
8A

Information/Action

Professional Services Committee

Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation and an Update on the Accreditation Review

Executive Summary: Part one provides background information about the Committee on Accreditation and its *Ninth Annual Accreditation Report* that summarizes the accomplishments, activities and plans of the COA. Part two is an update on activities related to the review of the Commission's accreditation process.

Recommended Action: On behalf of the Committee on Accreditation, staff recommends that the Commission receive its *Ninth Annual Accreditation Report*. No action is necessary on the accreditation update.

Presenter: Lawrence Birch, Administrator, Cheryl Hickey, Consultant, and Teri Clark, Consultant, Professional Services Division and Edward Kujawa and David Madrigal, Co-Chairs, Committee on Accreditation, 2003-2004

Strategic Plan Goal: 1

Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators.
- ◆ Assess and monitor the efficacy of the Accreditation System, Examination System, and State and Federal Funded Programs.

Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation and an Update on the Accreditation Review

Introduction

This agenda item is written in two parts. Part one provides background information about the Committee on Accreditation and its *Ninth Annual Accreditation Report*. (The full report is contained in Attachment A of this agenda item.) Part two is an update on activities related to the review of the Commission's accreditation process.

Part One: Committee on Accreditation Activities

Background Information on the Ninth Annual Report

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) consists of 12 professional educators selected by the Commission for their distinguished records of accomplishment in education. The following responsibilities are delegated to the Committee on Accreditation in Education Code Section 44373 and outlined in the Commission's *Accreditation Framework*:

The Committee shall . . . make decisions about the accreditation of educator preparation. The Committee's decision making process shall be in accordance with the *Accreditation Framework* adopted by the Commission.

The Committee shall . . . make decisions about the initial accreditation of new programs of educator preparation in accordance with procedures established by the Committee.

The Committee shall . . . determine the comparability of standards submitted by applicants with those adopted by the Commission, in accordance with the *Accreditation Framework*.

The Committee shall . . . adopt guidelines for accreditation reviews, and (shall) monitor the performance of accreditation teams and other aspects of the accreditation system.

The Committee shall . . . present an annual accreditation report to the Commission and respond to accreditation issues and concerns referred to the Committee by the Commission.

In establishing the Committee on Accreditation, the Commission did not cede any of its policymaking authority over the preparation of educators or the accreditation of institutions. Under SB 655 (Bergeson, Chapter 426, Statutes of 1993) and the *Accreditation Framework*, the Commission retains the exclusive authority and responsibility to adopt standards for educator preparation, and to make all

other policy decisions that govern the system of professional accreditation in education. The COA is responsible for implementing the Commission's policies, enforcing the Commission's preparation standards and annually reporting its activities to the Commission.

The *Ninth Annual Accreditation Report* (attached) reviews the accreditation decisions made by the Committee on Accreditation during 2003-2004, including specific information about the Committee's decisions during 2003-2004 to grant initial accreditation to new programs of professional preparation. The *Accreditation Report* also presents an update on the 2003-2004 workplan for the Committee on Accreditation and the proposed workplan for 2004-2005.

The *Ninth Annual Accreditation Report* was adopted by the Committee on Accreditation on August 19, 2004 and will be presented to the Commission by Edward Kujawa and David Madrigal, Committee on Accreditation Co-Chairs for 2003-2004. Following their presentation to the Professional Services Committee, they will be available to answer questions.

Part Two: Update on the Accreditation Review

Background

In January 2004, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) directed the Committee on Accreditation to meet with stakeholders to identify options for establishing a process for the review of the Commission's *Accreditation Framework* that would be open, inclusive of key stakeholders, and consultative. At its meeting in May 2004, the Commission authorized the formation of an Accreditation Study Work Group. This work group, comprised of four members of the Committee on Accreditation and various representatives from the education stakeholder community, is charged with reviewing the Commission's current accreditation system and recommending any changes, if needed, to the Committee on Accreditation for its consideration. In turn, the Committee on Accreditation will submit its recommendations for changes to the system to the Commission for its consideration.

Following the Commission action in May 2004, the Committee on Accreditation, developed a general timeline for the review process as well as a concise list of deliverables and expectations for the work group. The general timeline proposed by the COA took into consideration the Commission's schedule for 2004-05 as well as recognition that a key component of this review is to ensure frequent communication and interaction between the work group, the COA, and the Commission.

The Accreditation Work Group was formed in June 2004. Stakeholder groups appointed representatives to the work group. The COA selected four individuals from its membership to serve on the work group. In order to ensure that all perspectives are addressed, the work group is co-facilitated by one representative of the COA and one individual chosen by the stakeholders. Work group members are required to be vested with the authority to represent and speak on behalf of their institution, organization, or constituency group. To the extent possible, the work group operates on a consensus model, although it was agreed that, where significant differences in perspectives exist, these differences will be reflected in documentation. Each representative, with the exception of the COA

members serving on the work group, commits to supporting the costs of their segmental participation in the review process.

Update

As of the Commission meeting, the work group will have met five times. All agendas, meeting notes, and most materials are available on the Commission's website. Meetings are open to the public. To date, the work group has discussed some of the numerous issues that fall under the umbrella of accreditation of educator preparation. While the work group has not arrived at the point of submitting recommendations and further discussion and study are needed on all topics, progress is being made in a number of areas. Below is a summary of some of the major issues addressed thus far and some of the possible options in each area that have been discussed to date. It is important to note that the work group has not finalized its thinking in any of these areas, but comment by members of the Commission would be informative to the process.

Purpose of Accreditation.

As a first step in the process of reviewing the Commission's policies and procedures, the work group found it useful to review the purpose of accreditation as it was described in the California Education Code, in the *Accreditation Framework*, and as it is generally described and accepted by other entities such as other accreditation bodies, other states, and other professions. In addition, the work group took into consideration the policy and budget environment in California and nationally. This discussion was important because it is serving as the basis for discussions around all other aspects of accreditation. As work group members consider potential changes in policy and procedures, each is considering the extent to which these potential changes are consistent with or work to achieve the agreed upon purposes of accreditation. The work group has asked the following question: *Does the current purpose of the Accreditation system as contained in the introduction of the Accreditation Framework reflect the generally agreed upon purpose(s) of accreditation today?*

The discussion to date has focused on the following options:

- (1) Continue the purposes as defined in *Accreditation Framework*, or
- (2) Modify the definition of purpose of accreditation to reflect four primary and interrelated purposes:
 - (a) Public Accountability
 - (b) Adherence to Standards
 - (c) Assure Quality
 - (d) Foster Program Improvement

The work group has also discussed the attributes of an accreditation system. Discussion to date has focused on following four: Professional Character of Accreditation, Breadth and Flexibility, Intensity in Accreditation, and Efficiency and Cost Effectiveness.

Roles of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation.

Under the existing Education Code and Commission *Framework*, the Commission establishes accreditation policy and the COA has responsibility for implementing the accreditation system including the determination of accreditation decisions. The COA reports to the Commission on at least an annual basis. The work group has considered the following question. *Do the roles and responsibilities of the Commission and COA under the current accreditation system provide appropriate oversight of teacher education and maximum efficiency?*

The discussion to date has focused on the following options:

- (1) Continue roles as defined in *Accreditation Framework*, but focus on increasing communication between the Commission and COA by
 - (a) COA representative reports at a number of Commission meetings annually;
 - (b) COA information item on the agenda at each Commission meeting, or as appropriate.
- (2) Modify the roles of the Commission and COA in accreditation by either:
 - (a) Commission ratification of accreditation decisions made by COA;
 - (b) eliminate COA, Commission makes all accreditation decisions; or
 - (c) COA initially accredits institutions instead of the Commission

Program approval and unit accreditation

Currently California's accreditation system involves a single accreditation decision for the institution - unit accreditation. The individual programs are approved within the process of coming to the institution's accreditation decision. Feedback gathered to date indicates that there are different perspectives on this issue as there are significant advantages and some disadvantages identified to either approach. The work group has considered the question: *Would appropriate accountability, oversight, and program improvement be increased with a different accreditation or program approval structure?*

The discussion to date has focused on the following options:

- (1) Continue to accredit the institution with program approval embedded in the single accreditation process.
- (2) Move back to a program approval system without any institution wide accreditation decision.
- (3) Develop a modified system that addresses both unit accreditation and individual program approval in a different manner.

Periodic site level accreditation activity

Under the current system, site visits by a team of higher education and K-12 experts comprise not only the central activity of accreditation, but the sole activity. Interviews are conducted and evidence reviewed over the course of several days, leading to an accreditation recommendation from the site review team. The work group has solicited stakeholder feedback in this area to assess the importance

of continuing some form of a site level activity in a revised accreditation process. The focus, scope, depth, length of, and interval between site level activities has not yet been discussed. The work group is considering the question: *What role should periodic site level accreditation activity play in a revised accreditation system and, if it should continue to play a role, how should it be structured?*

The role of qualitative and quantitative data and periodic data collection

Currently, the accreditation review process allows for a variety of evidence, both quantitative and qualitative, to be used to demonstrate that the institution or district is meeting the Commission adopted standards. By almost all accounts, the process of producing and reviewing evidence is costly, time consuming, and burdensome. The work group is currently examining the appropriate role of data in accreditation, the types of data that are used in the accreditation process to determine what is valuable and useful to the process, what may be outdated and can be streamlined, and whether more regular or frequent collection of data can help improve the process.

Interim activity

Currently, the accreditation review is on a 5-7 year review cycle. Institutions are visited by a team of experts at this time and an accreditation decision is made based upon the results of that visit. If an institution is found to have stipulations, they must address those stipulations in one year. If an institution receives full accreditation with no stipulations, then it has no further accreditation-related activities or requirements until the next site visit.

The work group is considering whether this process as currently structured adequately fosters program improvement and ensures public accountability. Information was shared from the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Program community on the informal peer review process which takes place in between the formal review site visits. The value of these activities was emphasized. The work group is considering whether accreditation's purposes can be better realized by including an interim activity or activities between the periodic site level activity. In discussing this topic, the work group has considered the following questions. *How can the accreditation system support ongoing program improvement and ensure greater accountability? What type of interim activities—unit or program focused—would support program improvement and greater accountability?*

The discussion to date has focused on the following options:

- (1) A standards based review process is completed on an annual or bi-annual process. The process could be focused on the unit or the programs.
- (2) A standards based activity is completed twice between the periodic site level activity. Institutions select among options to use an activity that meets their needs.
- (3) No interim review activity.

Use of historical information and follow up to site level activity.

Currently the accreditation decision reflects a point in time, or snapshot approach. The accreditation review team is prohibited from reviewing past accreditation decisions and examining the actions taken

by an institution to address stipulations. The work group is discussing whether this particular structure provides sufficient accountability.

Other issues

Numerous other issues continue to be discussed including national unit and national program accreditation; the accreditation cycle; the related issues of subject matter, fifth year, blended programs, and induction and where these issues fit in the accreditation system; unique accreditation issues related to particular credential areas such as Education Specialist, Pupil Personnel Services, Designated Subjects, and Administrative Services Credentials to name a few.

Transition Process

The Committee on Accreditation has discussed the importance of ensuring a fair and appropriate transition to a revised accreditation system. The COA recommends that any transition process should include reasonable timelines, consideration of institutional budgeting and preparations required prior to a review, and that every effort must be made to ensure clear communication to the field regarding any revised policies and procedures the Commission may enact. To that end, the Committee on Accreditation has considered a transition process that contains several principles for moving forward with a revised system. Because the revisions to the system are still under discussion, the following principles or components of a transition process are intended to provide reassurance, to the extent possible, to the field that they will be given sufficient time to prepare and budget for the revised accreditation review system, that the Commission is committed to communicating in a clear and timely manner issues related to a new revised structure, and to reassure the public that the Commission will continue to move forward with accreditation related activities during the transition process. Provided that the Commission approves a new revised and restructured accreditation system, and provided that there is funding for accreditation review activities, the Committee on Accreditation recommends a process for transitioning to the new revised system of accreditation that includes the following principles and components. Comment from the Commission about these components would be informative.

- The scheduling of future site level activity will take into account the order in which the institution or district was originally scheduled for a review prior to the postponement. In other words, those institutions that have had the longest periods between reviews will be among the first to be reviewed.
- New institutions that have never had an accreditation review beyond initial program approval will also be among the first to be reviewed.
- The format for review of new institutions may be formative in nature.

Other accreditation activities that will take place in 2005-06

- Merged NCATE/CTC visits will continue in accordance with the existing protocol.
- The existing NCATE partnership and protocol will be reviewed to consider its alignment with the revised accreditation structure.
- A new Accreditation Handbook outlining the new procedures will be developed.
- Technical assistance will be provided to communicate the changes and requirements in the accreditation system to the field.
- Training sessions will be developed and conducted.

- Transitional reporting by all institutions will be required. The form and nature of the reporting will be informed by continuing work group discussions.
- Consideration will be given to the development of a phase-in plan for implementation of new accreditation system procedures and requirements.

The work group is scheduled to meet next in January 2005 and will continue to discuss the issues described above.

Attachment A

*The Ninth Annual Accreditation Report
of the Committee on Accreditation*



**NINTH ANNUAL
ACCREDITATION REPORT**

To the
**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON
TEACHER CREDENTIALING**

By the
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

**Ninth Annual Accreditation Report to the
California Commission on
Teacher Credentialing**

**By the Committee
on Accreditation**

**Assisted by the
Professional Services Division**

**Sacramento, California
August 2004**

Ninth Annual Accreditation Report to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing by the Committee on Accreditation

Table of Contents

Letter of Transmittal to the Commission		v
The Committee on Accreditation (June, 2004)		vii
Section I: Major Activities of the Committee on Accreditation		1
(1) Election of Co-Chairs for 2003-2004		1
(2) Schedule of Committee Meetings for 2003-2004		1
(3) Major Accomplishments of the Committee on Accreditation		1
(4) Schedule of Committee Meetings for 2004-2005		2
Section II: Accomplishment of the Committee's Workplan in 2003-2004		3
Task 1	Review the Results of the Evaluation of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i>	3
Task 2	Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National Organizations (including NCATE)	3
Task 3	Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs	4
Task 4	Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and School Districts and their Credential Preparation Programs	4
Task 5	Revise the <i>Accreditation Handbook</i> and Team Training Curriculum	5
Task 6	Maintain Public Access to the Committee on Accreditation	5
Task 7	Receive Regular Updates on the Implementation of SB 2042 and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation	6
Task 8	Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission	6
Task 9	Other Required Elements of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> - Election of Co-Chairs, Adoption of Meeting Schedule, Orientation of New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.	6
Section III: Proposed Workplan for the Committee in 2004-2005		7
Task 1	Review the Results of the Evaluation of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i>	7
Task 2	Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National Organizations (including NCATE)	7
Task 3	Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs	8
Task 4	Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and School Districts and their Credential Preparation Programs	8
Task 5	Revise the <i>Accreditation Handbook</i> and Team Training	8

	Curriculum	8
Task 6	Maintain Public Access to the Committee on Accreditation	8
Task 7	Receive Regular Updates on the Implementation of SB 2042 and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation	9
Task 8	Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission	9
Task 9	Other Required Elements of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> - Election of Co-Chairs, Adoption of Meeting Schedule, Orientation of New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.	9
Appendix A:	Continuing Accreditation Decisions Made by the Committee on Accreditation Based Upon Site Visits Conducted - 2003-2004	11
Appendix B:	Initial Program Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation - 2003-2004	21
Appendix C:	Additional Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation – 2003-2004	37

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814-4213
(916) 323-4508 fax



COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
(916) 327-2967

November 8, 2004

Dear Commissioners:

It is with personal and professional pleasure that, on behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation, we submit to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing the *Ninth Annual Accreditation Report* by the Committee on Accreditation in accordance with the provisions of the *Accreditation Framework*. This report presents an overview of the activities and accomplishments of the Committee in the past year and its proposed workplan for 2004-2005 as it implements the Commission's accreditation system.

2003-2004 was the seventh year that the Committee fully exercised its responsibilities under the *Accreditation Framework*. Through the continued receiving of accreditation team reports and the accreditation decision-making activity, the Committee has gained a comprehensive understanding of its work and continues to take steps to enhance its procedures.

The Committee now looks forward to maintaining the high standards set by the Commission for its accreditation responsibilities in 2004-2005. The Committee also stands ready to assist the Commission as it considers its accreditation policies for the future.

Sincerely,

David Madrigal
Committee Co-Chair

Edward Kujawa
Committee Co-Chair

The Committee on Accreditation

June 2004

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Sacramento, California

- **Fred Baker**, Professor
School of Education & Integrative Studies
Calif. State Polytechnic Univ., Pomona
- **David Madrigal**, COA Co-Chair
Principal, John Muir Elementary School
Antioch Unified School District
- **Diane Doe**, Teacher
Peer Assistance and Review
San Francisco Unified School District
- **Karen O'Connor**, Teacher
Sunset Hills Elementary School
Poway Unified School District
- **Lynne Cook**, Professor
College of Education
California State University, Northridge
- **Ruth Sandlin**, Chair, Ed. Psych & Couns.
College of Education
Calif. State University, San Bernardino
- **Irma Guzman-Wagner**, Dean
College of Education
California State University, Stanislaus
- **Sue Teele**, Director
Education Extension
University of California, Riverside
- **Dana Griggs**
Assistant Superintendent
Ontario Montclair School District
- **Donna Uyemoto**
Chief Personnel Officer
Dublin Unified School District
- **Edward Kujawa**, COA Co-Chair
Dean, School of Business, Education
and Leadership
Dominican University
- **Michael Watenpaugh**
Superintendent
Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District

Committee Support Staff (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing)

- **Beth Graybill**, Director, Professional Services Division
- **Lawrence Birch**, Administrator for Accreditation, Professional Services Division
- **Philip A. Fitch**, Consultant, Professional Services Division
- **Teri Ackerman**, Analyst, Professional Services Division
- **Marla Miles**, Secretary, Professional Services Division

Section I. Major Activities of the Committee on Accreditation

This section of the Annual Report provides specific information about the principal activities of the Committee on Accreditation during the past year, including the organization of the Committee, list of meetings for 2003-2004, a summary of major accomplishments for the year and the adopted schedule of meetings for 2004-2005.

(1) Election of Co-Chairs for 2003-2004

In developing its procedures, the Committee agreed that Co-Chairs (one from postsecondary education and one from K-12 education) would be elected annually. In August of 2003, the Committee elected Edward Kujawa and David Madrigal to serve as Co-Chairs during the 2003-2004 accreditation cycle.

(2) Schedule of Committee Meetings for 2003-2004

In accordance with the duties assigned to the Committee on Accreditation and its adopted workplan for 2003-2004, the Committee on Accreditation held the following meetings.

August 21, 2003	Commission Offices, Sacramento
October 23, 2003	Commission Offices, Sacramento
January 22, 2004	Commission Offices, Sacramento
March 25, 2004	Commission Offices, Sacramento
May 20, 2004	Commission Offices, Sacramento

(3) Major Accomplishments of the Committee on Accreditation

The Committee on Accreditation has now completed its seventh year of full accreditation decision-making responsibility. In addition to its major activity, hearing and acting upon two accreditation team reports and one accreditation re-visit, the COA made initial accreditation decisions for 270 professional preparation programs, mostly programs of professional preparation for multiple and single subject credentials in response to Senate Bill 2042 and programs of professional preparation for pupil personnel services credentials.

Each year, the Committee has made improvements in the accreditation procedures or in its own procedures. The COA scheduled regular discussions at a number of its meetings about ways to improve the accreditation process and procedures. The Committee continued a practice, initiated during its first year, of scheduling a de-briefing discussion about the accreditation decision-making process at every meeting in which an accreditation decision had been made. The discussions have continued to be very helpful to the Committee in “fine tuning” the accreditation procedures. As a result, the COA has incorporated a number of refinements in the accreditation decision-making process. During the past year, the COA devoted a significant part of its activity to assisting the Commission in planning for the review of its accreditation policies and procedures. In summary, the Committee on Accreditation has completed its workplan, and looks forward to continuing to exercise its responsibility to implement the Commission’s accreditation system.

(4) Schedule of Committee Meetings for 2004-2005

In order to fulfill its responsibilities and accomplish its workplan, the Committee on Accreditation has adopted a schedule for meetings for the 2004-2005 accreditation cycle.

August 19, 2004	Commission Offices, Sacramento
October 21, 2004	Commission Offices, Sacramento
January 27-28, 2005	Commission Offices, Sacramento
March 17, 2005	Commission Offices, Sacramento
June 9, 2005	Commission Offices, Sacramento

Section II. Accomplishment of the Committee's Workplan in 2003-2004

On August 21, 2003, the Committee on Accreditation adopted its workplan for 2003-2004. The Committee's elected Co-Chairs presented this workplan to the Commission at the November 2003 Commission meeting. The nine items that follow represent the key elements of the 2003-2004 workplan for the Committee on Accreditation. They include a detailed explanation of each task and its current status.

Task 1 Review of the Results of the Evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework*

The *Accreditation Framework* called for an outside evaluator to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the *Framework* over a four-year period beginning with the first official accreditation visits. The contractor was selected in December 1999 and the contract was subsequently approved by the Commission. The contractor was fully involved in gathering data, attending COA meetings, observing accreditation visits, and interviewing participants in the accreditation process. The final report was presented to the Executive Director in April 2003 and initially reviewed at the May 2003 meeting of the COA. During the 2003-2004 year, the Committee on Accreditation continued to review the final report and provide assistance to the Commission in considering the results of the evaluation that may lead to making changes in the accreditation system and modification of accreditation procedures.

Task 2 Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National Organizations (including NCATE)

The Partnership Agreement in effect with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) was renewed in October 2001. The COA continued to conduct merged NCATE/COA accreditation visits and monitor the agreement in the same manner as during previous years to make certain that the implementation of the partnership results in assuring that state issues are appropriately addressed in each visit and that the process reduces duplication.

As part of the implementation of the *Accreditation Framework*, the Committee has negotiated formal memoranda of understanding with some national professional education organizations. These memoranda govern the portion of the *Accreditation Framework* that permits national accreditation of credential programs to substitute for state accreditation. The Committee has delayed further efforts to negotiate formal memoranda of understanding with national professional education organizations as the Commission is reviewing its accreditation policies. The Committee will further consider this section of the *Framework*, evaluate the agreements previously made and their effectiveness, and advise the Commission on possible changes that should be made.

Task 3 Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs

This is one of the major ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The Committee has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Some of the decisions are made on the basis of expert review panel recommendations and some are made on the basis of staff recommendations. In all cases, programs are not given initial accreditation until the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's program standards are met.

During the 2003-2004 year, the following number of programs were given initial accreditation:

Administrative Services Credential Programs	1
Pupil Personnel Services Credential Programs	49
Education Specialist Credential and Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential Programs	11
Reading Certificate Programs	1
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Programs	3
Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs under the SB2042 Standards	138
Professional Preparation Program - Special Teaching Authorization in Health	1
Program of Preparation for the Fifth Year of Study	1
Blended Programs Of Subject Matter Preparation and Professional Preparation for the Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs	11
Bilingual and Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) Emphasis Programs	54

A detailed listing of the programs granted initial accreditation is included in Appendix B.

Task 4 Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and School Districts and Their Credential Preparation Programs

This is the principal ongoing task of the Committee on Accreditation. Effective September 1, 1997, the Committee on Accreditation assumed full responsibility for making the decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of postsecondary education institutions and school districts and their credential programs. This task normally makes up the major portion of the January through May agendas of the Committee on Accreditation. In December 2002 the Commission took action to postpone accreditation visits for Spring 2003 and for the 2003-2004 accreditation cycle, with the exception of merged COA/NCATE visits.

During the 2003-2004 year, there were two accreditation visits to colleges and universities. All visits were merged COA/NCATE visits. The following is a list of institutions visited.

2003-2004 Accreditation Visits

Institution	Accreditation Decision
California Lutheran University	This visit did not affect the status of full Accreditation granted by the COA in 2001.
University of the Pacific	Accreditation

A more detailed report of each accreditation visit is included in Appendix A. For each visit, the accreditation team report information is provided, followed by the COA accreditation decision, the list of all credential programs authorized for the institution or district, any stipulations given by the Committee on Accreditation, and the date of the next accreditation visit.

In addition to the above accreditation visits, the Committee on Accreditation received follow-up information from the institution that received stipulations in the 2002-2003 accreditation cycle. Based on the information received, the Committee acted to remove the stipulations and to change the accreditation status of institution, based upon the removal of stipulations. In addition, the COA acted to approve the withdrawal of programs upon the request of program sponsors.

Task 5 Revise the *Accreditation Handbook* and Team Training Curriculum

Activities related to the *Accreditation Handbook* and team training have been postponed until after the Commission has made modifications in accreditation policies as a result of the evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework*.

Task 6 Maintain Public Access to the Committee on Accreditation

The Committee makes formal presentations upon request. All meetings of the COA are held in public. Regular information about the Committee and its deliberations is posted on the COA webpage at the Commission's website.

Task 7 Receive Regular Updates on the Implementation of SB 2042 and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation

The Committee believes that the implementation of the SB 2042 reforms will continue to have significant implications for its work in accreditation. Thus, regular reports on the topic were presented. The Committee also received information about other Commission activities and actions that is related to accreditation issues.

Task 8 Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission

The Committee on Accreditation adopted its Eighth Annual Accreditation Report in August 2003 and presented it to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing at its November 2003 meeting. The COA Co-Chairs made presentations to the Commission at three of its meetings between January and May.

Task 9 Other Required Elements of the Accreditation Framework - Election of Co-Chairs, Adoption of Meeting Schedule, Orientation of New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.

Each year, the Committee elects Co-Chairs, adopts a meeting schedule, orients new members, and modifies its own procedures manual. In August 2003, the Co-Chairs were elected and the 2003-2004 workplan was adopted. The 2003-2004 schedule of meetings was adopted in May 2003.

As a part of its ongoing review of accreditation process and procedures, the COA reviewed the results of the evaluations of team members and the evaluations of the accreditation process completed by team members and institutions. At any COA meeting in which an institutional accreditation decision was made, the COA scheduled a debriefing discussion at the end of the meeting about the accreditation decision-making process. During the spring of 2004, the COA worked with stakeholders to present a plan to the Commission for a comprehensive review of Commission accreditation policies and procedures. All of these activities together contribute to continuous improvement in the implementation of the Commission's accreditation system.

Section III. Proposed Workplan for the Committee in 2004-2005

The items that follow represent the key elements of the 2004-2005 workplan for the Committee on Accreditation. In this year the Committee, with the assistance of the Accreditation Study Workgroup, will be heavily involved in activities related to the review of the Accreditation Framework and the COA accreditation procedures.

Task 1 Review of the Results of the Evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework*

The *Accreditation Framework* called for an outside evaluator to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the *Framework* over a four-year period beginning with the first official accreditation visits. The contractor was selected in December 1999 and the contract was subsequently approved by the Commission. The contractor (American Institutes for Research) was fully involved in gathering data, attending COA meetings, observing accreditation visits, and interviewing participants in the accreditation process. The final report was presented to the Executive Director in April 2003 and initially reviewed at the May 2003 meeting of the COA and was the subject of discussion at subsequent COA meetings. An analysis of the AIR Report will be included in the larger review of the *Accreditation Framework* initiated by the Commission at its May 2004 meeting when it appointed the Accreditation Study Workgroup to work with the COA in the review. During the 2004-2005 year, the Committee on Accreditation will be working closely with the Accreditation Study Workgroup and will ultimately provide recommendations for Commission consideration that may lead to making changes in the accreditation system and modifying accreditation procedures.

Task 2 Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National Organizations (including NCATE)

The Partnership Agreement in effect with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) was renewed in October 2001. The COA will continue monitoring the agreement in the same manner as during the past year to make certain that the implementation of the partnership results in assuring that state issues are appropriately addressed in each visit and that the process reduces duplication. The Accreditation Study Workgroup and the COA will also be reviewing the provisions in the *Accreditation Framework* related to NCATE and consider whether or not these provisions are still appropriate for California.

As part of the implementation of the *Accreditation Framework*, the Committee has negotiated formal memoranda of understanding with some national professional education organizations. These memoranda govern the portion of the *Accreditation Framework* that permits national accreditation of credential programs to substitute for state accreditation. The Committee will further consider this section of the *Framework*, evaluate the agreements and their effectiveness, and advise the Commission on possible changes that should be made.

Task 3 Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs

This is one of the major ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The Committee has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Some of the decisions are made on the basis of expert review panel recommendations and some are made on the basis of staff recommendations. In all cases, programs will not be given initial accreditation until the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's program standards are met.

Task 4 Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and Their Credential Preparation Programs

This is the principal ongoing task of the Committee on Accreditation. Effective September 1, 1997, the Committee on Accreditation assumed full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of postsecondary education institutions and their credential programs. In December 2002 the Commission took action to postpone accreditation visits for Spring 2003 and for all of the 2003-2004 accreditation cycle, with the exception of merged COA/NCATE visits. In March 2004 the Commission took further action to postpone accreditation visits originally scheduled for the 2004-2005 accreditation cycle. The Accreditation Study Workgroup and the Committee on Accreditation will advise the Commission on developing a new schedule for evaluation activities.

During the 2004-2005 year, there will be four accreditation visits to colleges and universities. All visits are merged COA/NCATE visits. The following is a list of institutions to be visited.

Institutional Reviews

California State University, Dominguez Hills
California State University, Los Angeles
Sonoma State University
University of San Diego

Task 5 Revise the *Accreditation Handbook* and Team Training Curriculum

Activities related to the *Accreditation Handbook* and team training will be postponed until after the Commission has completed the evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework* and made decisions about future policies and procedures.

Task 6 Maintain Public Access to the Committee on Accreditation

The Committee will make formal presentations upon request. All meetings of the COA are held in public. Regular information about the Committee and its deliberations is posted on the COA webpage at the Commission's website.

Task 7 Receive Regular Updates on the Implementation of SB 2042 and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation

The Committee believes that the implementation of the SB 2042 reforms will continue to have significant implications for its work in accreditation. Thus, regular reports on the topic will be presented. The Committee will also be receiving information about other Commission activities and actions that may be related to accreditation issues.

Task 8 Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission

Each year the Committee on Accreditation presents its annual report to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing in the fall. Interim reports to the Commission will be made as needed.

Task 9 Other Required Elements of the Accreditation Framework - Election of Co-Chairs, Adopt Meeting Schedule, Orient New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.

Each year, the Committee elects Co-Chairs, adopts a meeting schedule, orients new members, and modifies its own procedures manual. Through numerous planned activities and in the process of the ongoing accreditation reports and discussions, the Committee conducts an on-going review of the accreditation process. As a result of those discussions, the Committee considers and adopts modifications in accreditation procedures, as needed.

APPENDIX A

**Continuing Accreditation Decisions Made by the Committee
on Accreditation Based Upon
Site Visits Conducted - 2003-2004**

APPENDIX A

Continuing Accreditation Decisions Made by the Committee on Accreditation Based Upon Site Visits Conducted - 2003-2004

Introduction

Following is a summary of the continuing accreditation decisions made by the Committee on Accreditation during the 2003-2004 academic year, based upon team site visits. Merged NCATE/COA Accreditation visits were conducted for two institutions. The accreditation information is presented in two parts as follows:

- Accreditation team report information, including the accreditation team recommendation and the rationale for the recommendation, the team membership, and a summary of the documents reviewed and the interviews conducted.
- Committee on Accreditation action, including the Committee's accreditation decision, a list of credentials for which an institution or district internship program is authorized to recommend its candidates, any stipulations given by the Committee on Accreditation, and the date of the next accreditation visit. (In some cases, the COA action may differ from the team recommendation, as the COA carries out its statutory responsibility.)

California Lutheran University **November 15-19, 2003** **(COA/NCATE Merged Accreditation Visit)**

A. Accreditation Team Report Information

Team Recommendation: The Findings Of The Merged Team Do Not Change the COA Accreditation Status for California Lutheran University

Rationale

In November 1999, a merged team of NCATE and COA representatives visited California Lutheran University (CLU). The COA report recommended accreditation of all credential programs operated by CLU, with two substantive stipulations:

“That the University provide evidence of policies and a plan to encourage the admission of students from under-represented groups and to recruit faculty who reflect cultural and linguistic diversity in order to better respond to the multicultural and multilingual public school region it serves.”

“That the University provide evidence that sufficient resources are being allocated to improve the facilities for the School of Education, to recruit and retain faculty and to increase faculty professional development.”

A state team re-visit was conducted a year later and the team found that the items covered in the stipulations had been appropriately addressed, and recommended that the stipulations be removed. The recommended action was taken by the COA.

At the original visit, the report by the NCATE Board of Examiners recommended initial accreditation for CLU. However the Unit Accreditation Board of NCATE did not accept that recommendation and denied initial NCATE accreditation. CLU reapplied for initial accreditation and the 2003 merged visit was for that purpose. Since the accreditation of credential programs by the COA was still in effect, and CLU was not scheduled for another state visit for some time, it was determined that the state team members on the 2003 merged team would evaluate credential programs for the purpose of assisting in collecting data and in recommending the NCATE accreditation status.

Team Membership

NCATE Board of Examiners Team Members:

Nancy L. Williams (Team Co-Chair)

Clara Burrows

Deborah Kraker

Gwendolyn Trotter

State Team Members:

Lamar Meyer (Team Co-Chair)
California State University, Los Angeles

Katy Gould Anderson
California State University, Chico

Cathy Buell
San Jose State University

Jim Reidt
San Juan Unified School District

State Consultants:

Phil Fitch
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Beth Graybill
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

NEA Representative:

Leslie Littman
California Teachers Association

The merged team again reviewed the programs at CLU and as a result of the accreditation visit, the COA/NCATE team found that all six NCATE Standards were met with certain areas for improvement noted. The team recommended to the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board that initial accreditation be granted. The team recommendation was considered by the Unit Accreditation Board of NCATE at its March 2004 meeting and initial NCATE accreditation was awarded.

University of the Pacific
March 27-31, 2004
(COA/NCATE Merged Accreditation Visit)

A. Accreditation Team Report Information

Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Rationale:

The recommendation pertaining to the accreditation status of University of the Pacific and all of its credential programs was determined according to the following:

1. NCATE's Six Standards and Conceptual Framework: The university elected to use the NCATE format and to write to NCATE's unit standards to meet the COA Common Standards requirement. There was extensive cross-referencing to the COA Common Standards. Also, the corresponding part of this team report utilizes the NCATE standards and format. The total team, NCATE and COA, reviewed each element of the six NCATE Standards, added appropriate areas of the Common Standards, and voted as to whether the standard was met, not met, or met with areas of improvement.
2. Program Standards: The University prepared responses to program standards in the following documents:

Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs
Education Specialist Programs
Administrative Services Programs
Pupil Services: School Psychology Programs
Clinical Rehabilitative Services Program

Team clusters for (1) Basic credential programs, and (2) Services Credentials reviewed all data regarding those credential programs. Appropriate input was provided by other team members to each of the clusters. Following discussion of each program the total

team, NCATE and COA, considered whether the program standards were either met, met minimally, or not met.

3. **Overall Recommendation:** The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that the six (6) NCATE Standards were met, with two identified areas for improvement for purposes of the NCATE report, that all elements of the CCTC Common Standards were addressed and met within the context of the NCATE report, that all internship elements were met in the context of the NCATE report, and that all Program Standards were met for all program areas. The following report further explains these findings.

Team Membership

State Team Leader: **Emily Brizendine** (Team Co-Chair)
California State University, Hayward

Common Standards Cluster:

Ron Colbert, Cluster Leader,
NCATE Chair (Team Co-Chair)
Fitchburg State College, Massachusetts

Marianne G. Handler (NCATE Team Member)
National-Louis University, Illinois

Dayne Antwine (NCATE Team Member)
Lubbock Independent School District, Texas

Karen C. Roark (NCATE Team Member)
Cohutta Elementary School, Virginia

Jeri A. Carrol (NCATE Team Member)
Wichita State University, Kansas

Cheryl Getz (State Team Member)
University of San Diego

Mark Cary (State Team Member)
Davis Joint Unified School District

Basic Credential Cluster:

Michael Jordan, Cluster Leader
California State University, Fresno

Bettie Spatafora
Moreno Valley Unified School District

Mel Lopez
Chapman University

Christine Givner
California State University, Los Angeles

Services Credential Cluster:

Jo Birdsell, Cluster Leader
Point Loma Nazarene University

Bill Watkins
Davis Joint Unified School District (Retired)

Terry Saenz
California State University, Fullerton

Data Sources

	Team Leader	Common Stands. Cluster	Basic Credential Cluster	Services Credential Cluster	TOTAL
Program Faculty	3	14	30	31	78
Institutional Administration	3	12	4	9	28
Candidates	2	6	63	57	128
Graduates	3	7	46	45	101
Employers of Graduates	1		6	13	20
Supervising Practitioners	2	6	22	14	44
Advisors				7	7
School Administrators		5	4	15	24
Credential Analyst			2	1	3
Advisory Committee			4	10	14

TOTAL INTERVIEWS 447

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

B. Committee on Accreditation Action

1. The decision for the University of the Pacific is **ACCREDITATION**.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
 - Preliminary Credential
 - Preliminary Internship
 - Professional Credential

- Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential
 - Language Speech and Hearing

- Education Specialist Credentials – Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II
 - Preliminary Level I
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship

 - Professional Level II
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities

- Multiple Subject Credential
 - Multiple Subject Credential
 - BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
 - Multiple Subject Internship

- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
 - School Psychology
 - School Psychology Internship

- Single Subject Credential
 - Single Subject Credential
 - Single Subject Internship

2. In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted

- The University of the Pacific is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.

- The University of the Pacific is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2011-2012 academic year subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation visits by both the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

APPENDIX B

Initial Program Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation 2003-2004

APPENDIX B

Initial Program Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation – 2003-2004

Introduction

Following is a summary of the initial program accreditation actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation during the 2003-2004 academic year. For each program area, the program sponsors are listed in alphabetical order. For each of the sponsors, the specific programs accredited are named in each listing.

Initial Accreditation Based Upon Panel Review

The Committee on Accreditation granted initial accreditation to the following preparation programs, based upon the recommendations of the appropriate review panels. Each of the program sponsors listed responded fully and appropriately to the adopted standards and preconditions by preparing a program proposal that described how each standard and precondition was met and that included appropriate supporting evidence. The program proposals were read by the appropriate review panels following the procedures adopted by the Committee on Accreditation. The programs were judged to meet all standards and preconditions.

B. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Education Specialist Credential

California State University, Channel Islands

Preliminary Level I

Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship

California State University, Monterey Bay

Preliminary Level I

Mild/Moderate Disabilities with Internship

California State University, San Bernardino

Professional Level II

Early Childhood Education

Claremont Graduate University

Preliminary Level I

Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship

National University
Early Childhood Special Education Certificate

Orange County Office of Education
Preliminary Level I
Mild/Moderate Internship

Sacramento County Office of Education
Professional Level II
Mild/Moderate Disabilities

San Diego Unified School District
Preliminary Level I
Mild/Moderate District Internship Program

Stanislaus County Office of Education
Preliminary Level I
Mild/Moderate District Internship Program

B. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Reading Certificate
National University

Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential
Notre Dame de Namur University
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Riverside

C. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential

Alliant International University
School Psychology
School Psychology Internship

California State University, Bakersfield
School Counseling

California State University, Dominguez Hills
School Counseling
School Counseling Internship
Child Welfare and Attendance Specialization

California State University, Fresno
School Counseling
School Psychology
School Psychology Internship

California State University, Hayward
School Counseling

California State University, Long Beach
School Counseling
School Counseling Internship
School Psychology

California State University, Los Angeles
School Counseling
School Counseling Internship
School Psychology
School Psychology Internship
Child Welfare and Attendance

California State University, Northridge
School Counseling
School Counseling Internship
School Psychology
School Psychology Internship

California State University, Sacramento
School Psychology
School Psychology Internship

California State University, San Bernardino
School Social Work

California State University, Stanislaus
School Counseling
Fresno Pacific University
School Counseling
School Psychology
School Psychology Internship

Humboldt State University
School Psychology
School Psychology Internship

La Sierra University
School Psychology
School Psychology Internship
Loma Linda University

School Counseling

Loyola Marymount University
School Psychology
School Psychology Internship

Phillips Graduate Institute
School Counseling

Point Loma Nazarene University
School Counseling
School Counseling Internship

University of California, Berkeley
School Social Work
Child Welfare and Attendance Specialization

University of California, Riverside
School Counseling (Extension)
School Counseling Internship (Extension)
Child Welfare and Attendance (Extension)

University of Redlands
School Counseling

University of San Francisco
School Counseling
School Counseling Internship

University of Southern California
School Counseling
School Counseling Internship

D. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Multiple and Single Subject Credentials Under SB 2042 Standards

Azusa Pacific University
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

Bethany College
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

Biola University
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

California Baptist University
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

California Lutheran University
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

California State University, Channel Islands
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

California State University, Hayward
Single Subject (Discrete Pathway)
Single Subject Internship (Discrete Pathway)

California State University, Long Beach
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

California State University, Los Angeles
Single Subject Internship

California State University, Monterey Bay
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

California State University, Sacramento

Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject

California State University, San Bernardino
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

California State University, Stanislaus
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

CalState TEACH
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship

Chapman University
Multiple Subject (University College)
Multiple Subject Internship (University College)
Single Subject (University College)
Single Subject Internship (University College)
Multiple Subject (Orange Campus)
Single Subject (Orange Campus)
Multiple Subject Internship (Orange Campus)
Single Subject Internship (Orange Campus)

Christian Heritage College
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

Claremont Graduate University
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject Internship

Fresno Pacific University
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

Hope International University
Multiple Subject
Humboldt State University
Multiple Subject

Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

John F. Kennedy University
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

The Master's College
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

Mills College
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

National Hispanic University
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

New College
Multiple Subject

Occidental College
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

Orange County Department of Education
Multiple Subject Internship

Pacific Oaks College
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship

Patten University
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

Pepperdine University
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject

Single Subject Internship

Project Pipeline (Sacramento County Office of Education)

Multiple Subject Internship

Single Subject Internship

San Diego State University

Single Subject Internship (CRSME)

San Francisco State University

Multiple Subject

Multiple Subject Internship

Single Subject

Single Subject Internship

Simpson College

Multiple Subject

Single Subject

Stanford University

Multiple Subject

St. Mary's College of California

Multiple Subject

Multiple Subject Internship

Single Subject

Single Subject Internship

University of California, Berkeley

Multiple Subject

Single Subject

University of California, Irvine

Multiple Subject

Multiple Subject Internship

Single Subject

Single Subject Internship

University of California, Los Angeles

Multiple Subject Internship (Extension Program)

University of California, Santa Barbara
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

University of the Pacific
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

University of San Francisco
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject

Western Governor's University
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject
Single Subject Internship

Westmont College
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

Whittier College
Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Internship

E. Blended Programs of Subject Matter Preparation and Professional Preparation for the Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs

California State University, Los Angeles
Elementary Subject Matter/Multiple Subject
Elementary Subject Matter/Education Specialist Internship

California State University, Sacramento
Physical Education/Single Subject
Mathematics/Single Subject
Elementary Subject Matter/Multiple Subject

Dominican University
Elementary Subject Matter/Multiple Subject

Humboldt State University
Elementary Subject Matter/Multiple Subject

San Francisco State University
Liberal Studies (Child & Adolescent Development)
Multiple Subject Credential

University of California, Riverside
Mathematics
Single Subject Credential

F. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Administrative Services Credential

University of California, Berkeley
Professional Credential

G. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Bilingual and Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) Emphasis

The Committee granted permission to the following programs to offer the BCLAD Emphasis Program based upon the SB2042 Standards:

California Lutheran University
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
Multiple Subject

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

California State University, Bakersfield
Multiple Subject

California State University, Chico
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

California State University, Dominguez Hills
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

California State University, Fresno
Multiple Subject

California State University, Long Beach
Multiple Subject

California State University, Los Angeles
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

California State University, Monterey Bay
Multiple Subject

California State University, Northridge
Multiple Subject Credential
Single Subject Credential

California State University, Sacramento
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

California State University, San Bernardino
Multiple Subject

California State University, San Marcos
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

California State University, Stanislaus
Multiple Subject Credential
Single Subject Credential

Chapman University
Multiple Subject (Orange Campus)

Fresno Pacific University
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

Los Angeles Unified School District Intern Program
Multiple Subject

Loyola Marymount University
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

National University
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

National Hispanic University
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

New College
Multiple Subject

Sonoma State University
Multiple Subject

Stanford University
Multiple Subject

University of California, Davis
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

University of California, Irvine
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

University of California, Los Angeles
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

University of California, Riverside
Multiple Subject Credential

University of California, San Diego
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

University of California, Santa Barbara
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

University of California, Santa Cruz
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

University of LaVerne
Multiple Subject

University of the Pacific
Multiple Subject

University of San Diego
Multiple Subject

University of San Francisco
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

University of Southern California
Multiple Subject
Single Subject

H. Program of Professional Preparation for the Special Teaching Authorization in Health

California State University, San Bernardino

I. Program of Preparation for the Fifth Year of Study

Point Loma Nazarene University

APPENDIX C

Additional Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation 2003-2004

APPENDIX C

Additional Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation – 2003-2004

Introduction

Following is a summary of other accreditation actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation during the 2003-2004 academic year. Actions include the withdrawal of programs, removal of accreditation stipulations and changing of accreditation status.

A. Withdrawal of Professional Preparation Programs

In August 2003, the Committee approved the voluntary withdrawal of the Multiple Subject Internship Program at the **University of California, San Diego**, effective June 30, 2004.

In January 2004, the Committee approved the voluntary withdrawal of the Multiple Subjects Credential Program at **Nova Southeastern University**, effective December 31, 2004.

Both of these programs no longer accept candidates and the programs are not included in any continuing accreditation visits. A withdrawn program may be re-accredited only when the institution submits a new proposal for initial accreditation according to the policies of the Committee on Accreditation. The institution must wait at least two years from the date in which candidates were no longer admitted to the program before requesting re-accreditation of the program.

B. Request for Extension of Experimental Program

In August 2003, the Committee agreed to grant a three-year extension to the following experimental combined program of professional preparation:

University of California, San Diego
Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis (American Sign Language/ASL)
Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing

C. Removal of Accreditation Stipulations and Change of Institutional Accreditation Status

In March 2004, the Committee voted to remove the substantive stipulations placed on the **University of Southern California** based the Accreditation Re-Visit Team Report, team recommendations and staff recommendations. The Committee voted to change the accreditation status from “Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations” to “Accreditation”.