

KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STAFF NOTE

Action Item:

Alice Lloyd College: Accreditation of the Educator Preparation Provider

Staff Recommendation:

The Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) should accept the recommendations from the Accreditation Audit Committee (AAC) to grant continued accreditation for the Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) for the initial level preparation programs at Alice Lloyd College.

Rationale:

16 KAR 5:010 outlines the role and responsibilities of the AAC. The AAC has followed the regulatory procedures.

Action Question:

Should the EPSB grant continuing EPSB state accreditation to the EPP for initial preparation programs at Alice Lloyd College?

Applicable Statute or Regulation:

KRS 161.028, 16 KAR 5:010

History/Background:

Existing Policy: 16 KAR 5:010 identifies the requirements and processes for EPPs to demonstrate evidence of meeting standards for accreditation and program approval. EPPs may pursue state accreditation or national accreditation from an EPSB approved accreditor. In accordance with 16 KAR 5:010, Section 2(2), state accreditation is based on the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards. All educator preparation programs leading to certification or rank change must be reviewed and approved by the EPSB.

In February 2022, the EPSB accepted the recommendation of the AAC to issue accreditation with conditions and approve the initial level educator preparation programs at Alice Lloyd College after it was found that Standard 5 was “not met.” The institution chose a two-year follow-up visit to focus on the standard that was not met.

Summary: An EPSB Site Visitors team conducted a targeted virtual site visit evaluation of the EPP on February 25-26, 2024, for unmet Standard 5.

Under EPSB guidelines, the site visitors make recommendations on Areas for Improvement (AFI) and Stipulations.

SITE TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS

CAEP STANDARD R5 PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE & CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

AFIs and Stipulations changed from the original visit:

AFI #3: The EPP has developed a quality assurance system; however, the QAS is not fully implemented to allow the EPP to regularly and formally compile, maintain, provide access, and analyze data (Component 5.1). This was previously an AFI.

Rationale: While the EPP has developed a written QAS document and is in the early stages of implementation, some aspects of the plan still need clarification and data review processes formalized. (Component 5.1)

AFI # 5: The EPP minimally demonstrated that it regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations, and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes (Component 5.3) This was previously a stipulation.

Rationale: The EPP provided evidence of limited use of data (i.e., PRAXIS) to inform program review and revision (i.e., elementary program). The EPP has developed a cycle for review of other programs. The EPP did not demonstrate the systematic use of data beyond PRAXIS for program improvement.

AFI # 6: The EPP minimally demonstrated that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. (Component 5.5). This was previously a stipulation.

Rationale: The EPP formed a Teacher Education Committee that meets at minimum once per semester. The committee includes all appropriate stakeholder groups and participates in curriculum changes and provides feedback to the EPP. Stakeholders described other informal processes of providing feedback to the EPP, but evidence of a formal, systematic process was not present.

AFIs and Stipulations retained from the original visit:

AFI #4: The EPP lacked data and analysis of completer impact that are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction. (Component 5.4)

Rationale: Though the EPP has stated intentions to conduct structured observations in completers' classrooms and to conduct student surveys, these actions have not been initiated and data have not been collected, analyzed, and used for program improvement.

Update: At the time of the site visit, the EPP had conducted two structured observations in completers' classrooms. Site visitors were told the EPP had discontinued the use of the student survey and had plans to implement student interviews. The site visit team did not see evidence that data from these sources had been analyzed, shared widely, or used for program improvement.

STIPULATION #3: The EPP does not demonstrate the use of a QAS that relies on current, relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent (Component 5.2)

Rationale: EPP confirmed in the addendum and through onsite interviews that the EPP's QAS has been non-functional since their last accreditation visit. While candidate data are systematically collected, most of the EPP-created instruments used did not include information that demonstrates sufficiency criteria (e.g., current, relevant, verifiable, representative cumulative, actionable, valid, consistent).

Update: At the time of the site visit, the EPP provided evidence that a couple of EPP-created instruments have been revised or are undergoing revision in an effort to meet sufficiency criteria. The site visit team did not see evidence that data from these instruments are systematically collected.

AAC RECOMMENDATIONS

On June 26, 2024, the AAC met and reviewed the accreditation materials including the Targeted Self-Study Report, the Targeted Formative Feedback Report, the Targeted Addendum, and the Targeted On-site Report. The AAC recommended no revisions to the Site Visit Report Findings.

The AAC recommends that Standard 5 be Met with AFIs. Pursuant to 16 KAR 5:010, Section 10, the AAC recommends to continue accreditation for Alice Lloyd College.

Budget Impact: KDE resources (staff) to facilitate the review and accreditation processes.

Contact Person:

Dr. Melissa Diebel, Academic Program Manager
Division of Educator Preparation and Certification
Office of Educator Licensure and Effectiveness
(502) 564-4606
Email: melissa.diebel@education.ky.gov