

KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STAFF NOTE

Action Item:

Brescia University: Accreditation and Continued Program Approval of the Educator Preparation Provider

Staff's Recommendation:

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

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 and continued program approval to the EPP initial preparation programs at Brescia University?

Applicable Statute or Regulation:

KRS 161.028, 16 KAR 5:010

History/Background:

Existing Policy: 16 KAR 5:010 identifies the requirement and processes for educator preparation providers to demonstrate evidence of meeting standards for accreditation and program approval.

Summary: An EPSB Site Visitors team conducted a Targeted virtual site visit evaluation of the EPP on February 24-25, 2026 for unmet Standards 4 and 5.

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

SITE TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS

CAEP STANDARD R4 PROGRAM IMPACT AND CAEP STANDARD R5 PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE & CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT:

AFIs and Stipulations changed from the original visit:

| Current Stipulation | Updated AFI | Rationale for Change |
|---|---|--|
| <p>The Absence of evidence/record of measuring/gathering completer effectiveness and the impact they have on student learning growth, as well as displaying professional skill (R4.1).</p> | <p>The EPP provided limited evidence/record of measuring/gathering completer effectiveness and the impact they have on student learning growth, as well as displaying professional skill (R4.1).</p> | <p>The EPP provided multiple sources of evidence related to completer effectiveness and professional skill; however, the data lacked documented validity and reliability, showed inconsistencies in collection and reporting, and did not provide verifiable evidence of completer impact on P-12 student learning growth.</p> |
| <p>Absence of evidence/record of measuring/gathering employer satisfaction and subsequent analysis (R4.2).</p> | <p>The EPP provided limited evidence/record of measuring/gathering employer satisfaction and subsequent analysis (R4.2).</p> | <p>The EPP collected employer satisfaction data through surveys and interviews, but the evidence was limited in duration and disaggregation, inconsistently reported, and lacked documented analysis to support conclusions or inform program improvement.</p> |
| <p>The EPP has not demonstrated that it maintains a quality assurance system that consists of valid data from multiple measures and supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based with input from internal</p> | <p>The EPP has limited evidence demonstrating the linkage of reviewed data to programmatic decisions and verification of quality for all EPP-created assessments, limiting the extent to which continuous</p> | <p>Documentation shows the QAS is implemented and used to monitor candidate progression and program outcomes. However, evidence does not consistently show that reviewed data inform</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>and external stakeholders (R5.1).</p> <p>The EPP has not demonstrated that relevant internal and external stakeholders are included in program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes (R5.3).</p> <p>The EPP does not have evidence that it regularly, systematically, and continuously assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, documents modifications and/or innovations, and their efforts on EPP outcomes (R5.4).</p> | <p>improvement is fully supported (R5.1).</p> <p>The EPP has limited evidence demonstrating the use of external stakeholder input in program design, modification, or evaluation decisions (R5.3).</p> <p>The EPP has limited evidence demonstrating systematic tracking of results over time, documentation of implemented program modifications or innovations, and analysis of their impact on EPP outcomes, despite collecting and reviewing multiple data sources (R5.4).</p> | <p>programmatic decisions or that all EPP-created assessments are verified for quality.</p> <p>Evidence shows that stakeholders participate in TEAC, SubTEAC, department meetings, and surveys; however, documentation does not consistently show how external stakeholders inform program design or evaluation decisions.</p> <p>While meeting minutes and reports reflect review of multiple data sources and discussion of potential program changes, documentation does not consistently show that implemented modifications are tracked longitudinally or that their effects on candidate performance and program outcomes are analyzed.</p> |
|---|--|---|

AFIs and Stipulations retained from the original visit:

| Current Stipulation | Rationale to Retain |
|---|--|
| Absence of evidence/record of measuring/gathering completer satisfaction that demonstrates skills gained during the program to feel | The EPP did not provide sufficient and appropriate evidence demonstrating that completer satisfaction was systematically measured in relation to skills gained for job preparedness, nor |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>prepared for the job. No record of subsequent data analysis as aligned with the standard (R4.3).</p> <p>The EPP has not demonstrated that it relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures to ensure interpretations of data are valid and consistent (R5.2).</p> | <p>was there documentation of data analysis aligned with CAEP Standard 4.3.</p> <p>The EPP has insufficient evidence demonstrating systematic review of EPP-created assessments for validity, reliability, and representativeness. Low survey response rates, incomplete program representation, and the absence of documented interrater reliability and statistical verification prevent determination of data quality for program-level analysis (R5.2).</p> |
|--|---|

ACCREDITATION AUDIT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

On May 19, 2026, 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 the following revisions to the Site Visit Report Findings. *Note: Anything not referenced below was retained as recommended by the Site Visit team.*

| Site Visit Recommendation | Retained or Changed | Rationale for Change |
|--|---------------------|--|
| <p>AFI #12 The EPP provided limited evidence/record of measuring/gathering completer effectiveness and the impact they have on student learning growth, as well as displaying professional skill (R4.1).</p> | <p>Cleared</p> | <p>The EPP provided multiple sources of evidence related to completer effectiveness and professional skill. Additionally, in the rejoinder, the EPP demonstrated verifiable evidence of completer impact on p-12 student growth.</p> |
| <p>AFI #13 The EPP provided limited evidence/record of measuring/gathering employer satisfaction and subsequent analysis (R4.2).</p> | <p>Cleared</p> | <p>The EPP collected employer satisfaction data through surveys and interviews, but the evidence was limited in duration and lacked documented analysis to support conclusions or inform program improvement.</p> |

| | | |
|--|------------------------|---|
| <p>Stipulation # 3: Absence of evidence/record of measuring/gathering completer satisfaction that demonstrates skills gained during the program to feel prepared for the job. No record of subsequent data analysis as aligned with the standard (R4.3).</p> | <p>Modified to AFI</p> | <p>The EPP provided limited evidence demonstrating that completer satisfaction was systematically measured in relation to skills gained for job preparedness, nor was there documentation of data analysis aligned with CAEP Standard 4.3.</p> |
| <p>AFI #15: The EPP has limited evidence demonstrating the use of external stakeholder input in program design, modification, or evaluation decisions (R5.3).</p> | <p>Cleared</p> | <p>Evidence shows that stakeholders participate in TEAC, SubTEAC, department meetings, and surveys; however, documentation in the rejoinder demonstrated how external stakeholders inform program design or evaluation decisions.</p> |
| <p>AFI #16: The EPP has limited evidence demonstrating systematic tracking of results over time, documentation of implemented program modifications or innovations, and analysis of their impact on EPP outcomes, despite collecting and reviewing multiple data sources (R5.4).</p> | <p>Cleared</p> | <p>Meeting minutes and reports reflect review of multiple data sources and discussion of potential program changes, documentation in the rejoinder consistently demonstrated that implemented modifications are beginning to be tracked longitudinally and program outcomes are analyzed.</p> |

The AAC recommend the following for Standards Met or Not Met:

From Initial Visit (2024):

- Standard 1: Met with AFI(s)
- Standard 2: Met with AFI(s)
- Standard 3: Met with AFI (s)

From Targeted Visit (2026):

- Standard 4: Met with AFI (s) or Stipulation
- Standard 5: Met with AFI(s) or Stipulation

Pursuant to 16 KAR 5:010, Section 19, the AAC recommends: (1) **Accreditation** of the initial level educator preparation programs at Brescia University.

On May 19, 2026 the AAC met and reviewed the initial programs for Brescia University. 16 KAR 5:010 requires EPPs to submit each of its program review documents for review prior to its on-site accreditation visit. Brescia University submitted their programs and received written notification of the results of the program review.

Pursuant to 16 KAR 5:010, Section 19, the AAC recommends: (1) **Approval** of the initial level educator preparation programs at Brescia University.

Budget Impact: Recurrent costs are incurred related to Kentucky Department of Education staff facilitating the review processes for educator preparation providers to demonstrate evidence of meeting standards for accreditation and program approval.

Groups Consulted and Brief Summary of Responses:

Aa indicated above, Brescia University submitted their programs to the Program Review Committee and received written notification of the program review results.

As indicated above, EPSB Site Visitors conducted a virtual site visit of Brescia University on February 24-25, 2026.

As indicated above, the AAC met on May 19, 2026 and recommended accreditation and approval of the initial level educator preparation programs at Brescia University.

Contact Person:

Dr. Melissa Diebel, KDE/KBE Academic Program Manager
Division of Educator Preparation and Certification
Office of Educator Licensure and Effectiveness
(502) 564-5846
Email: Melissa.diebel@education.ky.gov