

Agenda Book

**EPSB Meeting Agenda
EPSB Offices, 100 Airport Road, Frankfort, KY 40601
September 22, 2008**

Sunday, September 21, 2008

- 5:30 PM EDT Support for New Programs
EPSB Offices, Conference Room A**
NO BUSINESS WILL BE CONDUCTED

Monday, September 22, 2008

- 9:00 AM EDT Call to Order**

Roll Call

Swearing-in of Board Member

Approval of August 18, 2008 Minutes (Pages 1-20)

Open Speak

Report of the Executive Director

- A. Report from the Kentucky Department of Education
B. Report from the Council on Postsecondary Education

Report of the Chair

Appointment of the Executive Director Evaluation Committee

Committee Reports

KTIP Task Force

Information/Discussion Items

- A. Math Task Force Recommendations (Pages 21-26)
(Dr. Marilyn Troupe)
B. 16 KAR 6:010. Written Examination Prerequisites for Teacher Certification, Amendment, Notice of Intent (Pages 27-54)
(Mr. Robert Brown)
C. 2007-2008 New Teacher Survey (Pages 55-56) (Mr. Brown)

Action Items

- A. Adoption of Goals and Strategies for 2009 and 2010 (Pages 57-60) (Dr. Phillip Rogers)
B. Alice Lloyd College: Accreditation of the Educator Preparation Unit and Approval of Programs (Pages 61-72)
(Dr. Troupe)

Agenda Book

- C. [Georgetown College: Accreditation of the Educator Preparation Unit and Approval of Programs \(Pages 73-78\)](#)
(Dr. Troupe)
- D. [University of Kentucky: Accreditation of the Educator Preparation Unit and Approval of Programs \(Pages 79-84\)](#)
(Dr. Troupe)
- E. [Emergency Review of Certification Program Pursuant to the 2006-2007 Title II Report, Eastern Kentucky University \(Pages 85-86\)](#) (Dr. Troupe)
- F. [2008 Title II Report \(Pages 87-88\)](#) (Dr. Troupe)
- G. [2008-09 Emergency Non-Certified School Personnel Program \(Pages 89-90\)](#) (Mr. Carr)

Waiver

[16 KAR 6:010. Request to Waive Elementary P-5 and Middle School \(5-9\) English Certification Assessment Requirements \(Pages 91-94\)](#) (Mr. Brown)

Alternative Route to Certification Application

[Karen Phillips, Family and Consumer Science, Grades 5-12 \(Pages 95-98\)](#) (Mr. Mike Carr)

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:
November 17, 2008
EPSB Offices

Agenda Book

The actions delineated below were taken in open session of the EPSB at the August 18, 2008 regular 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 Business Meeting
EPSB Offices, 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor
Frankfort, Kentucky
August 18, 2008

Call to Adjourn

Vice-chair Lorraine Williams asked for a motion to adjourn the June 23, 2008 EPSB meeting.

Motion made by Dr. Sam Evans, seconded by Mr. Lonnie Anderson, to adjourn the June 23, 2008 EPSB meeting.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Call to Order

Vice-chair Lorraine Williams convened the August 18, 2008 meeting at 9:10 a.m. (EDT).

Swearing-In and Introduction of New Board Member

Notary Public Ashley Abshire swore in Dr. Cathy Gunn, Dean of the College of Education at Morehead State University. Dr. Gunn expressed her pleasure at being asked to serve on the board and stated that she hoped that her diverse background in P-12 education will be beneficial to the EPSB.

Roll Call

The following members were present: Lonnie Anderson, Jim Applegate, Frank Cheatham, Sam Evans, Mary Hammons, Michael Miller, Greg Ross, Sandy Sinclair-Curry, Zenaida Smith, Bobbie Stoess, Tom Stull, and Lorraine Williams. Rebecca Goss, Kent Juett, and Cynthia York were absent.

Approval of June 7, 2008 Special EPSB Meeting Minutes

Motion made by Dr. Frank Cheatham, seconded by Mr. Greg Ross, to approve the minutes of the special EPSB board meeting.

Vote: *10 – Yes*

2 – Recuse (Mr. Tom Stull, Dr. Sam Evans)

Approval of June 23, 2008 EPSB Meeting Minutes

Motion made by Dr. Sam Evans, seconded by Ms. Bobbie Stoess, to approve the minutes of the June 23, 2008 EPSB meeting.

Vote: 8 – Yes

4 – Recuse (Dr. Frank Cheatham, Mr. Lonnie Anderson, Mr. Tom Stull,
Ms. Sandy Sinclair-Curry)

Amendment of the August 18, 2008 EPSB Meeting Agenda

Motion made by Dr. Cheatham, seconded by Mr. Tom Stull, to amend the meeting agenda to remove Information/Discussion Item B. 16 KAR 6:010. Written Examination Prerequisites for Teacher Certification, Notice of Intent and add the following items to the agenda: Action Item, Waiver C. 16 KAR 2:010. Request for Waiver of 15 New Graduate Hours for the Initial 5-Year Renewal of a Certificate Issued, Mr. Robert Lightning; Action Item, Waiver D. 16 KAR 5:010. Request to Waive the Implementation Date for the Teacher as Leader Master's Program and Endorsement, Asbury College; Action Item, Waiver E. 16 KAR 6:010. Request to Waive Moderate and Severe Disabilities (P-12) Certification Assessment Requirements.

Vote: Unanimous

Recognition of Former Board Member

Vice-chair Lorraine Williams presented Ms. Jennifer Forgy with a plaque and thanked her for her insight and talents that she brought to the board. Ms. Forgy stated that she appreciated the support and friendship of the board and Dr. Rogers. As she has taken a position as an assistant principal, Ms. Forgy is no longer able to continue serving on the board as a teacher representative.

Open Speak

There were no requests for open speak.

Report of the Executive Director

Staff Recognition

Dr. Phillip Rogers recognized Ms. Cindy Owen with a plaque for her retirement. Ms. Owen expressed her appreciation for the opportunity she was given that provided so many blessings in her life. Dr. Rogers welcomed Mr. Robert Brown back to the agency. Mr. Brown will be replacing Ms. Owen upon her retirement at the end of August.

Dr. Marilyn Troupe recognized Elizabeth Springate, who is retiring, and announced a retirement reception for her following the lunch break. Mr. Gary Freeland introduced Sherry Brumback as the agency's new internal policy analyst.

Financial Report

Mr. Freeland presented a financial report on the 2008 fiscal year. Overall, the agency utilized \$585,000.00 from operating funds and personnel to pay for KTIP. Only \$1,115.00 was left in general operating and personnel funds at the end of the fiscal year. Mr. Freeland stated that \$100,042.00 in National Board funds was not spent and therefore rolled over into the National Board Trust Fund where it is available for use in fiscal year

Agenda Book

2009. Additionally, the agency saw an increase in restricted funds, which is primarily believed to be due to an increase in Continuing Education Option (CEO) fees this year.

Dr. Rogers introduced Ryan Holleran, Assistant Attorney General, who will serve as Board counsel.

Report from the Kentucky Department of Education

Mr. Michael Miller, director of the KDE curriculum division, reported on recent events and the work of KDE.

- 1) The first meeting of the task force on assessment and accountability was held on August 5, 2008. The task force will meet five (5) times through November in order to prepare any proposals for presentation to the Kentucky General Assembly in January 2009. The next meeting of the task force will be held on August 26, 2008.
- 2) At the August 6 Kentucky Board of Education (KBE) meeting, the report of the blue ribbon panel on interventions in low performing schools was accepted. The blue ribbon panel has made the following decisions:
 - * To provide the document titled “Promising Practices from Kentucky High Performing Schools and Districts” and the Promising Practices Framework to low-performing schools and districts as a resource from which to choose those practices that best fit their situation
 - * To implement Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) assistance using “A Systemic Model of Intervention and Support”
 - * To address governance as a crucial centerpiece of any legislative proposal, including a recommendation that low student academic performance be added to the existing statute as grounds for removal of a superintendent or school board member.

The EPSB authorized KDE staff to move forward with immediate implementation of the recommendations that can be put in place this fall. The board also approved, for those items requiring additional authority, the drafting of a legislative package for consideration by the 2009 General Assembly.

- * At the August KBE meeting, Joe Brothers was reelected as chair and C.B. Akins was elected as vice chair. Each will serve a one year term.

Report from the Council on Postsecondary Education

Dr. Jim Applegate reported on the work and several upcoming events at CPE:

- 1) Governor Beshear signed an executive order attaching CPE to the governor’s office.
- 2) The Improving Educator Quality (IEQ) grant program focuses on increasing the academic achievement of all students through professional development initiatives to ensure that K-12 teachers and administrators are highly qualified. Each year, CPE receives a million dollars in federal grants for this program. For those interested, requests for proposals are due on November 1.

Agenda Book

- 3) The search for a new CPE president has begun. The council anticipates hiring a new president by the end of the year.

Dr. Rogers informed the board that he has established regular monthly meetings with Commissioner Draud and Interim President Crofts and has suggested the idea of bringing the three boards together for a summit.

Appointment of the Certification Task Force

Vice-chair Lorraine Williams made the following appointments to the Certification Task Force: Kim Alexander, Michael Dailey, Bill Eckels, Frank Cheatham, Kenneth Galloway, Cindy Godsey, Jon Hall, Kevin Hub, Henry Lacy, John Marks, Kricket McClure, Roger Johnson, Melodee Parker, Paul Wirtz, Mickey Rice, Brad Stanley, Mike Tolliver, and Russ Wall.

Appointment to the Kentucky Advisory Council on Internships (KACI)

Vice-chair Lorraine Williams appointed Richard “Rich” Crowe to KACI.

Committee Reports

Nominating Committee

Dr. Frank Cheatham reported that the committee recommended that Ms. Lorraine Williams serve as chair and Mr. Tom Stull as vice-chair. There were no further recommendations from the board.

Motion made by Dr. Frank Cheatham, seconded by Mr. Tom Stull, to elect Ms. Lorraine Williams as chair.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Motion made by Dr. Cheatham, seconded by Mr. Lonnie Anderson, to elect Mr. Tom Stull as vice-chair.

Vote: *Unanimous*

KTIP Task Force

In the absence of board member Becky Goss, Dr. Rogers reported on the KTIP Task Force. The task force met on July 25th and looked at ways to improve KTIP and how to move KTIP to the next level despite the funding shortage. The task force is scheduled to meet again on September 2. Dr. Rogers said that three (3) priorities have been identified with floating strategies surrounding each one. Topics for the meeting were gathered by Ms. Cindy Owen from educators around the state.

Information/Discussion Items

Adoption of Goals and Strategies for 2009 and 2010

Dr. Rogers reported that it is customary for the board to review the EPSB goals every two years. The proposed changes to the goals grew out of consultation with educational partners and EPSB staff. The most significant change in the goals is the elimination of

Agenda Book

Goal 5, which deals with a safe and supportive school environment. The board believes it has no control over this goal, and a lack of funds precludes conducting a survey.

EPSB Meeting Schedule

Motion made by Mr. Lonnie Anderson, seconded by Mr. Stull, to approve the meeting calendar for 2008-2009 as recommended.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Awarded Contracts

Motion made by Ms. Zenaida Smith, seconded by Dr. Frank Cheatham, to approve the contracts as recommended.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Asbury College, Master of Arts in Education for Rank II and I Programs and Teacher Leader Endorsement

Dr. Sam Evans asked several questions to Asbury College staff regarding their proposed program. He stated his concerns that some of the guidelines have not been met, particularly that the institution does not have enough multiple career pathways for students. Asbury staff gave examples of different multiple career pathways for students, including qualifying for a consultant certificate and teacher leader endorsement. Dr. Troupe explained to Dr. Evans that the Master's Redesign Committee wanted to see some flexibility for teachers and was more interested in addressing the leadership needs of the school districts. She further added that the committee plans to send comments to institutions on what the committee is looking for in the teacher preparation programs. Dr. Evans encouraged Dr. Troupe to send these comments out to the institutions quickly. Mr. Greg Ross applauded the Asbury College proposal, saying that he is very impressed with the high level of rigor.

Motion made by Dr. Cathy Gunn, seconded by Dr. Frank Cheatham, to approve the Asbury College request for the Master of Arts in Education for Rank II and I Teacher Leader Endorsement proposal.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Approval of Proposed Educator Preparation Program: English as a Second Language P-12 Endorsement (Advanced Level): Campbellsville University

Motion made by Mr. Lonnie Anderson, seconded by Dr. Gunn, to approve the proposed educator preparation program addition for Campbellsville University.

Vote: *11 – Yes*

1 – Recuse (Dr. Frank Cheatham)

Certification Task Force Charter

Motion made by Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Greg Ross, to approve the Certification Task Force with a noted correction that in Objective 1 the wording should be changed to read “an examination of alternative certification programs within the state.”

Agenda Book

Vote: *Unanimous*

Kentucky Teacher Internship Program Appeal

Elizabeth Haas:

Motion made by Dr. Sam Evans, seconded by Dr. Gunn, to approve the appeals committee's recommendation that procedural error(s) by the intern committee make(s) it impossible to determine if the intern was, in fact, unsuccessful. The internship should be nullified and the intern allowed to repeat the internship without penalty.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Kristen Kischnick:

Motion made by Dr. Gunn, seconded by Mr. Ross, to approve the appeals committee's recommendation that the decision of "unsuccessful" by the intern committee be upheld. Another Statement of Eligibility shall be issued to the intern, unless the intern has exhausted the two (2) year provision for participation in KTIP, or the period of validity for the Statement of Eligibility has expired pursuant to 16 KAR 7:010, Section 10.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Veronica Parker:

Motion made by Ms. Sandy Sinclair-Curry, seconded by Ms. Zenaida Smith, to approve the appeals committee's recommendation that procedural error(s) by the intern committee make(s) it impossible to determine if the intern was, in fact, unsuccessful. The internship should be nullified and the intern allowed to repeat the internship without penalty.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Benjamin Rodway:

Motion made by Dr. Evans, seconded by Dr. Cheatham, to approve the appeals committee's recommendation that the decision of "unsuccessful" by the intern committee be upheld. Another Statement of Eligibility shall be issued to the intern, unless the intern has exhausted the two (2) year provision for participation in KTIP, or the period of validity for the Statement of Eligibility has expired pursuant to 16 KAR 7:010, Section 10.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Amy Moore:

Motion made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Ms. Mary Hammons, to approve the appeals committee's recommendation that procedural error(s) by the intern committee make(s) it impossible to determine if the intern was, in fact, unsuccessful. The internship should be nullified and the intern allowed to repeat the internship without penalty.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Kentucky Principal Internship Program Appeal

Hill:

Motion made by Mr. Anderson, seconded by Ms. Smith, to approve the appeals committee's recommendation that the decision of "unsuccessful" by the intern committee be upheld. The EPSB shall issue another Statement of Eligibility for Principal Internship, unless the principal intern has exhausted the two (2) year provision for participation in KPIP, or the period of validity for the Statement of Eligibility has expired pursuant to 16 KAR 7:020, Section 9.

Vote: 10 – Yes

2 – Recuse (Mr. Tom Stull; Mr. Greg Ross)

Waivers

16 KAR 6:010. Request to Waive Music, All Grades Certification Assessment Requirements

Motion made by Dr. Gunn, seconded by Ms. Smith, to accept the FTCE SAE Music K-12 in place of the Praxis II Music: Content Knowledge (0113). Do not accept the FTCE SAE Music K-12 in place of the Praxis II Music: Concepts and Processes (0111) and do not accept the FTCE General Knowledge or the FTCE SAE Music K-12 in place of the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching: 0522, 0523, or 0524.

Vote: Unanimous

16 KAR 6:010. Request to Waive Exceptional Children (P-12) Certification Assessment Requirements

Motion made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Ms. Sinclair-Curry, to accept Praxis II Special Education: Knowledge-Based Core Principles (0351) in place of Praxis II Education of Exceptional Children: Core Content Knowledge (0353).

Vote: Unanimous

Action Item, Waiver C. 16 KAR 2:010. Request for Waiver of 15 New Graduate Hours for the Initial 5-Year Renewal of a Certificate Issued, Mr. Robert Lightning

Motion made by Dr. Gunn, seconded by Mr. Ross to waive the requirement of 15 new graduate hours applicable to the fifth-year program for the initial five-year renewal of a certificate for Mr. Robert Lightning.

Vote: 11- Yes

1- Recuse (Dr. Evans)

Action Item, Waiver D.16 KAR 5:010. Request to Waive the Implementation Date for the Teacher as Leader Masters Program and Endorsement, Asbury College

Motion made by Mr. Anderson, seconded by Dr. Gunn, to approve Asbury College's request to waive the January 1, 2009 program start date.

Vote: Unanimous

Agenda Book

Action Item, Waiver E.16 KAR 6:010. Request to Waive Moderate and Severe Disabilities (P-12) Certification Assessment Requirements

Motion made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Ms. Sinclair-Curry, to accept the MTTC 56 Cognitive Impairments in place of the Praxis II Special Education: Teaching Students with Mental Retardation (0321), but do not accept the MTTC 56 Cognitive Impairments in place of Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353) or Exceptional Education: Severe to Profound Disabilities (0544).

Vote: *Unanimous*

Alternative Route to Certification Applications

Teresa Moberly, Middle School Science, Grades 5-9

Motion made by Mr. Ross, seconded by Ms. Bobbie Stoess, to approve the alternative route to certification application for Ms. Teresa Moberly.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Katherine Weible, Theatre, Grades P-12

Motion made by Dr. Gunn, seconded by Mr. Anderson, to approve the alternative route to certification application for Ms. Katherine Weible.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Board Comments

Dr. Evans expressed his concern with the KTIP changes pertaining to teacher educators and higher education's liability. Ms. Alicia Sneed assured Dr. Evans that under the KTIP statute, institutions are not liable if they are unable to supply a teacher educator. Ms. Lorraine Williams asked staff to bring to the September meeting the process for assigning teacher educators.

DISCIPLINARY MATTERS: MINUTES OF CASE REVIEW August 18, 2008

Motion made by Dr. Sam Evans, seconded by Ms. Bobbie Stoess, 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 Dr. Evans, seconded by Dr. Frank Cheatham, to return to open session.

Vote: *Unanimous*

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

Agenda Book

Tom Stull, Sam Evans, Mary Hammons, Frank Cheatham, Bobbie Stoess, Lorraine Williams, Cathy Gunn, Zenaida Smith, and Sandy Sinclair-Curry.

Attorneys present were Alicia A. Sneed, Gary A. Stephens, and Ryan Halloran.

Motion made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Ms. Stoess, to accept the KTIP Charter.

Vote: *Unanimous*

INITIAL CASE REVIEW

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Decision</u>
08010276	Hear
08020524	Defer for proof
0804691	Hear
0803664	Admonish
0803666	Hear
07101723	Dismiss
08010310	Admonish
08010316	Admonish
0804705	Dismiss
0804692	Dismiss
0803660	Defer for proof
07112123	Admonish
07122495	Defer for proof
07122884	Defer for proof
0803686	Admonish
0803688	Dismiss
0803663	Dismiss
0803665	Defer for proof
0803684	Hear
0803662	Hear
08020409	Hear
0803654	Hear
08020608	Admonish
0803689	Hear
0803683	Hear
0804768	Hear
08020584	Hear
07112143	Admonish
07112153	Dismiss
07112221	Hear
0803680	Dismiss
0803681	Dismiss

Agenda Book

07122932	Admonish
07122904	Admonish
07122565	Hear
08020630	Hear
08020643	Admonish
07112081	Admonish
07112220	Admonish
08010206	Hear
07-0589	Dismiss
07112223	Dismiss
08010049	Hear
0802644	Hear
0804792	Hear
0805865	Hear
07111883	Hear
0806900	Admonish
0804721	Admonish
0804769	Defer for proof
07111888	Admonish
08020634	Dismiss
0804690	Hear
0804750	Dismiss
08020637	Defer
08020636	Hear
0805821	Defer for proof
0804698	Admonish
08010314	Admonish
0806885	Admonish
0804696	Defer for proof
0805826	Admonish
0805823	Hear
0804773	Admonish
0804760	Admonish
0805818	Hear
0804778	Admonish
0804785	Hear
0805824	Defer for proof
0804780	Defer for proof
0804784	Hear
0804805	Hear
0805866	Hear
0804782	Hear
0805860	Hear
0805825	Hear
0805830	Hear
0805833	Hear

Agenda Book

0804776	Admonish
0803679	Hear
0803655	Dismiss
0805816	Dismiss
0804808	Hear
0804695	Admonish
0804741	Admonish
0805856	Defer for proof
0804804	Hear
0805828	Defer
0805829	Defer
07112047	Dismiss
07112366	Dismiss
07112184	Dismiss
06-09235	Dismiss

Character/Fitness Review

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Decision</u>
08791	Defer
08947	Approve
08898	Approve
08927	Approve
08959	Approve
08975	Defer
08886	Approve
08981	Approve
081003	Defer
081001	Approve
08986	Approve
081023	Approve
081026	Defer
081027	Approve
081030	Approve
081033	Approve
08883	Approve
081034	Approve
081035	Approve
081022	Defer
081014	Approve with conditions
081055	Approve
081061	Approve
08942	Approve
081047	Approve

Agenda Book

081050	Approve
081057	Approve
081086	Approve
081090	Approve
081081	Approve
081906	Approve
081095	Approve
081094	Approve
081102	Approve
081111	Approve
081059	Approve
081125	Approve
081123	Approve
08946	Approve
081122	Approve
081134	Approve
081140	Approve
081135	Approve
081148	Approve
081119	Approve

Agreed Orders

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Decision</u>
06-06178 (Patricia Seiber)	<p>Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for failing to properly report the number of Calloway County School District students attending schools in the Murray Independent School District. A Director of Pupil Personnel must abide by all applicable school laws and regulations. It is her duty to advise superiors when past policies and practices violate these laws and make every effort within her power to remedy wrongdoing.</p> <p>Respondent shall testify truthfully at any hearing involving Larry Reid, William Franklin, and/or Willie Jackson at the Board's request. Should Respondent refuse to do so, the Board may void this Order, reopen this case, and seek additional sanction against Respondent's teaching certificates.</p>

Vote: *Unanimous*

Agenda Book

- 06-06176 (Willie Jackson) Accept Agreed Order sanctioning Respondent's certificate as follows. The Professional Certificates for School Administration and Supervision with endorsements for Director of Pupil Personnel and School Superintendent shall be suspended for six months following acceptance of this Agreed Order by the Board. Respondent shall surrender the original and all copies of this certificate immediately, by first class mail or personal delivery, to the Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, Third Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601. All remaining certificates and specializations shall remain intact and are not affected by this Order. Respondent shall testify truthfully in any hearing involving Patricia Seiber, William Franklin, and/or Larry Reid at the Board's request. Should Respondent refuse to do so, the Board may void this Order, reopen this case, and seek additional sanctions against Respondent's certificates.

Vote: *Unanimous*

- 06-11280 (George Davidson) Accept Agreed Order suspending Respondent's certificate, including any and all endorsements, for a period of one (1) year. Six (6) months of the one year suspension will be served retroactively from December 1, 2007 through June 1, 2008. The remaining six (6) months will be served from the time this Order is approved by the Board. Upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board, Respondent shall immediately surrender the original certificate and all copies of his certificate to the EPSB, by delivering or mailing them to 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601. In addition to any educational requirements, reinstatement of Respondent's teaching certificate at the conclusion of the one (1) year period is expressly conditioned upon Respondent providing written proof to the Board that he has complied with the following:
1. Prior to reinstatement, Respondent shall supply the Board with a report from a licensed and Board approved alcohol/substance abuse counseling program that he has been assessed and complied with all recommended treatment. Any expense for

Agenda Book

said assessment and treatment shall be paid by Respondent.

2. Respondent shall provide written proof to the Board that he has received twelve (12) hours of professional development/training in ethics as approved by the Board. Any expense for this professional development/training in ethics shall be paid by Respondent.

Should Respondent fail to satisfy either of these conditions, his teaching certificate shall not be reinstated.

Vote: *Unanimous*

07-09173 (Herod Parks)

Accept Agreed Order which provides for the following:

1. Respondent shall complete three (3) hours of professional development/training in Cultural Comprehension/Competency, as approved by the Board, no later than December 31, 2009. Any expenses incurred for said training shall be paid by Respondent. Respondent agrees that should he fail to satisfy this condition, his certificate shall be automatically suspended until Respondent provides written proof to the Board that he has completed said training.

2. Respondent shall complete six (6) hours of professional development/training in Ethics, as approved by the Board, no later than December 31, 2009. Any expenses incurred for said training shall be paid by Respondent. Respondent agrees that should he fail to satisfy this condition, his certificate shall be automatically suspended until he provides written proof to the Board that he has completed said training.

3. Respondent shall complete three (3) hours of professional development/training in Sexual Harassment Awareness, as approved by the Board, no later than December 31, 2009. Any expenses incurred for said training shall be paid by Respondent. Respondent agrees that should he fail to satisfy this condition, his certificate shall be automatically suspended until Respondent provides written proof to the Board that he has completed said training.

Agenda Book

Vote: *Unanimous*

07-0339 (Sonia Howe)

Accept Agreed Order suspending Respondent's certificate for a period of two years beginning on March 1, 2007. Respondent shall surrender the original and all copies of this certificate immediately, by first class mail or personal delivery to the Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, Third Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601. Reinstate of Respondent's certificate is conditioned upon Respondent complying with all terms of probation required by the McCracken Circuit Court in case 07-CR-289.

Following reinstatement, Respondent's certificate shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. In accordance with KRS 161.175, Respondent shall submit to random drug testing to be administered by a provider approved by the Board for a period of one year. Any expenses for the drug testing shall be paid by Respondent. If any drug test is positive for illegal substances or is in excess of therapeutic levels generally acceptable in the medical community, Respondent's certificate shall be automatically suspended for a period of two years and shall be subject to additional sanction by the Board pursuant to KRS 161.120.

2. Respondent shall not be convicted of any crime involving the use of any controlled substance, alcohol, or any offense relating to attempting to obtain a controlled substance by fraud. Should Respondent violate this condition, her certificate shall be automatically suspended for a period of two years and shall be subject to additional sanction by the Board pursuant to KRS 161.120.

Vote: *Unanimous*

07111947 (Carmela Bartels)

Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for using inappropriate techniques to discipline a student. The Board reminds Respondent that she has a duty to take reasonable measures to protect the health, safety, and emotional well-being of students. The Board will not tolerate any further incidents of misconduct from Respondent. This settlement agreement is expressly conditioned upon Respondent providing written proof to the Board

Agenda Book

that she has received twelve (12) hours of professional development/training in professional ethics and appropriate classroom management/discipline, as approved by the Board, no later than July 1, 2009. Any expense incurred for said training shall be paid by Respondent. Respondent agrees that should she fail to satisfy the above condition, her certificate shall be automatically suspended until Respondent provides written proof to the Board that she has completed the conditions.

Vote: *Unanimous (Ms. Hammons, recused)*

06-06177 (William Franklin) Accept Agreed Order sanctioning Respondent's certificate as follows. The Professional Certificate for School Administration and Supervision with the endorsement for School Superintendent shall be suspended for one year following acceptance of this Agreed Order by the Board. All remaining certificates and endorsements shall remain intact and are not affected by this Order. Respondent shall testify truthfully in any hearing involving Patricia Seiber, Willie Jackson, and/or Larry Reid at the Board's request. Should Respondent refuse to do so, the Board may void this Order, reopen this case, and seek additional sanctions against Respondent's certificates.

Vote: *Unanimous (Dr. Evans, recused)*

07-0588 (Kenneth Sammons) Accept Agreed Order permanently revoking Respondent's teaching 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. Additionally, Respondent shall neither apply for nor accept any positions as a substitute teacher in the Commonwealth of Kentucky at any time in the future.

Vote: *Unanimous (Ms. Stoess, recused)*

07-0457 (Bonnie Koehler) Accept Agreed Order suspending Respondent's certificate for a period of one (1) year beginning March 9, 2007.

Agenda Book

Upon reinstatement, 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 from the date of acceptance of this Order by the Board:

1. Respondent shall complete twelve (12) hours of ethics training prior to December 31, 2008. Any expense for required training shall be born by the Respondent.
2. Respondent shall receive no further disciplinary action by any school district in the United States including, but not limited to, admonishment, reprimand, suspension or termination. By entering into this Agreed Order, Respondent agrees that should she fail to satisfy any of these conditions during the probationary period, her certificate shall be automatically suspended for an additional period of one (1) year. If applicable, at the conclusion of the one year suspension, Respondent's certificate shall remain suspended until such time as the probationary conditions are met. Respondent is aware that should she violate KRS 161.120, either during or following this two (2) year period of probation, the Board shall initiate new disciplinary action and seek additional sanctions.

Vote: *Unanimous*

06-05152 (Paul Cestaric)

Accept Agreed Order dismissing Case Number 06-05152 upon receiving written proof that Respondent has completed six (6) hours of Board-approved ethics training. Any expense for required training shall be born by the Respondent.

Vote: *Unanimous*

07101764 (Michael Colvett)

Accept Agreed Order permanently revoking Respondent's certificate. Respondent shall neither apply for, nor be issued, a teaching certificate in the Commonwealth of Kentucky at any time in the future.
Respondent shall immediately surrender the original certificate and all copies of his certificate to the

Agenda Book

EPSB, by delivering or mailing to 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.

Vote: *Unanimous*

07-09168 (Tonda Wickliffe) Accept Agreed Order admonishing Respondent for using poor judgment and excessive force in response to student misconduct. As a teacher, it is Respondent's responsibility to maintain a safe and positive learning environment at all times. She must make every effort to protect the health, welfare and safety of even the most difficult in her care.

This agreement is conditioned upon Respondent providing written proof to the Board, on or before January 1, 2009, that she has completed three hours of professional development/training in the areas of classroom and behavior management, approved by the Board and at her own expense. Respondent agrees that should she fail to satisfy this condition, her certificate number shall be automatically suspended and remain so until Respondent provides written proof to the Board that this condition is met.

Vote: *Unanimous*

06-09236 (Gretchen Morrison)Accept Agreed Order which provides for the following.

1. Respondent shall complete twelve (12) hours of ethics training prior to December 31, 2008. Any expense for required training shall be born by the Respondent.

2. Respondent shall complete a Board-approved professional development course in the areas of appropriate teacher-student relationships and boundaries prior to December 31, 2008. Any expense for required training shall be born by the Respondent.

By entering into this Agreed Order, Respondent agrees that should she fail to satisfy any of these conditions, her certificate shall be automatically suspended until such time as conditions 1 and 2 are met.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Agenda Book

KTIP Charter

Motion made by Ms. Zenaida Smith, seconded by Ms. Bobbie Stoess, to approve the KTIP Task Force Charter.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Motion made by Ms. Stoess, seconded by Ms. Hammons, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: *Unanimous*

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Next Meeting: September 22, 2008
 9:00 AM
 EPSB Board Room
 Frankfort, Kentucky

Agenda Book

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Information/Discussion Item A

Information Item:

Mathematics Task Force recommendation for elementary education teachers

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028, 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.

Background:

During the 2005 regular session of the General Assembly, House Bill 93 was enacted, establishing by statute the Committee for Mathematics Achievement (CMA) that would be housed at the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). The legislation requires the committee to “develop and oversee a multi-faceted strategic plan to improve student achievement in mathematics at all levels of schooling in Kentucky.” By December 2006 the CMA had developed a strategic plan for presentation to the Education Assessment and Accountability Review Subcommittee of the Kentucky General Assembly (EAARS).

During the August 2006 retreat of the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE), the Research, Economic Development and Commercialization Policy Group created the CPE STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) Task Force, a group of 110 highly skilled professionals in their respective disciplines. The task force was charged to “develop a statewide strategic action plan to accelerate Kentucky’s performance with the STEM disciplines.” The action plan of the STEM Task Force was presented to CPE March 2007 for implementation.

The Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) reviewed and discussed both the CMA and STEM strategic plans during the June 2007 annual retreat. Particular attention was given to the sections in both reports that focused on the EPSB and the role of colleges and universities in preparing teachers in the STEM disciplines. The EPSB decided to focus on elementary mathematics teachers and requested that staff submit names for appointment to a task force. Members of the Mathematics Task Force (MTF) were appointed during regularly scheduled board meetings in October and November of 2007.

Members of the MTF first met on February 11, 2008, and immediately addressed the issues related to the preparation of elementary teachers to teach mathematics. Dr. Phillip

Agenda Book

Rogers, EPSB Executive Director, gave the charge to the group stating that “nothing is off the table here. We need a continuum that clearly prepares teachers.” The overarching question: What do elementary teachers need to know and be able to teach in math? As the MTF members began to identify the issues, the discussion included the need for elementary teachers to have a depth of mathematical knowledge beyond the content they teach as well as the ability to think mathematically. Task force members also agreed that teachers need a bigger toolbox of strategies to reach students with different learning styles. Finally, the MTF recommended the establishment of a mathematics endorsement. (Task Force recommendations are attached.)

Groups Consulted:

Mathematics Task Force

Contact Person:

Dr. Marilyn K. Troupe, Director
Division of Educator Preparation
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: marilyn.troupe@ky.gov

Executive Director

Date:

September 22, 2008

EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
MATHEMATICS TASK FORCE

Recommendation I:

Develop an Endorsement Certificate for Mathematics

Rationale:

The education of elementary math teachers should continue beyond initial certification. The mathematics endorsement should provide teachers with mathematical content and pedagogical knowledge and skills to enhance their preparation as classroom teachers to enrich the curriculum in the schools. These teachers may be teacher leaders to whom other teachers can turn for support in the teaching of math.

Recommendation II:

Educator preparation programs should adopt a three-pronged approach to preparing elementary teachers to teach math.

A. Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching (MKT)

Educator preparation programs should reorganize mathematics courses to accomplish the following:

- Embrace current approaches for math educator programs because pre-service preparation is crucial
- Emphasize deepening teachers' knowledge of the mathematics they teach as well as increasing their understanding of why math procedures work
- Emphasize promoting mathematical reasoning, sense making, problem solving, computational fluency, and justification, each facilitating the learning of the others
- Ensure that the Kentucky Program of Studies and the Core Content for Assessment are covered by courses and are viewed collaboratively with districts, teachers, and arts and sciences faculty

B. Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK)

Educator preparation's mathematics programs should ensure that candidates learn the following:

- How children learn mathematics so teachers can use different texts and design instruction to meet individual learning needs
- How to determine what students know and understand, using formative assessments to guide instruction
- How to provide strategies and resources for teaching mathematics, including those for differentiated instruction

C. Verticality (V) of the Mathematics in P-12 Curriculum

"Teacher education programs and licensure tests for early childhood teachers, including all special education teachers at this level, should fully address the topics on whole numbers, fractions, and the appropriate geometry and measurement topics in

the Critical Foundations of Algebra, as well as the concepts and skills leading to them; for elementary teachers, including elementary level special education teachers, all topics in the Critical Foundations of Algebra and those topics typically covered in an introductory Algebra course; and for middle school teachers, including middle school special education teachers, the Critical Foundations of Algebra and all of the Major Topics of School Algebra.” *The National Mathematics Advisory Panel Final Report - 2008*

- Teachers should have a sense of how concepts are introduced in the elementary curriculum and then woven through the middle school curriculum.
- Teachers need to see the vertical nature of mathematics, to understand that teaching fractions in elementary lays the foundation for algebra in middle school.
- Colleges/universities should determine the desired math learning outcomes and design courses to meet those outcomes.
- IHE’s should ensure that their preservice teachers are well-versed in the Kentucky Program of Studies and the Core Content for Assessment.

Recommendation III:

- Colleges/universities should identify where in their mathematics courses/program the three components (MKT, PCK and V) are emphasized.

Recommendation IV:

- As curriculum changes, educator preparation programs and school districts should collaborate in co-designing mathematics courses.

Recommendation V:

- Provide opportunities for PreK-12 teachers to collaborate and discuss the challenges and issues of teaching math across grade levels.
- Communicate the outcome of such discussions to administrators.

Rationale for recommendations II through V:

“The national advisory panel has recommended that the PreK-8 content curriculum should be streamlined to emphasize the topics in what the panel calls the Critical Foundations of Algebra. These topics are very closely aligned to the topics recommended by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) in its 2006 publication, *Curriculum Focal Points for Prekindergarten through Grade 8 Mathematics: A Quest for Coherence.*” *The National Mathematics Advisory Panel Final Report - 2008*

The MTF supports the National Advisory Panel’s recommendation that the PreK-8 mathematics curriculum be streamlined through collaborative efforts of the Kentucky Department of Education and the Education Professional Standards Board.

Agenda Book

BIBIOGRAPHY

Cavanagh, Sean, *Essential Qualities of Math Teaching Remain Unknown*, Education Week, March 28, 2008

Friedberg, Solomon, *Teachers must be up for count*, Boston Herald, April 23, 2007

Hechinger, John, *Effort to Fix ‘Broken’ System Sets Targets for Each Grade*, Avoids Taking Sides on Method, March 5, 2008

Kessel, Cathy and Ma, Liping; *What we think that elementary teachers need*, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 2008

Manzo, Kathleen Kennedy, *U.S. Middle-Grades Teachers Found III-Prepared in Math*, Education Week, December 19, 2007, Vol. 27.No. 16

Millman, Richard and Ma, Xin; *The Design of a Mathematics Content Course to Integrate the Assessment Principle: Recent Results*, October 17, 2005

Newman, Steve, *The Algebra Problem*, White Paper, Department of Mathematics, Northern Kentucky University

Reys, Barbara, *Who should lead mathematics instruction at the elementary school level: a case for mathematics specialists*, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Inc., 2003

Schencker, Lisa, Math report recommends teachers focus more in depth on fewer skills, Salt Lake Tribune, April 11, 2008

Zuckerbrod, Nancy, *Poor math scores are examined: More focus urged on basics, fractions*, Herald-Leader, March 14, 2008

Dr. Deborah L. Ball, Dean of the School of Education and William H. Payne Collegiate Professor at the University of Michigan. Dr. Ball, a former elementary school teacher, was a member of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel appointed by the President.

Dr. Lee Shulman was President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. His focus has been on strengthening the role of teaching in higher education. Through the Carnegie Foundation he has “emphasized the importance of ‘teaching as community property’ and the central role of the scholarship of teaching in supporting the needed changes in the cultures of higher education.” Teaching and teacher education have been the focus of his writing.

Committee on Mathematics Achievement, Strategic Plan for Improving Mathematics Achievement in Kentucky, January 2007

Curriculum Focal Points for Prekindergarten through Grade 8 Mathematics, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 2006

The National Mathematics Advisory Panel Final Report: Foundations for Success, The National Mathematics Advisory Panel, U.S. Department of Education, 2008

Agenda Book

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Information/Discussion Item B

Information Item:

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

Applicable Statute and Regulation:

KRS 161.030
16 KAR 6:010

Applicable Goal:

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

Background:

Issue 1: Amend 16 KAR 6:010 to correct change in test name.

The current name of the Praxis II School Psychologist test is *School Psychologist*. The NTE term is no longer used.

Issue 2: Amend 16 KAR 6:010 to provide consistency in capitalization, spacing, and punctuation throughout.

Throughout the years, testing requirements for specific areas have changed, and the regulation has been amended to reflect those changes. As a result, the capitalization and punctuation within the regulation may vary slightly from section to section. To improve clarity, staff is recommending consistency in capitalization and punctuation throughout the regulation.

Issue 3: Reviews and Standard Setting Studies

Under the direction of the Education Professional Standards Board, staff works in collaboration with the Educational Testing Service (ETS) to conduct both test reviews and standard setting studies of Praxis II tests. Test reviews are held on currently used Praxis II tests to determine whether the content of the tests is still current and aligned with what beginning Kentucky teachers should know and/or be able to do and to decide whether the current passing scores are still appropriate in light of performance trends, supply and demand, disparate impact on subpopulations, and/or other issues in the field.

Standard setting studies are conducted on Praxis II tests under consideration for use in Kentucky to determine whether the tests are valid for the use for which they are being considered, and through the process passing scores are recommended. The processes adopted by the EPSB and conducted in collaboration with ETS are consistent with other states'.

Agenda Book

Test reviews and standard setting studies are scheduled based on issues from the field, the date of the last test review or standard setting study, performance trends, test volume, and highly qualified (HQ) requirements. This year's test reviews and standard setting studies were held June 9-13 for the tests listed below.

Test Reviews:

- *Middle School English Language Arts (0049)*
- *Theatre (0640)*
- *Middle School Mathematics (0069)*
- *Middle School Science (0439)*
- *Earth Science (0571)*

Standard Setting Studies:

- *Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education (IECE) (0023)*
- *Gifted Education (0357)*

Note: Setting of Cut Scores

In November of 2007, the Board approved the cut score framework to accept the recommendation of the validation panel if it is between the 15th – 25th percentiles, inclusive; greater than or equal to the current cut score; and comparable to the SREB average cut score.

Based on this framework, each cut score in bold in the following tables represents staff cut score recommendations.

Test Review Results

Middle School English Language Arts (0049)

Four (4) members (three classroom teachers and one higher education faculty member)

- All panel members judged the test to be sufficiently job relevant for continued use in Kentucky.
- One panel member recommended that the passing score remain at 157. The other three recommended an increase in the passing score to 158, 160, or 161.

Current Passing Score	Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Average Passing Score	Proposed Passing Score	National Percentile Ranking*	State Pass Rate 2006-2007	KY Subpopulation Pass Rate 2006-2007		
					Female	Male	African American or Black
157	153	157	14.58	85%	85%	81%	50%
		158	15.92	84%	84%	81%	50%
		160	17.94	80%	81%	77%	50%
		161	19.82	78%	79%	75%	45%

Theatre (0640)

Five (5) members (four classroom teachers and one higher education faculty member)

Agenda Book

- All panel members judged the test to be sufficiently job relevant for continued use in Kentucky.
- The majority of panel members recommended the passing score remain at 630.

Current Passing Score	Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Average	Proposed Passing Score	National Percentile Ranking*	State Pass Rate 2006-2007	KY Subpopulation Pass Rate 2006-2007		
					Female	Male	Other
630	565	630	23.03	<5	<5	<5	<5

Middle School Mathematics (0069)

Six (6) members (five classroom teachers and one higher education faculty member)

- All panel members judged the test to be sufficiently job relevant for continued use in Kentucky.
- The majority of panel members recommended that the passing score be increased to 151.

Current Passing Score	Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Average	Proposed Passing Score	National Percentile Ranking*	State Pass Rate 2006-2007	KY Subpopulation Pass Rate 2006-2007		
					Female	Male	African American or Black
148	148	148	21.49	85%	83%	90%	73%
		151	26.83	78%	74%	84%	64%

Middle School Science (0439)

Four (4) members (three classroom teachers and one higher education faculty member)

- All panel members judged the test to be sufficiently job relevant for continued use in Kentucky.
- The majority of panel members recommended the passing score be raised to 144.

Current Passing Score	Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Average	Proposed Passing Score	National Percentile Ranking*	State Pass Rate 2006-2007	KY Subpopulation Pass Rate 2006-2007		
					Female	Male	Other
139	144	139	12.48	94%	94%	93%	<5
		144	18.84	86%	85%	87%	<5

Earth Science (0571)

Four (4) members (three classroom teachers and one higher education faculty member)

- All panel members judged the test to be sufficiently job relevant for continued use in Kentucky.
- Two panel members recommended that the current passing score remain the same. One panel member recommended raising the passing score to 147, and one recommended raising it to 150.

Agenda Book

Current Passing Score	Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Average	Proposed Passing Score	National Percentile Ranking*	State Pass Rate 2006-2007	KY Subpopulation Pass Rate 2006-2007		
					Female	Male	Other
145	148	145	13.21	79%	70%	89%	<5
		147	16.00	79%	70%	89%	<5
		150	19.86	74%	60%	89%	<5

*National Percentile Ranking reflects 3 year rolling data from October 2004 through July 2007.

Standard Setting Studies

Gifted Education (0357)

Kentucky currently offers several certification endorsements. The endorsements for which an appropriate Praxis II test exists require successful completion of the corresponding test. Two SREB states, Arkansas and West Virginia, currently use the *Gifted Education (0357)* test. The purpose of the *Gifted Education (0357)* SSS was to determine whether (0357) is appropriate for Kentucky teachers of gifted students and, if so, to determine an appropriate passing score.

The standard setting study panel was composed of 10 members, teachers of gifted and talented students and higher education faculty who work with gifted and talented programs. Panelists rated test specifications according to job relevancy to an entry-level teacher in Kentucky: (1=Very Important; 2=Important; 3=Slightly Important; 4=Not Important). Kentucky's decision rules for validating a test for state use require at least 70% of the test specifications to be rated 1 or 2. There are five test specifications for (0357). 100% of the panelists judged four of the five specifications as 1 or 2. 90% of the panelists judged one of the five specification areas as 1 or 2. The panel recommends a passing score of 146. This score was derived from the members' item level judgments.

<i>Gifted Education (0357)</i>		National Percentile Ranking*	National Pass Rate*
Proposed Passing Score	146	Not obtained	Not obtained
Closest Score Obtained	147	9.2	91%
Staff Recommended Passing Score	152	15.8	84%
Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Average	159	34.2	66%

Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education (IECE) (0023)

In September of 2006, the EPSB hosted a review of the EPSB-administered IECE test. The review panel, composed of higher education experts and a classroom teacher, agreed unanimously that the IECE test was not current and valid for certifying incoming teachers; therefore, the EPSB suspended the test effective November 2006 and soon posted an Request For Information (RFI) for development of a new IECE test.

In July of 2007, the EPSB, in coordination with the ETS, convened a committee of Kentucky IECE teachers and teacher educators to develop a new IECE test. In June of 2008, a SSS was held to verify that the new test is appropriate for certifying Kentucky IECE teachers and to determine the passing score.

The Praxis II *IECE (0023)* SSS Panel was composed of 11 early childhood teachers and higher education faculty who work with early childhood and special education programs. Panelists rated test specifications according to job relevancy to an entry-level teacher in Kentucky: (1=Very Important; 2=Important; 3=S somewhat Important; 4=Not Important). Kentucky's decision rules for validating a test for state use require at least 70% of the test specifications to be rated 1 or 2. There are six test specifications for (0023). 100% of the panelists judged each of the six specifications as 1 or 2.

Since the *IECE (0023)* is a new test, a conversion table to convert a raw score to a scaled score will not be available until after the first group of test takers completes the test at the November 15, 2008 test administration.

Although the test will be available beginning with the November 2008 Praxis II test administration, in the past, the Board has provided a one-year hold harmless window before adding the requirement for certification. Provided the Board agrees, staff intends to recommend that the test be required with no cut score effective September 1, 2009. A cut score will be established pursuant to data collected from a minimum of fifty (50) examinees.

Issue 4: Test Code and Scale Score Change

ETS is transitioning the older NTE scaled tests (250-990 scale) to the Praxis score scale (100-200). Therefore, effective September 1, 2008 test codes and scores changed for the two tests are listed below.

Test	Current Code	Current Score	New Code	Passing Score on New Scale
<i>Family Consumer Sciences</i>	0120	600	0121	162
<i>School Psychologist</i>	0400	630	0401	161

Agenda Book

Contact Person:

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

Executive Director

Date:

September 22, 2008

1 **EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD**
2 **(AMENDMENT)**

3 **16 KAR 6:010. Written examination prerequisites for teacher certification.**

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

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

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

12 Section 1. A teacher applicant for certification shall successfully complete the
13 appropriate written tests identified in this administrative regulation prior to Kentucky
14 teacher certification.

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

18 (1) Beginning September 1, 2009 an applicant for Interdisciplinary Early Childhood
19 Education certification (birth to primary) shall take “Interdisciplinary Early Childhood
20 Education (0023).

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

Agenda Book

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

- 4 (a) Middle School English and Communications: "Middle School English
5 Language Arts (0049)" - 158;
6 (b) Middle School Mathematics: "Middle School Mathematics (0069)" - 148;
7 (c) Middle School Science: "Middle School Science (0439)" - 144; or
8 (d) Middle School Social Studies: "Middle School Social Studies (0089)" – 149.

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

- 12 (a) Biology: "Biology: Content Knowledge (0235)" - 146;
13 (b) Chemistry: "Chemistry: Content Knowledge (0245)" - 147;
14 (c) Earth Science: "Earth and Space Sciences: Content Knowledge (0571)" – 147;
15 (d) English:
16 1. "English Language, Literature and Composition: Content Knowledge
17 (0041)" - 160; and
18 2. "English Language, Literature and Composition Essays (0042)" - 155;
19 (e) Mathematics:
20 1. "Mathematics: Content Knowledge (0061)" - 125; and
21 2. "Mathematics: Proofs, Models and Problems, Part 1 (0063)" - 141;
22 (f) Physics: "Physics: Content Knowledge (0265)" - 133; and
23 (g) Social Studies:

Agenda Book

- 1 1. "Social Studies: Content Knowledge (0081)" - 151; and
- 2 2. "Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials (0083)" – 159.
- 3 (5) An applicant for certification in all grades shall take the content test or tests
- 4 corresponding to the applicant's area or areas of specialization with the passing scores
- 5 identified in this subsection:
- 6 (a) Art:
 - 7 1. "Art: Content Knowledge (0133)" - 158; and
 - 8 2. "Art Making (0131)" - 154;
- 9 (b) French: "French: Content Knowledge (0173)" - 159;
- 10 (c) German: "German: Content Knowledge (0181)" - 157;
- 11 (d) Health: "Health Education (0550)" - 630;
- 12 (e) Integrated Music:
 - 13 1. "Music: Content Knowledge (0113)" - 154; and
 - 14 2. "Music: Concepts and Processes (0111)" - 145;
- 15 (f) Instrumental Music:
 - 16 1. "Music: Content Knowledge (0113)" - 154; and
 - 17 2. "Music: Concepts and Processes (0111)" - 145;
- 18 (g) Vocal Music:
 - 19 1. "Music: Content Knowledge (0113)" - 154; and
 - 20 2. "Music: Concepts and Processes (0111)" - 145;
- 21 (h) Latin: "Latin (0600)" - 700;
- 22 (i) Physical Education:
 - 23 1. "Physical Education: Content Knowledge (0091)" - 147; and

Agenda Book

- 1 2. “Physical Education: Movement Forms-Analysis and Design (0092)” -
2 151;
3 (j) School Media Librarian: “Library Media Specialist (0310)” - 640;
4 (k) School Psychologist: “School Psychologist (0401)” – 161; or
5 (l) Spanish: “Spanish: Content Knowledge (0191)” – 160.
6 (6) An applicant for certification for teacher of exceptional children in
7 Communication Disorders, Learning and Behavior Disorders, Hearing Impaired, Hearing
8 Impaired with Sign Proficiency, Visually Impaired, or Moderate and Severe Disabilities
9 shall take the content test or tests based on the applicant's area or areas of specialization
10 with the corresponding passing scores as identified in this subsection:
11 (a) Communication Disorders:
12 1. “Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)” -
13 157; and
14 2. “Speech-Language Pathology (0330)” - 600;
15 (b) Hearing Impaired:
16 1. “Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)” -
17 157; and
18 2. “Education of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students (0271)” - 167;
19 (c) Hearing Impaired With Sign Proficiency:
20 1. “Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)” -
21 157;
22 2. “Education of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students (0271) – 167”; and

Agenda Book

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

2 Level:

3 a. “Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI)”; or

4 b. “Educational Sign Skills Evaluation (ESSE)”; and

5 (d) Learning and Behavior Disorders:

6 1. “Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)” -

7 157; and

8 2. “Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities

9 (0542)” - 172;

10 (e) Moderate and Severe Disabilities:

11 1. “Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)” -

12 157; and

13 2. “Education of Exceptional Students: Severe to Profound Disabilities

14 (0544)” – 156;

15 (f) Visually Impaired:

16 1. “Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)” -

17 157; and

18 2. “Teaching Students with Visual Impairments (0280)” - 700.

19 (7) An applicant for Career and Technical Education certification to teach in grades

20 5-12 shall take the content test or tests corresponding to the applicant's area or areas of

21 specialization with the passing scores identified in this subsection:

22 (a) Agriculture: “Agriculture (0700)” - 520;

23 (b) Business and Marketing Education: “Business Education (0100)” - 590;

1 (c) Family and Consumer Science: “Family and Consumer Sciences (0121)” -
2 162;

3 (d) Technology Education: “Technology Education (0050)” - 600; or
4 (e) An applicant for Industrial Education shall take the content test or tests
5 corresponding to the applicant's area or areas of specialization with the
6 passing scores identified in 16 KAR 6:020.

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

10 (a) English as a Second Language: “English to Speakers of Other Languages
11 (0360)” - 620;
12 (b) Speech/Media Communications: “Speech Communication (0220)” - 580; or
13 (c) Theater: “Theatre (0640)” - 630.

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

17 (a) English as a Second Language: “English to Speakers of Other Languages
18 (0360)” - 620;
19 (b) Learning and Behavior Disorders, grades 8-12: “Education of Exceptional
20 Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542)” – 172; or
21 (c) Gifted Education, grades P-12: “Gifted Education (0357)” – 152.

22 Section 3. In addition to the content area test or tests established in Section 2 of this
23 administrative regulation, the pedagogy tests and passing scores identified in this section

Agenda Book

1 shall be required for each new teacher applicant. If an individual is seeking additional
2 certification in any area, the applicant shall only take one (1) of the pedagogy tests
3 identified in this administrative regulation.

4 (1) An applicant for Elementary certification (grades P-5) shall take “Principles of
5 Learning and Teaching: Grades K-6 (0522)” - 161.

6 (2) An applicant for certification at the middle school level (grades five (5) through
7 nine (9)) shall take “Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5-9 (0523)” - 161.

8 (3) An applicant for certification at the secondary level (grades eight (8) through
9 twelve (12)) shall take “Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7-12 (0524)” - 161.

10 (4) An applicant for certification in all grades with a content area (e.g., art, music,
11 etc.) shall take either:

12 (a) “Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K-6 (0522)” - 161;

13 (b) “Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5-9 (0523)” - 161; or

14 (c) “Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7-12 (0524)” - 161.

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

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

21 (a) “Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5-9 (0523)” - 161; or

22 (b) “Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7-12 (0524)” - 161.

Agenda Book

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

- 3 (a) “Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K-6 (0522)” - 161;
4 (b) “Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5-9 (0523)” - 161; or
5 (c) “Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7-12 (0524)” - 161.

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

9 (1) An applicant for elementary certification shall take Elementary Education:
10 Content Knowledge (0014) with a passing score of 148.

11 (3) An applicant for middle school certification shall take the middle school content
12 test or tests based on the applicant’s content area or areas with passing scores as
13 identified in this subsection:

- 14 (a) Middle School Mathematics (0069) – 148;
15 (b) Middle School Science (0439) – 139;
16 (c) Middle School English Language Arts (0049) – 157; or
17 (d) Middle School Social Studies (0089) – 149.

18 (4) An applicant for certification for teacher of exceptional children in
19 Communication Disorders, Learning and Behavior Disorders, Hearing Impaired, Hearing
20 Impaired with Sign Proficiency, Visually Impaired, or Moderate and Severe Disabilities
21 shall take each content test or test based on the applicant’s content area or areas with the
22 corresponding passing scores as identified in this subsection:

- 23 (a) Communication disorders:

Agenda Book

- 1 1. Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)—157; and
- 2 2. Speech Language Pathology (0330)—600;
- 3 (b) Learning and behavior disorders:
 - 4 1. Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)—157; and
 - 5 2. Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542)—172;
- 6 (c) Moderate and severe disabilities:
 - 7 1. Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)—157; and
 - 8 2.a. Until August 31, 2007, Special Education: Teaching Students with Mental Retardation (0321)—146;
 - 9 b. Beginning September 1, 2007 and until August 31, 2008, Special Education: Teaching Students with Mental Retardation (0321)—146 or Education of Exceptional Students: Severe to Profound Disabilities (0544)—156;
 - 10 c. Beginning September 1, 2008, Education of Exceptional Students: Severe to Profound Disabilities (0544)—156;
- 11 (d) Hearing impaired:
 - 12 1. Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)—157; and
 - 13 2. Education of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students (0271)—167;
- 14 (e) Hearing impaired with sign proficiency:
 - 15 1. Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353)—157;
 - 16 2. Education of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students (0271)—167; and
 - 17 3. One (1) of the following tests with a passing score of "Intermediate Level":
 - 18 a. Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI); or
 - 19 b. Educational Sign Skills Evaluation (ESSE); and

1 (f) Visually impaired:

2 1. Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353) — 157; and

3 2. Teaching Students with Visual Impairments (0280) — 700.

4 (5) An applicant for certification at the secondary level shall take the content test or
5 tests corresponding to the applicant's content area or areas with the passing scores
6 identified in this subsection:

7 (a) Biology: Content Knowledge (0235) — 146;

8 (b) Chemistry: Content Knowledge (0245) — 147;

9 (c) English:

10 1. English Language and Literature: Content Knowledge (0041) — 160; and

11 2. English Language, Literature and Composition Essays (0042) — 155;

12 (d) Social Studies:

13 1. Social Studies: Content Knowledge (0081) — 151; and

14 2. Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials (0083) — 159;

15 (e) Mathematics:

16 1. Mathematics: Content Knowledge (0061) — 125; and

17 2. Mathematics: Proofs, Models, and Problems (0063) — 141;

18 (f) Physics: Content Knowledge (0265) — 133; and

19 (g) Earth Science: Content Knowledge (0571) — 145.

20 (6) An applicant for certification in all grades in the following content area or areas
21 shall take the content test or tests with the passing scores as identified in this subsection.

22 (a) Art:

23 1. Art Content Knowledge (0133) — 158; and

- 1 2. Art Making (0131) — 154;
- 2 (b) French: French: Content Knowledge (0173) — 159;
- 3 (c) German: German: Content Knowledge (0181) — 157;
- 4 (d) Health: Health Education (0550) — 630;
- 5 (e) Latin: Latin (0600) — 700;
- 6 (f) Integrated music:
 - 7 1. Music: Content Knowledge (0113) — 154; and
 - 8 2. Music: Concepts and Processes (0111) — 145;
- 9 (g) Vocal music:
 - 10 1. Music: Content Knowledge (0113) — 154; and
 - 11 2. Music: Concepts and Processes (0111) — 145;
- 12 (h) Instrumental music:
 - 13 1. Music: Content Knowledge (0113) — 154; and
 - 14 2. Music: Concepts and Processes (0111) — 145;
- 15 (i) Physical education:
 - 16 1. Physical Education: Content Knowledge (0091) — 147; and
 - 17 2. Physical Education: Movement Forms Analysis and Design (0092) — 151;
- 18 (j) Spanish: Spanish: Content Knowledge (0191) — 160;
- 19 (k) School Media Librarian: Library Media Specialist (0310) — 640; or
- 20 (l) School Psychologist: NTE Specialty Area Examination — 630.
- 21 (7) An applicant for career and technical education certification to teach in grades 5
- 22 12 with one (1) or more of the following specializations shall take the content test or tests
- 23 with the passing scores as identified in this subsection:

Agenda Book

- 1 (a) Agriculture: Agriculture (0700) 520;
- 2 (b) Business and Marketing Education—Business Education (0100) 590;
- 3 (c) Family and Consumer Sciences (0120) 600;
- 4 (d) Technology Education—Technology Education (0050) 600; or
- 5 (e) Industrial education. An applicant for industrial education with one (1) or more
6 trade and industry specializations shall complete the assessments established in 16 KAR
7 6:020.
- 8 (8) An applicant for a restricted base certificate in the following content area or areas
9 shall take the content test or tests with the passing scores identified in this subsection:
- 10 (a) English as a Second Language: English to Speakers of Other Languages (0360)—
11 620;
- 12 (b) Speech/Media Communications: Speech Communication (0220) 580; or
- 13 (c) Theater: Theatre (0640) 630.
- 14 (9) An applicant for an endorsement in the following content area or areas shall take
15 the content test or tests with the passing scores identified in this subsection:
- 16 (a) English as a Second Language: English to Speakers of Other Languages (0360)—
17 620; or
- 18 (b) Learning and Behavior Disorders, grades 8-12: Education of Exceptional
19 Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542) 172.
- 20 Section 3. In addition to the content area test or tests established in Section 2 of this
21 administrative regulation, the pedagogy tests and passing scores identified in this section
22 shall be required for each new teacher applicant. If an individual is seeking additional

Agenda Book

1 certification in any area, the applicant shall only take one (1) of the pedagogy tests
2 identified in this administrative regulation.

3 (1) An applicant for elementary certification (grades P 5) shall take Principles of
4 Learning and Teaching: Grades K 6 (0522) 161.

5 (2) An applicant for middle school certification grades five (5) through nine (9) shall
6 take Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5 9 (0523) 161.

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

11 (4) An applicant for certification at the secondary level grades eight (8) through
12 twelve (12) shall take Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7 12 (0524) 161.

13 (5) An applicant for certification in all grades with a content area (e.g., art, music,
14 etc.) shall take either:

15 (a) Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K 6 (0522) 161;

16 (b) Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5 9 (0523) 161; or

17 (c) Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7 12 (0524) 161.

18 (6) An applicant for career and technical education certification in grades five (5)
19 through twelve (12) shall take either:

20 (a) Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5 9 (0523) 161; or

21 (b) Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7 12 (0524) 161.

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

Agenda Book

- 1 (a) ~~Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K-6 (0522)~~ 161;
2 (b) ~~Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5-9 (0523)~~ 161; or
3 (c) ~~Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7-12 (0524)~~ 161.

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

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

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

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

16 (a) The Educational Testing Service; or
17 (b) [The Education Professional Standards Board for special administration; or
18 —(e)]he agency established by the Education Professional Standards Board as the
19 authorized test administrator.

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

Agenda Book

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

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

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

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

14

Agenda Book

Approved:

Date

Ms. Lorraine Williams, Chairperson
Education Professional Standards Board

Agenda Book

PUBLIC HEARING AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: A public hearing on this administrative regulation shall be held on May 30, 2008 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 June 2, 2008. Send written notification of intent to be heard at the public hearing or written comments on the proposed administrative regulation to the contact person.

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: 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: The amendment adds to the current assessment requirements for middle school English, middle school math, and middle school social studies the option to take the assessments required for those same secondary certification areas. Any other proposed changes to this regulation are designed to improve the clarity of the regulation.

(b) The necessity of the amendment to this administrative regulation: This amendment is necessary to establish testing options for middle school English, mathematics, and social studies certification.

(c) How the amendment conforms to the content of the authorizing statutes: The authorizing statutes, KRS 161.020, 161.028, and 161.030, govern the certification of

Agenda Book

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, 29 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 districts will be positively affected by the increase in availability of properly certified teachers. The educator preparation programs will be positively affected by the possibility of exiting potential educators who are properly certified for more than one grade range. The applicants will be positively affected by the option to complete fewer tests and opportunity to apply for a broader range of certified vacancies.

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

Agenda Book

implement 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.

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 (+/-):

Agenda Book

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.

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Information/Discussion Item C

Information Item:

2007-2008 New Teacher Survey

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028
16 KAR 5:010

Applicable Goal:

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

Background:

2007-2008 New Teacher Survey

The New Teacher Survey (NTS) is a survey of student teachers and their cooperating teachers and of intern teachers and their resource teachers. The survey was originally developed with the assistance of the Continuous Assessment Review Committee. The focus of the survey is to ascertain how well new teachers and their supervising teachers believe new teachers are prepared to teach in Kentucky schools. The 2007-2008 survey included 24 survey items based on a four-point scale, with 4.00 being the highest. In addition, there were four open-ended questions to solicit feedback regarding the teacher preparation and internship programs.

The NTS mean score was part of the Kentucky Educator Preparation Program (KEPP) Report Card Quality Performance Index (QPI) prior to the Board's suspension of QPI in June 2007. Though the 2007-2008 NTS mean score was not part of the QPI, there were 7,227 respondents, resulting in a 56% response rate, down just 2% from last year.

As in the past, Synthesis Technology, Assessment & Research, Inc. (STAR) administered the survey and provided a variety of static reports which are available through the KEPP web site at <https://wd.kyepsb.net/EPSB.WebApps/KEPPReportCard/Public/>. In addition, the comments by university and raw data sets are available electronically by sending a request to marcie.lowe@ky.gov. The staff has also made available a hard copy of the comments reports today.

Under separate cover is a copy of the 2007-2008 NTS Results for Public Institutions and Private Institutions. Results from the respondents are consistent with previous years' results, showing the highest satisfaction with preparation in exhibiting and promoting

Agenda Book

ethical and professional behavior as a teacher and the lowest satisfaction with preparation in designing instruction and assessment for students with special needs.

In response to the Board's request last year, STAR developed a dynamic report which gives staff the ability to provide each college/university with the average score for each question by individual certification area (see under separate cover). This report provides detailed program information for specific certification areas in which at least five responses were received. These reports are also available by sending a request to marcie.lowe@ky.gov.

New Teacher Survey Revision

With the suspension of the QPI and the revision of the Kentucky Teacher Standards came an opportunity to revise the New Teacher Survey and more closely align the items to the standards. In October 2007, staff formed a NTS Revision Committee composed of college/university faculty, representatives from the field of resource teachers, interns, student teachers, and cooperating teachers as well as EPSB staff, both from Educator Preparation and Professional Learning & Assessment Divisions. In January of 2008, the review committee completed the revision and alignment. Because the survey will not be administered during the 2008-2009 school year due to reductions in funding, fall 2008 staff will solicit feedback regarding the alignment of the revised survey items to the standards from stakeholders (student teachers, cooperating teachers, interns, resource teachers, principals, KTIP district and university coordinators, field supervisors, superintendents, and Deans/Chairs) using the Zoomerang survey software. The next step will be to analyze the results and have the final survey items reviewed by survey experts. This will ensure that once funding is available, the survey instrument will be ready for use.

Contact Person:

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

Executive Director

Date:

September 22, 2008

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Action Item A

Action Item:

Adoption of 2009-2010 Goals and Strategies

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028

Issue:

Should the Education Professional Standards Board adopt the attached 2009-2010 Goals and Strategies?

Background:

KRS 161.028 establishes the powers and duties of the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB). In order to fulfill these duties and responsibilities, the EPSB organizes its work around vision and mission statements as well as goals and strategies. These statements and goals and strategies are reviewed every two years.

The EPSB met for a Sunday evening study session on August 17, 2008 and reviewed its Goals and Strategies. During the study session the board also reviewed comments received from its education partners (see the list of persons and groups consulted). During the August 18, 2008 regular meeting of the EPSB, the board had further discussion on the goals and strategies. The attached final draft of EPSB Goals and Strategies reflects the board's suggested edits to the 2006-2008 EPSB Goals and Strategies.

Persons and Groups Consulted:

An email requesting comments on updating the EPSB 2006-08 Goals and Initiatives was sent to the following:

- All state district superintendents
- Secretary of the Education and Workforce Development Cabinet
- All members of the Kentucky Board of Education
- Commissioner of Education
- All EPSB staff
- Executive Directors of all education cooperatives
- KEA leadership
- KSBA leadership
- KASA leadership
- Senate leadership education liaison
- House of Representatives education liaison

Agenda Book

- All deans and chairs of education
- Executive Director of OEA
- Staff Administrator of the LRC Education Committee

Alternative Actions:

Option 1: Adopt the 2009-20010 Goals and Strategies as presented

Option 2: Modify and adopt the 2009-20010 Goals and Strategies

Option 3: Do not adopt the 2009-20010 Goals and Strategies

Staff Recommendation:

Option 1

Rationale:

The 2009-2010 EPSB Goals and Strategies reflect the input of the EPSB, agency employees, agency leadership, and the EPSB education partners. In addition the 2009-2010 Goals and Strategies align with KRS 161.028, the founding legislation for the EPSB.

Contact Person:

Dr. Phillip S. Rogers
Executive Director
E-mail: phillip.rogers@ky.gov
502.564.4606

Executive Director

Date:

September 22, 2008



Education Professional Standards Board's 2009-2010 Goals and Strategies

Vision Statement

Every public school teacher and administrator in Kentucky is an accomplished professional committed to helping all children become productive members of a global society.

Mission Statement

The Education Professional Standards Board, in full collaboration and cooperation with its education partners, promotes high levels of student achievement by establishing and enforcing rigorous professional standards for preparation, certification, and responsible and ethical behavior of all professional educators in Kentucky.

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.

- Strategy 1.1. Maintain regular and rigorous reviews of all program quality indicators.*
- Strategy 1.2. Document and publish information on the quality of each preparation program.*
- Strategy 1.3. Provide technical assistance to support program improvement.*
- Strategy 1.4. Utilize research to inform program improvements.*
- Strategy 1.5. Review programs to ensure focus on student learning.*
- Strategy 1.6. Maintain a focus on continuous improvement of all preparation programs.*
- Strategy 1.7. Provide accurate and reliable data to support decision making.*

Goal 2:

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

- Strategy 2.1. Document every assignment of educators in Kentucky public schools.*
- Strategy 2.2. Document the highly qualified status of all Kentucky teachers as required under NCLB.*
- Strategy 2.3. Monitor the validity and reliability of teacher and administrator assessments.*
- Strategy 2.4. Document and publish the results of all assessments required of new teachers and new administrators.*
- Strategy 2.5. Maintain a focus on continuous improvement of all traditional and alternative route certification procedures and processes.*

Agenda Book

Strategy 2.6. Provide accurate and reliable data to support decision making.

Goal 3:

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

Strategy 3.1. Promote awareness of the EPSB Code of Ethics.

Strategy 3.2. Maintain an accurate database of misconduct and character and fitness cases.

Strategy 3.3. Present in a timely manner all cases for review by the EPSB.

Strategy 3.4. Maintain a focus on continuous improvement of all hearing procedures.

Strategy 3.5. Provide accurate and reliable data to support decision making.

Goal 4:

Every credentialed educator participates in a high quality induction into the profession and approved educational advancement programs that support effectiveness in helping all students achieve.

Strategy 4.1. Develop and utilize reliable measures of teacher effectiveness and student achievement that may be used in evaluation of induction and professional advancement activities.

Strategy 4.2. Ensure that every new teacher and principal has a high quality induction experience while demonstrating knowledge and skills that support student learning.

Strategy 4.3. Ensure that high quality mentoring and support services are provided for teachers seeking National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification.

Strategy 4.4. Ensure that the Continuing Education Option for rank change program maintains appropriate rigor while demonstrating advanced knowledge and skills that support student learning.

Strategy 4.5. Provide accurate and reliable data to support decision making.

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.

Strategy 5.1. Maintain a qualified and diverse EPSB workforce.

Strategy 5.2. Ensure that all personnel are experiencing life-long learning and professional experiences that support their professional growth.

Strategy 5.3. Seek full funding for all EPSB operations, personnel, and programs through an approved biennial budget request.

Strategy 5.4. Provide semiannual budget reports to the EPSB.

Strategy 5.5. Maintain facilities, equipment, and agency technology that support efficient and productive agency operations.

**KENTUCKY EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Action Item B

Action Item:

Alice Lloyd College: Accreditation of the Educator Preparation Unit and Approval of Programs

Applicable Statute or Regulation:

KRS 161.028
16 KAR 5:010

Applicable Goal:

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

Issue:

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

Background:

A state Board of Examiners (BOE) team conducted the probationary visit to the Educator Preparation Unit at Alice Lloyd College on March 29 – April 2, 2008. The BOE team found all standards were met with seven corrected areas for improvement, one continued area for improvement, and no new areas for improvement. The BOE also evaluated program review documents as part of the on-site visit and found them to be in compliance with program guidelines as established and approved by the EPSB. At its July 25, 2008 meeting, the Accreditation Audit Committee (AAC) met (see attached minutes) and reviewed the accreditation materials, including the institutional report, the BOE Report, and the unit's rejoinder.

The AAC reviewed each area for improvement cited in the BOE Report. The following areas for improvement were included in the BOE Report:

Corrected

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

- 1) Teacher candidates are not consistently assessing P-12 student learning or developing learning experiences based on students' development levels or prior experience.

Agenda Book

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

- 1) Information technology is not currently being used to systematically and consistently aggregate or analyze data for the purpose of program improvement.
- 2) The assessment system does not have a complete data set for the last two years.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

- 1) There is no systematic mechanism in place to ensure that all candidates have the opportunity to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn.

Standard 4: Diversity

- 1) The composition of the faculty does not represent cultural diversity.
- 2) The unit does not have a systematic method to ensure that all candidates work with racially diverse students.
- 3) There is no clear indication of how diversity proficiencies are measured during clinical practice. Assessments of candidate proficiencies do not provide data on candidates' abilities to help all students learn.

Continued

Standard 2: Assessment System and Evaluation

- 1) Not all data are aggregated, summarized, evaluated, and regularly distributed to decision-making bodies.

New

There were no new areas for improvement cited in the BOE Report.

The AAC voted to accept the areas for improvement as cited in the BOE Report.

Pursuant to 16 KAR 5:010, Section 20, the AAC accepts the areas for improvement identified above and recommends: (1) ACCREDITATION and (2) APPROVAL OF THE INITIAL LEVEL EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS at Alice Lloyd College.

Groups/Persons Consulted

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

Alternative Actions:

Issue One: Unit Accreditation

1. Accept the recommendation of the AAC and grant ACCREDITATION for Alice Lloyd College.
2. Do not accept the AAC recommendation and REVOKE ACCREDITATION for Alice Lloyd College.

Issue Two: Program Approval

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

AAC Recommendation:

Issue One: Alternative 1

Issue Two: Alternative 1

Rationale:

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

Contact Person:

Dr. Marilyn Troupe, Director
Division of Educator Preparation
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: marilyn.troupe@ky.gov

Executive Director

Date:

September 22, 2008

Agenda Book

Accreditation Audit Committee (AAC)

**Education Professional Standards Board
Conference Room A
July 25, 2008**

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:

Judi Conrad, Chair
Shirley Nelson
Ann Walls
Tim Watkins
Diane Woods-Ayers

EPSB Staff Present:

Marilyn Troupe
Allison Bell
Elizabeth Springate

Members Absent:

Jack Rose
Zella Wells

Judi Conrad opened the meeting at 8:55 a.m. and announced a quorum was present.

Marilyn Troupe reviewed the decision options for first accreditation and continuing accreditation visits.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion made by Ann Walls, seconded by Tim Watkins, to approve the minutes from the March 27, 2008 AAC meeting.

Vote: Approve the motion (Yes: Unanimous (4-0))

Diane Woods-Ayers arrived after the approval of the minutes but before the first institution was reviewed.

Marilyn Troupe announced to the group that Elizabeth Springate is planning to retire as of September 1, 2008. Ann Walls made a motion for commendation for Elizabeth Springate for her 33 years of service to education in Kentucky and her assistance to the AAC. Motion was seconded by Tim Watkins. Vote: Approve the motion (*Yes: Unanimous (5-0)*).

The AAC reviewed the documentation including the Institutional Reports (IR), Board of Examiner (BOE) team reports, institutional rejoinders, annual data and narrative reports, and made recommendations for accreditation and program approval for:

ALICE LLOYD COLLEGE

Dr. Jacqueline Hansen, who served as chair of the state Board of Examiners (BOE) team, gave an overview of the visit, including team representatives and the areas for improvement by standard. Dr. Hansen attested that the BOE team was an excellent group of dedicated professionals who worked together to complete this visit. Although the BOE focused its review of the previously unmet standards and the cited areas for improvement, it did review all the standards and elements. Dr. Hansen stated the team found all standards were met and the team identified seven corrected areas for improvement as follows:

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

- 1) Teacher candidates are not consistently assessing P-12 student learning or developing learning experiences based on students' developmental levels or prior experience.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

- 1) Information technology is not currently being used to systematically and consistently aggregate or analyze data for the purpose of program improvement.
- 2) The assessment system does not have a complete data set for the last two years.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

- 1) There is no systematic mechanism in place to ensure that all candidates have the opportunity to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn.

Standard 4: Diversity

- 1) The composition of the faculty does not represent cultural diversity.
- 2) The unit does not have a systematic method to ensure that all candidates work with racially diverse students.
- 3) There is no clear indication of how diversity proficiencies are measured during clinical practice. Assessments of candidate proficiencies do not provide data on candidates' abilities to help all students learn.

Dr. Hansen indicated that the team cited one continuing area for improvement in Standard 2: Assessment System and Evaluation:

Not all data are aggregated, summarized, evaluated, and regularly distributed to decision-making bodies.

The BOE team cited no new areas for improvement. Dr. Hansen was complimentary of the college's efforts to address the areas for improvement and meet all the standards.

Dr. Parker Tiller, Chair of the Education Department at Alice Lloyd College, spoke in appreciation of the BOE team and the EPSB staff for their efforts. Mr. Jim Silliman, Director of Assessment and Institutional Research, spoke in regards to the unit's efforts in addressing the area for improvement cited in Standard 2. The unit has developed plans for dissemination of data through regularly scheduled faculty meetings. He has requested and received assistance from colleagues at other institutions regarding the collection, aggregation and summarization of data. Dr. Claude Crum, Academic Dean, offered thanks to the BOE team for its professionalism and thoroughness of the team in an effort to strengthen its programs.

Questions and comments from the AAC committee members related to the self-reported low scores of the Praxis II tests in Social Studies and Physical Education. Dr. Tiller indicated that the unit has plans to address these concerns with the faculty heads. A question about the field experience placements was raised in how the unit ensures a diverse experience if the candidate self-selects the placement. Dr. Tiller explained that the unit has identified certain criteria each placement must meet before it is approved. Although a candidate can select the field placement, the Director of Field Experiences must affirm that the placement meets the criteria identified by the unit.

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

- 1) Voted unanimously (5-0) that the BOE team followed approved accreditation guidelines when conducting the visit.
- 2) Voted unanimously (5-0) to agree with the corrected areas for improvement cited in the BOE Report.
- 3) Voted unanimously (5-0) to agree with the continuing area for improvement.
- 4) Voted unanimously (5-0) that all standards are met.

In addition to decisions identified above, the AAC recommends **PROGRAM APPROVAL** and **ACCREDITATION** for Alice Lloyd College (Vote: Unanimous (5-0).

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

Tim Watkins recused from the committee for this report.

Dr. Renee Campoy served as co-chair on the NCATE/state joint continuing accreditation visit to UK. She presented an overview of the team members and commented on the members' professionalism, abilities to ask pertinent questions, and persistence in understanding of the information before making its decisions. She indicated the team was very thorough. Dr. Campoy attested there was sufficient evidence provided by the unit to merit removing previously cited

areas for improvement. The coordination and understanding of the School Social Work program between the College of Social Work and the College of Education has been defined and clarified. The unit has increased its budget and put many efforts into upgrading the technology and the use of the facilities.

Corrected Areas for Improvement:

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

- 1) (Advanced) Evidence does not show that candidates in school social work are competent in their field.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

- 1) (Advanced) The unit's authority over the school social work program is not well defined.
- 2) (Initial and Advanced) The unit has limited and outdated physical space to ensure high quality instruction.

Dr. Campoy attested that the BOE team found all standards met and the team did not cite any continued or new areas for improvement

Dr. Rosetta Sandidge and Dr. Deborah Slaton represented the University of Kentucky (UK). Dr. Sandidge who is the current Interim Dean but served as Associate Dean and NCATE Coordinator at the time of the visit affirmed the thoroughness of the review. She was complimentary of the time, work, and effort of UK's faculty and staff of all the planning and training completed while in preparation for the visit. She was also complimentary of the working relationship between the NCATE and state team members.

There were no questions from the AAC committee members related to the standards or areas for improvement. Dr. Shirley Nelson noted the well written BOE report. Diane Woods-Ayers asked for clarification in Standard 6 regarding the structure of the unit's governance, specifically the program faculties. Drs. Campoy and Sandidge explained the composition and the decision making process for the unit starting with the individual program representatives (called program faculties). Dr. Sandidge affirmed that the structure was unique and indicated that coordinating the program faculties was vital because the unit has 45 programs across 7 colleges.

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

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

In addition to decisions identified above, the AAC recommends **PROGRAM APPROVAL** and **ACCREDITATION** for the University of Kentucky (Vote: Unanimous (4-0)).

GEORGETOWN COLLEGE

Dr. Bonnie Marshall served as co-chair on the NCATE/state joint first accreditation visit to Georgetown College. She presented an overview of the team membership, the standards and the areas for improvement. She was complimentary of the unit's preparedness for the visit. As this was a first visit there were no previously cited areas for improvement to review. The following areas for improvement were cited by the BOE team:

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

- 1) The unit assessment system does not collect follow-up data for graduates of advanced programs.

Standard 4: Diversity

- 1) Initial candidates have limited opportunities to interact with **candidates** from **other** diverse backgrounds.*

* NCATE changed the wording of this area for improvement as follows: Initial candidates have limited opportunities to interact with **peers** from diverse backgrounds.

Dr. Rebecca Powell, Dean of the Department of Education, and Dr. Eve Proffitt, Dean of the Graduate Education Department, spoke on behalf of the unit. Dr. Powell agreed with the findings of the BOE team and was also complimentary of the team's thoroughness. She provided a handout to the AAC which identified the unit's plan for addressing the areas for improvement.

Diane Woods-Ayers asked for additional information regarding the Bishop College initiatives and the unit's recruitment and outreach to other surrounding counties in addition to Scott County. Dr. Powell indicated the unit does have a grant to work with Bourbon, Harrison, and Fayette counties on English Language Learner initiatives.

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

- 1) Voted unanimously (5-0) that the BOE team followed approved accreditation guidelines when conducting the visit.
- 2) Voted unanimously (5-0) to agree with the new areas for improvement cited in the BOE Report.
- 3) Voted unanimously (5-0) that all standards are met.

In addition to decisions identified above, the AAC recommends **PROGRAM APPROVAL** and **ACCREDITATION** for Georgetown College (Vote: Unanimous (5-0)).

Meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Agenda Book

Agenda Book

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

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

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

(3) Decision options following a first accreditation visit shall 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 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

(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.

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:

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

Agenda Book

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.

**KENTUCKY EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Action Item C

Action Item:

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

Applicable Statute or Regulation:

KRS 161.028
16 KAR 5:010

Applicable Goal:

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

Issue:

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

Background:

A joint NCATE/state Board of Examiners (BOE) team conducted the on-site evaluation of the Educator Preparation Unit at Georgetown College on November 3 – 7, 2007. The BOE team found all standards were met with two areas for improvement. There were no corrected or continued areas for improvement as this was Georgetown College's first joint NCATE/State accreditation visit. The BOE also reviewed program review documents as part of the on-site visit and found them to be in compliance with program guidelines as established and approved by the EPSB. At its July 25, 2008 meeting, the Accreditation Audit Committee (AAC) met (see attached minutes) and reviewed the accreditation materials, including the institutional report, the BOE Report, and the unit's rejoinder.

The AAC reviewed each area for improvement cited in the BOE Report. As this was a first NCATE/State joint visit, there were no corrected or continued areas for improvement. There were two new areas for improvement cited by the BOE team.

New

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

- 1) The unit assessment system does not collect follow-up data for graduates of advanced programs.

Standard 4: Diversity

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

NCATE worded this area for improvement differently in the accreditation action letter it sent to Georgetown on May 1, 2008. NCATE cited the area for improvement as:

- 1) Initial candidates have limited opportunities to interact with peers from diverse backgrounds.

The AAC voted to agree with the new areas for improvement cited in the BOE Report. Pursuant to 16 KAR 5:010, Section 20, the AAC accepts the areas for improvement listed above and recommends: (1) ACCREDITATION and (2) APPROVAL OF THE INITIAL AND ADVANCED LEVEL EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS at Georgetown College.

Groups/Persons Consulted

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

Alternative Actions:

Issue One: Unit Accreditation

1. Accept the recommendation of the AAC and grant ACCREDITATION for Georgetown College.
2. Modify the AAC recommendation and grant PROVISIONAL ACCREDITATION for Georgetown College.
3. Do not accept the AAC recommendation and DENY ACCREDITATION for Georgetown College.

Issue Two: Program Approval

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

AAC Recommendation:

Issue One: Alternative 1

Issue Two: Alternative 1

Rationale:

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

Contact Person:

Dr. Marilyn Troupe, Director
Division of Educator Preparation
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: marilyn.troupe@ky.gov

Executive Director

Date:

September 22, 2008

Agenda Book

Agenda Book

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

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

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

(3) Decision options following a first accreditation visit shall 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 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

(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.

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:

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

Agenda Book

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.

**KENTUCKY EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Action Item D

Action Item:

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

Applicable Statute or Regulation:

KRS 161.028
16 KAR 5:010

Applicable Goal:

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

Issue:

Should the EPSB grant continuing accreditation to the Educator Preparation Unit and approve the initial and advanced level preparation programs at the University of Kentucky?

Background:

A joint NCATE/state Board of Examiners (BOE) team conducted the on-site evaluation of the Educator Preparation Unit at the University of Kentucky on November 10 – 14, 2007. The BOE team found all standards were met with three corrected areas for improvement, no continued areas for improvement, and no new areas for improvement. The BOE also evaluated program review documents as part of the on-site visit and found them to be in compliance with program guidelines as established and approved by the EPSB. At its July 25, 2008 meeting, the Accreditation Audit Committee (AAC) met (see attached minutes) and reviewed the accreditation materials, including the institutional report, the BOE Report, and the unit's rejoinder.

The AAC reviewed each area for improvement cited in the BOE Report. There were three corrected areas for improvement and no continuing or new areas for improvement cited by the BOE team.

Corrected

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

- 1) (Advanced) Evidence does not show that candidates in school social work are competent in their field.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

- 1) (Advanced) The unit's authority over the school social work program is not well defined.
- 2) (Initial and Advanced) The unit has limited and outdated physical space to ensure high quality instruction.

The AAC voted to agree with the findings of the BOE team as cited in the BOE Report and by NCATE. Pursuant to 16 KAR 5:010, Section 20, the AAC accepts the corrected areas for improvement listed above and recommends: (1) ACCREDITATION and (2) APPROVAL OF THE INITIAL AND ADVANCED LEVEL EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS at the University of Kentucky.

Groups/Persons Consulted

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

Alternative Actions:

Issue One: Unit Accreditation

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

Issue Two: Program Approval

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

AAC Recommendation:

Issue One: Alternative 1

Issue Two: Alternative 1

Agenda Book

Rationale:

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

Contact Person:

Dr. Marilyn Troupe, Director
Division of Educator Preparation
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: marilyn.troupe@ky.gov

Executive Director

Date:

September 22, 2008

Agenda Book

Agenda Book

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

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

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

(3) Decision options following a first accreditation visit shall 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 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

(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.

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:

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

Agenda Book

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.

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Action Item E

Action Item:

Emergency Review of Certification Program Pursuant to the 2006-2007 Title II Report

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028 and 030
16 KAR 5:010

Applicable Goal:

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

Issue:

Should the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) accept the Executive Director's recommendation subsequent to the emergency review conducted on the basis of the 2006-2007 Title II Report?

Background:

Pursuant to KRS 161.028 (1), the EPSB oversees all educator preparation programs in the Commonwealth. Accordingly, the board established the Emergency Review of Certification Programs Procedure (September 22, 2003), which authorizes the Executive Director to request information regarding any program in which one or more Praxis (or state) assessments required for certification in the respective area evidence a pass rate below 80 percent on the annual Title II Report. For cells of fewer than 10 persons, an aggregate of program completer data from the past three years is used. Any certification area having less than a total of three program completers for the past three years is not reported.

Based on the 2006-2007 Title II Report results, the Executive Director in May 2008 sent a letter to Eastern Kentucky University concerning the 78 percent pass rate on the Art Making (0131) Praxis examination. The letter requested a plan for improving the pass rate for the listed test. The university responded with a thoughtful and complete letter that included planned procedures designed to ensure an improved pass rate on the Praxis test for the Art Making program. Some of the procedures have already been implemented, and others are planned for fall 2008. (EKU letter mailed under separate cover.) The recommendation of the Executive Director is to accept the letter from Eastern Kentucky University with no follow-up action necessary.

Alternative Action:

1. Accept and approve the recommendation of the Executive Director
2. Modify and approve the recommendation of the Executive Director
3. Do not approve the recommendation pursuant to the Executive Director's emergency program review

Staff Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

The institution was responsive in addressing the Executive Director's concerns regarding Praxis pass rates. Staff will review the 2007-2008 pass rates to determine if the implemented procedures improve the score.

Contact Person:

Dr. Marilyn K. Troupe, Director
Division of Educator Preparation
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: marilyn.troupe@ky.gov

Executive Director

Date:

September 22, 2008

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Action Item F

Action Item:

2006-07 Title II Report

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

Title II of the 1998 Higher Education Act
KRS 161.028, 161.030
16 KAR 5:010

Applicable Goal:

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

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

Issue 1: Should the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) designate Thomas More College as “at risk of low performing” for the Federal Title II Report due to the summary pass rate of less than 80 percent?

Issue 2: Should the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) approve the Title II Report for 2006/2007 for submission to the United States Department of Education (USDOE)?

Background:

Issue 1:

Of the 27 reporting institutions, 26 institutions achieved the 80 percent summary pass rate for this reporting year. Thomas More College had a 79 percent summary pass rate. The college was notified by the executive director June 2008 that the pass rate and the designation of “at risk of low performing” would be included on the Title II Report.

Issue 2: 2006-07 Title II Report

Title II of the Higher Education Act supports efforts to improve the recruitment, preparation, and induction of new teachers, and includes reporting requirements for institutions and states regarding teacher preparation and certification. Section 207 of the Act requires the annual preparation and submission of three reports on teacher preparation and certification: one from institutions to the states, one from the states to the U.S. Secretary of Education, and one from the Secretary to the U.S. Congress and the public.

Agenda Book

Kentucky's teacher preparation institutions submitted the 2006-07 annual report (Title II reporting is always one year behind the current year) to the EPSB. EPSB staff will submit the 2006-07 state report to the U.S. Secretary of Education in October. Attached are the Summary of the 2006-07 Praxis Pass Rates and Five-Year Comparison as submitted for all Kentucky institutions, public and independent (programs with fewer than ten completers cannot be publicly identified). The complete Title II Report will be available for review at the September board meeting.

Alternative Actions:

Issue 1:

1. Approve the "at risk of low performing" designation for Thomas More College due to summary pass rate of less than 80 percent for the Federal Title II Report.
2. Do not approve the "at risk of low performing" designation for Thomas More College due to summary pass rate of less than 80 percent for the Federal Title II Report.

Issue 2:

1. Approve the 2006-07 Title II Report for submission to the USDOE
2. Do not approve the 2006-07 Title II Report for submission to the USDOE

Staff Recommendation:

Issue 1

Alternative 1

Issue 2

Alternative 1

Rationale:

The Title II Report for 2006/2007 was compiled in accordance with federal requirements, and all information contained therein was verified by the institutions and by EPSB staff. The report must be submitted by October 7, 2008. The Quality Performance Index was removed from regulation 16 KAR 5:010 last year, requiring a separate action by the board for Thomas More College.

Contact Person:

Dr. Marilyn K. Troupe, Director
Division of Educator Preparation
(502) 564-4606
E-mail: marilyn.troupe@ky.gov

Executive Director

Date:

September 22, 2008

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Action Item G

Action Item:

2008-09 Emergency Non-Certified School Personnel Program

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

16 KAR 2:030, Section 3

Applicable Goal:

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

Issue:

Should the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) approve the local school districts' applications for the Emergency Non-Certified School Personnel Program, 2008-09, as recommended by staff?

Background:

Pursuant to 16 KAR 2:030, Section 3, a school district may submit a written application for participation in the Emergency Non-Certified School Personnel Program any time during the school year. Under separate cover is a list of the school districts that staff is recommending for continuance in the program for the 2008-09 school year, as well the addition of Fulton Independent as a new participant in the program for the upcoming year.

Alternative Actions:

1. Approve staff recommendations
2. Modify and approve staff recommendations
3. Do not approve staff recommendations

Staff Recommendation:

Alternative 1

Rationale:

All districts recommended have submitted a year-end summary report as required by 16 KAR 2:030 and have requested continuation in this program for 2008-09. Fulton Independent has submitted a qualifying application as reviewed by staff.

Contact Person:

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

Executive Director

Date:

September 22, 2008

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Action Item, Waiver

Action Item:

Request to waive language in 16 KAR 6:010 pertaining to Elementary P-5 and Middle School (5-9) English certification assessment requirements

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028; KRS 161.030
16 KAR 6:010

Applicable Goal:

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

Issue:

Should the Education Professional Standards Board waive language in 16 KAR 6:010 requiring an individual pursuing Elementary (P-5) and Middle School (5-9) English certification to successfully complete the Praxis II *Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K-6 (0522)* or *5-9 (0523)*, *Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (0014)*, and *Middle School English Language Arts (0049)*?

Background:

Kentucky requires the following Praxis II tests for Elementary (P-5) certification:

- *Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K-6 (0522)* and
- *Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (0014)*

Kentucky requires the following Praxis II tests for Middle School (5-9) English certification:

- *Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5-9 (0523)* and
- *Middle School English Language Arts (0049)*

To determine whether the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (*MTTC*) *96 Basic Skills, MTTC 02 English, and MTTC 84 Social Studies* tests are equivalent to the Praxis II *Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K-6 (0522)*, *Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (0014)* *Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5-9 (0523)* and/or *Middle School English Language Arts (0049)*, staff reviewed the MTTC Study Guides and Test Objectives as well as the Educational Testing Service (ETS) Test at a Glance (TAAG) documents. Below is a summary of the review.

Agenda Book

The *MTTC 96 Basic Skills* test consists of approximately 85 multiple-choice items and one written performance assignment that assesses basic knowledge and skills in the areas of reading, mathematics, and writing.

The *MTTC 02* is a multiple-choice item test that covers four test objectives:

- Meaning and Communication
- Literature and Understanding
- Genre and Craft of Language
- Skills and Processes

The *MTTC 84 Social Studies* test is a multiple-choice item test that covers five content areas:

- Historical Perspective
- Geographic Perspective
- Civic Perspective
- Economic Perspective
- Inquiry and Public Discourse and Decision Making

The Praxis II (0049) is a multiple-choice and constructed-response item test that includes the following content categories:

- Reading and Literature Study
- Language and Study
- Composition and Rhetoric
- Textual Interpretation
- Teaching Reading/Writing

The Praxis II *Elementary Education: Content Knowledge* (0014) is a 120 question multiple-choice item test that includes the following content categories:

- Reading/Language Arts
- Mathematics
- Social Studies
- Science

The Praxis II *Middle School English Language Arts* (0040) is a multiple-choice and constructed-response item test that includes the following content categories:

- Reading and Literature Study
- Language Study
- Composition and Rhetoric
- Short Essays regarding Textual Interpretation and Teaching Reading/Writing

The Praxis II *Principles of Learning and Teaching Tests* include the question types and content areas listed below.

24 Multiple-Choice Items:

- Students as Learner
- Instruction and Assessment
- Teacher Professionalism

12 Short-Answer Items:

- Students as Learner
- Instruction and Assessment
- Communication Techniques
- Teacher Professionalism

Alternative Actions:

1. Do not accept the *MTTC 96 Basic Skills, MTTC 02 English, and/or MTTTC 84 Social Studies* test(s) in place of the *Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K-6 (0522), Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (0014) Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5-9 (0523)* and/or *Middle School English Language Arts (0049)*.
2. Accept the *MTTC 96 Basic Skills, MTTC 02 English, and/or MTTTC 84 Social Studies* tests in place of the *Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades K-6 (0522), Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (0014) Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 5-9 (0523)* and/or *Middle School English Language Arts (0049)*.

Staff Recommendation:

Alternative Action 1

Rationale:

Based on the MTTC Study Guides and Test Objectives as well as the Praxis II TAAG documents, *MTTC 96 Basic Skills* test does not assess the same content areas as the Praxis II (0014). The *MTTC 96* assesses basic knowledge and skills in the areas of reading, mathematics, and writing. The Praxis II (0014) test focuses on four major areas: reading/language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science. The test is designed for prospective teachers of children in primary through upper elementary school grades. The *MTTC 96* does not assess the areas of science or social studies. Even the *MTTC 96* and the *MTTC 84* tests combined are not equivalent (in content or level of difficulty) to the Kentucky-required Praxis II (0014).

The *MTTC 02* test does not measure the same content or pedagogical skills as the Praxis II (0049). In addition, the *MTTC 02* does not include the same question format as the Praxis II (0049). The *MTTC 02* is a multiple-choice item test. Praxis II (0049) includes both multiple-choice and constructed-response items. The constructed-response items assess the examinee's ability to apply critical thinking skills to situations that a teacher is likely to encounter in teaching middle school English/language arts. As a multiple-choice item test, the *MTTC 02* does not provide the prospective teacher with the opportunity to demonstrate the same application skills.

Agenda Book

The Praxis II *Principles of Learning and Teaching Tests* (0522) and (0523) are designed to assess a beginning teacher's knowledge of job-related criteria. The *MTTC* tests do not include any specific pedagogical objectives, and very few questions within the tests appear to measure pedagogical constructs. Therefore, none of the *MTTC* tests appear to be an acceptable replacement for (0522) or (0523).

Contact Person:

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

Executive Director

Date:

September 22, 2008

**EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD
STAFF NOTE**

Action Item, Alternative Route to Certification Application

Action Item:

Alternative Route to Certification Application

Applicable Statutes and Regulation:

KRS 161.028, 161.030, 161.048
16 KAR 9:010

Applicable Goal:

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

Issue:

Should the Education Professional Standards Board approve the alternative route to certification application?

Background:

The following individual is requesting certification on the basis of exceptional work experience:

Karen Phillips, Family and Consumer Science, Grades 5-12

The application will be sent under separate cover.

Alternative Actions:

1. Approve the alternative route to certification application
2. Modify and approve the alternative route to certification application
3. Do not approve the alternative route to certification application

Contact Person:

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

Executive Director

Date:

September 22, 2008

Agenda Book

Agenda Book

16 KAR 9:010. Professional certificate for exceptional work experience, limited to secondary education.

RELATES TO: KRS 161.028, 161.030, 161.048

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: KRS 161.028, 161.030, 161.048

NECESSITY, FUNCTION, AND CONFORMITY: KRS 161.048 establishes the eligibility requirements for a candidate seeking to participate in an alternative teacher preparation program. This administrative regulation establishes the requirements for issuance and renewal of a professional certificate for secondary education based on exceptional work experience.

Section 1. Definitions. (1) "Exceptional work experience" means a person with recognized superiority as compared with others in rank, status, and attainment or superior knowledge and skill in comparison with the generally accepted standards in the area in which certification is sought.

(2) "Secondary education" means the area in which certification is sought in a subject taught in grades 9 - 12 in a Kentucky school.

Section 2. Verification of exceptional qualifications of an applicant for certification, in a field of endeavor taught or service practiced in a public school of Kentucky, shall include:

(1) Sufficient documentation that demonstrates to the local school district and the Education Professional Standards Board that an applicant is one who has exceptional work experience as defined in Section 1 of this administrative regulation and has talents and abilities commensurate with the new teacher standards, established in 16 KAR 1:010;

(2) Documentation of achievement that may include advanced degrees earned, distinguished employment, evidence of related study or experience, publications, professional achievement, or recognition attained for contributions to an applicant's field of endeavor; and

(3) Recommendations from professional associations, former employers, professional colleagues, or any other individual or group whose evaluations shall support exceptional work in the field.

Section 3. Certification Requirements. An eligible candidate who meets the requirements of KRS 161.048(1) and character and fitness review established in KRS 161.040 shall be issued the provisional certificate, limited to secondary education and valid for one (1) year. Upon successful completion of the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program as established in KRS 161.030(5) to (8), the professional certificate, limited to secondary education, shall be issued and shall be valid for an additional four (4) years.

Section 4. Renewal Requirements. Each five (5) year renewal of the professional certificate identified in Section 3 of this administrative regulation shall meet the renewal requirements established in 16 KAR 4:060. (25 Ky.R. 1283; Am. 1602; eff. 1-19-99; recodified from 704 KAR 20:720, 7-2-2002.)

Agenda Book