EDUCATION AND LABOR CABINET
Education Professional Standards Board
(Amendment)

16 KAR 5:010. Standards for accreditation of educator preparation providers[and approval of programs].

RELATES TO: KRS 161.028, 161.030, 164.945, 164.946,164.947, 20 U.S.C. 1021-1022
STATUTORY AUTHORITY: KRS 161.028, 161.030
CERTIFICATION STATEMENT:
NECESSITY, FUNCTION, AND CONFORMITY: This administrative regulation establishes the standards for accreditation of an educator preparation provider. This administrative regulation complies with KRS 161.028(1)(b), which requires[authorizes] the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) to set[establish] standards for educator preparation providers, and with[and requirements for obtaining and maintaining a teaching certificate and for programs of preparation for teachers and other professional school personnel.] KRS 161.030(1), which vests the EPSB with authority over the certification of all teachers and other school personnel and requires the issuance of all certificates [issued]under KRS 161.010 to 161.126 be done[to be issued] in accordance with the EPSB's administrative regulations[of the EPSB].[This administrative regulation establishes the standards for accreditation of an educator preparation provider and approval of a program to prepare an educator.]

Section 1. Definitions.

(1) "Accreditation Audit Committee" (AAC) is the committee that assists with the transition to National Education Accreditation, presents and acknowledges National Education Accreditation results, and reviews and makes recommendations to the EPSB concerning program approval, which is governed by 16 KAR 5:015. [**"Accreditation Reviewers" means the evaluators who review educator preparation providers as part of the accreditation process.**]

[(2)] [**"Advanced programs" means educator preparation programs offered at the graduate level and designed to develop additional specialized professional skills or credentials for P-12 educators who have already completed an initial certification program.**]

[(3)] [**"CAEP" means the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation that establishes a set of national accreditation standards for educator preparation that apply to the state accreditation process.**]

(2) [(4)] "Educator Preparation Provider" (EPP) means the accredited unit at an Institution[institution] responsible for the preparation of educators.

(3) [(5)] "National Education Accreditation" means the accreditation that is granted to an EPP by a Council for Highter Education Accreditation (CHEA) approved accreditor. [**"Initial programs" means educator preparation programs offered at the undergraduate or graduate levels to prepare an individual for a first professional teaching credential. These programs are designed to prepare candidates who have not yet earned a certificate to become P-12 educators.**]

(4) [(6)] "Institution" means a college or university.[.]

(5) "Institutional Accreditation" means the accreditation that is granted to an entire Institution. This may be earned through a regional accreditor or national accreditor that is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

(6) "Title II" refers to the Federal Title II Report Card State Guidelines established in 20 U.S.C. 1022f and 1022g.

[(7)] [**"National Specialized Professional Association" means the association that defines the content area standards for specialized programs.**] [EPSB approved National

~~Specialized Professional Associations are published on the EPSB website.]~~

~~[(8)] ["State accreditation" means recognition by the EPSB that an EPP has met accreditation standards as a result of review, including an on-site team review.]~~

~~[(9)] ["Technical visit" means an on-campus, in-person visit by EPSB staff to an]i[nstitution or EPP to advise for program and accreditation reviews.]~~

~~[(10)] ["Unit" means the college, school, or department of education that is seeking a first-time EPSB accreditation.]~~

~~[(11)] ["Institutional accreditation" means the accreditation that is granted to an entire institution. This may be earned through a regional accreditor or national accreditor that is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.]~~

Section 2. General Accreditation Requirements.

(1) A Kentucky Institution~~[institution]~~ offering an educator preparation program shall have~~[:]~~

~~[(a)]~~ ~~[National accreditation]~~ National Education Accreditation by an educator preparation accreditor approved by the EPSB pursuant to KRS 161.028 as demonstrated in Section 3(2)(a) in this regulation~~[; or]~~

~~[(b)]~~ ~~[State accreditation by the EPSB]~~.

~~[(2)] [State accreditation shall be based on the EPSB-approved national accreditation standards aligned to the components enumerated in KRS 161.028(1)(b), and that are established by CAEP.]~~

~~[(a)] [The 2022 CAEP Initial-Level Standards shall be the accreditation standards for EPPs offering initial teacher certification programs.]~~

~~[(b)] [The CAEP Standards for Accreditation at the Advanced Level shall be the accreditation standards for EPPs offering advanced educator preparation programs.]~~

(2) ~~[(3)]~~ All educator preparation Institutions~~[institutions]~~ and programs operating in Kentucky that require licensure by the Council on Postsecondary Education under KRS 164.945, 164.946,164.947, and 13 KAR 1:020 shall be approved by the EPSB under this administrative regulation as a condition of offering an educator preparation program or a program leading to rank change.

(3) The developmental process for a new EPP is detailed in 16 KAR 5:015, Section 4.

(4) The developmental process for a new program in an established EPP is detailed in 16 KAR 5:015, Section 5.

(5) For continuing National Education Accreditation~~[national or state accreditation]~~, an EPP shall submit the following evidence as part of the accreditation process:

(a) Documentation submitted to the EPSB staff for Title II compliance, indicating that the EPP's summary pass rate on state licensure examinations meets or exceeds the required state pass rate of eighty (80) percent;~~[and]~~

(b) Documentation of Institutional Accreditation~~[institutional accreditation]~~. Required documentation shall include a copy of the current Institutional Accreditation~~[institutional accreditation]~~ letter or report that indicates Institutional Accreditation~~[institutional accreditation]~~ status~~[.]~~; and

(c) Documentation of National Education Accreditation through an EPSB approved national accreditor, which may include, for example, a letter from an accreditor or a report showing successful accreditation.

Section 3. Process to Seek EPSB Approval to Operate as a National Accreditor. ~~[Developmental Process for New Educator Preparation Institutions.]~~

(1) To be approved by the EPSB, a national accreditor shall apply and submit documentation of the following to the EPSB:

(a) Established rigorous standards for educator preparation that align with KRS 161.028(1)(b) and guide institutions in establishing and maintaining high-quality programs that produce evidence of academic achievement and educator performance;

(b) Attestation that all accreditation standards shall be met for an EPP to obtain and maintain accredited status;
(c) The scope of accreditation;
(d) The capacity for staff and resources to carry out the operations of the national accreditor;
(e) Public dissemination of information about the accreditation status of EPPs, including length of a term of accreditation, reasons for awarding accreditation status, information about any deficiencies in relation to accreditation standards and policies, and reasons for conditional approval or denial of accreditation;
(f) A system of quality assurance for standards, policies, and procedures that is reviewed on a cyclical basis;
(g) Policies and procedures and a governance structure that support the established accreditation and decision-making processes; and
(h) Letter(s) of support and interest from a currently accredited Kentucky EPP. [Institutions requesting approval from the EPSB to be recognized as a new EPP shall follow the four (4) stage developmental process established in this Section to gain temporary authority to admit and exit candidates and operate one (1) or more educator preparation programs. The developmental process is required whether an institution intends to seek national or state accreditation.]

(2) National accreditors approved by the EPSB shall notify the EPSB in writing of any changes to the requirements of subsection (1) of this Section of the administrative regulation and shall include the rationale for the changes. [Stage One: Application.]

[(a)] [The institution shall submit to the EPSB for review and acceptance an official notice of intent from the chief executive officer and the governing board of the institution indicating the institution's intent to begin the developmental process to become an educator preparation provider.]

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

[(c)] [The institution shall submit the following documentation:]

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

[2.] [A chart or narrative that lists all educator preparation programs to be offered by the institution, including any nontraditional and alternative programs, and shall depict:]

[a.] [The degree or award levels for each program;]

[b.] [The administrative location for each program; and]

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

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

[4.] [An organizational chart of the institution that depicts the educator preparation unit and indicates the unit's relationship to other administrative units within the college or university;]

[5.] [The name and job description of the head of the unit and an assurance that the head has the authority and responsibility for the overall administration and operation of the unit;]

[6.] [The policies and procedures that guide the operations of the unit. Required documentation shall include the cover page and table of contents for codified policies, bylaws, procedures, and student handbooks;]

[7.] [The unit's processes, including a description of the quality assurance system, to regularly monitor and evaluate its operations, the quality of its offerings, the performance of candidates, and the effectiveness of its graduates;]

[8.] [Program review documentation identified in Section 18 of this administrative regulation; and]

[9.] [The institutional accreditation. Required documentation shall include a copy of the current institutional accreditation letter or report that indicates institutional accreditation status.]

[(d)] [Stage One documentation shall be reviewed by EPSB staff and the Program Review Committee. The Program Review Committee shall make one (1) of the following recommendations:]

[1.] [Concerns identified and reported to the educator preparation unit for resolution; or]

[2.] [Recommendation to proceed to Stage Two.]

[(e)] [Following a recommendation from the Program Review Committee , EPSB staff shall make an additional technical visit to the institution.]

[(3)] [Stage Two: On-Site visit and Accreditation Audit Committee Recommendation.]

[(a)] [Nine (9) months prior to the scheduled on-site visit, the institution shall submit to the EPSB a written narrative self-study to describe the process and document that the unit has evaluated its practices against the EPSB approved accreditation standards. The written narrative may be supplemented by a chart, graph, diagram, table, or other similar means of presenting information and shall not exceed 100 pages in length.]

[(b)] [A team of trained reviewers identified by EPSB staff shall make a one (1) day visit to the institution to verify the self-study evidence.]

[(c)] [The team of three (3) shall be comprised of:]

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

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

[3.] [One (1) representative from a P-12 organization.]

[(d)] [The team shall submit a written report of its findings to the EPSB staff.]

[(e)] [The EPSB staff shall provide a copy of the written report to the institution.]

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

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

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

[1.] [Approval;]

[2.] [Approval with conditions; or]

[3.] [Denial of approval.]

[(4)] [Stage Three: EPSB Ruling.]

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

[1.] [Approval;]

[2.] [Approval with conditions; or]

[3.] [Denial of approval.]

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

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

[2.] [Continue the developmental process by pursuing accreditation as established in this administrative regulation.]

[(c)] [An institution denied temporary authorization may reapply twelve (12) months after the EPSB's decision.]

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

[1.] [Admit and exit candidates;]

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

[3.] [Provide reports to the EPSB staff on the institution's progress as requested.]

[(c)] [During the two (2) year period of temporary authorization, the EPSB staff:]

[1.] [May schedule additional technical visits; and]

[2.] [Shall monitor progress by review of annual reports and admission and exit data.]

[(5)] [Stage Four: Initial Accreditation Visit.]

[(a)] [The institution shall pursue either national or state level accreditation within two (2) years of the approval or approval with conditions of temporary authorization.]

[(b)] [If the institution pursues national accreditation, all further accreditation activities shall be governed by Section 4 of this administrative regulation.]

[(c)] [If the institution pursues state accreditation, all further accreditation activities shall be governed by Section 6 of this administrative regulation.]

Section 4. National Accreditor Revocation or Dissolution.

(1) Should the EPSB have reason to believe that a national accreditor is not upholding approved standards for educator preparation that align with KRS 161.028(1)(b) as required in Section 3(1) in this regulation, the EPSB may revoke the ability of the national accreditor to accredit Kentucky EPPs.

(2) In the event the EPSB believes revocation of the accreditation authority of a national accreditor may be warranted:

(a) The EPSB shall provide written notification of its concerns to the national accreditor;

(b) Within sixty (60) days of the date of the EPSB notification, the national accreditor shall submit a written response to the EPSB and, during that same timeframe, also may choose to attend a regularly scheduled meeting of the EPSB to verbally respond, present, and answer questions; and

(c) Within sixty (60) days of receiving the national accreditor's written response or, if no written response is submitted, within one hundred and twenty (120) days of the EPSB's written notification outlined in subsection (2), paragraph (a) of this Section of the administrative regulation, the EPSB shall make the final decision and provide final written notice to the national accreditor as well as to any EPPs known to be using that national accreditor.

(3) In the case that a national accreditor dissolves, is no longer approved by CHEA, or has their accreditation authority revoked by the EPSB, the EPSB may grant approval for the EPP to temporarily operate for a reasonable period time and in order to allow the EPP to establish an accrediting relationship with a new national accreditor. In most instances, the EPP shall be expected to provide written proof to the EPSB that they have established an accrediting relationship with a new national accreditor within a timeframe of one hundred and eighty (180) days of the dissolution of the current national accreditor.

Section 5. [Section 4.] National Accreditation Process and Decisions.

(1) An EPP may only pursue initial or continuing National Education Accreditation[national accreditation, if the]from a national accreditor that has been approved by the EPSB in accordance with Section 3 of this administrative regulation[as demonstrating the requirements of KRS 161.028].

(2) [A national accreditor seeking EPSB approval shall apply to the EPSB and submit documentation of the following:]

[(a)] [Established rigorous standards for educator preparation that align with KRS 161.028(1)(b) and guide institutions in establishing and maintaining high quality programs that produce evidence of academic achievement and educator performance;]

~~[(b)] [Attestation that all accreditation standards be met for an educator preparation provider to obtain and maintain accredited status;]~~

~~[(c)] [The scope of accreditation;]~~

~~[(d)] [The capacity for staff and resources to carry out the operations of the organization;]~~

~~[(e)] [Public dissemination of information about the accreditation status of educator preparation providers including length of a term of accreditation, reasons for awarding accreditation status, information about any deficiencies in relation to accreditation standards and policies and reasons for conditional approval or denial of accreditation;]~~

~~[(f)] [A system of quality assurance for standards, policies, and procedures that is reviewed on a cyclical basis;]~~

~~[(g)] [Policies and procedures and a governance structure that support the established accreditation and decision-making processes; and]~~

~~[(h)] [Letter(s) of support and interest from a Kentucky EPP.]~~

~~[(3)] [National accreditors approved by the EPSB shall notify the EPSB in writing of any changes to the requirements of subsection (2) of this section and shall include the rationale for the changes.]~~

~~[(4)] [If an EPP pursues initial or continuing accreditation from a national accreditor approved by the EPSB,]~~ If the EPP is granted accreditation by the national accreditor, the accreditation decision ~~[of the national accreditor]~~shall be presented for recognition by the EPSB at the next regularly scheduled meeting following the National Education Accreditation~~[national accreditation]~~ decision.

(3) ~~[(5)]~~ If the EPP is denied accreditation by the national accreditor, the EPP shall provide written notification to the EPSB within fourteen (14) days of the National Education Accreditation decision. Thereafter, and within sixty (60) days of the National Education Accreditation decision to deny accreditation, the EPP shall submit a contingency teach-out plan to the EPSB for consideration at the next regularly scheduled meeting following the deadline~~[may seek Emergency Authorization to Operate from the EPSB as outlined in Section 5 of this administrative regulation]~~.

(4) If the EPP is denied accreditation by the national accreditor, the EPP also shall provide written notification to all candidates currently admitted to a certification or rank change program as follows:

(a) A currently admitted candidate shall receive the certification or advancement in rank sought so long as:

1. The candidate is recommended for certification or advancement in rank within one (1) year of the date of the decision to deny or revoke accreditation; and

2. The candidate submits a completed application, including payment of any applicable fees, for certification or advancement in rank to the EPSB within one (1) year and ninety (90) days from the date of the decision to deny or revoke accreditation; or

(b) A candidate who does not meet the criteria established in paragraph (a) of this subsection shall transfer to an EPSB approved EPP that currently holds National Education Accreditation to receive the certificate or advancement in rank.

(5) To maintain continuing National Education Accreditation, the EPP shall follow the cycle and timelines established by the national accreditor.

(6) In the event an EPP notifies its current national accreditor mid-cycle of the intent to change to a different national accreditor for future National Education Accreditation, the EPP shall, at the same time, provide written notice of such change to the EPSB.

(7) Thereafter, and within one hundred and eighty (180) days of the notice provided to the current national accreditor and to the EPSB, the EPP shall provide written proof to the EPSB of having established an accrediting relationship with a new national accreditor.

Section 6. EPP Transition from State-Only to National Education Accreditation.

(1) Beginning with the 2027-2028 academic year, no EPP shall be permitted to choose a state-only accreditation process.

(2) An EPP with any state-issued stipulations or areas of improvement shall:

(a) At least one (1) year and one hundred and eighty (180) days prior to the next accreditation visit, submit a written report to the AAC providing a narrative notation of resolutions with aligned evidence demonstrating that the standards have been sufficiently met to ensure educator programs produce effective, high-quality teachers through evidence-based, rigorous review. Evidence submitted for these purposes shall demonstrate an intentional use of documentation, valid multiple measures, and analysis to support and prove an EPP's claims regarding adherence to accreditation standards; and

(b) At least one (1) year prior to the next accreditation visit, prepare and present changes and improvements at a regularly scheduled meeting of the AAC.

(3) The AAC shall consider the current stipulations or areas for improvement and decide to:

(a) Remove current stipulations or areas for improvement;

(b) Modify current stipulations or areas for improvement; or

(c) Retain current stipulations or areas for improvement.

(4) For any EPP for which the AAC determines to modify or retain current stipulations or areas for improvement, the AAC also shall make a recommendation to the EPSB to:

(a) Grant the EPP continued approval with National Education Accreditation that addresses the remaining stipulations or areas for improvement;

(b) Grant the EPP conditional approval, requiring the remaining stipulations or areas for improvement be addressed by providing supplemental documentation, data, or evidence as determined necessary by the EPSB; or

(c) Revoke the EPP's state-only accreditation.

Section 7. Coordination of Accreditation and Program Review Processes.

(1) ~~[(6)]~~ As part of National Education Accreditation~~[national accreditation]~~, an EPP's programs leading to educator certification and rank change shall be reviewed through the state program review process as established in 16 KAR 5:015~~[Section 17][of this administrative regulation]~~. At least two (2) years~~[Twenty-four (24) months]~~ prior to the scheduled on-site visit, the EPP shall submit programs for review in accordance with 16 KAR 5:015.~~[Section 18 of this administrative regulation.]~~

(2) ~~[(7)]~~ Prior to the scheduled on-site evaluation visit, EPSB staff shall participate in the pre-visit to the institution to serve as a state consultant to the national chair.

(3) ~~[(8)]~~ At least one (1) EPSB staff member shall be assigned as support staff and liaison during the National Education Accreditation~~[national accreditation]~~ visit and one (1) state representative trained in the standards of the national accreditor shall serve as a member of the site visit team.

~~[(9)] [To maintain continuing national accreditation, the EPP shall follow the cycle and timelines established by the national accreditor.]~~

Section 8. Annual Reporting.

(1) EPPs shall submit the following data to the EPSB annually:

(a) Verification of institution and EPP profile information;

(b) Verification of alignment to appropriate standards in each program;

(c) A list of qualified content review experts, information to include name, area of specialization, and contact information;

(d) Verification of meeting eighty (80) percent pass rate on required licensure assessments for each program;

(e) Notations of change, data collection, analysis of data, and innovations for each of the following six (6) domains:

1. Candidate admission and progression;
2. Standards alignment and coursework;
3. Professional capabilities;
4. Clinical partnerships and practice;
5. Program assessments; and
6. Quality assurance and continuous improvement.

(2) The EPSB shall have staff review each EPP's annual report to monitor progress of the EPP to continue a program of high quality.

(3) After reviewing the annual report, the EPSB may pursue punitive action against the EPP in the event the EPSB:

(a) Has reason to believe that the EPP is limited in its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates; or

(b) Observes substantive changes to the program, EPP, or Institution since its original or most recent continued program approval. For these purposes, substantive changes may include any change in the published mission or objectives of the EPP or Institution or the addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure in terms of either content or delivery from those that were offered when the EPP was most recently accredited.

(4) Failure to comply with the reporting requirements in this Section may also result in the EPSB pursuing punitive action against the EPP through either the process outlined in 16 KAR 5:015, Section 6(3)-(8), which pertains to action against the individual program(s) offered by the EPP, or Section 7, which provides a process to revoke the EPP where warranted.

Section 9. Identification of a Low Performing EPP. In compliance with Title II, the EPSB shall identify an EPP as:

(1) "At-risk of low performing" if an EPP:

(a) Has received a Praxis II or Praxis PLT pass rate below eighty (80) percent in any approved program area for a consecutive 3-year cycle; or

(b) Is assigned an accreditation status by a nationally recognized accrediting body that indicates deficiencies, stipulations, or required corrective actions, regardless of the specific terminology used by the accreditor; or

(2) "Low performing" if an EPP:

(a) Has received a Praxis II or Praxis PLT pass rate below eighty (80) percent in at least fifty (50) percent of approved program areas; or

(b) Is assigned an accreditation status by a nationally recognized accrediting body that indicates significant deficiencies, stipulations, or required corrective actions, regardless of the specific terminology used by the accreditor.

~~[Section 5.] [Emergency Authorization to Operate (EAO).]~~

~~[(1)] [If a Kentucky EPP seeks initial or continuing national accreditation from a national accreditor approved by the EPSB and is denied accreditation, the EPP may apply for an EAO.]~~

~~[(2)] [An EAO shall allow the EPP to temporarily operate for one (1) year or two (2) academic terms.]~~

~~[(3)] [The EPP shall not admit new candidates during the EAO period.]~~

~~[(4)] [The application for an EAO shall be made from the EPP to the EPSB within five (5) business days of the date of the official notification by the national accreditor that the EPP was denied national accreditation.]~~

~~[(5)] [The EPSB staff shall conduct a technical visit to the EPP within ten (10) business days of receipt of the request for EAO.]~~

[(6)] [The EPP shall submit a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) addressing all identified deficiencies from their national accreditation within fifteen (15) calendar days following the technical visit.]

[(7)] [The CAP shall be reviewed by the Accreditation Audit Committee for recommendation to the EPSB for state accreditation, state accreditation with conditions, state accreditation with probation, or denial.]

[(8)] [The EPSB shall review the recommendation from the Accreditation Audit Committee at the next EPSB meeting and make the determination to grant the EPP state accreditation, state accreditation with conditions, state accreditation with probation, or deny accreditation.]

[Section 6.] [State Accreditation.]

[(1)] [EPPs seeking first or continuing state accreditation shall be on a seven (7)year review cycle.]

[(2)] [If an EPP held national accreditation prior, but now seeks state accreditation, the EPP shall be reviewed for state accreditation in the same year as their previous national cycle.]

[(3)] [Twenty-four (24) months prior to the scheduled on-site visit, the EPP shall submit programs for review in accordance with Section 18 of this administrative regulation.]

[(4)] [Nine (9) months prior to the on-site visit the EPP shall submit a self-study document and supporting evidence that address the state accreditation standards.]

[(5)] [Assigned accreditation reviewers shall conduct an offsite review of the self-study and supporting evidence and produce a Formative Feedback Report to the EPP. 009]

[Section 7.] [Accreditation Reviewers.]

[(1)] [Accreditation Reviewers shall be comprised of:]

[(a)] [Teacher educators;]

[(b)] [P-12 teachers and administrators; and]

[(c)] [State and local policymaker groups.]

[(2)] [Accreditation reviewers shall be trained on the CAEP accreditation standards.]

[(3)] [The EPSB staff shall select and appoint for each scheduled on-site accreditation a team of Accreditation Reviewers giving consideration to the number and type of programs offered by the institution.]

[(4)] [The EPSB staff shall identify a chair for the team.]

[Section 8.] [State Accreditation Previsit to the Institution. No later than one (1) month prior to the scheduled on-site evaluation visit, the EPSB staff and team chair shall conduct a pre-visit to the institution to make a final review of the arrangements.]

[Section 9.] [State On-site Accreditation Visit.]

[(1)] [At least one (1) staff member of the EPSB shall be assigned as support staff and liaison during the accreditation visit.]

[(2)] [The educator preparation institution shall reimburse a state team member for travel, lodging, and meals in accordance with 200 KAR 2:006.]

[(3)] [The Accreditation Reviewers shall conduct an on-site evaluation of the self-study materials prepared by the institution and seek out additional information, as needed, to make a determination as to whether the standards were met for the accreditation of the institution's educator preparation unit and for the approval of an individual educator preparation program..]]

[(4)]

[(a)] [An off-campus site that offers a self-standing program shall require a team review. If additional team time is required for visiting an off-campus site, the team chair, the institution, and the EPSB shall negotiate special arrangements.]

[(b)] [Off-campus programs shall be:]

[1.] [Considered as part of the unit and the unit shall be accredited, not the off-campus programs; and]

[2.] [Approved in accordance with Section 23 of this administrative regulation.]

[(5)] [Accreditation reviewers shall recommend findings on each of the accreditation standards. A recommendation about each standard shall be limited to the following options:]

[(a)] [Met;]

[(b)] [Met, with one (1) or more defined areas for improvement; or]

[(c)] [Not met.]

[(6)]

[(a)] [The Accreditation Reviewers shall review each program and cite the areas for improvement for each, if applicable.]

[(b)] [The Accreditation Reviewers shall define the areas for improvement in its report.]

[(7)] [The EPP may submit within thirty (30) working days of receipt of the report a written rejoinder that may be supplemented by materials pertinent to a conclusion found in the evaluation report.]

[(a)] [The accreditation documentation shall be provided for review by the Accreditation Audit Committee and EPSB.]

[(b)] [An unmet standard or area of improvement cited by the team may be recommended for change or removal by the Accreditation Audit Committee or by the EPSB because of evidence presented in the rejoinder.]

[Section 10.] [Accreditation Audit Committee.]

[(1)] [The Accreditation Audit Committee shall be a committee of the EPSB, and shall report to the full EPSB. The EPSB shall appoint the Accreditation Audit Committee as follows:]

[(a)] [One (1) lay member;]

[(b)] [Two (2) classroom teachers;]

[(c)] [Four (4) EPP representatives, two (2) from a state-supported institution and two (2) from an independent educator preparation institution, appointed from nominees provided by the Kentucky Association of Colleges for Teacher Education; and]

[(d)] [One (1) school administrator.]

[(2)] [The chair of the EPSB shall designate a member of the Accreditation Audit Committee to serve as its chair.]

[(3)] [An appointment shall be for a period of four (4) years except that three (3) of the initial appointments shall be for a two (2) year term. A member may serve an additional term if renominated and reappointed in the manner established for membership. A vacancy shall be filled as it occurs in a manner consistent with the provisions for initial appointment.]

[(4)] [Following an on-site accreditation visit, the Accreditation Audit Committee shall review the reports and materials constituting an institutional self-study, the report of the accreditation reviewers, and the institutional response to the evaluation report. The committee shall then prepare a recommendation for consideration by the EPSB.]

[(a)] [The committee shall review procedures of the Accreditation Reviewers to determine whether approved accreditation guidelines were followed.]

[(b)] [For each institution, the committee shall make a recommendation with respect to the accreditation of the institutional unit for educator preparation as well as for approval of the individual programs of preparation.]

[(c)] [For first accreditation, one (1) of four (4) recommendations shall be:]

[1.] [Accreditation;]

[2.] [Provisional accreditation with conditions;]

[3.] [Provisional Accreditation with probation; or]

[4.] [Denial of accreditation.]

[(d)] [For regular continuing accreditation, one (1) of four (4) recommendations shall be:]

[1.] [Accreditation;]

[2.] [Accreditation with conditions;]

[3.] [Accreditation with probation; or]

[4.] [Revocation of accreditation..]]

[(5)] [The Accreditation Reviewers Team Chair may write a separate response to the recommendation of the Accreditation Audit Committee if the Accreditation Audit Committee's decision differs from the Accreditation Reviewer's evaluation report.]

[Section 11.] [Official State Accreditation Action by the EPSB.]

[(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 EPP.]

[(3)] [Decision options following a first accreditation visit shall be "accreditation", "provisional accreditation with conditions", "provisional accreditation with probation", or "denial of accreditation".]

[(a)] [Accreditation.]

[1.] [This accreditation decision indicates that the EPP meets each of the standards for accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the educator preparation 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 for seven (7) years following the semester of the visit.]

[(b)] [Provisional accreditation with conditions.]

[1.] [This accreditation decision indicates that the EPP has three (3) or more areas for improvement within one (1) standard or multiple areas for improvement across multiple standards. The EPP has accredited status but shall satisfy conditions by providing evidence of addressing each area for improvement. The EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the areas for improvement within six (6) months of the accreditation decision. Following the review of the documentation, the EPSB shall decide to:]

[a.] [Accredit;]

[b.] [Provisionally accredit with probation; or]

[c.] [Deny accreditation.]

[2.] [If the EPP is accredited, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester of the first accreditation visit.]

[(c)] [Provisional Accreditation with Probation.]

[1.] [This accreditation decision indicates that the EPP has not met one (1) or more of the accreditation standards. The EPP has accredited status but is on probation. The EPP shall schedule an on-site visit within two (2) years of the semester in which the provisional probationary decision was rendered. The EPP as part of this visit shall address the unmet standard and the identified areas for improvement. Following the on-site review, the EPSB shall decide to:]

[a.] [Accredit; or]

[b.] [Deny accreditation.]

[2.] [If the EPP is accredited, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester of the first accreditation visit.]

[(d)] [Denial of accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the EPP does not meet two (2) or more of the standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates.]

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

[(a)] [Accreditation.]

[1.] [This accreditation decision indicates that the EPP meets each of the standards for accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the EPPs attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the EPP shall 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 EPP has met all standards, but has three (3) or more areas of improvement within one (1) standard or multiple areas for improvement across multiple accreditation standards. If the EPSB renders this decision, the EPP shall maintain its accredited status, but shall satisfy conditions by addressing each area for improvement in a written report. EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the areas for improvement within six (6) months of the decision to accredit with conditions. Following the review of the documentation, the EPSB shall decide to:]

[a.] [Continue accreditation;]

[b.] [Continue accreditation with probation; or]

[c.] [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 EPP has not met one (1) or more of the accreditation 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 EPP shall schedule an on-site visit within two (2) years of the semester in which the probationary decision was rendered. The EPSB Staff shall schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the accreditation with probation decision was granted. 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 seven (7) years after the semester of the continuing accreditation visit.]

[(d)] [Revocation of accreditation. This decision follows a probationary visit and indicates that the EPP does not meet one (1) or more of the accreditation 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 requirements of accreditation, such as loss of state program approval, national accreditation for educator preparation, or institutional

accreditation;]

[2.] [Misrepresents its accreditation status to the public;]

[3.] [Falsely reports data or plagiarized information submitted for accreditation and program review purposes; or]

[4.] [Fails to submit annual reports or other documents required for accreditation and program review.]

[(5)] [Notification of the EPSB action to revoke continuing accreditation or deny first accreditation shall include notice that:]

[(a)] [The EPP shall inform candidates currently admitted to a certification or rank program of the following:]

[1.] [A candidate 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 candidate who does not meet the criteria established in subparagraph 1. of this paragraph shall transfer to an EPSB accredited EPP to receive the certificate or advancement in rank.]

[(b)] [An institution for which the EPSB has denied or revoked accreditation may seek national or state accreditation. For state accreditation, 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. During this two (2) year period, candidates may not be admitted to any educator preparation program.]

[Section 12.] [Revocation for Cause.]

[(1)] [If an area of concern or an allegation of misconduct arises between accreditation visits, staff shall bring a complaint to the EPSB for initial review.]

[(2)] [After review of the allegations in the complaint, the EPSB may change the accreditation status of the EPP or refer the matter to the Accreditation Audit Committee for further investigation.]

[(3)]

[(a)] [Notice of the EPSB's decision to refer the matter and the complaint shall be sent to the EPP.]

[(b)] [Within thirty (30) days of receipt of the complaint, the EPP shall respond to the allegations in writing and provide evidence pertaining to the allegations in the complaint to the EPSB.]

[(4)]

[(a)] [The Accreditation Audit Committee shall review any evidence supporting the allegations and any information provided by the EPP.]

[(b)] [Upon completion of the review, the Accreditation Audit Committee shall issue a report containing one (1) of the following four (4) recommendations to the EPSB:]

[1.] [Accreditation;]

[2.] [Accreditation with conditions;]

[3.] [Accreditation with probation; or]

[4.] [Revocation of accreditation.]

[(5)] [The EPP shall receive a copy of the Accreditation Audit Committee's report and may file a response to the Accreditation Audit Committee's recommendation.]

[(6)]

[(a)] [The recommendation from the Accreditation Audit Committee and the EPP's response shall be presented to the EPSB.]

[(b)] [The EPSB shall consider the findings and recommendations of the Accreditation Audit Committee and make a final determination regarding the accreditation of the

EPP.]

[Section 13.] [Public Disclosure.]

[(1)] [After an accreditation and program approval decision becomes final, the EPSB shall prepare official notice of the action. The disclosure notice shall include the essential information provided in the official letter to the institution, including the decision on accreditation, program approval, standards not met, program areas for improvement, and dates of official action.]

[(2)] [The public disclosure shall be entered into the minutes of the EPSB for the meeting in which the official action was taken by the EPSB.]

[Section 14.] [Appeals Process.]

[(1)] [If an institution seeks appeal of a decision, the institution shall appeal within thirty (30) days of receipt of the EPSB official notification. An institution shall appeal on the grounds that:]

[(a)] [A prescribed standard was disregarded;]

[(b)] [A state procedure was not followed; or]

[(c)] [Evidence of compliance in place at the time of the review and favorable to the institution was not considered.]

[(2)] [An ad hoc appeals board of no fewer than three (3) members shall be appointed by the EPSB chair from members of the Accreditation Reviewers who have not had involvement with the team visit or a conflict of interest regarding the institution. The ad hoc committee shall recommend action on the appeal to the EPSB.]

[(3)] [The consideration of the appeal shall be in accordance with KRS Chapter 13B.]

[Section 15.] [Interim Reports.]

[(1)] [Each state accredited EPP shall report to the EPSB in the third year following its previous accreditation visit to provide data about:]

[(a)] [Progress made in addressing areas for improvement identified by its last accreditation evaluation;]

[(b)] [Changes in the institution's institutional accreditation status; and]

[(c)] [Continuous improvement efforts relating to the accreditation standards.]

[(2)]

[(a)] [The EPSB staff shall review each EPP's interim report to monitor the progress of the EPP to continue a program of high quality.]

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

[Section 16.] [In compliance with the Federal Title II Report Card State Guidelines established in 20 U.S.C. 1022f and 1022g, the EPSB shall identify an EPP as:]

[(1)] ["At-risk of low performing" if an EPP has received a:]

[(a)] [State accreditation rating of "provisional";]

[(b)] [State accreditation rating of "accreditation with conditions";]

[(c)] [Summative Praxis II pass rate below eighty (80) percent ; or]

[(d)] [National accreditation rating of "accreditation with stipulation"; or]

[(2)] ["Low performing" if an EPP has received a state or national accreditation rating of "accreditation with probation".]

[Section 17.] [The Education Professional Standards Board shall maintain data reports related to the following:]

[(1)] [Current accreditation status of all institutions with EPSB approved programs;]

[(2)] [Contact information for the person responsible for the EPP;]

[(3)] [Year of last state accreditation visit and year of next scheduled visit;]

[(4)] [Table of the EPP's approved certification program or programs;]

[(5)] [Tables relating the EPP's total enrollment disaggregated by ethnicity and gender for the last three (3) years;]
[(6)] [Tables relating the EPP's faculty disaggregated by the number of full-time equivalents (FTE), ethnicity, and gender for the last three (3) years;]
[(7)] [Table of the number of program completers (teachers and other school professionals) for the last three (3) years;]
[(8)] [Table relating pass rates on the required assessments;]
[(9)] [Table relating pass rates for the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (if applicable);]
[(10)] [Table relating pass rates for the Kentucky Principal Internship Program (if applicable);]
[(11)] [Table indicating student teacher satisfaction with the preparation program;]
[(12)] [Table relating teacher intern satisfaction with the preparation program; and]
[(13)] [Table relating new teacher (under three (3) years) and supervisor satisfaction with the preparation program.]

[Section 18.] [Program Review Components for Developmental Process.]
[(1)] [To operate a program leading to certification or rank change, the EPP shall have its program review documents reviewed by the EPSB for each separate program of educator preparation for which the EPP is seeking approval.]
[(2)] [The following information shallbe demonstrated in the program review documentation:]
[(a)] [An overview that includes:]
[1.] [The context and unique characteristics;]
[2.] [Description of the organizational structure;]
[3.] [The vision, mission, and goals; and]
[4.] [The shared values and beliefs for educator preparation.]
[(b)] [A description of its systematic approach for continuous improvement;]
[(c)] [A description of its clinical partnerships;]
[(d)] [An alignment of the program's coursework and field and clinical experiences with the content standards of the relevant National Specialized Professional Association, student academic expectations as established in 703 KAR 4:060, and relevant state performance standards in Title 16 of the Kentucky Administrative Regulations;]
[(e)] [Identification and alignment of the program assessments to the state performance standards to assure each candidate's mastery prior to exit from the program;]
[(f)] [Identification of how the program addresses the applicable regulatory requirements of Title 16 of the Kentucky Administrative Regulations;]
[(g)] [A list of faculty responsible for and involved with the conduct of the specific program, along with the highest degree of each, qualifications for the program, and status of employment within the program and the university; and]
[(h)] [A curriculum guide provided to each candidate that includes the following:]
[1.] [Name of the program and resulting certification and rank;]
[2.] [Program admission criteria;]
[3.] [Program coursework;]
[4.] [Program exit requirements;]
[5.] [Certification requirements if they differ from the program exit requirements.]

[Section 19.] [New Program Approval for an Accredited EPP.]
[(1)] [An accredited EPP shall submit a program proposal for each new educator preparation program.]
[(2)] [A program proposal shall demonstrate the following components:]
[(a)] [A description of its clinical partnerships relevant to the new program;]

[(b)] [A description of the application of the EPP's continuous improvement plan as it pertains to the new program;]

[(c)] [An alignment of the program's coursework and field and clinical experiences with the content standards of the relevant National Specialized Professional Association, student academic expectations as established in 703 KAR 4:060, and relevant state performance standards in Title 16 of the Kentucky Administrative Regulations;]

[(d)] [Identification and alignment of the program assessments to the state performance standards to assure each candidate's mastery prior to exit from the program;]

[(e)] [Identification of how the program addresses the applicable regulatory requirements of Title 16 of the Kentucky Administrative Regulations;]

[(f)] [A list of faculty responsible for and involved with the conduct of the specific program, along with the highest degree of each, qualifications for the program, and status of employment within the program and the university; and]

[(g)] [A curriculum guide provided to each candidate that includes the following:]

[1.] [Name of the program and resulting certification and rank;]

[2.] [Program admission criteria;]

[3.] [Program coursework;]

[4.] [Program exit requirements; and]

[5.] [Certification requirements if they differ from the program exit requirements.]

[(3)] [A program shall receive EPSB approval prior to admission of students to the program. The Program approval decision options shall be:]

[(a)] [Approval with the next review scheduled during the regular accreditation cycle;]

[(b)] [Approval with conditions with a maximum of one (1) year probationary extension for correction of a specific problem to be documented through written materials or through an onsite visit. At the end of the extension, the EPSB shall decide if the documentation supports:]

[1.] [Approval; or]

[2.] [Denial.]

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

[Section 20.] [Continuing Program Approval.]

[(1)] [An EPP that has been granted approval for each of its educator preparation programs, shall submit the following for each educator preparation program for which it seeks continuing approval:]

[(a)] [Report of any changes in the program since the last EPSB review;]

[(b)] [Summary analysis of the program assessment data to identify areas of strength and weakness relevant to the educator performance standards; and]

[(c)] [Description of the program's continuous improvement plan based on the program analysis.]

[(2)] [The EPSB shall order a review of an educator preparation program if it has cause to believe that the quality of the preparation is seriously jeopardized.]

[(a)] [The review shall be conducted under the criteria and procedures established in the EPSB "Emergency Review of Certification Programs Procedure" policy incorporated by reference.]

[(b)] [Phase One Review shall require a written report about the identified program(s) and the continuous improvement plans.]

[(c)] [The Phase Two Review shall require an on-site review to be conducted by EPSB staff and a team of trained reviewers.]

[(d)] [The review shall result in a report to which the EPP may respond.]

[(c)] [The review report and EPP response shall be used by the Program Review Committee as the basis for a recommendation to the full EPSB for:]

[1.] [Approval;]

[2.] [Approval with conditions; or]

[3.] [Denial of approval for the program.]

[(f)] [If the EPSB denies approval of a program, the EPP shall notify each candidate currently admitted to that program of the EPSB action. The notice shall include the following information:]

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

[2.] [A candidate who does not meet the criteria established in subparagraph 1. of this paragraph shall transfer to an EPSB approved program to receive the certificate or advancement in rank.]

[Section 21.] [Content Review Committee.]

[(1)]

[(a)] [EPSB staff shall identify and train a content review committee in each of the certificate areas to provide content area expertise to EPSB staff and the Program Review Committee.]

[(b)] [Nominations for the content review committees shall be solicited from the education constituent groups.]

[(2)]

[(a)] [A content review committee shall review all new educator preparation program proposals to establish congruence of the program with standards of National Specialized Professional Association and appropriate state performance standards in Title 16 of the Kentucky Administrative Regulations.]

[(b)] [EPSB staff may initiate a content review committee for a continuing approval review as determined by program changes that may have occurred since the last review.]

[(3)] [A content review committee shall submit written comments to EPSB staff and the Program Review Committee for use in the program review process.]

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

[Section 22.] [Program Review Committee.]

[(1)] [The EPSB shall appoint and EPSB staff shall train a Program Review Committee representative of the constituent groups to the EPSB.]

[(2)] [The Program Review Committee shall conduct a preliminary review of the Development Process Stage One documentation for adequacy, timeliness, and conformity with the corresponding standards and Kentucky Administrative Regulations.]

[(3)] [The Program Review Committee shall send a Program Review Update to the Stage One applicants indicating whether the documentation satisfies the submission requirements. If a requirement has not been met, the applicant shall be asked to revise or send additional documentation.]

[(4)] [For new program approval, the Program Review Committee shall:]

[(a)] [Determine that the submitted material meets requirements;]

[(b)] [Ask EPSB staff to resolve with the EPP a discrepancy or omission in the report or programs;]

[(c)] [Make a recommendation for program approval to the EPSB; or]

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

[(5)] [For continuing program approval, the Program Review Committee shall:]

[(a)] [Determine that the submitted material meets requirements;]

[(b)] [Identify additional components of the program to be reviewed;]

[(c)] [Ask EPSB staff to resolve with the EPP a discrepancy or omission in the report or programs;]

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

[(e)] [Recommend that the evaluation and approval process be terminated as a result of a severe deficiency in the program.]

[(6)] [EPSB staff shall discuss a recommendation for termination with the EPP. The EPP may submit a written response that shall be presented with the Program Review Committee comments and program review documents to the full EPSB.]

[Section 23.] [Approval of Off-site Programs.]

[(1)] [Institutions in Kentucky with educator preparation programs shall seek approval from the EPSB before offering courses or whole programs at an off-campus site.]

[(a)] [The institution shall submit a written request to the EPSB to begin offering courses at the off-site location describing the location and physical attributes of the off-campus site, resources to be provided, faculty and their qualifications, and a list of courses or programs to be offered.]

[(b)] [The off-site location shall be approved by the EPSB before the institution may begin offering courses at the location.]

[Section 24.] [Incorporation by Reference.]

[(1)] [The following material is incorporated by reference:]

[(a)] ["2022 CAEP Initial Level Standards", December 2020;]

[(b)] ["CAEP Standards for Accreditation at the Advanced Level", June 2021; and]

[(c)] ["Education Professional Standards Board Emergency Review of Certification Programs Procedure", 2020.]

[(2)] [This material may be inspected, copied, or obtained, subject to applicable copyright law, at the Kentucky Department of Education, 300 Sower Boulevard, 5th Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601, Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.]

L. AMBER SNELL, Board Chair

APPROVED BY AGENCY: October 28, 2026

FILED WITH LRC: October 30, 2026 at 3:55 p.m.

CONTACT PERSON: Todd G. Allen, General Counsel, Kentucky Department of Education, 300 Sower Boulevard, 5th Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601, phone 502-564-4474, fax 502-564-9321, email regcomments@education.ky.gov.

REGULATORY IMPACT ANALYSIS AND TIERING STATEMENT

Contact Person:Todd G. Allen, Phone: 502-564-4474, Email: todd.allen@education.ky.gov

Subject Headings:Education, Education: Elementary, Education: Secondary

(1) Provide a brief summary of:

(a) What this administrative regulation does:

As currently promulgated, this administrative regulation establishes the standards for accreditation of an educator preparation provider (EPP) and for approval of a program to prepare an educator.

(b) The necessity of this administrative regulation:

This administrative regulation is necessary to comply with KRS 161.028(1)(b), which requires that the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) set standards for EPPs, and with KRS 161.030(1), which vests the EPSB with authority over the certification of all teachers and other school personnel and requires the issuance of certificates authorized under KRS 161.010-161.126 be done in accordance with the EPSB's administrative regulations.

(c) How this administrative regulation conforms to the content of the authorizing statutes:

KRS 161.028(1)(b) states, in part, that the EPSB "has the authority and responsibility to…[s]et standards for, approve, and evaluate college, university, and school district programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel." Further, KRS 161.030(1) vests the EPSB with authority over the certification of all teachers and other school personnel and requires the issuance of certificates authorized under KRS 161.010-161.126 be done in accordance with the EPSB's administrative regulations.

(d) How this administrative regulation currently assists or will assist in the effective administration of the statutes:

As currently promulgated, this administrative regulation establishes the standards for accreditation of an EPP and for approval of a program to prepare an educator in compliance with KRS 161.028(1)(b), which requires that the EPSB set standards for EPPs, and with KRS 161.030(1), which vests the EPSB with authority over the certification of all teachers and other school personnel and requires the issuance of certificates authorized under KRS 161.010-161.126 be done in accordance with the EPSB's administrative regulations.

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

(a) How the amendment will change this existing administrative regulation:

This amendment removes the state-only accreditation process currently provided for in regulation, which will necessitate all EPPs use an EPSB-approved national accreditor beginning with the 2027-2028 academic year and beyond. This amendment also removes language specific to new and continuing EPP program approvals, which will now be governed by a separate, new regulation, 16 KAR 5:015. This amendment better reflects the distinction between the accreditation and program approval processes and the entities that conduct such processes.

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

This amendment is necessary to remove the state-only accreditation review process currently provided for in regulation and to provide for a transitional process beginning in the 2027-2028 academic year, during and after which time no educator preparation provider will be permitted to use the state-only accreditation review that is being removed from the regulation through this amendment. This amendment also is necessary to remove language specific to new and continuing program approvals for accredited EPPs. Program approvals will, instead, be governed by a newly promulgated administrative regulation, 16 KAR 5:015. Separating the program approval and accreditation governance reflects the distinct nature of the two processes and the entities that conduct such processes. Finally, this amendment is necessary to set forth, in the renumbered Section 8 of this administrative regulation, "Annual Reporting" requirements for EPPs. These mandates were previously promulgated in 16 KAR 5:020; however, amendments to that regulation remove such reporting requirements, which are more appropriately addressed in this administrative regulation.

(c) How the amendment conforms to the content of the authorizing statutes:

This administrative regulation, as amended, establishes the standards for accreditation of an EPP in conformance with KRS 161.028(1)(b), which requires that the EPSB set standards for EPPs, and with KRS 161.030(1), which vests the EPSB with authority over the certification of all teachers and other school personnel and requires the issuance of certificates authorized under KRS 161.010-161.126 be done in accordance with the EPSB's administrative regulations. (d) How the amendment will assist in the effective administration of the statues: This administrative regulation, as amended, establishes the standards for accreditation of an EPP. Specifically, this amendment removes the state-only accreditation review process currently provided for in regulation and provides for a transitional process, which will begin with the 2027-2028 academic year, at which time no educator preparation provider will be permitted to use the state-only accreditation review removed by this amendment. This amendment also removes language specific to new and continuing program approvals for accredited EPPs. Program approvals will, instead, be governed by a newly promulgated administrative regulation, 16 KAR 5:015. Separating the program approval and accreditation governance reflects the distinct nature of the two processes and the entities that conduct such processes. Finally, this amendment sets forth, in the renumbered Section 8 of this administrative regulation, "Annual Reporting" requirements for EPPs. These mandates were previously promulgated in 16 KAR 5:020; however, amendments to that regulation remove such reporting requirements, which are more appropriately addressed in this administrative regulation.

(d) How the amendment will assist in the effective administration of the statutes:

No answer provided.

(3) Does this administrative regulation or amendment implement legislation from the previous five years?No.

(4) List the type and number of individuals, businesses, organizations, or state and local governments affected by this administrative regulation:

National accreditors of EPPs, EPPs, and the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE).

(5) Provide an analysis of how the entities identified in question (4) 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 (4) will have to take to comply with this administrative regulation or amendment:

National accreditors of EPPs will have to comply with the requirements of this regulation in order to be approved to accredit Kentucky EPPs. In order to be EPSB-approved, EPPs will have to implement the requirements of this regulation by using EPSB-approved national accreditors and will no longer have the option to use a state-only accreditation process. EPPs also will have to comply with the "Annual Reporting" requirements established in Section 8 of this administrative regulation. The KDE staff that support the work of EPSB and EPPs will have to implement the requirements of this regulation.

(b) In complying with this administrative regulation or amendment, how much will it cost each of the entities identified in question (4):

Implementation of this amendment is not expected to substantially increase costs for any entity identified in question (4). National accreditors may incur minimal administrative burdens to comply; however, any such costs or burdens are anticipated to be the same under this amendment as they were under the existing regulatory requirements. The state-only accreditation process that is being removed from the amended regulation was undoubtably cost efficient for EPPs, and EPPs who have previously utilized that process for compliance with this regulation may incur some increased costs and burdens in having to use, going forward, a national accreditor to comply. EPP compliance with new annual reporting requirements in this amended regulation should result in the same costs and burdens that EPPs sustained when these requirements were, instead, addressed in 16 KAR 5:020. Minimal administrative burdens may result to the KDE staff implementing the regulation; however, cumulative costs will be reduced under this amendment in light of the removal of the state-only accreditation process, which was a significant process for the KDE staff to facilitate.

(c) As a result of compliance, what benefits will accrue to the entities identified in question (4):

All parties should benefit from the clarity this amendment provides through removal of language specific to new and continuing program approvals for accredited EPPs, with program approvals now being governed by a newly promulgated administrative regulation, 16 KAR 5:015. Separating the program approval and accreditation governance reflects the distinct nature of the two processes and the entities that conduct such processes. Additionally, the KDE is anticipated to further benefit from reduced costs and burdens related to the removal of the state-only accreditation process, which was a significant process for the KDE staff to facilitate. (6) Provide an estimate of how much it will cost to implement this administrative regulation:

(6) Provide an estimate of how much it will cost the administrative body to implement this administrative regulation:

(a) Initially:

There will be minimal, if any, cost to the EPSB and the KDE to implement this administrative regulation. And, in fact, the EPSB and the KDE are anticipated to see reduced costs with the removal of the state-only accreditation process, which was a significant process for the KDE staff to facilitate.

(b) On a continuing basis:

There will be minimal, if any, cost to the EPSB and the KDE to implement this administrative regulation. And, in fact, the EPSB and the KDE are anticipated to see

reduced costs with the removal of the state-only accreditation process, which was a significant process for the KDE staff to facilitate.

(7) What is the source of the funding to be used for the implementation and enforcement of this administrative regulation or this amendment:

General funds.

(8) 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:

None.

(9) State whether or not this administrative regulation establishes any fees or directly or indirectly increases any fees:

This administrative regulation neither establishes any fees nor directly or indirectly increases any fees.

(10) TIERING: Is tiering applied?

Tiering is not applied. The regulation applies uniformly.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(1) Identify each state statute, federal statute, or federal regulation that requires or authorizes the action taken by the administrative regulation:

KRS 161.020, 161.028, 161.030, 161.048.

(2) State whether this administrative regulation is expressly authorized by an act of the General Assembly, and if so, identify the act:

Yes, KRS 161.028 and 161.030 provide the statutory authority for this administrative regulation.

(3)(a) Identify the promulgating agency and any other affected state units, parts, or divisions:

Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) and Kentucky Department of Education (KDE).

(b) Estimate the following for each affected state unit, part, or division identified in (3)(a):

1. Expenditures:

For the first year:Any expenditures are expected to be minimal.

For subsequent years:Any expenditures are expected to be minimal.

2. Revenues:

For the first year:This regulation is not expected to generate revenue.

For subsequent years:This regulation is not expected to generate revenue.

3. Cost Savings:

For the first year:The EPSB and the KDE are anticipated to experience costs savings in light of the removal of the state-only accreditation process previously available under this administrative regulation, which was a significant process for the KDE to facilitate. Such costs are difficult to calculate as they have always been unpredictable and dependent on how many, if any, educator preparation providers (EPPs) chose the state-only accreditation process in order to comply with this administrative regulation.

For subsequent years:The EPSB and the KDE are anticipated to experience costs savings in light of the removal of the state-only accreditation process previously available under this administrative regulation, which was a significant process for KDE to facilitate. Such costs are difficult to calculate as they have always been unpredictable and dependent on how many, if any, EPPs chose the state-only accreditation process in order to comply with this administrative regulation.

(4)(a) Identify affected local entities (for example: cities, counties, fire departments, school districts):

None.

(b) Estimate the following for each affected local entity identified in (4)(a):

1. Expenditures:

For the first year:Not applicable.

For subsequent years:Not applicable.

2. Revenues:

For the first year:Not applicable.

For subsequent years:Not applicable.

3. Cost Savings:

For the first year:Not applicable.

For subsequent years:Not applicable.

(5)(a) Identify any affected regulated entities not listed in (3)(a) or (4)(a):
National accreditors as well as EPPs.

(b) Estimate the following for each regulated entity identified in (5)(a):

1. Expenditures:

For the first year:Any expenditures by national accreditors will remain the same under this amendment as they are under the current administrative regulation. Expenditures for some EPPs under this amendment may increase related to the unavailability of a state-only accreditation process. However, those expenditures are difficult to calculate as they have always been unpredictable and dependent on whether an EPP chose the state-only accreditation process in order to comply with this administrative regulation.

For subsequent years:Any expenditures by national accreditors will remain the same under this amendment as they are under the current administrative regulation. Expenditures for some EPPs under this amendment may increase related to the unavailability of a state-only accreditation process. However, those expenditures are difficult to calculate as they have always been unpredictable and dependent on whether an EPP chose the state-only accreditation process in order to comply with this administrative regulation.

2. Revenues:

For the first year:This regulation is not expected to generate revenue.

For subsequent years:This regulation is not expected to generate revenue.

3. Cost Savings:

For the first year:For national accreditors and EPPs, no cost savings are expected.

For subsequent years:For national accreditors and EPPs, no cost savings are expected.

(6) Provide a narrative to explain the following for each entity identified in (3)(a), (4)(a), and (5)(a)

(a) Fiscal impact of this administrative regulation:
National accreditors may incur minimal administrative burdens to comply; however, any such costs or burdens should be the same under this amendment as they were under the prior regulation. The state-only accreditation process that is being removed from the amended regulation was undoubtably cost efficient for EPPs, and EPPs who have previously utilized that process for compliance with this regulation may incur some increased costs and burdens in having to use, going forward, a national accreditor in order to comply. EPP compliance with new "Annual Reporting" requirements in this amended regulation should result in the same costs and burdens that EPPs sustained when these requirements were, instead, addressed in 16 KAR 5:020. Minimal

administrative burdens may result to the KDE staff that implement the regulation; however, cumulative costs will be reduced under this amendment in light of the removal of the state-only accreditation process, which was a significant process for staff of the KDE to facilitate.

(b) Methodology and resources used to reach this conclusion:
The estimates herein are based on prior program operations.

(7) Explain, as it relates to the entities identified in (3)(a), (4)(a), and (5)(a):

(a) Whether this administrative regulation will have a "major economic impact", as defined by KRS 13A.010(14):
The administrative regulation is not expected to have a major economic impact.

(b) The methodology and resources used to reach this conclusion:
The estimates herein are based on prior program operations.