacher Leaders at Brescia University is based on literature, the experience of our collaborating schools, the results of our survey, and our experience with working with education students in both the graduate and undergraduate levels. Partnership with the university and school districts allow for authentic, task-specific work within the schools that enhances teacher leadership. The MSTL will provide field experience for Teacher Leaders, asking them to practice instructional leadership while in the program. As evident from the syllabi, practicing teachers will implement activities in their schools as an authentic, job-embedded assignment. Participants of the program will write an analyses and a reflection of their job-embedded assignments and present them in their classes, this practice will improved candidates learning leading for improved student achievement. In the action research projects candidates will analyze authentic learning problems in the district and devise plans to improve teaching to improve students‘ achievement.

EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE

Consent Item F

Action Item:

Waiver of the Cooperating Teacher Eligibility Requirements

Applicable Statute or Regulation:

16 KAR 5:040, Section 2 (c)

Applicable Goal:

Goal I: 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 Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) grant a waiver of the cooperating teacher eligibility requirements?

Background:

Dr. Cathy Gunn, Dean, College of Education, Morehead State University (MSU), is requesting a waiver of Regulation 16 KAR 5:040, Section 2 (c) which requires a cooperating teacher to have "at least three (3) years of teaching experience on a Professional Certificate." The request is for the Spring 2011 semester.

This request is for a student teacher to be assigned to Krista Hayslip, agriculture teacher at Rowan County Senior High School. A Morehead State University student teacher seeking certification in agriculture needs to be placed with a certified agriculture teacher in the spring semester. The student teacher is on a football scholarship at MSU and is required to attend spring football practice. As such, it would be a hardship for him to be placed in a school in a surrounding county.

Ms. Hayslip will have earned 15 hours toward her Rank II by the end of this semester, which will make her eligible to supervise a student teacher; however, she is only in her second year of teaching. Debbie Howes, principal at Rowan County Senior High has written a letter in support of the waiver request, providing positive evidence of Ms. Hayslip's success in the classroom. In addition Dr. Cathy Gunn supports this placement.

A copy of Dr. Gunn's letter and a copy of Ms. Howes' letter were sent under separate cover. A copy of the pertinent part of the regulation is attached to this request.

Alternative Actions:

1. Approve the waiver requests of 16 KAR 5:040, Section 2 (c)
2. Deny the waiver requests of 16 KAR 5:040, Section 2 (c) A

Contact Person:

Dr. Phillip Rogers, Executive Director
Education Professional Standards Board
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: phillip.rogers@ky.gov

_____

Executive Director

Date:

January 10, 2011

16 KAR 5:040. Admission, placement, and supervision in student teaching.

RELATES TO: KRS 161.020, 161.028, 161.030, 161.042

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: KRS 161.028, 161.030, 161.042

NECESSITY, FUNCTION, AND CONFORMITY: KRS 161.028 requires that an educator preparation institution be approved for offering the preparation program corresponding to a particular certificate on the basis of standards and procedures established by the Education Professional Standards Board. KRS 161.030 requires that a certificate shall be issued to a person who has completed a program approved by the Education Professional Standards Board. KRS 161.042 requires the Education Professional Standards Board to promulgate an administrative regulation relating to student teachers, including the qualifications for supervising teachers. This administrative regulation establishes the standards for admission, placement, and supervision in student teaching.

Section 1. Definition. "Cooperating teacher" or "supervising teacher" means a teacher employed in a school in Kentucky who is contracting with an educator preparation institution to supervise a student teacher for the purpose of fulfilling the student teaching requirement of the approved educator preparation program.

Section 2. Cooperating Teacher Eligibility Requirements. (1) Except as provided in subsection (2) of this section, the cooperating teacher, whether serving in a public or nonpublic school, shall have:

(a) A valid Kentucky teaching certificate for each grade and subject taught;

(b) Attained Rank II certification;

(c) At least three (3) years of teaching experience on a Professional Certificate; and

(d) Taught in the present school system at least one (1) year immediately prior to being assigned a student teacher.

(2) If a cooperating teacher has not attained Rank II certification, the teacher shall have attained a minimum of fifteen (15) hours of approved credit toward a Rank II within a minimum period of five (5) years.

(3) Teachers assigned to a teaching position on the basis of a probationary or emergency certificate issued by the Education Professional Standards Board shall not be eligible for serving as a cooperating teacher.

(4) In selecting a cooperating teacher, the district shall give consideration to the following criteria:

(a) A demonstrated ability to engage in effective classroom management techniques that promote an environment conducive to learning;

(b) An ability to model best practices for the delivery of instruction;

(c) A mastery of the content knowledge or subject matter being taught;

(d) The demonstration of an aptitude and ability to contribute to the mentoring and development of a preservice educator;

(e) An ability to use multiple forms of assessment to inform instruction; and

(f) An ability to create a learning community that values and builds upon students' diverse cultures.

Section 3. Admission to Student Teaching. In addition to the appropriate sections of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards which are incorporated under 16 KAR 5:010, each educator preparation institution shall determine minimum standards for admission to student teaching which shall include the procedures established in this section. Admission to student teaching shall include a formal application procedure for each teacher candidate.

(1) A record or report from a valid and current medical examination, which shall have included a tuberculosis test, shall be placed on file with the admissions committee.

(2) Prior to and during the student teaching experience, the teacher candidate shall adhere to the Professional Code of Ethics for Kentucky School Personnel established in 16 KAR 1:020.

Section 4. Teacher-student Ratio. The ratio of student teachers to cooperating teachers shall be one (1) to one (1).

Section 5. College Supervisor. (1) The college supervisor shall make periodic observations of the student teacher in the classroom and shall prepare a written report on each observation and share it with the student teacher.

(2) The observation reports shall be filed as a part of the student teacher record and also used as a validation of the supervisory function.

(3) A student teacher shall receive periodic and regular on-site observations and critiques of the actual teaching situation a minimum of four (4) times excluding seminars and workshops.

(4) The college supervisors shall be available to work with the student teacher and personnel in the cooperating school regarding any problems that may arise relating to the student teaching situation.

Section 6. Professional Experience. (1) In addition to the appropriate NCATE standards incorporated by reference under 16 KAR 5:010, the educator preparation institution shall provide an opportunity for the student teacher to assume major responsibility for the full range of teaching duties in a real school situation under the guidance of qualified personnel from the educator preparation institution and the cooperating elementary, middle, or high school. In placing the student teachers in classroom settings, the educator preparation program and the school district shall make reasonable efforts to place student teachers in settings that provide experiences, situations, and challenges similar to those encountered by first year teachers.

(2) Each educator preparation institution shall provide a full professional semester to include a period of student teaching for a minimum of twelve (12) weeks, full day, or equivalent, in school settings that correspond to the grade levels each and content area of the student teacher's certification program.

Section 7. Compensation of Cooperating Teachers. (1) The Education Professional Standards Board shall contract with the local school district, or make other appropriate arrangements, for the direct service of a cooperating teacher to each student teacher.

(2)(a) The educator preparation institution shall electronically submit a report of all cooperating teachers and their corresponding student teachers to the Education Professional Standards Board:

1. On or before October 15 for a cooperating teacher supervising a student teacher during the fall semester; or

2. On or before February 15 for a cooperating teacher supervising a student teacher during the spring semester.

(b) Each report shall include:

1. The number of contract weeks that the cooperating teacher is working with each student teacher for that semester;

2. The cooperating teacher's full name and certificate number;

3. The student teacher's full name, Social Security number, demographic data, and contact information;

4. The student teacher's preparation and certification area by assigned certification code;

5. The names and assigned codes of the school and school district where the cooperating teacher is employed and the student teaching requirement is being fulfilled. If the certified cooperating teacher is employed in a nonpublic school which meets the state performance standards as established in KRS 156.160 or which has been accredited by a regional or national accrediting association, the institution shall submit the name, assigned code, and address of the school.

(c) If an educator preparation institution fails to provide the report by the date established in paragraph (a) of this subsection, the Education Professional Standards Board shall not be liable for payment under this administrative regulation.

(3)(a) Upon receipt of the report, the Education Professional Standards Board shall submit a "Cooperating Teacher Payment Voucher" to each cooperating teacher.

(b) The voucher, or its electronic equivalent if available, shall be signed by the cooperating teacher, building principal, and the college supervisor as verification of the cooperating teacher's service to the student teacher.

(c) To be eligible for compensation under this administrative regulation, the cooperating teacher shall submit the completed voucher to the Education Professional Standards Board:

1. On or before December 15 for a cooperating teacher supervising a student teacher during the fall semester; or

2. On or before May 1 for a cooperating teacher supervising a student teacher during the spring semester.

(d) If a cooperating teacher fails to provide the completed voucher, or its electronic equivalent, by the date established in paragraph (c) of this subsection, the cooperating teacher shall not be eligible to receive any compensation available under this administrative regulation.

(4)(a) The payment to a cooperating teacher shall be determined based upon available funding allocated under the biennial budget bill and the total number of weeks served by all cooperating teachers reported for the fiscal year.

(b) The payment shall be allocated to a cooperating teacher based upon the number of weeks the teacher supervised a student teacher as reported in subsections (2) and (3) of this section.

(5) Payments to cooperating teachers shall be disbursed to the school districts or to cooperating teachers in nonpublic schools by the Education Professional Standards Board:

(a) On an annual basis; and

(b) On or before June 15.

(6) Compensation to cooperating teachers shall be provided under this administrative regulation if state funds are appropriated for this purpose. Payment of state funds under this administrative regulation shall:

(a) Be a supplement to the compensation provided by an educator preparation institution to a cooperating teacher who is supervising an institution's student teacher; and

(b) Not supplant the educator preparation institutions' compensation responsibility.

Section 8. Incorporation by Reference. (1) "Cooperating Teacher Payment Voucher", revised 7/2000, is incorporated by reference.

(2) This material may be inspected, copied, or obtained, subject to applicable copyright law, at the Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601, Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. (23 Ky.R. 4281; eff. 8-4-97; Am. 27 Ky.R. 1082; 1475; eff. 12-21-2000; 28 Ky.R. 2077; 2347; eff. 5-16-2002; Recodified from 704 KAR 20:706, 7-2-2002; 33 Ky.R. 838; 1274; eff. 12-1-06.)

EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE

Presentation

Information Item:

Signing of the 2010-2015 NASDTEC Interstate Agreement

Applicable Statutes and Regulations:

KRS 161.020, 161.028, 161.030, 161.048, 161.123, 161.124, 161.126
KAR Title 16

Applicable Goal:

Goal 2: Every professional position in a Kentucky public school is staffed by a properly credentialed educator.

Background:

Every five years the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) revises its Interstate Educator Licensure Agreement (Interstate Agreement) and asks all member states to sign this document, signifying those states from which the receiving state will readily accept an educator's certification. The most current agreement, published at the June 2010 NASDTEC Annual Conference, is now ready for state participation.

The most recent agreement is different in that it asks all states to complete a specific outline of the stages of licensure within that state, including all "Jurisdiction-Specific Requirements (JSRs)," —grade point average, clinical practice, assessments, internship, etc.—for obtaining each stage of certification. These stages (1-4) are characterized by specific requirements required by the state to obtain the appropriate level of licensure. For example, Kentucky's Professional Certificate is categorized as a "Stage 3 license" because it is "issued to an individual who holds a minimum of a Bachelor's degree, has completed an approved program and has met all jurisdiction-specific requirements" in Kentucky.

Just as the agreement has changed, so has the landscape for educator certification in the United States. Many more teachers are being prepared by alternative route programs, and teachers, in particular, are becoming more mobile. In addition, EPSB has modified its regulations since the past agreement was signed to reflect the teacher leader master's programs and post-master's principal preparation programs. The agreement was last signed by Kentucky in 2005.

A discussion guide and other background materials regarding the agreement and the issue of reciprocity in general are being presented for the Board's discussion at this time. The EPSB executive director needs to sign appropriate sections of the Interstate Agreement in the coming weeks, and that action will be placed on the March agenda for final action.

Contact Person:

Mr. Michael C. Carr, Director
Division of Certification
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: mike.carr@ky.gov

_____

Executive Director

Date:

January 10, 2011

Preparing for the 2010-15 NASDTEC Interstate Agreement
A discussion guide for the EPSB
Michael C. Carr, EPSB Director of Certification
January 10, 2011

What is the NASDTEC Interstate Agreement (as explained by NASDTEC)?

The NASDTEC *(National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification)* Interstate Agreement facilitates the movement of educators among the states and other jurisdictions that are members of NASDTEC and have signed the Agreement. Although there may be conditions applicable to individual jurisdictions, the Agreement makes it possible for an educator who completed an approved program and/or who holds a certificate or license in one jurisdiction to earn a certificate or license in another state or jurisdiction. For example, a teacher who completed an approved teacher preparation program in Alabama generally will be able to earn a certificate in Georgia. Receiving states may, however, impose certain special requirements which must be met in a reasonable period of time.

What it is:
The interstate agreement, arranged by NASDTEC, is a collection of over 50 individual agreements by states and Canadian provinces. Each individual agreement is a statement by that state or jurisdiction outlining which other states' educator certificates will be accepted by that state. Specifically the agreement outlines which particular types of educator certificates (teachers, administrators, service personnel, or career/technical), and which particular styles of certifications (titles, fields, etc.) will be accepted.

Such an "acceptance" agreement means that the "receiving" state will issue some form of authorization allowing the inbound certificate holder to legally teach or provide service in the receiving state, provided the license issued by the "sending" state is acceptable under the agreement. This authorization may be limited in time by the receiving state, and the receiving state may impose additional requirements which need to be accomplished before the educator can teach or practice after the end of the time limit.

What it is not:
It is not a collection of 2-way agreements of reciprocal acceptance. For example, although Georgia affirms with its agreement that it will accept certificates from Connecticut, this acceptance in no way implies that Connecticut will accept Georgia certificates.

It is not a guarantee that all certificate titles will be accepted by a receiving state. For example, in the "sending" state you may hold a "temporary" or "provisional" certificate which is excluded from the agreement signed by the "receiving" state. In such a case, the NASDTEC Interstate Agreement provides no help toward your receipt of a certificate in the "receiving" state.

It is not necessarily "full" reciprocity. The educator may have to complete additional requirements, such as coursework, assessments, or classroom experience, before receiving a full professional certificate in the new state.

NOTE: Kentucky has signed for teaching certificates only (not administrative certificates) with AL, CA, DC, GA, IL, IN, ME, MI, MT, NV, NH, NJ, NY, RI, PA, SC, UT, VA, & WY.

What does the EPSB Division of Certification say about reciprocity on its website?

Q: Does Kentucky have full reciprocity regarding teaching certification?
A. *Reciprocity* is a term often used when educators need to transfer their certification from one state to another. This does not mean, however, that a state with reciprocity will automatically grant the same certification as was held in another state, since each state has its own special

requirements. Kentucky is part of the NASDTEC Interstate Agreement; therefore, the state accepts recommendations from teacher preparation programs from state-accredited colleges and universities in many states. Cases are evaluated on an individual basis. In general, Kentucky does not recognize certificates which have been granted by testing only.

What EPSB regulation primarily governs out-of-state preparation (reciprocity)?

16 KAR 4:030. Out-of-state preparation.

RELATES TO: KRS 161.020, 161.028, 161.030, 161.124, 161.126
STATUTORY AUTHORITY: KRS 161.020, 161.028, 161.030
NECESSITY, FUNCTION, AND CONFORMITY: KRS 161.020 and 161.030 require that a teacher and other professional school personnel hold a certificate of legal qualifications for the respective position to be issued upon completion of a program of preparation prescribed by the Education Professional Standards Board. KRS 161.028 requires the Education Professional Standards Board to establish the standards for obtaining and maintaining a teaching certificate. KRS 161.124 enacts into law the Interstate Agreement on Qualifications of Educational Personnel. KRS 161.126 designates the Executive Director of the Education Professional Standards Board as the state official responsible for signing contracts under this agreement. This administrative regulation establishes the certification provisions for applicants with out-of-state preparation.

Section 1. (1) An applicant for Kentucky teacher certification whose professional preparation was completed at a teacher education institution located outside the Commonwealth of Kentucky shall have completed a program of preparation and the curriculum requirements approved by the responsible state education agency for teacher certification.

(2) An out-of-state applicant who meets the requirements of subsection (1) of this section shall be issued a Kentucky teaching certificate or statement of eligibility established in 16 KAR 2:010 at the grade range and content area corresponding to the out-of-state preparation.

(3) An out-of-state applicant shall follow the procedures for application established in 16 KAR 2:010.

Section 2. (1) An out-of-state applicant shall be subject to the testing and internship requirements of KRS 161.030 and implementing administrative regulations of the Education Professional Standard Board in KAR Title 16. *(NOTE: Two years experience needed to waive KY testing and KTIP requirements)*

(2) An out-of-state applicant shall be subject to the certificate issuance, recency, reissuance, renewal, and rank change provisions of KRS Chapter 161 and KAR Title 16. (SBE 42.005(4), (6), (7); 1 Ky.R. 494; **eff. 3-12-75**; Am. 11 Ky.R. 624; eff. 11-13-84; 28 Ky.R. 2065; 2340; eff. 5-16-2002; recodified from 704 KAR 20:035, 7-2-2002.)

NOTE: This regulation pre-dates all alternative certification programs, which are prevalent across the country (including KY) and the EPSB's 2008 regulation regarding the acceptance of out-of state, on-line programs for initial certification and/or rank change. (See next question for details.)

What is the EPSB's stance on acceptance of out-of-state, on-line programs for initial certification and/or rank change?

From 16 KAR 5:010, Section 28

(2)(a) Until May 31, 2008, initial and continuing on-line educator preparation programs shall be regionally or nationally accredited and accredited or approved, as applicable, by the program's state of origin.

(b) Beginning June 1, 2008, initial and continuing on-line educator preparation programs originating from outside Kentucky shall be regionally accredited, accredited or approved, as applicable, by the program's state of origin, and accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

What are the key questions to be answered as we sign the new NASDTEC Agreement?

1. **Is our stance that we want to treat all teachers entering the state the same, i.e., all (even those with over two years experience and a full state certificate) must meet our requirements in 16 KAR 2:010?**

    - *This is most often an issue with:*
        - *on-line programs for certification or rank change/determination*
        - *alternative certification programs*
        - *"testing-only" certificate areas*
        - *academic major requirement*
        - *middle school area requirement (24 hours in content)*

2. **Do we want to address incoming school principal applicants differently in light of Kentucky's redesigned principal programs, requiring post-master's work and clinical components?**

    - *Currently we require those with less than two years of experience as a principal to take the KYPT and ISSLC tests. (All applicants must take the KYPT.) This is all that is addressed in statute and reg. We could:*
        - *Not accept any out of state principal certs*
        - *Use a two years' experience requirement to accept certificate as Level I with requirement to complete Level II in KY within 5 years*

3. **Do we want to sign only the base agreement on teaching certificates or do a full analysis to exclude certain states from any exchange privileges?**
    - *We could adopt a stance which allows full reciprocity for any out of state teaching applicant with two years' experience and a certificate equal to our Professional Certificate, for example.*

16 KAR 4:030. Out-of-state preparation.

RELATES TO: KRS 161.020, 161.028, 161.030, 161.124, 161.126
STATUTORY AUTHORITY: KRS 161.020, 161.028, 161.030
NECESSITY, FUNCTION, AND CONFORMITY: KRS 161.020 and 161.030 require that a teacher and other professional school personnel hold a certificate of legal qualifications for the respective position to be issued upon completion of a program of preparation prescribed by the Education Professional Standards Board. KRS 161.028 requires the Education Professional Standards Board to establish the standards for obtaining and maintaining a teaching certificate. KRS 161.124 enacts into law the Interstate Agreement on Qualifications of Educational Personnel. KRS 161.126 designates the Executive Director of the Education Professional Standards Board as the state official responsible for signing contracts under this agreement. This administrative regulation establishes the certification provisions for applicants with out-of-state preparation.

Section 1. (1) An applicant for Kentucky teacher certification whose professional preparation was completed at a teacher education institution located outside the Commonwealth of Kentucky shall have completed a program of preparation and the curriculum requirements approved by the responsible state education agency for teacher certification.

(2) An out-of-state applicant who meets the requirements of subsection (1) of this section shall be issued a Kentucky teaching certificate or statement of eligibility established in 16 KAR 2:010 at the grade range and content area corresponding to the out-of-state preparation.

(3) An out-of-state applicant shall follow the procedures for application established in 16 KAR 2:010.

Section 2. (1) An out-of-state applicant shall be subject to the testing and internship requirements of KRS 161.030 and implementing administrative regulations of the Education Professional Standard Board in KAR Title 16.

(2) An out-of-state applicant shall be subject to the certificate issuance, recency, reissuance, renewal, and rank change provisions of KRS Chapter 161 and KAR Title 16. (SBE 42.005(4), (6), (7); 1 Ky.R. 494; eff. 3-12-75; Am. 11 Ky.R. 624; eff. 11-13-84; 28 Ky.R. 2065; 2340; eff. 5-16-2002; recodified from 704 KAR 20:035, 7-2-2002.)

16 KAR 4030 (out of state)

161.124 Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel.

The Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel is hereby enacted into law and entered into with all jurisdictions legally joining therein, in the form substantially as follows:

ARTICLE I. PURPOSE, FINDINGS, AND POLICY

(1) The states party to this agreement, desiring by common action to improve their respective school systems by utilizing the teacher or other professional educational person wherever educated, declare that it is the policy of each of them, on the basis of cooperation with one another, to take advantage of the preparation and experience of these persons wherever gained, thereby serving the best interests of society, of education, and of the teaching profession. It is the purpose of this agreement to provide for the development and execution of these programs of cooperation as will facilitate the movement of teachers and other professional educational personnel among the states party to it, and to authorize specific interstate educational personnel contracts to achieve that end.

(2) The party states find that included in the large movement of population among all sections of the nation are many qualified educational personnel who move for family and other personal reasons but who are hindered in using their professional skill and experience in their new locations. Variations from state to state in requirements for qualifying educational personnel discourage these personnel from taking the steps necessary to qualify in other states. As a consequence, a significant number of professionally prepared and experienced educators is lost to our school systems. Facilitating the employment of qualified educational personnel, without reference to their states of origin, can increase the available educational resources. Participation in this compact can increase the availability of educational manpower.

ARTICLE II. DEFINITIONS

As used in this agreement and contracts made pursuant to it, unless the context clearly requires otherwise:

(1) "Educational personnel" means persons who must meet requirements pursuant to state law as a condition of employment in educational programs.

(2) "Designated state official" means the education official of a state selected by that state to negotiate and enter into, on behalf of his state, contracts pursuant to this agreement.

(3) "Accept," or any variant thereof, means to recognize and give effect to one (1) or more determinations of another state relating to the qualifications of educational personnel in lieu of making or requiring a like determination that would otherwise be required by or pursuant to the laws of a receiving state.

(4) "State" means a state, territory, or possession of the United States; the District of Columbia; or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(5) "Originating state" means a state and its subdivisions, if any, whose determination that certain educational personnel are qualified to be employed for specific duties in schools is acceptable in accordance with the terms of a contract made pursuant to Article III.

(6) "Receiving state" means a state and its subdivisions which accept educational personnel in accordance with the terms of a contract made pursuant to Article III.

ARTICLE III. INTERSTATE EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL CONTRACTS

(1) The designated state official of a party state may make one or more contracts on behalf of his state with one or more other party states providing for the acceptance of educational personnel. Any contract for the period of its duration shall be applicable to and binding on the states whose designated state officials enter into it, and the subdivisions of those states, with the same force and effect as if incorporated in this agreement. A designated state official may enter into a contract pursuant to this Article only with states in which he finds that there are programs of education, certification standards or other acceptable qualifications that assure preparation or qualification of educational personnel on a basis sufficiently comparable, even though not identical to that prevailing in his own state.

(2) Any contract shall provide for:

(a) Its duration.

(b) The criteria to be applied by an originating state in qualifying educational personnel for acceptance by a receiving state.

(c) Waivers, substitutions, and conditional acceptance as shall aid the practical effectuation of the contract without sacrifice of basic educational standards.

(d) Any other necessary matters.

(3) No contract made pursuant to this agreement shall be for a term longer than five years but any contract may be renewed for like or lesser periods.

(4) Any contract dealing with acceptance of educational personnel on the basis of their having completed an educational program shall specify the earliest date or dates on which originating state approval of the program or programs involved can have occurred. No contract made pursuant to this agreement shall require acceptance by a receiving state of any persons qualified because of successful completion of a program prior to January 1, 1954.

(5) The certification or other acceptance of a person who has been accepted pursuant to the terms of a contract shall not be revoked or otherwise impaired because the contract has expired or been terminated. However, any certificate or other qualifying document may be revoked or suspended on any ground which would be sufficient for revocation or suspension of a certificate or other qualifying document initially granted or approved in the receiving state.

(6) A contract committee composed of the designated state officials of the contracting states or their representatives shall keep the contract under continuous review, study means of improving its administration, and report no less frequently than once a year to the heads of the appropriate education agencies of the contracting states.

ARTICLE IV. APPROVED AND ACCEPTED PROGRAMS

(1) Nothing in this agreement should be construed to repeal or otherwise modify any law or regulation of a party state relating to the approval of programs of educational preparation having effect solely on the qualification of educational personnel within that state.

(2) To the extent that contracts made pursuant to this agreement deal with the educational requirements for the proper qualification of educational personnel, acceptance of a

program of educational preparation shall be in accordance with such procedures and requirements as may be provided in the applicable contract.

ARTICLE V. INTERSTATE COOPERATION

The party states agree that:

(1) They will, so far as practicable, prefer the making of multilateral contracts pursuant to Article III of this agreement.

(2) They will facilitate and strengthen cooperation in interstate certification and other elements of educational personnel qualification and for this purpose shall cooperate with agencies, organizations, and associations interested in certification and other elements of educational personnel qualification.

ARTICLE VI. AGREEMENT EVALUATION

The designated state officials of any party state may meet from time to time as a group to evaluate progress under the agreement, and to formulate recommendation for changes.

ARTICLE VII. OTHER ARRANGEMENTS

Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to prevent or inhibit other arrangements or practices of any party state or states to facilitate the interchange of educational personnel.

ARTICLE VIII. EFFECT AND WITHDRAWAL

(1) This agreement shall become effective when enacted into law by two (2) states. Thereafter it shall become effective as to any state upon its enactment of this agreement.

(2) Any party state may withdraw from this agreement by enacting a statute repealing the agreement, but no withdrawal shall take effect until one (1) year after the Governor of the withdrawing state has given notice in writing of the withdrawal to the Governors of all other party states.

(3) No withdrawal shall relieve the withdrawing state of any obligation imposed upon it by a contract to which it is a party. The duration of contracts and the methods and conditions of withdrawal therefrom shall be those specified in their terms.

ARTICLE IX. CONSTRUCTION AND SEVERABILITY

This agreement shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate its purposes. The provisions of this agreement shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence, or provision of this agreement is declared to be contrary to the Constitution of any state or of the United States, or the application thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this agreement and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this agreement shall be held contrary to the Constitution of any state participating therein, the agreement shall remain in full force and effect as to the state affected as to all severable matters.

Effective: July 13, 1990

EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE

Information/Discussion Item A

Information Item:

To inform the EPSB about contracts and amendments which were signed by the executive director since the previous EPSB board meeting.

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028 (1) (v) (d)
KRS 161.017 (3)

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:

KRS 161.028 (1) (v) authorizes the EPSB to enter into contracts and KRS 161.017 (3) stipulates that with board approval the executive director may enter into agreements "…to enlist assistance to implement the duties and responsibilities of the board." The EPSB approved procedures for seeking approval and authorization for entering contractual agreements at the October 23, 2006 EPSB meeting.

- Contracts totaling $42,706.50 were awarded to the universities for the KTIP program to provide funding to support the Career and Technical Education teacher educators and training of KTIP committee members. The contract amounts were calculated on an allocation of interns, using 2010 enrollment, times a set amount of $401.00 per intern. These contracts were issued in accordance with the directions established by the Office of Career and Technical Education and distributed based on FY 2010 interns served. The source of funds is the federal Carl Perkins grant. The funds were distributed as follows:

Vendor Name	Services	Service Period	Contract Amt.
EKU	CTE Teacher Educators	October 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011	$5,012.50
KSU			$3,208.00
MoSU			$6,416.00
MuSU			$7,218.00
NKU			$3,208.00
UK			$4,812.00
UL			$2,807.00
WKU			$10,025.00

- EPSB has awarded a contract to Cassandra Trueblood for legal services and expenses totaling $69,023.00. The contract was awarded based on a competitive RFP. Services commenced on December 1, 2010, and will continue through June 30, 2011. Cassandra shall work primarily at the EPSB's offices located at 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Frankfort, KY. We will consider renewal of this contract at the end of that period, based on her performance in resolving disciplinary cases. This contract replaces a similar agreement that EPSB had with Katie Morgan, who accepted a position with another organization and resigned on October 29, 2010.
- Due to a greater than anticipated need for KTIP teacher educators at certain universities, the contracts listed below were amended to provide enough funding to pay the teacher educator fees and travel. Other university contracts for this program are expected to have lower than planned spending in 2010-11; therefore, there are adequate funds to cover these increases.

Program	Vendor	Original Amount	Addl. Funds
KTIP	University of Kentucky	90,472.00	19,462.00
KTIP	University of Louisville	122,821.00	11,572.00
KTIP	Eastern Kentucky University	74,429.00	3,156.00
KTIP	Kentucky State University	25,642.50	1,315.00
Total			35,505.00

Groups/Persons Consulted:

The contract attorney RFP responses were evaluated by a committee consisting of Alicia Sneed, Elise Borne, Gary Freeland, Robert Brown, and Mona Curtsinger. Personal interviews with the top three candidates were conducted by Alicia Sneed, Mona Curtsinger, and Mike Carr.

Contact Person:

Mr. Gary W. Freeland
Deputy Executive Director
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: garyw.freeland@ky.gov

Executive Director

Date:

January 10, 2011

EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE

Information/Discussion Item B

Information Item:

A report on the year-to-date financial performance of the agency's programs and operations through December 31, 2010

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, 2010, will be emailed to members of the EPSB as soon as it is completed after January 1, 2011, but prior to the board meeting on January 10, 2011.

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
Deputy Executive Director
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: garyw.freeland@ky.gov

Executive Director

Date:

January 10, 2011

EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE

Information/Discussion Item C

Information Item:

16 KAR 6:030. Examination Prerequisites for Principal Certification, Notice of Intent

Applicable Statute or Regulation:

KRS 161.027
16 KAR 6:030

Applicable Goals:

Goal 2: Every professional position in a Kentucky public school is staffed by a properly credentialed educator.

Background:

The Kentucky Specialty Test of Instructional and Administrative Practices, also known as the Kentucky Principal Test (KYPT) is one of two required assessments mandated by KRS 161.027 for applicants seeking principal certification. Since 1985, the KYPT has been maintained and administered by the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB); however, recent reviews by staff have revealed that efficiencies could be gained by using a third party.

EPSB staff approached the Educational Testing Service (ETS) to determine if ETS was willing to assume the maintenance and administration of the test. In October 2010, the Commonwealth Collaborative for School Leadership Programs (CCSLP) and EPSB staff met with Kentucky's ETS Client Relations Director to explore the viability of ETS' maintaining the KYPT. In addition, a test advisory committee was formed to work with ETS in reviewing and revising the current assessment. The test advisory committee includes practicing Kentucky administrators, several members of the CCSLP, and other administrative preparation program faculty. All parties have agreed that it would be a more efficient and effective use of resources to have ETS maintain and administer the KYPT.

ETS has agreed to update and augment content as well as develop two new test forms, a Test at a Glance document (outline and sample questions), and a study guide. ETS has also agreed to administer the test on the same dates as the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) test. Beginning in September of 2011, the KYPT will initially be paper-based; however, it will soon be administered by computer. The cost of the test will increase from $80.00 to $85.00 plus a registration fee. Because most candidates will take the SLLA during the same testing year, we do not anticipate the registration fee to be a financial burden. After reviewing the test transition timeline, EPSB staff members have determined there should be no interruption in test administrations.

The test, *Kentucky Specialty Test of Instructional and Administrative Practices (1015,)* will be available for registration July 2011 with the first administration held September 2011. Pending approval by the EPSB, staff intends to recommend that the test be required effective September 1, 2011, with no required cut score since a Standard Setting Study (SSS) value for the test will not yet be available. EPSB staff plans to bring the state SSS

value for the test to the Board as the recommended passing score, effective September 1, 2012.

Contact Person:

Mr. Robert Brown
Division of Professional Learning and Assessment
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: robertl.brown@ky.gov

_____
Executive Director

Date:

January 10, 2011

EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD

(Amendment)

16 KAR 6:030. Examination prerequisites for principal certification.

RELATES TO: KRS 161.020, 161.027, 161.030

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: KRS 161.027

NECESSITY, FUNCTION, AND CONFORMITY: KRS 161.020 requires a certificate of legal credentials for any public school position for which a certificate is issued. KRS 161.027 requires the Education Professional Standards Board to develop or select appropriate tests, establish minimum scores for successful completion, and establish a reasonable fee to be charged for actual cost of administration of the tests, for an applicant seeking certification as principal, and further requires that each applicant for certification as school principal with less than two (2) years of appropriate experience complete a one (1) year internship program developed by the Education Professional Standards Board. This administrative regulation establishes the examination requirements for certification as principal required under KRS 161.027.

Section 1. (1)(a) The certificate for school principal shall be valid for serving in the position of principal or assistant principal.

(b) A new applicant for certification as a school principal, including vocational school principal, shall successfully complete the prerequisite tests specified in Section 2 of this administrative regulation prior to certification as a school principal.

(c) A score on a test completed more than five (5) years prior to application for certification shall not be acceptable.

(2) In addition to the examination requirement specified in Section 2 of this administrative regulation, an applicant for certification shall successfully complete a one

DRAFT

(1) year internship program as required by 16 KAR 7:020 if the applicant has had less than two (2) years of successful experience as a principal in another state.

Section 2. An applicant for certification as principal shall complete the following tests and attain the minimum score specified for each test:

(1) School Leaders Licensure Assessment (1011) - 160; and

(2) (a) Until August 31, 2011, the Kentucky Specialty Test of Instructional and Administrative Practices - eighty-five (85) percent correct responses; and

(b) Beginning September 1, 2011, the Kentucky Specialty Test of Instructional and Administrative Practices (1015) administered by the Educational Testing Service with no passing score.

Section 3. The successful completion of the School Leaders Licensure Assessment shall not be required for an applicant who has:

(1) Two (2) years of experience as a certified principal in another state; and

(2) Successfully completed a nationally administered test in the area of educational leadership and administration.

Section 4. (1) An applicant for certification as principal shall take the required School Leaders Licensure Assessment on a date established by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). An applicant shall authorize that test results be forwarded to the Education Professional Standards Board by the ETS.

(2) Public announcement of a testing date and location shall be issued sufficiently in advance to permit registration as required by the ETS and the Education Professional Standards Board.

(3) [~~(4)~~] An applicant shall seek information regarding the dates and location of the test and make application for the appropriate examination prior to the deadline

DRAFT

established and sufficiently in advance of anticipated employment to permit test results to be received by the Education Professional Standards Board and processed in the normal certification cycle.

Section 5. (1) For the required School Leaders Licensure Assessment, the applicant shall pay all fees assessed by the ETS.

(2) (a) Until August 31, 2011, an applicant for the Kentucky Specialty Test of Instructional and Administrative Practices[~~, an applicant~~] shall pay a fee of eighty (80) dollars, and

(b) Beginning September 1, 2011, an applicant for the Kentucky Specialty Test of Instructional and Administrative Practices shall pay all fees assessed by the ETS .

Section 6. An applicant who fails to achieve a minimum score on a required test as specified in Section 2 of this administrative regulation shall be permitted to retake the test or tests during a regularly-scheduled test administration.

Section 7. A temporary certificate issued in accordance with KRS 161.027(6)(a) shall not be extended for an applicant who does not successfully complete the assessments within the year.

Section 8. (1) For an applicant applying for a certificate under KRS 161.027(6)(b), the school superintendent of the employing district shall submit a request that shall include an affirmation that the applicant pool consisted of three (3) or less applicants who met the requirements for selecting a principal.

(2) The temporary certificate issued in accordance with KRS 161.027(6)(b) shall not be extended beyond the one (1) year period.

Section 9. (1) To provide for confidentiality of information, the Education Professional Standards Board shall report individual scores on the Kentucky Specialty

DRAFT

Test of Instructional and Administrative Practices to the individual applicant. The scores shall not be released to other individuals or agencies.

(2) A score shall not be used by the Education Professional Standards Board in an individually identifiable form other than for purposes of determining eligibility for certification as school principal.

Section 10. On an annual or biennial basis, the Education Professional Standards Board shall collect and analyze data provided by the Educational Testing Service through score and institution reports which permit evaluation of the examination prerequisites covered by this administrative regulation.

DRAFT

EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE

Action Item A

Action Item:

Charter for the Kentucky Teacher Standards Review Committee (KTSRC)

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028
16 KAR 1:010

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 Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) approve a charter to guide the work of a special committee to review the current Kentucky Teacher Standards and the Model Core Teaching Standards developed by InTASC?

Background:

In the fall of 2010, InTASC released its Model Core Teaching Standards for public comment. Developed through a collaboration of several states, these standards were designed as a model by which states could evaluate and improve their current standards. As indicated by leadership of InTASC, these model standards were not created to be adopted in their entirety. States should use these standards to review and make recommendations for improvement to their standards. The committee shall recommend to the EPSB ways to amend the Kentucky Teacher Standards. Once the committee recommendations have been reviewed and approved by the EPSB, regulatory changes shall be made to incorporate the necessary changes to the Kentucky Teacher Standards.

Alternative Actions:

1. Approve the charter for the Kentucky Teacher Standards Review Committee
2. Modify the charter for the Kentucky Teacher Standards Review Committee
3. Do not approve the charter for the Kentucky Teacher Standards Review Committee

Contact Person:

Mr. Robert Brown, Director
Division of Professional Learning and Assessment
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: robertl.brown@ky.gov

_____

Executive Director

Date:

January 11, 2010

CHARTER

Kentucky Teacher Standards Review Committee (KTSRC)

Purpose

In light of the recent release of the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards, the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) is establishing a committee to review the Kentucky Teacher Standards. The Kentucky Teacher Standards Review Committee (KTSRC) will utilize the Model Core Teaching Standards as a guide to bring forth recommendations to the EPSB on ways to update and improve the professional utility of the Kentucky Teacher Standards.

Membership of the Committee

The committee will include representatives from both public and independent colleges and universities, the Kentucky Department of Education, the Council on Postsecondary Education, P-12 teachers and district leaders, along with other stakeholders with knowledge of and interest in the purpose of the committee.

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

The KTRSC shall:

1. Utilize the Model Core Teaching Standards to update the Kentucky Teacher Standards and indicators.
2. Align each Kentucky Teacher Standard with improved measures of teacher performance, essential knowledge for effective practice, and critical dispositions necessary to create a school culture in which every child learns.
3. Collaborate with the Kentucky Department of Education's Teacher Effectiveness Evaluation Committee.
4. Ensure that teacher preparation programs implement the new standards in courses and student teaching in a timely manner.

Time Frame

The committee will be expected to complete a final report with specific recommendations by January 30, 2012.

EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE

Action Item B

Action Item:

16 KAR 6:010. Written Examination Prerequisites for Teacher Certification, Final Action

Applicable Statute or Regulation:

KRS 161.030
16 KAR 6:010

Applicable Goals:

Goal 2: Every professional position in a Kentucky public school is staffed by a properly credentialed educator.

I. Cut Score Changes for Existing Test Requirements

Issue I.A.:

Should the EPSB approve amendments to 16 KAR 6:010, Written Examination Requirements for Teacher Certification, reflecting the World Languages and Business Education test cut scores, effective September 1, 2011?

Background:

The Educational Testing Service (ETS) developed *French*, *German*, and *Spanish* World Language tests and a new *Business Education* test that will replace the current *French: Content Knowledge (0173)*, *German: Content Knowledge (0181)*, *Spanish: Content Knowledge (0191)*, and *Business Education (0100)* tests. In May 2010, the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) approved the requirement of the new tests with no passing score, effective January 1, 2011. Table A shows the results of the multi-state Standard Setting Study (SSS) for these new tests. EPSB staff recommends the implementation of the multi-state SSS study value of each test as the recommended passing score, effective September 1, 2011.

Table A

Multi-state Standard Setting Study (SSS) Study Value* and Standard Error of Measure (SEM) Scores							
French: World Language (5174) *Time-2 hours 45 min.*		***German: World Language (5183)*** *Time-2 hours 45 min.*		***Spanish: World Language (5195)*** *Time-2 hours 45 min.*		***Business Education (0101)*** *Time-2 hours*	
-2 SEM	149	-2 SEM	151	-2 SEM	156	-2 SEM	142
-1 SEM	156	-1 SEM	157	-1 SEM	163	-1 SEM	148
Study Value	**162**	**Study Value**	**163**	**Study Value**	**168**	**Study Value**	**154**
+1 SEM	167	+1 SEM	169	+1 SEM	175	+1 SEM	161
+2 SEM	174	+2 SEM	175	+2 SEM	180	+2 SEM	167

*Study Value refers to the recommended passing score of the SSS panels.

Issue I. A. Alternative Action:

Implement the *French: World Language (5174)* cut score of 162, the *German: World Language (5183)* cut score of 163, the *Spanish: World Language (5195)* cut score of 168, and the *Business Education (0101)* cut score of 154 effective September 1, 2011.
1. Approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.
2. Do not approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.

Staff Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

At the May 2010 meeting, the Board approved the implementation, effective January 1, 2011, of the newly developed *World Language* and the *Business Education* tests with no required passing score. This recommendation is to implement a required passing score for each test, effective September 1, 2011.

Issue I. B.:

Should the EPSB approve amendments to 16 KAR 6:010, Written Examination Requirements for Teacher Certification, reflecting the *Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (0856)* cut score of 156, effective September 1, 2011?

Background:

In May 2010, the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) approved the use of *(0856)* with no passing score as an option for individuals seeking certification in both Health and Physical Education (PE) simultaneously, effective January 1, 2011.

Table B below shows the results of the state SSS. The study value of the state SSS is 151. Because *(0856)* is not a newly developed test, staff were able to review national performance data, which show that a score of 151 falls at the 11th percentile nationally *. In accordance with the Board's Cut Score Framework (See November 2007 Board Minutes), staff recommends a required passing score of 156, effective September 1, 2011. A score of 156 falls at the 23rd percentile and remains within 1 SEM of the study value.

Table B

Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (0856) *Time-2 hours*	
-2 SEM	142
-1 SEM	147
Study Value	**151**
+1 SEM	157
+2 SEM	163

**national percentile information is based on 3-year rolling data from August 2006 through July 2009.*

Issue I. B. Alternative Action

Implement the *Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (0856)* cut score of 156, effective September 1, 2011.

1. Approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.
2. Do not approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.

Staff Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

At the May 2010 meeting, the Board approved the implementation of the *Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (0856)* test, effective January 1, 2011, as an option for individuals seeking certification in both health and physical education. This recommendation is to implement a required passing score for the test, effective September 1, 2011.

Issue I. C.:

Should the EPSB approve amendments to 16 KAR 6:010, Written Examination Requirements for Teacher Certification, reflecting the *Teaching Reading (0204)* cut score of 153, effective September 1, 2011?

Background:

The ETS recently developed the *Teaching Reading (0204)* test. In January and February 2010, Kentucky teachers and teacher educators participated in multi-state SSSs for the newly developed tests. In May 2010, the EPSB approved the requirement of the new test for the Reading endorsement with no passing score, effective January 1, 2011.

EPSB staff recommends the Board implement the multi-state SSS study value as the cut score for this test, effective September 1, 2011. Table C below shows the results of the SSS.

Table C

Teaching Reading (0204) *Time-1 hour*	
-2 SEM	143
-1 SEM	148
Study Value	**153**
+1 SEM	159
+2 SEM	165

Issue I. C. Alternative Action:

Implement *Teaching Reading (0204)* test cut score of 153, effective September 1, 2011.
1. Approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.
2. Do not approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.

Staff Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

At the May 2010 meeting, the Board approved the implementation of the *Teaching Reading (0204)* test with no required passing score for the Reading endorsement, effective January 1, 2011. This recommendation is to implement a required passing score for the test, effective September 1, 2011.

II. New Test Requirements and Corresponding Cut Scores

Issue II. A.:

Should the EPSB approve amendments to 16 KAR 6:010, Written Examination Requirements for Teacher Certification, reflecting the option for individuals seeking Physical Education (P-12) certification, effective September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012?

Background:

The ETS developed the new *Physical Education: Content and Design (0095)* test. In June 2010, Kentucky teachers and teacher educators participated in a multi-state SSS for the newly developed test. In July 2010, the EPSB held a state-specific review of the test. All panelists recommended the EPSB move forward toward adoption of the newly developed test and setting of a required passing score.

EPSB staff recommends the Board implement the multi-state SSS study value as the cut score for the test with the option to choose either the currently required tests or the newly developed test from September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. Table D shows the results of the multi-state SSS for the new test. Table E shows how the test revisions would impact the test requirements should the Board approve staff's recommendation. Please note that the test options currently in place for individuals seeking certification in both health and PE simultaneously will still be in place.

Table D

Physical Education : Content and Design (0095) *Time-2 hours*	
-2 SEM	158
-1 SEM	164
Study Value	**169**
+1 SEM	175
+2 SEM	181

Table E

Physical Education Test Revision	
Physical Education (P-12) Certification	
Current Tests and Corresponding Passing Scores	**Newly Developed Test and Corresponding Passing Score**
Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K-6 (0522)-161 ; Time-2 hours **or** *Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5-9 (0523) – 161; Time-2 hours* **or** *Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7-12 (0524) – 161 ; Time-2 hours* **and** *Physical Education: Content Knowledge (0091) - 147 ; Time-1 hour* **and** *Physical Education: Movement Forms-Analysis and Design (0092) - 151; Time-2 hours*	*Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K-6 (0522)-161; Time-2 hours* **or** *Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5-9 (0523) – 161 ; Time-2 hours* **or** *Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7-12 (0524) – 161 ; Time-2 hours* **and** *Physical Education: Content and Design (0095)-169; Time-2 hours*

Issue II. A. Alternative Action:

Implement the option to choose either the currently required content tests, *(0091)* with cut score of 147 and *(0092)* with cut score of 151, or the newly developed (0095) test with a cut score of 169, effective September 1, 2011, through August 31, 2012.

1. Approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.
2. Do not approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.

Staff Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

At the May 2010 meeting, the Board approved the implementation of *Physical Education: Content and Design (0095)* with no required passing score, effective January 1, 2011. This recommendation is to implement a required passing score for the test, effective September 1, 2011.

Issue II. B.:

Should the EPSB approve amendments to 16 KAR 6:010, Written Examination Requirements for Teacher Certification, reflecting the requirement of the *Reading Specialist (0300)* test and cut score of 520 for the Literacy endorsement, effective September 1, 2011?

Background:

In March 2010, the EPSB hosted a review of the *Reading Specialist (0300)* test to determine whether the test might be suitable for the Literacy Specialist endorsement. In July 2010, the EPSB hosted a state-specific SSS of *(0300)* to set a passing score for the test. This passing score

would be used for the Literacy Specialist endorsement as well as Highly Qualified status for teaching reading.

Table F below shows the results of the state SSS. The study value of the state SSS is 530. Because *(0300)* is not a newly developed test, staff were able to review national performance data, which show that a score of 530 falls at the 26th percentile nationally. Therefore, in accordance with the Board's Cut Score Framework (See November 2007 Board Minutes), staff recommends a required passing score of 520, effective September 1, 2011. A score of 520 falls at the 22nd percentile nationally and remains within 1SEM of the study value.

Table F

Reading Specialist (0300) *Time-2 hours*	
-2 SEM	480
-1 SEM	510
Study Value	**530**
+1 SEM	560
+2 SEM	590

Issue II. B. Alternative Action:

Implement the requirement of the *Reading Specialist (0300)* test and cut score of 520 for the Literacy Specialist endorsement, effective September 1, 2011.

1. Approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.
2. Do not approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.

Staff Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

Implementing *(0300)* will provide an appropriate assessment for individuals seeking the Literacy Specialist endorsement. It will also provide an option for individuals seeking to be deemed HQ to teach reading.

Issue II. C.:

Should the EPSB approve amendments to 16 KAR 6:010, Written Examination Requirements for Teacher Certification, reflecting the new test options for individuals seeking certification in exceptional children (p-12), effective September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2011?

Background:

The ETS developed new *Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications (0354)*, *Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications (0543)*, and *Special Education: Core Knowledge and Severe to Profound Applications (0545)* tests. In January and February 2010, Kentucky teachers and teacher educators participated in multi-state SSSs for the newly developed tests. In March 2010, the EPSB held a state-specific review of the tests. All panelists recommended the EPSB move forward toward adoption of the newly developed tests.

EPSB staff recommends the Board implement the multi-state SSS study value as the cut score for each test with the option to choose either the currently required tests or the newly developed tests from September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. Table G shows the results of the multi-state SSS for these new tests. Table H shows how the test revisions would impact the test requirements should the Board approve staff's recommendation.

Table G

Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications (0354) *Time-2 hours*		***Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications (0543)*** *Time-2 hours*		***Special Education: Core Knowledge and Severe to Profound Applications (0545)*** *Time-2 hours*	
-2 SEM	138	-2 SEM	147	-2 SEM	147
-1 SEM	145	-1 SEM	153	-1 SEM	153
Study Value	**151**	**Study Value**	**158**	**Study Value**	**158**
+1 SEM	159	+1 SEM	164	+1 SEM	164
+2 SEM	166	+2 SEM	170	+2 SEM	170

Table H

Exceptional Education Test Revisions	
Learning and Behavior Disorders (P-12) Certification	
Current Tests and Corresponding Passing Scores	**Newly Developed Test and Corresponding Passing Score**
Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)-157; *Time-2 hours* **and** *Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542)*-172; *Time-1 hour*	*Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications (0543)*-158; *Time-2 hours*
Moderate and Severe Disabilities (P-12) Certification	
Current Tests	**Newly Developed Test**
Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353) -157; *Time-2 hours* **and** *Education of Exceptional Students: Severe to Profound Disabilities (0544)* -156; *Time-1 hour*	*Special Education: Core Knowledge and Severe to Profound Applications (0545)* -158; *Time-2 hours*

All Other Areas	
Current Tests	**Newly Developed Test**
Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353) -157 ; *Time-2 hours* **and** *Currently Required Specialty Area Test*	*Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications (0354)* -151; *Time-2 hours* **and** *Currently Required Specialty Area Test*

Issue II. C. Alternative Action:

Implement the following exceptional children (p-12) certification test options, effective September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012:

Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353) with cut score of 157 or *Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications (0354)* with cut score of 151;
Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542) with cut score of 172 or Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications (0543) with cut score of 158; and
Education of Exceptional Students: Severe to Profound Disabilities (0544) with cut score of 156 or
Special Education: Core Knowledge and Severe to Profound Applications (0545) with cut score of 158.

1. Approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.
2. Do not approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.

Staff Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications (0354), *Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications (0543)*, and *Special Education: Core Knowledge and Severe to Profound Applications (0545)* tests were validated for state use. The recommended cut score is the study-value provided by the multi-state Standard Setting Study. The 12-month overlapping of tests permits both students and teacher preparation programs time to transition to the new tests.

III. 16 KAR 6:010 Language Modifications

Issue III. A.:

Should the EPSB modify language in 16 KAR 6:010 regarding assessment requirements for applicants of any exceptional children certificate?*"*

Background:

Currently, Section 2 of 16 KAR 6:010 states, "The Education Professional Standards Board shall require the test or tests and passing scores identified in this section for each new teacher applicant and each teacher seeking an additional certificate." Although at present, *Education of*

Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353) is required for each new applicant of certification for teacher of exceptional children, it is not required of teachers who currently hold exceptional education certification and who wish to add an area. Therefore staff recommends a revision in wording as indicated below.

Current:

Section 2 (6) "An applicant for certification for teacher of exceptional children in Communication Disorders, Learning and Behavior Disorders, Hearing Impaired, Hearing Impaired with Sign Proficiency, Visually Impaired, or Moderate and Severe Disabilities shall take the content test or tests based on the applicant's area or areas of specialization with the corresponding passing scores as identified in this subsection:. . ."

Proposed:

Add- "If a teacher is seeking additional certification for any exceptional children certificate area, the applicant shall not be required to take *Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)* nor *Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications (0354)."*

Issue III. A. Alternative Action:

Modify Language in 16 KAR 6:010 Regarding Assessment Requirements for Applicants of Any Exceptional Children Certificate by adding, "If a teacher is seeking additional certification for any exceptional children certificate area, the applicant shall not be required to take *Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)* nor *Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications (0354)."*

1. Approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.
2. Do not approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.

Staff Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

These changes will ensure that those who currently hold exceptional education certification and wish to add an area can move without delay toward the appropriate test requirement.

Issue III. B.:
Should the EPSB modify language in 16 KAR 6:010 to accommodate computer-delivered assessments?

Background:
ETS began administering computer-delivered tests in August 2010. To differentiate the computer-delivered tests, ETS has placed the number "5" preceding the current test code. Because 16 KAR 6:010 specifies test codes and names, staff recommends slight changes in the regulation language.

Current:

"Written examination prerequisites for teacher certification."

Proposed:

"Examination prerequisites for teacher certification."

Issue III. B. Alternative Action:

Modify Language in 16 KAR 6:010 to accommodate computer-delivered assessments.

1. Approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.
2. Do not approve the proposed amendments to 16 KAR 6:010.

Staff Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

These changes will ensure that the option to meet teacher certification requirements via computer-based testing is permissible within the regulation. This change will also enable the board to address other differentiated assessment formats that become available.

Contact Person:

Mr. Robert Brown
Division of Professional Learning and Assessment
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: robertl.brown@ky.gov

_____
Executive Director

Date:

January 10, 2011

EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD

(Amendment)

16 KAR 6:010. [~~Written~~] Examination prerequisites for teacher certification.

RELATES TO: KRS 161.020, 161.028(1), 161.030(3), (4)

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: KRS 161.028(1)(a), 161.030(3), (4)

NECESSITY, FUNCTION, AND CONFORMITY: KRS 161.028(1)(a) authorizes the Education Professional Standards Board to establish standards and requirements for obtaining and maintaining a teaching certificate. KRS 161.030(3) and (4) requires the Education Professional Standards Board to select the appropriate assessments required prior to teacher certification. This administrative regulation establishes the [~~written~~] examination prerequisites for teacher certification.

Section 1. A teacher applicant for certification shall successfully complete the appropriate [~~written~~] tests identified in this administrative regulation prior to Kentucky teacher certification.

Section 2. The Education Professional Standards Board shall require the test or tests and passing scores identified in this section for each new teacher applicant and each teacher seeking an additional certificate.

(1) An applicant for Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education certification (birth to primary) shall take "Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education (0023)" with a passing score of 166.

(2) An applicant for Elementary certification (grades P-5) shall take "Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (0014)" with a passing score of 148.

DRAFT

(3) An applicant for certification at the middle school level (grades five (5) through nine (9)) shall take the content test or tests based on the applicant's content area or areas with the corresponding passing scores as identified in this subsection:

(a) Middle School English and Communications: "Middle School English Language Arts (0049)" - 158;

(b) Middle School Mathematics: "Middle School Mathematics (0069)" - 148;

(c) Middle School Science: "Middle School Science (0439)" - 144; or

(d) Middle School Social Studies: "Middle School Social Studies (0089)" – 149.

(4) An applicant for certification at the secondary level (grades eight (8) through twelve (12)) shall take the content test or tests corresponding to the applicant's content area or areas with the passing scores identified in this subsection:

(a) Biology: "Biology: Content Knowledge (0235)" - 146;

(b) Chemistry: "Chemistry: Content Knowledge (0245)" - 147;

(c) Earth Science: "Earth and Space Sciences: Content Knowledge (0571)" – 147;

(d) English:

1."English Language, Literature and Composition: Content Knowledge (0041)" - 160; and

2. "English Language, Literature and Composition Essays (0042)" - 155;

(e) Mathematics:

1. "Mathematics: Content Knowledge (0061)" - 125; and

2. "Mathematics: Proofs, Models and Problems, Part 1 (0063)" - 141;

(f) Physics: "Physics: Content Knowledge (0265)" - 133; or

(g) Social Studies:

1. "Social Studies: Content Knowledge (0081)" - 151; and

DRAFT

2. "Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials (0083)" – 159.

(5) An applicant for certification in all grades shall take the content test or tests corresponding to the applicant's area or areas of specialization identified in this subsection, and, if a passing score is established in this subsection, the applicant shall achieve the passing score or higher:

(a) Art:

1. "Art: Content Knowledge (0133)" - 158; and

2. "Art Making (0131)" - 154;

(b) French:

1. Until August 31, 2011, "French: World Language (5174) [~~(0174)~~]"- no passing score; and

2. Beginning September 1, 2011, "French: World Language (5174)" - 162;

(c) German:

1. Until August 31, 2011, "German: World Language (5183) [~~(0183)~~]" -no passing score; and

2. Beginning September 1, 2011, "German: World Language (5183)" - 163;

(d) Health: "Health Education (0550)" - 630;

(e) Health and Physical Education:

1. a. Until August 31, 2011, "Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (0856)"- no passing score; and

b. Beginning September 1, 2011, "Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge (0856)" – 156; and

2. "Physical Education: Movement Forms - Analysis and Design (0092)" - 151;

DRAFT

(f) Integrated Music:

1. "Music: Content Knowledge (0113)" - 154; and

2. "Music: Concepts and Processes (0111)" - 145;

(g) Instrumental Music:

1. "Music: Content Knowledge (0113)" - 154; and

2. "Music: Concepts and Processes (0111)" - 145;

(h) Vocal Music:

1. "Music: Content Knowledge (0113)" - 154; and

2. "Music: Concepts and Processes (0111)" - 145;

(i) Latin: "Latin (0600)" - 700;

(j) Physical Education:

1. a. Until August 31, 2012,"Physical Education: Content Knowledge (0091) – 147; and

b. ~~2.~~ "Physical Education: Movement Forms-Analysis and Design (0092)" - 151; or

2. Beginning September 1, 2011 "Physical Education: Content and Design (0095)" – 169.

(k) School Media Librarian: "Library Media Specialist (0311)" - 156;

(l) School Psychologist: "School Psychologist (0401)" – 161; or

(m) Spanish:

1. Until August 31, 2011, "Spanish: World Language (5195) [~~(0195)~~]"- no passing score; and

2. Beginning September 1, 2011, "Spanish: World Language (5195)" - 168.

(6) An applicant for certification for teacher of exceptional children in Communication Disorders, Learning and Behavior Disorders, Hearing Impaired, Hearing Impaired with Sign

DRAFT

Proficiency, Visually Impaired, or Moderate and Severe Disabilities shall take the content test or tests based on the applicant's area or areas of specialization with the corresponding passing scores as identified in this subsection:

(a) Communication Disorders:

1. a. Until August 31, 2012, "Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)" - 157; or [~~and~~]

b. Beginning September 1, 2011, "Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications (0354)" – 151; and

2. "Speech-Language Pathology (0330)" - 600;

(b) Hearing Impaired:

1. a. Until August 31, 2012, "Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)" - 157; or [~~and~~]

b. Beginning September 1, 2011, "Special Education: Core Knowledge and Severe to Profound Applications (0354)" – 151; and

2. "Education of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students (0271)" - 167;

(c) Hearing Impaired With Sign Proficiency:

1. a. Until August 31, 2012, "Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)" - 157; or [~~and~~]

b. Beginning September 1, 2011, "Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications (0354)" – 151;

2. "Education of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students (0271)" – 167; and

3. One (1) of the following tests with a passing score of Intermediate Level:

a. "Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI)"; or

DRAFT

b. "Educational Sign Skills Evaluation (ESSE)";

(d) Learning and Behavior Disorders:

1.Until August 31, 2012:

a."Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)" - 157; and

b. [~~2.~~] "Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542)" – 172; or [~~and~~]

2. Beginning September 1, 2011, "Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications (0543) – 158;

(e) Moderate and Severe Disabilities:

1. Until August 31, 2012:

a. "Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)" - 157; and

b. [~~2.~~] "Education of Exceptional Students: Severe to Profound Disabilities (0544)" – 156; or

2. Beginning September 1, 2011, "Special Education: Core Knowledge and Severe to Profound Applications (0545)" – 158; or

(f) Visually Impaired:

1. a. Until August 31, 2012, "Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)" - 157; or [~~and~~]

b. Beginning September 1, 2011, "Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications (0354)" – 151; and

2. "Teaching Students with Visual Impairments (0281)" - 161.

(g) A holder of an exceptional child certificate in Learning and Behavior Disorders or Moderate and Severe Disabilities who is seeking additional certification for any exceptional

DRAFT

children teaching certificate listed in this subsection, shall not be required to take "Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)" or "Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications (0354)".

(7)(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this subsection, an applicant for Career and Technical Education certification to teach in grades five (5) - twelve (12) shall take the content test or tests corresponding to the applicant's area or areas of specialization identified in this paragraph, and, if a passing score is established in this paragraph, the applicant shall achieve the passing score or higher:

1. Agriculture: "Agriculture (0700)" - 520;

2. Business and Marketing Education:

a. Until August 31, 2011, "Business Education (0101)" – no passing score; and

b. Beginning September 1, 2011 "Business Education (0101)" - 154;

3. Family and Consumer Science: "Family and Consumer Sciences (0121)" - 162; or

4. Engineering and Technology Education: "Technology Education (0050)" - 600.

(b) An applicant for Industrial Education shall take the content test or tests corresponding to the applicant's area or areas of specialization with the passing scores identified in 16 KAR 6:020.

(8) An applicant for a restricted base certificate in the following area or areas shall take the content test or tests based on the applicant's area or areas of specialization with the corresponding passing scores as identified in this subsection:

(a) English as a Second Language: "English to Speakers of Other Languages (0361)" - 157;

(b) Speech/Media Communications: "Speech Communication (0221)" - 146; or

(c) Theater: "Theatre (0640)" - 630.

DRAFT

(9) An applicant for an endorsement in the following content area or areas shall take the content test or tests based on the applicant's area or areas of specialization with the passing scores identified in this subsection:

(a) English as a Second Language: "English to Speakers of Other Languages (0361)" - 157;

(b) Learning and Behavior Disorders, grades eight (8) - twelve (12):

1. Until August 31, 2012, "Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542)" – 172; or

2. Beginning September 1, 2011, "Special Education: Core Knowledge and Mild to Moderate Applications (0543)" – 158;

(c) Literacy Specialist: "Reading Specialist (0300)" – 520;

(d) Gifted Education, grades primary - twelve (12): "Gifted Education (0357)" – 152; or

(e) [~~(d)~~] Reading Primary through Grade 12:

1. Until August 31, 2011, "Teaching Reading (0204)" – no passing score; and

2. Beginning September 1, 2011, "Teaching Reading (0204)" - 153.

Section 3. In addition to the content area test or tests established in Section 2 of this administrative regulation, each new teacher shall take the pedagogy test and meet the passing score identified in this section that corresponds to the grade level of certification sought. If a certified teacher is seeking additional certification in any area, the applicant shall not be required to take an additional pedagogy test.

(1) An applicant for Elementary certification (grades primary [~~preschool~~] - five (5)) shall take "Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades kindergarten - six (6) (0522)", with a passing score of 161.

DRAFT

(2) An applicant for certification at the middle school level (grades five (5) through nine (9)) shall take "Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades five (5) - nine (9) (0523)", with a passing score of 161.

(3) An applicant for certification at the secondary level (grades eight (8) through twelve (12)) shall take "Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades seven (7) - twelve (12) (0524)", with a passing score of 161.

(4) An applicant for certification in all grades with a content area identified in Section 2(5) of this administrative regulation shall take either:

(a) "Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades kindergarten - six (6) (0522)", with a passing score of 161;

(b) "Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades five (5) - nine (9) (0523)", with a passing score of 161; or

(c) "Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades seven (7) - twelve (12) (0524)", with a passing score of 161.

(5) An applicant applying only for certification for teacher of exceptional children shall not be required to take a separate pedagogy test established in this section. The content area test or tests established in Section 2 of this administrative regulation shall fulfill the pedagogy test requirement for a teacher of exceptional children.

(6) An applicant for Career and Technical Education certification in grades five (5) through twelve (12) shall take either:

(a) "Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades five (5) - nine (9) (0523)", with a passing score of 161; or

DRAFT

(b) "Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades seven (7) - twelve (12) (0524)", with a passing score of 161.

(7) An applicant for a restricted base certificate shall take one (1) of the following pedagogy tests corresponding to the grade range of the specific restricted base certificate:

(a) "Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades kindergarten - six (6) (0522)", with a passing score of 161;

(b) "Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades five (5) - nine (9) (0523)", with a passing score of 161; or

(c) "Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades seven (7) - twelve (12) (0524)", with a passing score of 161.

Section 4. Assessment Recency. (1) A passing score on a test established at the time of administration shall be valid for the purpose of applying for certification for five (5) years from the test administration date.

(2) A teacher who fails to complete application for certification to the Education Professional Standards Board within the applicable recency period of the test and with the passing score established at the time of administration shall retake the appropriate test or tests and achieve the appropriate passing score or scores required for certification at the time of application.

(3) The test administration date shall be established by the Educational Testing Service or other authorized test administrator.

Section 5. (1) An applicant for initial certification shall take the assessments on a date established by:

(a) The Educational Testing Service; or

DRAFT

(b) The agency established by the Education Professional Standards Board as the authorized test administrator.

(2) An applicant shall authorize test results to be forwarded by the Educational Testing Service, or other authorized test administrator, to the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board and to the appropriate teacher preparation institution where the applicant received the relevant training.

(3)(a) Public announcement of testing dates and locations shall be issued sufficiently in advance of testing dates to permit advance registration.

(b) An applicant shall seek information regarding the dates and location of the tests and make application for the appropriate examination prior to the deadline established and sufficiently in advance of anticipated employment to permit test results to be received by the Education Professional Standards Board and processed in the normal certification cycle.

Section 6. An applicant shall pay the appropriate examination fee established by the Educational Testing Service or other authorized test administrator for each relevant test required to be taken.

Section 7. An applicant who fails to achieve at least the minimum score on any of the appropriate examinations may retake the test or tests during one (1) of the scheduled test administrations.

Section 8. The Education Professional Standards Board shall collect data and conduct analyses of the scores and institutional reports provided by the Educational Testing Service or other authorized test administrator to determine the impact of these tests.

Date	Lorraine Williams, Chairperson Education Professional Standards Board

DRAFT

PUBLIC HEARING AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: A public hearing on this administrative regulation shall be held on February 28, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the offices of the Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Conference Room A, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601. Individuals interested in being heard at this hearing shall notify this agency in writing five workdays prior to the hearing, of their intent to attend. If no notification of intent to attend the hearing is received by that date, the hearing may be canceled. This hearing is open to the public. Any person who wishes to be heard will be given an opportunity to comment on the proposed administrative regulation. A transcript of the public hearing will not be made unless a written request for a transcript is made. If you do not wish to be heard at the public hearing, you may submit written comments on the proposed administrative regulation. Written comments shall be accepted until February 28, 2011. Send written notification of intent to be heard at the public hearing or written comments on the proposed administrative regulation to the contact person.

DRAFT

Contact person: Alicia A. Sneed, Director of Legal Services
Education Professional Standards Board
100 Airport Road, Third Floor
Frankfort, KY 40601
(502) 564-4606
FAX: (502) 564-7080

REGULATORY IMPACT ANALYSIS AND TIERING STATEMENT

Regulation #: 16 KAR 6:010

Contact Person: Alicia A. Sneed, Director of Legal Services

(1) Provide a brief summary of:

(a) What this administrative regulation does: This administrative regulation establishes the written examination prerequisites and the corresponding passing scores for teacher certification.

(b) The necessity of this administrative regulation: This administrative regulation is necessary to provide notice to teacher candidates of the assessment requirements for obtaining and maintaining a teaching certificate.

(c) How this administrative regulation conforms to the content of the authorizing statutes: KRS 161.020 requires a certificate of legal qualifications for any public school position for which a certificate is issued. KRS 161.028 requires the Education Professional Standards Board to establish standards and requirements for obtaining and maintaining a teaching certificate. KRS 161.030 places the responsibility of selecting the assessments and determining the minimum acceptable level of achievement on each assessment on the Education Professional Standards Board.

(d) How this administrative regulation currently assists or will assist in the effective administration of the statutes: This administrative regulation lists the required teacher certification assessments and their corresponding minimum acceptable scores.

(2) If this is an amendment to an existing administrative regulation, provide a brief summary of:

(a) How the amendment will change this existing administrative regulation: This amendment also establishes passing scores beginning September 1, 2011 for the following tests: *French: World Language, German: World Language, Spanish: World Language, Business Education, Health and Physical Education: Content Knowledge, Teaching Reading, Reading Specialist,* and *Physical Education: Content and Design.* The amendment also adopts new specialty tests for individuals seeking certification in exceptional children certification.

(b) The necessity of the amendment to this administrative regulation: This amendment is

DRAFT

necessary to ensure that the required assessments and corresponding scores are adequately set to produce the most competent educators.

(c) How the amendment conforms to the content of the authorizing statutes: The authorizing statues, KRS 161.020, 161.028, and 161.030, govern the certification of professional school personnel and grant the Education Professional Standards Board certification authority and the responsibility for establishing the requirements for obtaining and maintaining a certificate. This amendment establishes the required assessments and corresponding passing scores for Kentucky teacher certification.

(d) How the amendment will assist in the effective administration of the statutes: This amendment more closely aligns assessment options with teacher preparation program requirements and opportunities within an actual school setting.

(3) List the type and number of individuals, businesses, organizations, or state and local governments affected by this administrative regulation: 174 Kentucky school districts, 30 educator preparation programs, and educators seeking new and additional teacher certification.

(4) Provide an analysis of how the entities identified in question (3) will be impacted by either the implementation of this administrative regulation, if new, or by the change, if it is an amendment, including:

(a) List the actions that each of the regulated entities identified in question (3) will have to take to comply with this administrative regulation or amendment: The school districts will not be required to take any additional action. The educator preparation programs will need to continue to direct students to the Education Professional Standards Board website for current assessment requirements. Applicants will need to continue to refer to the Education Professional Standards board website for current assessment requirements.

(b) In complying with this administrative regulation or amendment, how much will it cost each of the entities identified in question (3): There should not be any additional cost to the entities impacted by the regulation.

(c) As a result of compliance, what benefits will accrue to the entities identified in question (3): The educator preparation programs and applicants will be positively affected by the clarifications to the regulation. The districts will be positively affected by a supply of teachers who are competent in their content area.

(5) Provide an estimate of how much it will cost the administrative body to implement

DRAFT

this administrative regulation:

(a) Initially: None

(b) On a continuing basis: None

(6) What is the source of the funding to be used for the implementation and enforcement of this administrative regulation: State General Fund

(7) Provide an assessment of whether an increase in fees or funding will be necessary to implement this administrative regulation, if new, or by the change if it is an amendment: No increase in fees or funding will be necessary to implement this administrative regulation.

(8) State whether or not this administrative regulation established any fees or directly or indirectly increased any fees: This administrative regulation does not establish any fees, or directly or indirectly increase fees.

(9) TIERING: Is tiering applied? (Explain why or why not) NO, tiering does not apply since all candidates for each certificate will be held to the same standard.

DRAFT

FISCAL NOTE ON STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Regulation No.16 KAR 6:010 Contact Person: Alicia Sneed_____

1. Does this administrative regulation relate to any program, service, or requirements of a state or local government (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts)?

Yes X No ___

If yes, complete questions 2-4.

2. What units, parts or divisions of state or local government (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) will be impacted by this administrative regulation? School districts, regional universities, and the Education Professional Standards Board.

3. Identify each state or federal statute or federal regulation that requires or authorizes the action taken by the administrative regulation. KRS 161.028(1) and KRS 161.030

4. Estimate the effect of this administrative regulation on the expenditures and revenues of a state or local government agency (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) for the first full year the administrative regulation is to be in effect. There should be none.

(a) How much revenue will this administrative regulation generate for the state or local government (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) for the first year? There should be no revenue generated.

(b) How much revenue will this administrative regulation generate for the state or local government (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) for subsequent years? There should be no revenue generated.

(c) How much will it cost to administer this program for the first year? There should be no revenue generated.

(d) How much will it cost to administer this program for subsequent years? There should be no revenue generated.

Note: If specific dollar estimates cannot be determined, provide a brief narrative to explain the fiscal impact of the administrative regulation.

Revenues (+/-):

Expenditures (+/-):

Other Explanation: This is not a fee generating or a revenue costing regulation, but merely establishes the testing requirements for teacher candidates to obtain certification.

DRAFT

EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE

Action Item C

Action Item:

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

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028, KRS 161.048
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 Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) approve the recommendation to amend 16 KAR 5:010, thus removing the expiration date for the Master's Redesign Review Committee, and establish this committee as the official reviewing body for all future master's submissions?

Background:

Revisions to 16 KAR 5:010 regarding a redesign of the teacher leader master's programs became effective in February 1, 2008. Institutions of higher education were permitted to submit a redesigned program for approval beginning May 31, 2008, becoming operational with an approved program beginning January 1, 2009. Current master's programs will sunset as of December 31, 2010.

The Master's Redesign Review Committee was created by the EPSB to review all new teacher leader programs between May 31, 2008 and December 31, 2010. These programs are not reviewed under the traditional program review process. An amendment to 16 KAR 5:010 Section 12 will remove the expiration date for the Master's Redesign Review Committee and establish this committee as the official reviewing body for all future master's submissions.

Alternative Actions:

1. Approve amending 16 KAR 5:010 to establish the Master's Redesign Review Committee as a permanent committee.
2. Do not approve amending 16 KAR 5:010.

Staff Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

An amendment to 16 KAR 5:010 ensures that all redesigned master's programs are given the same review and consideration, both for future master's submissions as well as for resubmissions of any institutions' proposals that were previously denied by the review committee.

Contact Person:

Mr. Robert Brown, Director
Division of Professional Learning and Assessment
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: robertl.brown@ky.gov

_____
Executive Director

Date:

January 10, 2011

EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD

(Amendment)

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

RELATES TO: KRS 161.028, 161.030, 164.945, 164.946,164.947, 20 U.S.C. 1021-1030

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: KRS 161.028, 161.030

NECESSITY, FUNCTION, AND CONFORMITY: KRS 161.028(1) authorizes the Education Professional Standards Board to establish standards and requirements for obtaining and maintaining a teaching certificate and for programs of preparation for teachers and other professional school personnel, and KRS 161.030(1) requires all certificates issued under KRS 161.010 to 161.126 to be issued in accordance with the administrative regulations of the board. This administrative regulation establishes the standards for accreditation of an educator preparation unit and approval of a program to prepare an educator.

Section 1. Definitions. (1) "AACTE" means the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

(2) "Biennial report" means the report prepared by the EPSB summarizing the institutionally-prepared annual reports for a two (2) year period.

(3) "Board of examiners" means the team who reviews an institution on behalf of NCATE or EPSB.

(4) "EPSB" means the Education Professional Standards Board.

(5) "NCATE" means the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

(6) "NCATE accreditation" means a process for assessing and enhancing academic and educational quality through voluntary peer review.

DRAFT

(7) "State accreditation" means recognition by the EPSB that an institution has a professional education unit that has met accreditation standards as a result of review, including an on-site team review.

Section 2. Accreditation Requirements. (1) An institution offering an educator certification program or a program leading to a rank change:

(a) Shall be accredited by the state; and

(b) May be accredited by NCATE.

(2) State accreditation shall be:

(a) A condition of offering an educator certification program or a program leading to a rank change; and

(b) Based on the national accreditation standards which include the program standards enumerated in KRS 161.028(1)(b), and which are set out in the "Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions" established by NCATE. The accreditation standards shall include:

1. Standard 1 - Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions. Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

2. Standard 2 - Assessment System and Unit Evaluation. The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

3. Standard 3 - Field Experience and Clinical Practice. The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates

DRAFT

and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

4. Standard 4 - Diversity. The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

5. Standard 5 - Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development. Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

6. Standard 6 - Unit Governance and Resources. The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

(3) NCATE accreditation shall not be a condition of offering an educator certification program or a program leading to a rank change.

(4) All educator preparation institutions and programs operating in Kentucky that require licensure by the Council on Postsecondary Education under KRS 164.945, 164.946,164.947, and 13 KAR 1:020 shall:

(a) Be accredited by the state through the EPSB under this administrative regulation as a condition of offering an educator certification program or a program leading to rank change; and

(b) Comply with the EPSB "Accreditation of Preparation Programs Procedure".

DRAFT

Section 3. Developmental Process for New Educator Preparation Programs. (1) New educator preparation institutions requesting approval from the EPSB to develop educator preparation programs that do not have a historical foundation from which to show the success of candidates or graduates as required under Section 9 of this administrative regulation shall follow the four (4) stage developmental process established in this section to gain temporary authority to admit candidates.

(2) Stage One.

(a) The educator preparation institution shall submit an official letter from the chief executive officer and the governing board of the institution to the EPSB for review and acceptance by the board indicating the institution's intent to begin the developmental process to establish an educator preparation program.

(b) The EPSB staff shall make a technical visit to the institution.

(c) The institution shall submit the following documentation:

1. Program descriptions required by Section 11 of this administrative regulation;

2. Continuous assessment plan required by Section 11(2) of this administrative regulation; and

3. Fulfillment of Preconditions 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 9 established in Section 9 of this administrative regulation.

(d) The EPSB shall provide for a paper review of this documentation by the Reading Committee and the Continuous Assessment Review Committee.

(e) Following review of the documentation, EPSB staff shall make an additional technical visit to the institution.

(3) Stage Two.

DRAFT

(a) A board of examiners team shall make a one (1) day visit to the institution to verify the paper review.

(b) The team shall be comprised of:

1. One (1) representative from a public postsecondary institution;

2. One (1) representative from an independent postsecondary institution; and

3. One (1) representative from the Kentucky Education Association.

(c) The team shall submit a written report of its findings to the EPSB.

(d) The EPSB shall provide a copy of the written report to the institution.

(e)1. The institution may submit a written rejoinder to the report within thirty (30) working days of its receipt.

2. The rejoinder may be supplemented by materials pertinent to the conclusions found in the team's report.

(f) The Accreditation Audit Committee shall review the materials gathered during Stages One and Two and make one (1) of the following recommendations to the EPSB with regards to temporary authorization:

1. Approval;

2. Approval with conditions; or

3. Denial of approval.

(4) Stage Three.

(a) The EPSB shall review the materials and recommendations from the Accreditation Audit Committee and make one (1) of the following determinations with regards to temporary authorization:

1. Approval;

DRAFT

2. Approval with conditions; or

3. Denial of approval.

(b) An institution receiving approval or approval with conditions shall:

1. Hold this temporary authorization for two (2) years; and

2. Continue the developmental process and the first accreditation process established in this administrative regulation.

(c) An institution denied temporary authorization may reapply.

(d) During the two (2) year period of temporary authorization, the institution shall:

1. Admit candidates;

2. Monitor, evaluate, and assess the academic and professional competency of candidates; and

3. Report regularly to the EPSB on the institution's progress.

(e) During the two (2) year period of temporary authorization, the EPSB:

1. May schedule additional technical visits; and

2. Shall monitor progress by paper review of annual reports, admission and exit data, and trend data.

(5) Stage Four.

(a) The institution shall host a first accreditation visit within two (2) years of the approval or approval with conditions of temporary authorization.

(b) All further accreditation activities shall be governed by Section 9 of this administrative regulation.

DRAFT

Section 4. Schedule and Communications. (1) The EPSB shall send an accreditation and program approval schedule to each educator preparation institution no later than August 1 of each year. The first accreditation cycle shall provide for an on-site continuing accreditation visit at a five (5) year interval. The regular accreditation cycle shall provide for an on-site continuing accreditation visit at a seven (7) year interval.

(2) The accreditation and program approval schedule shall be directed to the official designated by the institution as the head of the educator preparation unit with a copy to the president. The head of the educator preparation unit shall disseminate the information to administrative units within the institution, including the appropriate college, school, department, and office.

(3) The EPSB shall annually place a two (2) year schedule of on-site accreditation visits for a Kentucky institution in the agenda materials and minutes of an EPSB business meeting.

(4) The EPSB shall coordinate dates for a joint state and NCATE accreditation on-site visit.

(5) At least six (6) months prior to a scheduled on-site visit, an institution seeking NCATE or state accreditation shall give public notice of the upcoming visit.

(6) The governance unit for educator preparation shall be responsible for the preparation necessary to comply with the requirements for timely submission of materials for accreditation and program approval as established in this administrative regulation.

Section 5. Annual Reports. (1)(a) Each institution shall report annually to the EPSB to provide data about:

1. Faculty and students in each approved program;

2. Progress made in addressing areas for improvement identified by its last accreditation evaluation; and

DRAFT

3. Major program developments in each NCATE standard.

(b)1. An institution seeking accreditation from NCATE and EPSB shall complete the Professional Educator Data System (PEDS) sponsored by AACTE and NCATE and located online at http//www.aacte.org. After the PEDS is submitted electronically, the institution shall print a copy of the completed report and mail it to the EPSB at 100 Airport Road, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.

2. An institution seeking state-only accreditation shall complete the Annual State-Only Institutional Data Report online at http://www.kyepsb.net/teacherprep/index.asp and submit it electronically to the division contact through the EPSB Web site.

(2)(a) The EPSB shall review each institution's annual report to monitor the capacity of a unit to continue a program of high quality.

(b) The EPSB may pursue action against the unit based on data received in this report.

(3) The Accreditation Audit Committee shall submit a biennial report, based on data submitted in the annual reports, to the unit head in preparation for an on-site accreditation visit.

Section 6. Content Program Review Committee. (1)(a) The EPSB shall appoint and train a content program review committee in each of the certificate areas to provide content area expertise to EPSB staff and the Reading Committee.

(b) Nominations for the content program review committees shall be solicited from the education constituent groups listed in Section 13 of this administrative regulation.

(2)(a) A content program review committee shall review an educator preparation program to establish congruence of the program with standards of nationally-recognized specialty program associations and appropriate state performance standards.

DRAFT

(b) A content program review committee shall examine program content and faculty expertise.

(3) A content program review committee shall submit written comments to EPSB staff and the Reading Committee for use in the program approval process.

(4) A content program review committee shall not make any determination or decision regarding the approval or denial of a program.

Section 7. Continuous Assessment Review Committee. (1) The EPSB shall appoint and train a Continuous Assessment Review Committee to be comprised of P-12 and postsecondary faculty who have special expertise in the field of assessment.

(2) The Continuous Assessment Review Committee shall conduct a preliminary review of each institution's continuous assessment plan.

(3) The Continuous Assessment Review Committee shall meet in the spring and fall semesters of each year to analyze the continuous assessment plan for those institutions that are within one (1) year of their on-site visit.

(4) The Continuous Assessment Review Committee shall provide technical assistance to requesting institutions in the design, development, and implementation of the continuous assessment plan.

Section 8. Reading Committee. (1) The EPSB shall appoint and train a Reading Committee representative of the constituent groups to the EPSB.

(2) The Reading Committee shall conduct a preliminary review of accreditation materials, annual reports, and program review documents from an educator preparation institution for adequacy, timeliness, and conformity with the corresponding standards.

(3) For first accreditation, the Reading Committee shall:

DRAFT

(a) Review the preconditions documents prepared by the institution; and

(b) Send to the EPSB a preconditions report indicating whether a precondition has been satisfied by documentation. If a precondition has not been met, the institution shall be asked to revise or send additional documentation. A preconditions report stating that the preconditions have been met shall be inserted into the first section of the institutional report.

(4) For continuing accreditation and program approval, the Reading Committee shall:

(a) Determine that a submitted material meets requirements;

(b) Ask that EPSB staff resolve with the institution a discrepancy or omission in the report or program;

(c) Refer an unresolved discrepancy or omission to the on-site accreditation team for resolution; or

(d) Recommend that the evaluation and approval process be terminated as a result of a severe deficiency in the submitted material.

(5) The EPSB shall discuss a recommendation for termination with the originating institution. The institution may submit a written response which shall be presented, with the Reading Committee comments and written accreditation and program, by EPSB staff for recommendation to the full EPSB.

Section 9. Preconditions for First Unit Accreditation. (1) Eighteen (18) months prior to the scheduled on-site visit of the evaluation team, the educator preparation institution shall submit information to the EPSB, and to NCATE if appropriate, documenting the fulfillment of the preconditions for the accreditation of the educator preparation unit, as established in subsection (2) of this section.

DRAFT

(2) As a precondition for experiencing an on-site first evaluation for educator preparation, the institution shall present documentation to show that the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) Precondition Number 1. The institution recognizes and identifies a professional education unit that has responsibility and authority for the preparation of teachers and other professional education personnel. Required documentation shall include:

1. A letter from the institution's chief executive officer that designates the unit as having primary authority and responsibility for professional education programs;

2. A chart or narrative that lists all professional education programs offered by the institution, including any nontraditional and alternative programs. The chart or narrative report shall depict:

a. The degree or award levels for each program;

b. The administrative location for each program; and

c. The structure or structures through which the unit implements its oversight of all programs;

3. If the unit's offerings include off-campus programs, a separate chart or narrative as described in subparagraph 2 of this paragraph, prepared for each location at which off-campus programs are geographically located; and

4. An organizational chart of the institution that depicts the professional education unit and indicates the unit's relationship to other administrative units within the college or university.

(b) Precondition Number 2. A dean, director, or chair is officially designated as head of the unit and is assigned the authority and responsibility for its overall administration and operation. The institution shall submit a job description for the head of the professional education unit.

DRAFT

(c) Precondition Number 3. Written policies and procedures guide the operations of the unit. Required documentation shall include cover page and table of contents for codified policies, bylaws, procedures, and student handbooks.

(d) Precondition Number 4. The unit has a well-developed conceptual framework that establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work in P-12 schools and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. Required documentation shall include:

1. The vision and mission of the institution and the unit;

2. The unit's philosophy, purposes, and goals;

3. Knowledge bases including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and education policies, that inform the unit's conceptual framework;

4. Candidate proficiencies aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards; and

5. A description of the system by which the candidate proficiencies described are regularly assessed.

(e) Precondition Number 5. The unit regularly monitors and evaluates its operations, the quality of its offerings, the performance of candidates, and the effectiveness of its graduates. Required documentation shall include a description of the unit's assessment and data collection systems that support unit responses to Standards 1 and 2 established in Section 2(2)(b)1 and 2 of this administrative regulation.

(f) Precondition Number 6. The unit has published criteria for admission to and exit from all initial teacher preparation and advanced programs and can provide summary reports of candidate performance at exit. Required documentation shall include:

DRAFT

1. A photocopy of published documentation (e.g., from a catalog, student teaching handbook, application form, or Web page) listing the basic requirements for entry to, retention in, and completion of professional education programs offered by the institution, including any nontraditional, alternative or off-campus programs; and

2. A brief summary of candidate performance on assessments conducted for admission into programs and exit from them. This summary shall include:

a. The portion of Title II documentation related to candidate admission and completion that was prepared for the state; and

b. A compilation of results on the unit's own assessments.

(g) Precondition Number 7. The unit's programs are approved by the appropriate state agency or agencies and the unit's summary pass rate meets or exceeds the required state pass rate of eighty (80) percent. Required documentation shall include:

1. The most recent approval letters from the EPSB and CPE, including or appended by a list of approved programs. If any program is not approved, the unit shall provide a statement that it is not currently accepting new applicants into the nonapproved program or programs. For programs that are approved with qualifications or are pending approval, the unit shall describe how it will bring the program or programs into compliance; and

2. Documentation submitted to the state for Title II, indicating that the unit's summary pass rate on state licensure examinations meets or exceeds the required state pass rate of eighty (80) percent. If the required state pass rate is not evident on this documentation, it shall be provided on a separate page.

DRAFT

(h) Precondition Number 8. If the institution has chosen to pursue dual accreditation from both the state and NCATE and receive national recognition for a program or programs, the institution shall submit its programs for both state and national review.

(i) Precondition Number 9. The institution is accredited, without probation or an equivalent status, by the appropriate regional institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. Required documentation shall include a copy of the current regional accreditation letter or report that indicates institutional accreditation status.

Section 10. Institutional Report. (1) For a first accreditation visit, the educator preparation unit shall submit, two (2) months prior to the scheduled on-site visit, a written narrative describing the unit's conceptual framework and evidence that demonstrates the six (6) standards are met. The written narrative may be supplemented by a chart, graph, diagram, table, or other similar means of presenting information. The institutional report, including appendices, shall not exceed 100 pages in length. The report shall be submitted to the EPSB and to NCATE, if appropriate.

(2) For a continuing accreditation visit, the educator preparation unit shall submit, two (2) months prior to the scheduled on-site visit, a report not to exceed 100 pages addressing changes at the institution that have occurred since the last accreditation visit, a description of the unit's conceptual framework, and evidence that demonstrates that the six (6) standards are met. The narrative shall describe how changes relate to an accreditation standard and the results of the continuous assessment process, including program evaluation. The report shall be submitted to the EPSB and to NCATE, if appropriate.

DRAFT

Section 11. Program Review Documents. Eighteen (18) months for first accreditation and twelve (12) months for continuing accreditation in advance of the scheduled on-site evaluation visit, the educator preparation unit shall prepare and submit to the EPSB for each separate program of educator preparation for which the institution is seeking approval a concise description which shall provide the following information:

(1) The unit's conceptual framework for the preparation of school personnel which includes:

(a) The mission of the institution and unit;

(b) The unit’s philosophy, purposes, professional commitments, and dispositions;

(c) Knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and education policies;

(d) Performance expectations for candidates, aligning the expectations with professional, state, and institutional standards; and

(e) The system by which candidate performance is regularly assessed;

(2) The unit’s continuous assessment plan that provides:

(a) An overview of how the unit will implement continuous assessment to assure support and integration of the unit’s conceptual framework;

(b) Each candidate’s mastery of content prior to exit from the program, incorporating the assessment of the appropriate performance standards;

(c) Assessment of the program that includes specific procedures used to provide feedback and make recommendations to the program and unit; and

(d) A monitoring plan for candidates from admission to exit;

(3) Program experiences including the relationship among the program's courses and experiences, content standards of the relevant national specialty program associations (e.g.,

DRAFT

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Council for the Social Studies, The Council for Exceptional Children, North American Association for Environmental Education, etc.), student academic expectations as established in 703 KAR 4:060, and relevant state performance standards established in 16 KAR 1:010 or incorporated by reference into this administrative regulation including:

(a) NCATE Unit Standards established in Section 2(2)(b) of this administrative regulation;

(b) Kentucky's Safety Educator Standards for Preparation and Certification;

(c) National Association of School Psychologists, Standards for School Psychology Training Programs, Field Placement Programs, Credentialing Standards; and

(d) Kentucky's Standards for Guidance Counseling Programs;

(4)(a) Identification of how the program integrates the unit's continuous assessment to assure each candidate's mastery, prior to exit from the program, of content of the academic discipline, and state performance standards as established in 16 KAR 1:010; and

(b) Identification of how the program utilizes performance assessment to assure that each candidate's professional growth is consistent with the Kentucky Teacher Standards as established in 16 KAR 1:010;

(5) A list of faculty responsible for and involved with the conduct of the specific program, along with the highest degree of each, responsibilities for the program, and status of employment within the unit and the university; and

(6) A curriculum guide sheet or contract provided to each candidate before or at the time of admittance to the program.

DRAFT

Section 12. Teacher Leader Master's Programs and Planned Fifth-Year Programs for Rank II. (1) All master's programs for rank change or planned fifth-year program for Rank II approved or accredited by the EPSB prior to May 31, 2008 shall no longer be approved or accredited as of December 31, 2010.

(a) Master's programs for initial certification shall be exempt from the requirements of this section.

(b) A master's program or planned fifth-year program for Rank II approved by the EPSB prior to May 31, 2008 shall cease admitting new candidates after December 31, 2010.

(c) Candidates admitted to a master's program or planned fifth-year program for Rank II approved by the EPSB prior to May 31, 2008 shall complete the program by January 31, 2013.

(d) An institution of higher learning with a master's program or a planned fifth-year program for Rank II approved by the EPSB prior to May 31, 2008 may submit a redesigned program for approval pursuant to the requirements of subsection (2) of this section beginning May 31, 2008.

(e) An institution may become operational beginning January 1, 2009, if the institution:

1. Submits a redesigned master's program or a planned fifth-year program for Rank II for review pursuant to the requirements of subsection (2) of this section; and

2. Receives approval of the redesigned program by the EPSB pursuant to Section 22 of this administrative regulation.

(f) [~~Institutions submitting a redesigned master's program or planned fifth-year program for Rank II shall not be subject to any submission dates for program approval until December 31, 2010.~~

DRAFT

~~(g)~~]1. The EPSB shall appoint a Master's Redesign Review Committee to conduct reviews of redesigned master's programs and planned fifth-year programs for Rank II submitted for approval after [~~between~~] May 31, 2008 [~~and December 31, 2010~~].

2. A master's program or a planned fifth-year program for Rank II submitted for approval after [~~between~~] May 31, 2008 [~~and December 31, 2010~~] shall not be reviewed by the Continuous Assessment Review Committee, Content Program Review Committee, or the Reading Committee prior to presentation to the EPSB pursuant to Section 22(2) of this administrative regulation, but shall be reviewed by the Master's Redesign Review Committee.

3.a. After review of a master's program or planned fifth-year program for Rank II, the Master's Redesign Review Committee shall issue one (1) of the following recommendations to the Educational Professional Standards Board:

i. Approval;

ii. Approval with conditions; or

iii. Denial of approval.

b. The EPSB shall consider recommendations from staff and the Master's Redesign Review Committee and shall issue a decision pursuant to Section 22(4) of this administrative regulation.

(2) Beginning May 31, 2008, the educator preparation unit shall prepare and submit to the EPSB for each separate master's program or planned fifth-year program for Rank II for which the institution is seeking approval a concise description which shall provide the following information:

(a) Program design components which shall include the following descriptions and documentation of:

DRAFT

1. The unit's plan to collaborate with school districts to design courses, professional development, and job-embedded professional experiences that involve teachers at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels;

2. The unit's collaboration plan with the institution's Arts and Science faculty to meet the academic and course accessibility needs of candidates;

3. The unit's process to individualize a program to meet the candidate's professional growth or improvement plan;

4. The unit's method to incorporate interpretation and analysis of annual P-12 student achievement data into the program; and

5. The institution's plan to facilitate direct service to the collaborating school districts by education faculty members.

(b) Program curriculum that shall include core component courses designed to prepare candidates to:

1. Be leaders in their schools and districts;

2. Evaluate high-quality research on student learning and college readiness;

3. Deliver differentiated instruction for P-12 students based on continuous assessment of student learning and classroom management;

4. Gain expertise in content knowledge, as applicable;

5. Incorporate reflections that inform best practice in preparing P-12 students for postsecondary opportunities;

6. Support P-12 student achievement in diverse settings;

7. Enhance instructional design utilizing the Program of Studies, Core Content for Assessment, and college readiness standards;

DRAFT

8. Provide evidence of candidate mastery of Kentucky Teacher Standards utilizing advanced level performances and Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) Standards if applicable; and

9. Design and conduct professionally relevant research projects; and

(c) The unit's continuous assessment plan that includes, in addition to the requirements of Section 11(2) of this administrative regulation:

1. Instruments to document and evaluate candidate ability to demonstrate impact on P-12 student learning;

2. Clinical experiences and performance activities; and

3. A description of a culminating performance-based assessment.

(3)(a) A master's program for rank change approved pursuant to this section shall be known as a Teacher Leader Master's Program.

(b) Upon completion of a Teacher Leader Master's Program and recommendation of the institution, a candidate may apply to the EPSB for a Teacher Leader endorsement.

(c)1. An institution with an approved Teacher Leader Master's Program may establish an endorsement program of teacher leadership coursework for any candidate who received a Master's degree at an out of state institution or who received a master's degree from a Kentucky program approved prior to May 31, 2008.

2. Upon completion of the teacher leadership course work and recommendation of the institution, a candidate who has received a master's degree at an out of state institution or a master's degree from a Kentucky program approved prior to May 31, 2008, may apply to the EPSB for a Teacher Leader endorsement.

Section 13. Board of Examiners. (1) A Board of Examiners shall:

DRAFT

(a) Be recruited and appointed by the EPSB. The board shall be comprised of an equal number of representatives from three (3) constituent groups:

1. Teacher educators;

2. P-12 teachers and administrators; and

3. State and local policymaker groups; and

(b) Include at least thirty-six (36) members representing the following constituencies;

1. Kentucky Education Association, at least ten (10) members;

2. Kentucky Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, at least ten (10) members; and

3. At least ten (10) members nominated by as many of the following groups as may wish to submit a nomination:

a. Kentucky Association of School Administrators;

b. Persons holding positions in occupational education;

c. Kentucky Branch National Congress of Parents and Teachers;

d. Kentucky School Boards Association;

e. Kentucky Association of School Councils;

f. Kentucky Board of Education;

g. Kentucky affiliation of a national specialty program association;

h. Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence;

i. Partnership for Kentucky Schools; and

j. Subject area specialists in the Kentucky Department of Education.

(2) An appointment shall be for a period of four (4) years. A member may serve an additional term if renominated and reappointed in the manner prescribed for membership. A vacancy shall be filled by the EPSB as it occurs.

DRAFT

(3) A member of the Board of Examiners and a staff member of the EPSB responsible for educator preparation and approval of an educator preparation program shall be trained by NCATE or trained in an NCATE-approved state program.

(4) The EPSB shall select and appoint for each scheduled on-site accreditation a team of examiners giving consideration to the number and type of programs offered by the institution. Team appointments shall be made at the beginning of the academic year for each scheduled evaluation visit. A replacement shall be made as needed.

(5) For an institution seeking NCATE accreditation, the EPSB and NCATE shall arrange for the joint Board of Examiners to be co chaired by an NCATE appointed team member and a state team chair appointed by the EPSB. The joint Board of Examiners shall be composed of a majority of NCATE appointees in the following proportions, respectively: NCATE and state - six (6) and five (5), five (5) and four (4), four (4) and three (3), three (3) and two (2). The size of the Board of Examiners shall depend upon the size of the institution and the number of programs to be evaluated.

(6) For an institution seeking state-only accreditation, the EPSB shall appoint a chair from a pool of trained Board of Examiners members.

(7) For state-only accreditation, the Board of Examiners shall have six (6) members.

(8) The EPSB shall make arrangements for the release time of a Board of Examiner member from his place of employment for an accreditation visit.

Section 14. Assembly of Records and Files for the Evaluation Team. For convenient access, the institution shall assemble, or make available, records and files of written materials which supplement the institutional report and which may serve as further documentation. The records and files shall include:

DRAFT

(1) The faculty handbook;

(2) Agenda, list of participants, and products of a meeting, workshop, or training session related to a curriculum and governance group impacting professional education;

(3) Faculty vitae or resumes;

(4) A random sample of graduates' transcripts;

(5) Conceptual framework documents;

(6) A curriculum program, rejoinder, or specialty group response that was submitted as a part of the program review process;

(7) Course syllabi;

(8) Policies, criteria, and student records related to admission and retention;

(9) Samples of students' portfolios and other performance assessments;

(10) Record of performance assessments of candidate progress and summary of results including a program change based on continuous assessment;

(11) Student evaluations, including student teaching and internship performance; and

(12) Data on performance of graduates, including results of state licensing examinations and job placement rates.

Section 15. Previsit to the Institution. No later than one (1) month prior to the scheduled on-site evaluation visit, the EPSB shall conduct a previsit to the institution to make a final review of the arrangements. For an NCATE-accredited institution, the previsit shall be coordinated with NCATE.

Section 16. On-site Accreditation Visit. (1) At least one (1) staff member of the EPSB shall be assigned as support staff and liaison during the accreditation visit.

DRAFT

(2) The educator preparation institution shall reimburse a state team member for travel, lodging, and meals in accordance with 200 KAR 2:006. A team member representing NCATE shall be reimbursed by the educator preparation institution.

(3) The evaluation team shall conduct an on-site evaluation of the self-study materials prepared by the institution and seek out additional information, as needed, to make a determination as to whether the standards were met for the accreditation of the institution's educator preparation unit and for the approval of an individual educator preparation program. The evaluation team shall make use of the analyses prepared through the preliminary review process.

(4)(a) An off-campus site which offers a self-standing program shall require a team review. If additional team time is required for visiting an off-campus site, the team chair, the institution, and the EPSB shall negotiate special arrangements.

(b) Off-campus programs shall be:

1. Considered as part of the unit and the unit shall be accredited, not the off-campus programs; and

2. Approved in accordance with Section 28 of this administrative regulation.

(5) In a joint team, all Board of Examiners members shall vote on whether the educator preparation institution has met the six (6) NCATE standards. A determination about each standard shall be limited to the following options:

(a) Met;

(b) Met, with one (1) or more defined areas for improvement; or

(c) Not met.

DRAFT

(6)(a) The Board of Examiners shall review each program and cite the areas for improvement for each, if applicable.

(b) The Board of Examiners shall define the areas for improvement in its report.

(7) The processes established in subsections (5) and (6) of this section shall be the same for first and continuing accreditation.

(8) The on-site evaluation process shall end with a brief oral report:

(a) By the NCATE team chair and state team chair for a joint state/NCATE visit; or

(b) By the state team chair for a state-only visit.

Section 17. Preparation and Distribution of the Evaluation Report. (1) For a state-only visit, the evaluation report shall be prepared and distributed as follows:

(a) The EPSB staff shall collect the written evaluation pages from each Board of Examiners member before leaving the institution.

(b) The first draft shall be typed and distributed to Board of Examiners members.

(c) A revision shall be consolidated by the Board of Examiners chair who shall send the next draft to the unit head to review for factual accuracy.

(d) The unit head shall submit written notification to the EPSB confirming receipt of the draft.

(e) The unit head shall submit to the EPSB and Board of Examiners chair within ten (10) working days either:

1. A written correction to the factual information contained in the report; or

2. Written notification that the unit head has reviewed the draft and found no factual errors.

(f) The Board of Examiners chair shall submit the final report to the EPSB and a copy to each member of the Board of Examiners.

DRAFT

(g) The final report shall be printed by the EPSB and sent to the institution and to the Board of Examiners members within thirty (30) to sixty (60) working days of the conclusion of the on-site visit.

(2) For a joint state/NCATE visit, the evaluation report shall be prepared and distributed as required by this subsection:

(a) The NCATE chair shall be responsible for the preparation, editing and corrections to the NCATE report.

(b) The state chair shall be responsible for the preparation, editing and corrections of the state report in the same manner established in subsection (1) of this section for a state-only visit.

(c) The EPSB Board of Examiners report for state/NCATE continuing accreditation visits shall be prepared in accordance with the format prescribed by NCATE for State/NCATE accreditation visits and available on its Web site at http//www.ncate.org/boe/boeResources.asp.

Section 18. Institutional Response to the Evaluation Report. (1)(a) The institution shall acknowledge receipt of the evaluation report within thirty (30) working days of receipt of the report.

(b) If desired, the institution shall submit within thirty (30) working days of receipt of the report a written rejoinder to the report which may be supplemented by materials pertinent to a conclusion found in the evaluation report.

(c) The rejoinder and the Board of Examiners report shall be the primary documents reviewed by the Accreditation Audit Committee and EPSB.

(d) An unmet standard or area of improvement statement cited by the team may be recommended for change or removal by the Accreditation Audit Committee or by the EPSB because of evidence presented in the rejoinder. The Accreditation Audit Committee or the EPSB

DRAFT

shall not be bound by the Board of Examiners decision and may reach a conclusion different from the Board of Examiners or NCATE.

(2) If a follow-up report is prescribed through accreditation with conditions, the institution shall follow the instructions that are provided with the follow-up report.

(3) If the institution chooses to appeal a part of the evaluation results, the procedure established in Section 24 of this administrative regulation shall be followed.

(4) The institution shall make an annual report relating to the unit for educator preparation and relating to the programs of preparation as required by Section 5 of this administrative regulation.

Section 19. Accreditation Audit Committee. (1) The Accreditation Audit Committee shall be a committee of the EPSB, and shall report to the full EPSB. The EPSB shall appoint the Accreditation Audit Committee as follows:

(a) One (1) lay member;

(b) Two (2) classroom teachers, appointed from nominees provided by the Kentucky Education Association;

(c) Two (2) teacher education representatives, one (1) from a state-supported institution and one (1) from an independent educator preparation institution, appointed from nominees provided by the Kentucky Association of Colleges for Teacher Education; and

(d) Two (2) school administrators appointed from nominees provided by the Kentucky Association of School Administrators.

(2) The chairperson of the EPSB shall designate a member of the Accreditation Audit Committee to serve as its chairperson.

DRAFT

(3) An appointment shall be for a period of four (4) years except that three (3) of the initial appointments shall be for a two (2) year term. A member may serve an additional term if renominated and reappointed in the manner established for membership. A vacancy shall be filled as it occurs in a manner consistent with the provisions for initial appointment.

(4) A member of the Accreditation Audit Committee shall be trained by NCATE or in NCATE-approved training.

(5) Following an on-site accreditation visit, the Accreditation Audit Committee shall review the reports and materials constituting an institutional self-study, the report of the evaluation team, and the institutional response to the evaluation report. The committee shall then prepare a recommendation for consideration by the EPSB.

(a) The committee shall review procedures of the Board of Examiners to determine whether approved accreditation guidelines were followed.

(b) For each institution, the committee shall make a recommendation with respect to the accreditation of the institutional unit for educator preparation as well as for approval of the individual programs of preparation.

(c) For first accreditation, one (1) of four (4) recommendations shall be made:

1. Accreditation;

2. Provisional accreditation;

3. Denial of accreditation; or

4. Revocation of accreditation.

(d) For regular continuing accreditation, one (1) of four (4) recommendations shall be made:

1. Accreditation;

2. Accreditation with conditions;

DRAFT

3. Accreditation with probation; or

4. Revocation of accreditation.

(6) For both first and continuing accreditation, the Accreditation Audit Committee shall review each program report including a report from the Reading Committee, Board of Examiners team, and institutional response and shall make one (1) of three (3) recommendations for each individual preparation program to the EPSB:

(a) Approval;

(b) Approval with conditions; or

(c) Denial of approval.

(7) The Board of Examiners Team Chair may write a separate response to the recommendation of the Accreditation Audit Committee's if the Accreditation Audit Committee decision differs from the Board of Examiners' evaluation report.

(8) The Accreditation Audit Committee shall compile accreditation data and information for each Kentucky institution that prepares school personnel. It shall prepare for the EPSB reports and recommendations regarding accreditation standards and procedures as needed to improve the accreditation process and the preparation of school personnel.

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 include:

DRAFT

(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; or

DRAFT

(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 include:

(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.

DRAFT

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; or

(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:

DRAFT

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.

(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.

Section 21. Revocation for Cause. (1) If an area of concern or an allegation of misconduct arises in between accreditation visits, staff shall bring a complaint to the EPSB for initial review.

DRAFT

(2) After review of the allegations in the complaint, the EPSB may refer the matter to the Accreditation Audit Committee for further investigation.

(3)(a) Notice of the EPSB's decision to refer to the matter and the complaint shall be sent to the institution.

(b) Within thirty (30) days of receipt of the complaint, the institution shall respond to the allegations in writing and provide evidence pertaining to the allegations in the complaint to the EPSB.

(4)(a) The Accreditation Audit Committee shall review any evidence supporting the allegations and any information provided by the institution.

(b) Upon completion of the review, the Accreditation Audit Committee shall issue a report containing one (1) of the following four (4) recommendations to the EPSB:

1. Accreditation;

2. Accreditation with conditions;

3. Accreditation with probation; or

4. Revocation of accreditation.

(5) The institution shall receive a copy of the Accreditation Audit Committee's report and may file a response to the Accreditation Audit Committee's recommendation.

(6)(a) The recommendation from the Accreditation Audit Committee and the institution's response shall be presented to the EPSB.

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

DRAFT

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 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

DRAFT

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.

Section 23. Public Disclosure. (1) After a unit and program approval decision becomes final, the EPSB shall prepare official notice of the action. The disclosure notice shall include the essential information provided in the official letter to the institution, including the decision on accreditation, program approval, standards not met, program areas for improvement, and dates of official action.

DRAFT

(2) The public disclosure shall be entered into the minutes of the board for the meeting in which the official action was taken by the EPSB.

(3) Thirty (30) days after the institution has received official notification of EPSB action, the EPSB shall on request provide a copy of the public disclosure notice to the Kentucky Education Association, the Council on Postsecondary Education, the Association of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities or other organizations or individuals.

Section 24. Appeals Process. (1) If an institution seeks appeal of a decision, the institution shall appeal within thirty (30) days of receipt of the EPSB official notification. An institution shall appeal on the grounds that:

(a) A prescribed standard was disregarded;

(b) A state procedure was not followed; or

(c) Evidence of compliance in place at the time of the review and favorable to the institution was not considered.

(2) An ad hoc appeals board of no fewer than three (3) members shall be appointed by the EPSB chair from members of the Board of Examiners who have not had involvement with the team visit or a conflict of interest regarding the institution. The ad hoc committee shall recommend action on the appeal to the EPSB.

(3) The consideration of the appeal shall be in accordance with KRS Chapter 13B.

Section 25. Approval of Alternative Route to Certification Programs. (1) Alternative route programs authorized under KRS 161.028(1)(s) or (t) shall adhere to the educator preparation unit accreditation and program approval processes established in this administrative regulation and in the EPSB policy and procedure entitled "Approval of Alternative Route to Certification Program

DRAFT

Offered Under KRS 161.028" as a condition of offering an educator certification program or program leading to a rank change.

(2) The EPSB shall consider a waiver upon request of the institution offering the alternative route program. The request shall be submitted in writing no later than thirty (30) days prior to the next regularly-scheduled EPSB meeting. In granting the waiver, the board shall consider the provisions of this administrative regulation and any information presented that supports a determination of undue restriction.

Section 26. In compliance with the Federal Title II Report Card State Guidelines established in 20 U.S.C. 1027 and 1028, the EPSB shall identify an educator preparation unit as:

(1) "At-risk of low performing" if an educator preparation program has received a:

(a) State accreditation rating of "provisional"; or

(b) State accreditation rating of "accreditation with conditions"; or

(2) "Low performing" if an educator preparation program has received a state accreditation rating of "accreditation with probation".

Section 27. The Education Professional Standards Board shall produce a state report card, which shall include:

(1) General information on the institution and the educator preparation unit;

(2) Contact information for the person responsible for the educator preparation unit;

(3) Type or types of accreditation the unit holds;

(4) Current state accreditation status of the educator preparation unit;

(5) Year of last state accreditation visit and year of next scheduled visit;

(6) Table of the unit’s approved certification program or programs;

DRAFT

(7) Tables relating the unit's total enrollment disaggregated by ethnicity and gender for the last three (3) years;

(8) Tables relating the unit's faculty disaggregated by the number of full-time equivalents (FTE), ethnicity, and gender for the last three (3) years;

(9) Table of the number of program completers (teachers and administrators) for the last three (3) years;

(10) Table relating pass rates on the required assessments;

(11) Table relating pass rates for the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program;

(12) Table relating pass rates for the Kentucky Principal Internship Program (if applicable);

(13) Table indicating student teacher satisfaction with the preparation program;

(14) Table relating teacher intern satisfaction with the preparation program;

(15) Table relating new teacher (<3 years) and supervisor satisfaction with the preparation program.

Section 28. Approval of Off-site and On-line Programs. (1) Institutions in Kentucky with educator preparation programs shall seek approval from the Education Professional Standards Board before offering courses or whole programs at an off-campus site.

(a) The institution shall submit a written request to the board to begin offering courses at the off-site location describing the location and physical attributes of the off-campus site, resources to be provided, faculty and their qualifications, and a list of courses or programs to be offered.

(b) The off-site location shall be approved by the board before the institution may begin offering courses at the location.

DRAFT

(2)(a) Until May 31, 2008, initial and continuing on-line educator preparation programs shall be regionally or nationally accredited and accredited or approved, as applicable, by the program's state of origin.

(b) Beginning June 1, 2008, initial and continuing on-line educator preparation programs originating from outside Kentucky shall be regionally accredited, accredited or approved, as applicable, by the program's state of origin, and accredited by NCATE.

Section 29. Incorporation by Reference. (1) The following material is incorporated by reference:

(a) "Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions", 2008 Edition, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education;

(b) "Education Professional Standards Board Accreditation of Preparation Programs Procedure", August 2002;

(c) "Education Professional Standards Board Approval of Alternative Route to Certification Program Offered under KRS 161.028", August 2002;

(d) "Education Professional Standards Board Emergency Review of Certification Programs Procedure ", September 2003;

(e) "Kentucky's Safety Educator Standards for Preparation and Certification", May 2004;

(f) "National Association of School Psychologists, Standards for School Psychology Training Programs, Field Placement Programs, Credentialing Standards", July 2000; and

(g) "Kentucky's Standards for Guidance Counseling Programs" derived from the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP) Standards, Education Professional Standards Board, November 2004.

DRAFT

(2) This material may be inspected, copied, or obtained, subject to applicable copyright law, at the Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601, Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

DRAFT

_____ _____

Date

Lorraine Williams, Chairperson
Education Professional Standards Board

PUBLIC HEARING AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: A public hearing on this administrative regulation shall be held on February 28, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the offices of the Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Conference Room A, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601. Individuals interested in being heard at this hearing shall notify this agency in writing five workdays prior to the hearing, of their intent to attend. If no notification of intent to attend the hearing is received by that date, the hearing may be canceled. This hearing is open to the public. Any person who wishes to be heard will be given an opportunity to comment on the proposed administrative regulation. A transcript of the public hearing will not be made unless a written request for a transcript is made. If you do not wish to be heard at the public hearing, you may submit written comments on the proposed administrative regulation. Written comments shall be accepted until February 28, 2011. Send written notification of intent to be heard at the public hearing or written comments on the proposed administrative regulation to the contact person.

DRAFT

Contact person: Alicia A. Sneed, Director of Legal Services
Education Professional Standards Board
100 Airport Road, Third Floor
Frankfort, KY 40601
(502) 564-4606
FAX: (502) 564-7080

REGULATORY IMPACT ANALYSIS AND TIERING STATEMENT

Contact Person:

(1) Provide a brief summary of:

(a) What this administrative regulation does: This administrative regulation establishes the standards for accreditation of an educator preparation unit and approval of a program to prepare an educator.

(b) The necessity of this administrative regulation: This administrative regulation is necessary to alert educator preparation institutions of the requirements for accreditation and program approval.

(c) How this administrative regulation conforms to the content of the authorizing statutes: KRS 161.028(1) authorizes the Education Professional Standards Board to establish standards and requirements for obtaining and maintaining a teaching certificate and to set standards for, approve, and evaluate college, university, and school district programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel.

(d) How this administrative regulation currently assists or will assist in the effective administration of the statutes: This administrative regulation sets the standards and the review process for accreditation of educator preparation units and approval of programs.

(2) If this is an amendment to an existing administrative regulation, provide a brief summary of:

(a) How the amendment will change this existing administrative regulation: This amendment makes the Master's Redesign Review Committee a standing committee so that all future master's degree and planned fifth-year programs for rank change in Kentucky will be reviewed by one committee.

(b) The necessity of the amendment to this administrative regulation: The amendment is necessary to ensure consistency in program review and implementation for all master's degree and planned fifth-year programs for rank change.

(c) How the amendment conforms to the content of the authorizing statutes: KRS 161.028(1) authorizes the Education Professional Standards Board to establish standards and requirements for obtaining and maintaining a teaching certificate and to set standards for, approve, and evaluate college, university, and school district programs for the preparation of

DRAFT

teachers and other professional school personnel.

(d) How the amendment will assist in the effective administration of the statutes: This amendment will maintain the current standards of review for all future institutions of higher learning seeking to provide master's degree and planned fifth-year programs for rank change.

(3) List the type and number of individuals, businesses, organizations, or state and local governments affected by this administrative regulation: 30 Educator Preparation Institutions and any institutions seeking future accreditation for an educator preparation program.

(4) Provide an analysis of how the entities identified in question (3) will be impacted by either the implementation of this administrative regulation, if new, or by the change, if it is an amendment, including:

(a) List the actions that each of the regulated entities identified in question (3) will have to take to comply with this administrative regulation or amendment: The 30 Educator Preparation Institutions and institutions seeking future approval for master's degree or planned fifth-year programs for rank change will have to submit programs to the Master's Redesign Review Committee for initial approval.

(b) In complying with this administrative regulation or amendment, how much will it cost each of the entities identified in question (3): This amendment should not impact the institutions financially.

(c) As a result of compliance, what benefits will accrue to the entities identified in question (3): The educator preparation programs will benefit from only having one reviewing committee for their master's degree and planned fifth year programs for rank change. Also, all programs will be subject to the same standards for approval.

(5) Provide an estimate of how much it will cost the administrative body to implement this administrative regulation:

(a) Initially: There should be no additional cost to the Education Professional Standards Board.

(b) On a continuing basis: There should be no additional cost to the Education Professional Standards Board.

(6) What is the source of the funding to be used for the implementation and enforcement of this administrative regulation: General Fund.

(7) Provide an assessment of whether an increase in fees or funding will be necessary to

DRAFT

implement this administrative regulation, if new, or by the change if it is an amendment: No fees are associated with this amendment.

(8) State whether or not this administrative regulation established any fees or directly or indirectly increased any fees: No fees are associated with this amendment.

(9) TIERING: Is tiering applied? (Explain why or why not) NO, all educator preparation programs will be treated the same.

DRAFT

FISCAL NOTE ON STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Regulation No.16 KAR 5:010 Contact Person: Alicia A. Sneed

1. Does this administrative regulation relate to any program, service, or requirements of a state or local government (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts)?
Yes __X___ No _____
If yes, complete questions 2-4.

2. What units, parts or divisions of state or local government (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) will be impacted by this administrative regulation? Public colleges and universities, the Education Professional Standards Board, and the 174 school districts.

3. Identify each state or federal statute or federal regulation that requires or authorizes the action taken by the administrative regulation. KRS 161.028.

4. Estimate the effect of this administrative regulation on the expenditures and revenues of a state or local government agency (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) for the first full year the administrative regulation is to be in effect. There should be no cost to the any government agency.

(a) How much revenue will this administrative regulation generate for the state or local government (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) for the first year? No revenue will generated.

(b) How much revenue will this administrative regulation generate for the state or local government (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) for subsequent years? No revenue will be generated.

(c) How much will it cost to administer this program for the first year? There should be no cost to administer this program since the institutions will be required to directly reimburse the Board of Examiners team members.

(d) How much will it cost to administer this program for subsequent years? There should be no cost to administer this program since the institutions will be required to directly reimburse the Board of Examiners team members.

Note: If specific dollar estimates cannot be determined, provide a brief narrative to explain the fiscal impact of the administrative regulation.
Revenues (+/-): No additional revenue is anticipated.
Expenditures (+/-): Educator Preparation Institutions will have to expend an additional $6000 every seven (7) years to maintain accreditation. This is an approximate amount and will differ depending on the location of the institution and the size of the institution's educator preparation program.
Other Explanation:

DRAFT