
6C

Information

Professional Services Committee

Options for Proposed Changes to the Accreditation System

Executive Summary: In May 2004, the Commission approved the formation of an Accreditation Study Work Group comprised of members of the Committee on Accreditation and representatives of stakeholders to review and suggest any changes, if needed, to the Commission's accreditation system for educator preparation in California. This item was originally prepared for the August Commission meeting. It has been updated to reflect recent discussions by the Committee on Accreditation and the Work Group. It contains the options considered to date and the options preferred by the Work Group and Committee.

Recommended Action: This is an information item that requires no action.

Presenters: Lawrence Birch, Administrator, Teri Clark, Consultant and Cheryl Hickey, Consultant, Committee on Accreditation and Accreditation Study Work Group members.

Goal 1: Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators.

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators.
- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates.

Goal 1: Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators.

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators.
- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Background.....	1
Adopting Modifications to the Current Accreditation System.....	2
Accreditation Topics	3
1: Purpose of the Accreditation System	4
2: Roles and Responsibilities of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation.....	4
3: Accreditation as an On-Going Activity.....	5
4: Accreditation Cycle and Activities	6
5: Unit Accreditation and Program Approval.....	9
6: Consistency in including all Credential and Certificate Programs in the Accreditation Process.....	10
7: Program Standard Options.....	14
8: Accreditation Decisions-Program Finding	14
9: Accreditation Decisions-Unit Finding	15
10: Selection of COA Members.....	15
11: National Unit Accreditation.....	17
12: National Program Accreditation	17
13: Evaluation of the Accreditation System.....	18
14: Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR)	18
15: Selection of Review Teams	19
16: Selection of Interviews and Site Visits.....	19
17: Data Collection	19
18: Standards Review Efforts	20
Projected Cost of the Preferred Options	32
Attachment A: Matrix of Issues and Options	35

List of Tables

Table 1: Accreditation Cycle and Activities	8
Table 2: COA Members Transition Plan	16
Table 3: Summary of Preferred Options	22
Table 4: Cost of the Current Accreditation System	32
Table 5: Budget for Transition to Revised System	33
Table 6: Budget for Revised Accreditation System	34

Options for the Proposed Changes to the Accreditation System

Introduction

This agenda item presents options for revising the accreditation system and *Framework* that govern educator preparation in California. This item is for Commission discussion and comment. Members of the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the Accreditation Study Work Group (Work Group) will discuss the options considered for changing the accreditation system and explain the rationale behind the preferred option identified by the two bodies.

Background

In January 2004, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) directed the Committee on Accreditation (COA) 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 suggesting any changes, if needed, to the Committee on Accreditation for its consideration. In turn, the Committee on Accreditation is to submit its preferred options for changes to the system to the Commission for its consideration. This report provides an update on the topics the Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation have reviewed, the options considered to date, and the options preferred by the Work Group and Committee.

At the June 2005 Commission meeting, a study session on accreditation was presented by staff, accreditation review team members, Work Group members and Committee on Accreditation members. Included in the study session was the description of the Commission's role in the policy decisions relating to accreditation and the Committee on Accreditation's role in implementing the Commission's policies. The June 2005 agenda item also summarized the structure of the proposed accreditation system and some of the following features being considered by the COA and the Work Group:

- Strengthen individual program accountability by blending "unit" accreditation with program evaluation
- Infuse the system with more data on candidate performance and program effectiveness
- Implement a biennial reporting system with data on candidate performance for all programs

- Biennial reports that do not include adequate measures of candidate competence will lead to investigation and intervention
- Other identified indicators in biennial reports will also lead to investigation and intervention
- Retain the site visit and institutional self-study document submission requirements to complement biennial data collection and confirm findings on quality and effectiveness
- Improve the selection and training of the Board of Institutional Reviewers
- Establish criteria for the selection of schools to visit during site visits

The study session also stressed that a central outcome of the revised accreditation system includes the concept that no institution or program sponsor be accredited unless it does all of the following:

- Meets Commission standards
- Produces qualified credential candidates
- Listens and attends carefully to feedback on program effectiveness from stakeholders
- Aligns programs with the State-adopted Academic Content and Performance Standards for Students

The Accreditation Study Work Group has met regularly since June 2004 and communicated with the Committee on Accreditation throughout the process. This agenda item is an informational reporting of the consensus items from both the Work Group and Committee on Accreditation.

Adopting Modifications to the Current Accreditation System

The education code stipulates that accreditation of educator preparation be governed by an *Accreditation Framework* adopted by the Commission. The current *Framework* was adopted by the Commission in 1993 and revised in 1995.

Education Code Section 44372 provides the Commission with the authority to modify the *Accreditation Framework* “in accordance with Section 8 of the *Framework* that was in effect on June 30, 1993.”

Section 8 (A) of the *Framework* addresses the evaluation of the *Framework* and Section 8 (B) addresses the conditions under which the *Accreditation Framework* may be modified. The *Framework* provides for modifications of three types: 1) General Provisions Regarding Modifications; 2) Refinements and Clarifications; and 3) Significant Modifications of the *Framework*. Because of its relevance to the current review process, the text of this section of the *Framework* is reproduced verbatim below.

Section 8 (B). Modification of the *Accreditation Framework*

1. **General Provisions Regarding Modifications.** The Commission will consult with the Committee on Accreditation and educational institutions and organizations regarding any proposed modifications of the *Framework*. Modifications will occur in public meetings of the Commission, after the Commission has considered relevant information provided by the Committee on Accreditation, postsecondary institutions, accreditation team members, the Commission's professional staff, and other concerned individuals. The Commission will determine the date when a policy modification is effective.
2. **Refinements and Clarifications of the *Framework*.** The Commission may modify the *Accreditation Framework* to refine or clarify its contents, as needed. The Commission retains its authority to reconsider and modify the Program Standards for Options 1, 4, and 5 as the need arises.
3. **Significant Modifications of the *Framework*.** The Commission will maintain without significant modifications the *Framework's* major features and options, including the Common Standards, and Option 3 (General Program Standards), until the summative evaluation is completed or until there is compelling evidence that a significant modification is warranted. The determination of compelling evidence and the warranted significant modification will be made by the Commission with the concurrence of the Committee on Accreditation and the Chancellor of the California State University, the President of the University of California, and the President of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities.

The summative evaluation referenced in #3 above occurred between 1999 and 2002. American Institute for Research (AIR) was hired by the Commission to conduct this evaluation of the system, and produced their final report in 2003. The completion of the required formal evaluation of the system led the Commission to appoint the current Accreditation Workgroup to review the findings and recommendations of AIR, and identify options for revisions to the system.

Accreditation Topics Identified by the Committee on Accreditation and the Accreditation Study Work Group

Below are the major topics addressed by the COA and the Work Group including some background, a statement of the preferred option for each issue and the rationale for identifying this particular option as the preferred option. Attachment A includes the matrix used as a working document by the Work Group and the COA to help keep track of the plausible options identified, and as the meetings and discussions progressed, to eliminate options. To review the options that were not selected as the preferred options, please see Attachment A, beginning on page 34 of this agenda item. At times, options were eliminated for practical reasons such as cost, but more often they were eliminated because the Work Group members believed the option did not adequately align with the four identified major purposes of accreditation, nor would it necessarily improve the accreditation system significantly. Table 3, beginning on page 21 of this agenda item, summarizes the preferred options of the COA and Work Group.

Topic 1: Purpose of the Accreditation System

Preferred Option: 1a: Revise the Accreditation Framework to reflect four broad purposes of accreditation:

- 1) To ensure accountability;**
- 2) To ensure high quality and effective preparation programs;**
- 3) To ensure adherence to credential standards; and**
- 4) To encourage and support on-going program improvement.**

Preferred Option: 1b: The essential attributes of accreditation defined in the Framework should be revised to include:

- 1) The professional nature of accreditation;**
- 2) Knowledgeable participants;**
- 3) Breadth and flexibility;**
- 4) Intensity;**
- 5) Efficiency; and**
- 6) Cost effectiveness.**

Background: The *Framework* adopted in 1995 outlines the purposes of accreditation as they were defined at that point in time. The Committee on Accreditation and the Accreditation Study Work Group reviewed these purposes to determine whether they reflected current needs and addressed the current educational policy environment. This discussion was a critically important first step as a common understanding and agreement about the purposes of accreditation was a necessary foundation to building a system that achieves these objectives.

Rationale: After examining the purposes of accreditation as defined by other states, other accrediting bodies, and other professions, the Committee on Accreditation and the Accreditation Study Work Group suggest that the language within the *Framework* be revised. The proposed language would align better with generally accepted purposes of accreditation, simplify the language to facilitate public understanding, and recognize the importance of accreditation in program improvement – a purpose not explicitly defined in the 1995 *Framework* language. The language related to essential attributes would be revised to eliminate outdated language, consolidate ideas, and better reflect the proposed system.

Topic 2: Roles and Responsibilities of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation

Preferred Option: Maintain the current roles and responsibilities of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation as defined in California Education Code Section 44372 and 44373 (c) but improve the communication between the COA and the Commission.

Improve communication by providing on-going reports from COA representatives at Commission meetings as appropriate, but more frequently than annual reporting. The

COA will investigate and implement processes that will allow the Commission to better determine how its accreditation policies are being implemented.

Background: California Education Code Section 44372 delineates the powers and duties of the Commission as it relates to accreditation and section 44373 (c) delineates the powers and duties of the Committee on Accreditation. In sum, the Commission establishes accreditation policies, appoints members of the COA, and hears appeals of accreditation decisions. The COA implements the accreditation system and renders accreditation decisions.

California Education Code Section 44373 (c) (5) requires the Committee on Accreditation to present an annual report to the Commission. Over the past decade, the Committee on Accreditation has produced and presented annual reports to the Commission. Beyond these annual reports, there has been little other interaction between the Committee on Accreditation and the Commission.

Rationale: The COA and the Work Group have agreed that the composition, roles, and responsibilities of the COA as currently defined by the Education Code have been beneficial for several reasons. First, the COA is composed of professional educators from both K-12 and higher education who are distinct from the Commission but who are appointed by the Commission because of their distinguished careers in education. Maintaining the current composition of the COA would keep accreditation decisions within the purview of professional educators and maintain a balance of K-12 and higher education. Second, having a body distinct from the Commission has allowed sufficient time for deliberation and depth of discussion required for making accreditation decisions. It was the general opinion of the members of both the COA and the Work Group that the Commission currently has a full workload without adding accreditation decision-making.

However, the Committee on Accreditation and the Accreditation Study Work Group agreed that there ought to be improved communication between the Commission and the Committee. It was agreed that annual reporting alone is insufficient given the critical nature of accreditation. Increasing the Commission's interaction with the COA will foster greater understanding of accreditation issues, allow the Commission more opportunity to determine whether its policies are being appropriately implemented, and allow for discussion of trends and issues related to accreditation matters. Further, more opportunity for Commission discussion about accreditation will raise the visibility of accreditation and provide greater recognition of the importance of this function.

Topic 3: Accreditation as an On-Going Activity

Preferred Option: Modify the system such that accreditation becomes an on-going activity instead of a once every six year event. Accreditation should include an on-going cycle of activities focused on accountability, meeting Commission standards, and data-driven decision making. Each institution's prior accreditation report and continuing data reports should be considered in the accreditation system.

Background: Currently, the accreditation system examines an institution every six years with a "snapshot" – that is, the review team is limited to the information about the institution available at that time. Previous documentation and accreditation decisions are not considered by the review team or the COA. The COA decides on an accreditation finding and if that finding is

“Accreditation” the institution is permitted to continue to operate its programs and is not required to provide further information to the COA until the next review. If an institution receives the status of accreditation with stipulations, it must take action to satisfactorily address the stipulations within one year, and no follow up occurs beyond that next year until the next review.

Rationale: The Committee on Accreditation and the Accreditation Study Work Group agreed that the snapshot approach does not sufficiently promote on-going program improvement at institutions and districts. Instead many faculty and administrators involved in credential programs treat accreditation as a cyclical event they “go through” and then do not have to think about again until the next site visit. While the accreditation process can and does, encourage the kind of dialogue that prompts positive change, many suggest that once the site visit is complete, the same level of focus on issues of program quality and effectiveness is not consistently maintained over the intervening years.

Further, the COA and the Work Group also agreed that the snapshot approach does not assure a sufficient level of accountability. As an example, a review team may have significant concerns about an institution or a program that leads to a stipulation. Under the existing system, it is difficult for the review team to know whether a concern has been raised by previous review teams and thus is indicative of an ongoing issue at the institution, or whether the concern is of a more recent or isolated nature.

If the change in focus of accreditation is that it is no longer viewed as a “snapshot” or point in time process, but rather a look at an institution over time, the use of historical data – including continuing reports – can and should be considered for use in the accreditation system. Under such a system, full “accreditation” would no longer mean that an institution had no responsibilities related to accreditation between reviews. On the contrary, accreditation activities and reporting of performance data would be required of all institutions and programs throughout the cycle. Likewise, follow up and corrective action on issues of concern would not be limited to one year. The COA would have the ability to follow-up on an area of concern over the next few years to ensure that the programs being offered continue to meet the Commission’s adopted standards.

Topic 4: Accreditation Cycle and Activities

Preferred Option: 4a: Revise the accreditation cycle from a single site visit once every 6 years, to a series of accreditation activities over the course of 7 years;

Preferred Option: 4b: Revise the cycle from a 3-4 day comprehensive site visit conducted every six years to a system that includes annual data collection by the institution or program sponsor;

Preferred Option: 4c: Require program sponsors to submit biennial reports to the COA;

Preferred Option: 4d: Retain and revise the review of documents submitted by all credential programs in the 4th year of the 7 year cycle;

Preferred Option: 4e: Retain and revise a site visit in the 6th year of the 7 year cycle focusing on Common Standards and where needed, program standards; and

Preferred Option: 4f: Use the 7th year in the cycle for required follow up.

Background: The current accreditation system utilizes a site visit at the institution once every five or six years to evaluate institution and program quality. The site visit team reviews all individual programs, program documentation, supporting evidence, and the institution as a whole during the one visit. No activities are required of institutions/program sponsors in the intervening years unless there has been a stipulation placed on the institution by the COA. All stipulations must be addressed within one year, after which time no ongoing accreditation activities are required

Rationale: The COA and the Work Group believe the structure and cycle of the accreditation system can be improved upon to encourage program improvement and public accountability on a more consistent basis. The proposed structure would require that the same type of activities – review of program documentation and information from candidates, graduates, and employers, and faculty – take place across time, rather than at a single point in time. By collecting specific information from programs at multiple times during the accreditation cycle, the COA and Work Group believe that reviewers will have a more accurate understanding of the institution and its programs.

Under the proposed system, a variety of accreditation activities would take place throughout a seven year cycle and build upon one another. Table 1, on page 8, provides a concise summary of the types of activities and the frequency of each activity. It is believed that this on-going cycle of activities is more likely to accomplish the four primary objectives of accreditation than the current system.

Annual Data Gathering and Analysis: Each program would be expected to collect data (contextual, demographic, and candidate competence data). The program would aggregate and analyze these data, use data to evaluate program effectiveness, and make adjustments as appropriate.

Report to the Commission/COA (Years 2, 4, and 6): The institution would report summary data for each program for the current and prior year to the Commission. Each program would submit information describing how candidate competence is assessed in the program and how the candidates perform on those assessments. In addition, each report would include a brief statement of analysis and an action plan based on the analysis. Each institution or program sponsor would also submit an institutional summary, identifying trends across the programs or critical issues. The COA and Commission staff would review the biennial reports. If the report is not submitted, or is incomplete or inadequate, Commission staff would contact the institution/program. Institutions that submit reports with data that do not demonstrate measures of candidate competence or that have other deficiencies would be reviewed by COA and could result in a request for additional information from the institution/program or possibly a site review.

Program Review (Years 4 and 5): Each program that is offered by an institution/program sponsor would submit an updated version of its approved program document including current course syllabi. The update would detail all modifications in the program since its prior approval. In addition, the candidate assessments, rubrics, and scoring procedures that generated the data gathered over the current year and previous three years would be submitted. Program reviewers (trained members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers) would review each program through a review of updates to approved program documents, data reports, and the reports to the Commission/COA. The program review team could raise questions or request additional

Table 1: Accreditation Cycle and Activities

	Institution or Program Sponsors		Commission on Teacher Credentialing Committee on Accreditation and/or CTC Staff will Review	
	At the Institution	Submit to CTC/COA		
Year 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Gathering & Analysis 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although no formal report is required, institution may be completing follow-up from the site visit in Year 6. All institutions will continue data gathering and analysis.
Year 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Gathering & Analysis 	Data Report Years 1 & 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biennial Data Report: Staff review of the report could result in a request for additional information and/or a focused site visit.
Year 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Gathering & Analysis Prepare program document updates 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report unless there was follow-up from questions generated from the Year 2 Biennial Report. Data gathering and analysis is on-going at the institution
Year 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit Program Document(s) Data Gathering & Analysis 	Data Report* Years 3 & 4	Program Review Document (s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biennial Data Report: Staff review of the report could result in a request for additional information and/or a focused site visit. Program reviewers are assigned to review each program’s documentation and pose questions for institution. Program review teams agree on preliminary findings for program standards.
Year 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Gathering & Analysis Prepare Common Standards self-study for site visit 		Response to questions on program review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program reviewers submit preliminary findings and remaining questions or concerns to the COA, with recommendations for any needed follow-up at the site visit. COA determines which, if any program(s) need to be included in the site visit and notifies institution at least one year prior to the site visit date.
Year 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Gathering & Analysis Complete preparations for site visit Host site visit 	Data Report Years 5 & 6	Common Standards Self-Study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site team is provided with preliminary findings from program review teams and all previous documentation from this cycle. Team is also provided with prior accreditation team report. Site team visits the institution reviewing all Common Standards and program(s) identified by the Program Reviews. Site team submits an accreditation report to COA, with recommendations. COA makes an accreditation decision and specifies required follow-up if necessary.
Year 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Gathering & Analysis Follow-up to site visit if necessary 		Follow-up to site visit, if necessary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> COA reviews follow-up, if warranted, asks further questions. Follow up may exceed one year at the discretion of the COA. After completing the seven year cycle, the institution begins the cycle again

* Data related to approved subject matter programs is submitted in Year 4

information. The program would submit additional information and evidence to address the questions that the reviewers have raised. Specific time limits would need to be observed by both the program and the reviewers so that the preliminary findings would be submitted to the COA at least one year prior to the scheduled site visit. The program review team would consider all information and agree upon “preliminary findings” for all program standards. The program review team submits any additional questions or areas of concern to the COA and makes a recommendation to COA whether the issue needs to be further reviewed at the site visit. The COA would consider the recommendation and in so doing, would determine the nature of the program review (size and composition of the team) that would take place during the site visit.

Site Visit (Year 6): Each institution or program sponsor would have an accreditation team visit the site in the sixth year of the accreditation cycle. Prior to the visit, the institution would submit a self-study that responds to the Common Standards. The institution would prepare for a site visit that focuses mainly on the Common Standards, but includes students, graduates, and faculty as well as other stakeholders from all programs that are sponsored by the institution. The site review team would be composed of 3 to 6 members that would focus on the Common Standards plus any program areas directed to be reviewed by the COA as a result of the program review. Within the site visit, each program in operation would participate fully in the interview schedule. The COA may add additional members to the team with expertise in the program area(s) to be reviewed at the site visit. The site review team would submit a report with program findings and an accreditation recommendation to the COA. It is possible that the site visit team may find a program concern or issue not previously identified by the program reviewers. In so doing, the team may recommend a follow up focused program review of the concerns or issues that have arisen. In this event, there would be no accreditation recommendation until after the focused review has been completed. The COA would review the team report and ask questions prior to making an accreditation decision. When follow-up is required, the COA would indicate what follow-up is required and when.

Follow-up to site visit: (Year 7) If necessary, the institution and all its programs would begin to respond to the follow-up required by the COA. COA will state the timeline for response from the institution. Institutions must address all stipulations within one year, however, the timeline for COA follow up may extend beyond the one year.

Topic 5: Unit Accreditation and Program Approval

***Preferred Option:* Revise the system such that it addresses unit accreditation and enhances program review.**

Background: 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. This system is often referred to as “unit plus” because it focuses on the program sponsor and all its credential programs.

Rationale: In gathering feedback from the constituencies represented on the Work Group, it was clear that there is overwhelming support for continuing a “unit” based system. Deans and administrators of education preparation commented that the unit based system allows them some degree of leverage with the university or district to initiate or implement improvements in programs, particularly with those programs that are out of their direct control. However,

concerns were raised that accreditation review team members have sometimes failed to sufficiently address program concerns in the report for fear of risking the accreditation status of the institution. This seemed to occur most often with larger institutions that might have one identified weak program among several strong programs. It was acknowledged that this is in part a structural issue and, in part, one of implementation and training.

One of the major ways in which the proposed system will enhance program review is that under the proposed system, findings for each standard of each credential program would be included in the accreditation report, rather than just findings on the common standards. In addition, the program review team would recommend whether review of a particular program should be part of a larger site visit at the institution or district office.

Topic 6: Establish consistency in the system by including all Credential and Certificate Programs in the Accreditation Process

Preferred Option: Adopt the general principle that all programs that lead to a credential or certificate in California should be reviewed on a periodic basis and that the review process should be implemented in a manner that recognizes program differences but maintains comparable rigor across program types.

Background: Currently, not all programs that a program sponsor may elect to offer are reviewed through the continuing accreditation system.

Rationale: The COA and the Work Group suggest that the Commission adopt a broad policy that all credential programs are subject to review on a periodic basis and are a part of the accreditation system. The COA and the Work Group recognize that this recommendation may have significant cost implications. The types of credential programs that are not currently part of the accreditation system include:

- Subject Matter Programs
- Certificate Programs (i.e. CLAD, BCLAD, Early Childhood)
- Designated Subjects Programs-sponsored by a LEA
- Professional Clear Credential Programs (Induction and Fifth Year)

Each credential program not currently included in the continuing accreditation process brings with it unique issues that would need to be addressed if they were brought into the system. For instance, induction programs were only recently added as a credential route as a result of SB 2042, although they have been operating in California for a number of years. Though they have not traditionally been part of the Commission's accreditation process they have been subject to rigorous program review process through their funding agencies.

Topic 6a: Designated Subjects Programs

Preferred Option: Continue the initial program approval process for designated subjects programs. Both Institution of Higher Education (IHE) and Local Educational Agency (LEA) sponsored programs should be reviewed through the accreditation system.

Background: Currently, only IHE sponsored Designated Subjects programs are reviewed through the accreditation system. LEA sponsored programs are reviewed initially, but are not reviewed on a periodic basis.

Rationale: Consistent with the proposed general principle that all programs leading to a credential should fall within the on-going accreditation system, the COA and the Work Group believe that all designated subjects credential programs should be subject to the accreditation review process regardless of the entity that delivers the services. The seven IHE sponsored programs have historically been included in the accreditation system. Reviewing the 16 existing LEA sponsored designated subjects programs will add an increased minor cost to the accreditation system in that 12 of the LEAs are not currently included in the accreditation system.

Topic 6b: Professional Administrative Services Credential Programs

Preferred Option: The Commission should consider that both the Guidelines-based Administrative Services Credential programs and the Standards-based Administrative Services Credential programs be reviewed by the COA for ongoing accreditation. The process for these two types of programs should be of comparable rigor, although not necessarily the same.

Background: The new guidelines-based administrative services credentials were adopted by the Commission several years ago in response to requests from public officials seeking a route to the Professional Administrative Services Credential that was designed around a strong mentoring component at the site level. The guidelines-based Administrative Services Credentials programs are currently subject to initial staff review and approval by the Commission, while the standards-based programs have been a part of the current initial and on-going accreditation process.

Rationale: The Work Group recognizes that the new guidelines-based programs are viewed favorably at the site level and have provided a viable new pathway to the Professional Administrative Services credential. But the COA and Work Group believe the inconsistency in the initial and on-going review process needs to be addressed. The COA and Work Group believe that, ultimately, while the process for reviewing these programs may be different, the process should be of **comparable** rigor.

Programs Leading to the Professional Clear Teaching Credential-Both the COA and the Work Group have had extensive discussion about the existing pathways to earn the Professional Clear Teaching Credential – Induction and the Fifth Year Advanced Coursework – and the extent to which they should be included in the accreditation system. In recent months, Commission staff has had meetings with stakeholders to determine whether it is possible, or advisable, to review the standards for both fifth year programs and induction programs and to consider the feasibility of revising the standards into one set of standards that would serve all types of programs leading to a Professional Clear Teaching Credential. Stakeholders continue to meet and an update of these discussions is scheduled to come before the Commission in the future. The result of this work may impact how these programs are accredited. However, regardless of the outcome of these discussions, the COA and Work Group were able to reach a general agreement with respect to these credential programs and the accreditation system.

Topic 6c: Fifth Year Programs

***Preferred Option:* Include Fifth Year programs in the accreditation system as other programs.**

Background: Under the Ryan Credential requirements, teacher candidates were required to complete a fifth year of study in order to earn their Professional Clear Teaching Credential. The fifth year was defined as 30 units of post-baccalaureate coursework that included courses in health, teaching special needs students and technology. Most institutions packaged their teacher preparation programs as post-baccalaureate coursework, thus enabling teacher candidates to easily meet this requirement and earn their Professional Clear Teaching Credential. SB 2042 restructured the teaching credential and required that teachers earn first a Preliminary Credential and then complete an induction program in order to earn their Professional Clear credential. Recent legislation (AB 2210) allows candidates for whom induction is not available to complete a fifth year program to earn the professional credential. A stakeholder group is currently working with Commission staff to update the definition of a fifth year of study in light of SB 2042.

Rationale: It is the strong belief of the Work Group that the two routes to the Professional Clear Credential be of comparable rigor and be reviewed through comparable processes. While the members recognize that the two routes themselves have distinct differences, they believe that the review process ought to be of comparable rigor, although not necessarily exactly the same.

Topic 6d: Induction Programs

***Preferred Option:* Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system. For funded programs, the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Task Force, comprised of staff from the Commission and the California Department of Education, under the direction of the COA would continue to coordinate the process, and the COA would accredit the program based on site visits and other reports. The process should be of at least comparable rigor to the adopted accreditation process.**

Background: SB 2042 provided for induction as the preferred route to a Professional Clear Credential. Currently, 149 induction programs have been approved by the Commission and are serving nearly all eligible public school beginning teachers in California. In the past, the BTSA Task Force has implemented a Formal Program Review process whereby each BTSA program was reviewed every four years.

Rationale: The current accreditation system does not include a review of BTSA programs or any other type of induction program, because SB 2042 was passed subsequent to adoption of the current *Framework*. Now that completion of an induction program leads to a credential, the Work Group and COA believe that induction programs should be folded into the accreditation process. Currently, only BTSA type induction programs exist, although the law allows for university based induction programs or alternative induction programs. Significant discussion has occurred about the current BTSA formal program approval process – which is generally believed to have encouraged on-going program improvement and accountability – and whether it can serve as the accreditation process with adjustments being made so that the results of these reviews would go to the COA for action. At this point, the Work Group has not reached

consensus regarding a specific process that would be involved, but has agreed to the elements of the preferred option above. Under this option, the Work Group and COA envision the BTSA Task Force working with the COA to determine a process that serves accreditation purposes. A transition to a fully integrated and articulated accreditation process would be the goal.

Topic 6e: Subject Matter Programs

Preferred Option: Continue initial program approval for subject matter programs but convene a group to review and suggest revisions to the subject matter initial program approval process. In addition, collect data periodically from subject matter programs to ensure on-going alignment with the K-12 content standards and to support program improvement.

Background: The issue of subject matter competence has taken on new importance in recent years due in part to the federal No Child Left Behind law and California's adoption and implementation of K-12 academic content standards for all students. Currently subject matter programs are reviewed by a team of readers and recommended for initial approval by the Commission. The initial approval process for subject matter programs includes the institution submitting a program document which is reviewed by experts to assure that the program meets the adopted subject matter program standards. The review process is considered to be a cumbersome task due to perceived redundancy in the standards, the complexity of the standards and the current budgetary constraints that require the review process to be accomplished without dedicated time for the reviewers to work together.

The current accreditation system does not include on-going review of subject matter preparation programs. One of the major reasons that these programs have not been part of the accreditation process is that they are considered within the purview of undergraduate programs and the academic departments sponsoring the programs are not usually within the schools of education. On the other hand, in California, the educator preparation programs are usually post graduate programs and housed within the schools of education at the college or university. The current accreditation system accredits the institution's education unit and all the professional preparation programs it offers.

Rationale: While there exists a universally accepted public policy that all teachers must be competent in the subjects that they teach, and knowledgeable about and able to effectively teach to the K-12 academic content standards, the current process may be a disincentive for institutions to submit subject matter preparation programs for Commission approval. The initial approval of subject matter programs assures that the programs meet the Commission's adopted subject matter program standards. The collection of periodic data (for example, CSET scores and course matrices showing alignment with K-12 academic content standards) will assure that programs continue to meet the adopted subject matter program standards.

It may not be appropriate to include the subject matter programs in the institution's accreditation decision, because subject matter programs are not housed within the education unit or offered by education faculty. It seems important, however, when data analysis and accreditation findings identify concerns to require subject matter program improvement. In addition, candidates may satisfy the subject matter requirement by passing an examination instead of completing an approved subject matter program. The current initial program review process is difficult and

extremely time consuming. The COA and Accreditation Work Group recognize the complexities of subject matter programs and the accreditation process. Therefore, the COA and Work Group suggest that further discussion take place that addresses the current need for subject matter programs, particularly in mathematics and science, and a review process that would not discourage institutions from seeking official recognition for their alignment with the Commission's subject matter program standards and the K-12 student content standards.

Topic 7: Program Standard Options

Preferred Option: Provide three program standard options: 1) California Program Standards; 2) National or Professional Program Standards; or 3) Alternate Program Standards. These alternate program standards would include experimental or research based and alternative standards. If national standards are used, comparability must be established and programs must address the California specific standards in addition to the national standards.

Background: Under the existing accreditation system, institutions or program sponsors have the option of choosing among five different sets of standards for accreditation: 1) California standards; 2) National or Professional Standards; 3) General Standards; 4) Experimental Standards, and 5) Alternative Standards.

Rationale: The COA and the Work Group acknowledges the importance of all credential programs addressing California program standards. Therefore, they recommend continuation of Option 1, California Standards. With respect to Option 2, if deemed comparable, national or professional standards could also be used in order to provide flexibility to the institution or program sponsor. As for Option 3, it was determined that under the current policy environment and given the development of California standards in each program area, the use of General Standards (found in Appendix 3 of the *Framework*) is no longer appropriate. In addition, very few institutions have chosen to exercise this option in the past. Therefore the two bodies are suggesting that this option be eliminated. Experimental standards, Option 4, are enabled in the Education Code and there is strong consensus that experimental programs are needed to serve the larger purpose of contributing to the body of knowledge about educator preparation. These programs can be used to support new pathways to the profession. COA and Work Group members suggest that both the experimental and alternative standard options be maintained with minor modifications. Minor modifications to the *Framework* would include consolidating the current Options 4 and 5 and clarifying the purpose and expectations regarding experimental programs.

Topic 8: Accreditation Decisions-Program Findings

Preferred Option: Modify the accreditation system to more clearly report individual program findings.

Background: Under the current system, members of the review team examine each program credential area against the standards. These findings contribute to and are incorporated into the team's recommendation about the accreditation of the unit.

Rationale: The COA and the Work Group indicated that one of the areas that needed strengthening in the accreditation system is to enhance program review and to better document the issues and concerns identified by reviewers about individual credential programs. Although the suggestion is to maintain focus on the whole institution as the unit that is accredited (unit accreditation), the members of both bodies agreed that there was a need for greater focus on ensuring that program issues are not ignored or minimized. To that end, the COA and the Work Group recommend that findings on program standards be more clearly and explicitly included in the accreditation report. Reviewers develop their findings for each and every credential program and for each standard within each program. These program standard findings may include: Standard Met, Met with Concerns, Met Minimally, and Not Met. The program reviewers will develop preliminary findings after the review of the program document and biennial reports in the fourth year of the cycle. The site visit team will investigate these preliminary findings during the site visit. The COA may choose to follow up on concerns raised with programs regardless of the accreditation status of the institution. In other words, an institution may receive full accreditation, but the COA may require follow up on issues raised for particular programs.

Topic 9: Accreditation Decisions-Unit Findings

Preferred Option: Revise the Unit Accreditation Findings to allow for the finding of full accreditation with required follow up.

Background: Under the existing system, an institution or program sponsor that receives full accreditation is not required to provide additional information once it has been awarded the status of full accreditation. In the past, review teams have noted concerns about a program or institution that did not rise to the level of a stipulation. In the current system, without a stipulation, there is no way for the COA to require follow up on these concerns. As a result, the current structure limits the COA's ability to determine whether these concerns are addressed by an institution over time, or whether they become more serious and impact the quality of services provided to students.

Rationale: The COA and the Work Group agreed that revising the menu of decision options to include "Accreditation with Follow Up Required" would allow the COA the flexibility to keep abreast of how an institution might be addressing a concern noted by the review team, despite receiving full accreditation status. In addition, under the proposed system, all institutions, not just those with stipulations, would be required to provide information between the site visits through the biennial reports.

Topic 10: Selection of COA Members

Preferred Option: Modify the selection process to reduce costs, prevent large turnover of COA members in the same year, and streamline the nominating panel process.

Background: Education Code Section 44373 (a) sets forth the process by which the Commission goes about selecting members of the COA. It requires that 12 members be selected for their distinguished records of accomplishments in education. Six must be from postsecondary education and six shall be certificated professionals in public schools, school districts, or county offices of education in California. Appointment of members shall be from nominees submitted by a distinguished panel named by consensus of the Commission and the Committee on

Accreditation. For each Committee position to be filled, the nominating panel would submit two qualified nominees from which the Commission chooses one.

Rationale: The process, as it has been implemented in the past is cumbersome, time consuming, and costly. The statute requires a two-phase process: 1) agreement by the Commission and the COA on the composition of a Nominating Panel; and 2) selection of COA members. The COA and the Work Group believe that the process can be adjusted and streamlined without affecting the quality of individuals who are selected to serve on the Committee.

The COA and the Work Group offer the following suggestions to improve the process:

1. Streamline the process to determine who shall serve as the nominating panel by establishing in the *Framework* that the Commission and the COA shall each nominate two individuals each to serve on the nominating committee. Each body shall nominate one college or university member, and one elementary or secondary school member.
2. Establish in the *Framework* that the terms of the Nominating Panel will be four years long and that members of the panel may serve more than one term. This will prevent the need for reestablishing the nominating panel each time there is a need for new COA members.
3. Change the length of the terms for COA members from 3-year terms to 4-year terms. This, together with staggering the terms, will ensure that the COA membership will be sufficiently balanced between new members and experienced members and necessitate selection of three members annually.
4. Stagger the COA members in the transition from the *Accreditation Framework* (1995) to the revised *Framework* (2005) such that there will be three new members appointed for four year terms in the first year. Nine of the current members will continue to serve, with three members serving for one additional year, three for two additional years, and three for three additional years. This transition will ensure that, notwithstanding vacancies, each subsequent year, three new members will be appointed to the Committee by the Commission, yet maintain an understanding of accreditation.

Table 2: COA Membership Transition Plan

05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
12 current members	9 continuing members	6 continuing members	3 continuing members	
		3 members with one year of experience	6 members with one to two years of experience	9 members with 1, 2 or 3 years of experience
	3 newly appointed members	3 newly appointed members	3 newly appointed members	3 newly appointed members

Topic 11: National Unit Accreditation

Preferred Option: Continue national unit accreditation options as defined in the California Education Code and the *Accreditation Framework*.

Background: The current system allows merged visits for national unit accreditations. The Commission currently has a long standing partnership agreement with the National Council of the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Presently NCATE is the only federally approved national unit accrediting body. Institutions seeking both state accreditation and voluntary national accreditation may do so through a “merged site visit” thus allowing program sponsors to prepare for one accreditation event and earn two distinct accreditations. In a merged visit, the NCATE team must have both out of state and California members. The institution must meet both national standards to earn national accreditation and state standards to earn state accreditation.

Rationale: In general, the COA and the Work Group believe that the current system has served California institutions well. In addition, the logistical issues related to merged visits identified by the American Institutes for Research in its review of the accreditation system have improved significantly over time. As a result, the Work Group does not propose any significant changes to the National Unit Accreditation option.

Please note: The current agreements and protocols with NCATE exempt California institutions from the program portfolio review process for NCATE because of California’s existing review of credential programs. Should the Commission decided to adopt the structure proposed by the COA and the Work Group, agreements and protocols with NCATE will need to be adjusted to accommodate the changes.

Topic 12: National Program Accreditation

Preferred Option: Clarify that all California programs would participate in the California accreditation process. California supports national program accreditation and when the national program review can be coordinated with the California process to ensure the program meets all the California requirements, the national review will be accepted .

Background: Current law states that national accreditation of a specific program may be substituted for state program review, if specific conditions are met, and delegates the nature of the conditions to the *Framework*. Under the current *Framework*, national accreditation of programs completely separate from state accreditation does not take place in California. Instead, the current accreditation system allows programs to combine state program review and national accreditation, however implementation has not been as easy as originally intended due primarily to the conditions surrounding national on site reviews, the make-up of the national teams and the compatibility of national accreditation cycles with those of California.

Rationale: The COA and the Work Group support the concept of national program accreditation with state accreditation substituting for state review when possible, but believe that all programs that prepare educators for California licensure must fully participate in the California accreditation process. The members of the two bodies agree that the California accreditation system should be designed to assure that educators are prepared to work in California schools, with California students, and are prepared to teach to the California K-12 adopted student content standards. To the extent possible, the system could foster better coordination with

national program accrediting associations and facilitate the use of national accreditation when requested by the institution. In addition, the members agreed that a critical component of the process is for the COA to review the national program standards for comparability with state program standards, consistent with its responsibility under Ed Code Section 44373 (c) (3).

Topic 13: Evaluation of the Accreditation System

Preferred Option: Revise Section 8 of the Accreditation Framework to incorporate an ongoing data collection process regarding the efficacy of the accreditation system. Define how modifications will be made in the future and when stakeholder input is required.

Background: Modification of Section 8 of the Framework is significantly limited without changing California Education Code language. However, because the language related to evaluation (Section 8A) refers to a particular point in time and tasks which the Commission has already completed, the COA and the Work Group believe this particular language may be modified. The same is not true for the language related to modification (Section 8 B).

Rationale: The COA and the Work Group believe that evaluation of the accreditation process itself should reflect the same general principle adopted for the institutions and districts it accredits – that there should be a system of on-going data collection, evaluation, reflection, and modification – to determine whether the system is working effectively.

Implementation Issues

Once the Commission adopts revised accreditation policies, there will be many implementation issues to be addressed. During implementation of the revised accreditation system, the COA will be responsible for developing the many procedures that will support implementation of the Commission’s policies. The COA will seek advice from stakeholders and Commission members prior to modification of procedures. Listed below are four of the implementation issues that the Work Group and COA have already discussed:

Topic 14: Training -- Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR)

Preferred Option: The COA should review and revise the content and process for BIR training to reflect the revised *Framework*.

Background: In the past, the training for BIR members (the professional educators who conduct accreditation reviews and make up the pool of reviewers) has been conducted over 4 days and has been designed around the existing accreditation system.

Rationale: If the accreditation system is revised, the training will likewise have to be revised to address all of the components of the new system. The roles of the BIR members in the revised system would be differentiated. Some members would review initial program documents, others would participate as program reviewers, while still others would serve as site visit team members. In addition, with the wide array of educator preparation programs, BIR members must be knowledgeable about and trained for the types of programs to which they are assigned to review. The training must ensure quality in the reviews and consistency in the process.

Topic 15: Selection of the Review Teams

Preferred Option: The COA should review and revise the guidelines for review team composition to reflect the revised *Framework*.

Background: Currently the guidelines for determining the composition of review teams are contained in the *Accreditation Handbook* and are implemented by the Commission's Administrator of Accreditation with the involvement of the staff Consultant assigned to facilitate the review.

Rationale: If the revised system of accreditation being proposed is ultimately adopted by the Commission, and the accreditation activities are distributed more broadly over the accreditation cycle, there will be a need to review the manner in which the composition of the review teams is determined. The current guidelines will need updating and revision to more appropriately address the changes in the new system. The revised guidelines will be included in the *Accreditation Handbook*.

Topic 16: Selection of Interviews and Site Visits

Preferred Option: The COA should review and revise the guidelines for selection of site visits and interviews to reflect the revised *Framework*.

Background: The current guidelines with respect to how sites and interviews are selected are contained in the *Accreditation Handbook*. It is the responsibility of the COA to make sure that staff Consultants and the Administrator of Accreditation are implementing the guidelines appropriately.

Rationale: Under the current system, there has been a concerted effort to ensure a fair and unbiased representation of interviewees so that the review team obtains an accurate understanding of the quality of an institution or district's credentialing programs. Random generation of lists of individuals to interview has been a common practice in the existing system. Nevertheless, there is always room for improvement. In particular, last minute changes and substitutions have always been an inherent difficulty in the site visit model. As such, a current review of the guidelines and modification to align with the revised system will be appropriate.

Topic 17: Data Collection

Preferred Option: Each institution submits a biennial web-based report particularly focused on a candidate competence standard. Periodically, the Commission can designate a specific standard to be the focus for a designated time period, with appropriate advance notice to programs. These reports are reviewed by Commission staff, the COA, program reviewers in year 4 of the review cycle, and the site review team.

Background: Collection and reporting of data is a key component of the proposed accreditation system. Where the current accreditation system has relied exclusively on site visits every 5-7 years to ascertain the quality and effectiveness of educator preparation, the revised system being proposed complements seven-year site visits with reports on credential program outcomes every other year. The proposed system would allow the COA to intervene between site visits if information in the biennial reports suggests that such intervention is necessary.

The nexus between educator preparation and student learning is of interest in the policy and research communities, both within California and nationally. California's credentialing system, as envisioned by SB 2042, was intended to inform this complex question. For multiple subjects and single subject credentials, the Commission has developed and validated the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) that represent the current research about the knowledge, skills and abilities teachers need in order to be effective in the classroom. Teaching Performance Assessments (TPAs) have been built to carefully assess these TPEs prior to candidates being recommended for preliminary teaching credentials. If the statutory requirements for TPAs are eventually funded and implemented, and if the Commission further validates the importance of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) in achieving student learning gains, then each candidate's performance on a TPA could serve as a predictor of future success in teaching K-12 students. (For all other credential programs, e.g. education specialist, administrative, pupil personnel, there are candidate competence standards. These standards, usually found in Section Three of the adopted standards, define the skills and abilities the educators need to successfully work in the K-12 schools.)

The revised accreditation system anticipates this future by proposing that candidate competence data be reported biennially, enabling the biennial reports to serve as one important indicator of the overall quality of an educator preparation program. The Work Group recognizes the complexity of what it is recommending: current measures of student achievement in use in California are so laden with complex variables that they would have limited usefulness in the accreditation system. Measures of student learning gains that could control for variables effectively are difficult to mount and would require resources. To adequately predict future teaching success, existing TPA models may need to be upgraded and would certainly need to be funded. But the 2042 system was intended to move the State in these directions, and the Accreditation Work Group believes it is important to fully examine these questions and issues.

Rationale: Because accreditation is an evidentiary process in which institutions are reviewed for their adherence to and implementation of standards, the data collection aspect of the new system is tied directly to the standards. Standards for all credential areas require sponsors of programs to assess their candidates prior to recommending them for a credential. The knowledge, skills and abilities to be assessed are also included in the standards. In keeping with the standards-based nature of accreditation, the biennial reports would focus on the candidate competence and performance standards and the evaluation standard. Program sponsors would be required to report on the nature and outcomes of their assessments.

Topic 18: Standard Review Efforts

Background: Standards adopted by the Commission play a central role in accreditation. They are the basis upon which institutions and other program sponsors are reviewed and ultimately, approved for accreditation. The Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation were not charged to review the Commission's standards since their primary focus was to conduct a review of the accreditation system. However, it was difficult, if not impossible, to discuss a revised accreditation system without discussing whether or not some of the current standards were in need of adjustment to align with and support the objectives of the revised system.

To that end, the Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation suggest that the revised accreditation system, if adopted by the Commission, would necessitate a limited review of particular aspects of the Commission's standards.

Preferred Option:

Common (Unit) Standards

The Commission's Common Standards, initially adopted in 1995, address overarching institutional issues (e.g., resources dedicated by the institution to support credential programs, advising, qualifications of faculty, program evaluation, etc.). The members of the Work Group and the COA have identified revised objectives for accreditation as well as a revised focus of the accreditation system on program evaluation and candidate competence. Given the revised objectives, a review of the Common Standards to ensure that they align with and support these objectives would be timely and appropriate.

Preconditions

The Commission's preconditions are credential requirements based upon State law or Commission policy that must be met by program sponsors offering educator preparation programs as a prerequisite to program accreditation. However, the review identified that preconditions are not uniformly coordinated, consistent, or organized across all credential programs areas. The Work Group and the COA suggest that the Commission direct staff to review the preconditions and present them to the Commission for consideration and possible adoption in the coming months.

Experimental Program Standards

The Work Group and COA suggest that the 1988 experimental program standards be updated to ensure alignment with the revised system.

Blended Program Standards

The Work Group and the COA recommend that the requirements of the six Blended Program Standards be infused into the teacher preparation program standards (MS, SS, and Education Specialist) to clarify that in fact, blended programs are not unique programs, but might better be described as an optional mode for program design and program delivery. The Work Group and the COA believe that this change would allow a program sponsor to address the blended standards within the basic program document.

Teacher Preparation Standards: Questions to Consider, Factors to Consider, or Required Elements

The Commission's adopted standards do not follow a consistent pattern in their basic structure. Every standard adopted by the Commission includes a paragraph that is the actual **standard**, which defines what the program sponsor is required to address in its preparation program. The current Common Standards were required by the *Accreditation Framework* to be accompanied by "questions to consider", which are intended to elaborate upon the intent and meaning behind the standard. Program standards adopted by the Commission prior to SB 2042 include "factors to consider", which are very similar to the "questions to consider", and are used to elaborate upon or clarify the intent and meaning of a particular standard. These devices in the structure of standards are extremely useful to accreditation team members because they provide focus and

guidance in the evaluation of a program. These structural devices are also useful to program sponsors when developing program documents for review. They support a common understanding regarding the scope and intent of the standards that must be addressed.

The SB 2042 standards introduced a new structure in the Commission's standards. The standards themselves were longer and more detailed than had been previously the case, and the "factors/questions to consider" were replaced by **required elements**. Required elements served some of the same purposes as "factors" and "questions", insofar as they provided clarification of intent for each standard. But they introduced a level of complexity to the review process that is viewed by many as unnecessarily cumbersome. Program documents that are submitted in response to standards with required elements are extremely long and often difficult for program reviewers to evaluate comprehensively. Rather than adding specificity to the description and detail behind a standards-based program, this new structure has added bulk and redundancy that may actually undermine the quality and consistency of program review.

The Work Group and the COA recommend that the Commission consider returning to the use of "factors to consider". However, simply substituting "factors to consider" for "required elements" would not be sufficient. Rather, some aspects of the elements that are considered truly essential might need to be incorporated into the language of the standard. To accomplish the change, it would be necessary to review the language of the standards and the "required elements" to ensure that no essential aspects of the standards are diminished by the modification.

Possible approaches to the standards revisions.

Pursuant to Education Code Section 44372 (b), the Commission has the authority and responsibility to establish and modify standards. Members of the Work Group and COA agree that a limited review of standards is essential for implementation of a revised accreditation system and voiced concern about the impact of any effort to revise existing standards upon the timeline for implementing a revised accreditation system. Among the members, there is a general desire for the Commission to ensure that revisions to accreditation standards, be completed in a timely manner that coordinates with implementation of the revised accreditation system. To that end, there are at least two ways in which the Commission could move forward in making modifications to the standards.

One option would be to convene a small group of six to eight individuals to undertake a first draft of standards revisions. In order to effectively accomplish this, the individuals involved would have to have extensive knowledge and expertise about the Commission standards and be familiar with the changes recommended by the accreditation review. Another approach would be for members of the Work Group and the COA, who have the knowledge about the standards and the proposed revisions to the accreditation system, to continue to work together, draft some possible standard modifications, solicit feedback from the field and bring recommendations to the Commission for consideration.

Summary Table of the Preferred Options

Table 3 follows on the next nine pages. It contains a summary of the preferred options described in this item. Within the table the preferred option is listed with a brief description of the how the topic is addressed in both the current accreditation system and the proposed system.

Table 3: Summary of Preferred Options: Current and Proposed System

Preferred Options	Current System (adopted 1995)	Proposed System
<p>1: Purposes of accreditation system</p> <p>1a: Revise the Accreditation Framework to reflect four broad purposes of accreditation:</p> <p>1b: Essential attributes of the accreditation system should be revised to include:</p>	<p>Purposes of accreditation and certification system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assure the public, the students and the profession that future educators have access to excellence in content education, specialized preparation and professional practica in education • ensure that future educators have actually acquired abilities and perspectives that are essential for fulfilling specified professional responsibilities • verify that each educator’s specialized preparation and attainments are appropriate for the assignment of particular responsibilities in schools • contribute to broader efforts to enhance the personal stature and professional standing of teachers and other educators as members of a profession <p>Key Attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orientation to Educational Quality • The Professional Character of Accreditation. • Breadth and Flexibility • Intensity in Accreditation • Integration with the Certification System. • Contributions of Accreditation to Improved Preparation • Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness 	<p>Purposes of system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure accountability • Ensure high quality and effective programs • Adherence to standards • Support program improvement <p>Key Attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • professional character of accreditation • knowledgeable participants • breadth and flexibility • intensity in accreditation • efficiency and cost effectiveness
<p>2: Roles and Responsibilities of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation: Maintain the current roles and responsibilities of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation but improve the communication between COA and the Commission.</p>	<p>The Commission establishes accreditation policies, appoints members of the COA, and hears appeals of accreditation decisions. The COA implements the accreditation system and renders accreditation decisions.</p>	<p>Maintain Commission as the policy board and the Committee on Accreditation implementing the Commission’s policies but increase communication between the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation to support Commission in determining whether its policies are being appropriately implemented and to identify trends and issues related to accreditation.</p>

Preferred Options	Current System (adopted 1995)	Proposed System
<p>3: Accreditation as an On-Going Activity: Modify the system to reflect the fact that accreditation is an on-going activity. Accreditation should be viewed as an on-going cycle of activities focused on accountability, meeting the standards, and data-driven decision making. The prior accreditation report and continuing data reports should be considered in the accreditation system</p>	<p>Snap shot look at an institution and all its programs No interim reporting is required of an institution Program reviews are completed during the site visit by a cluster of K-12 and IHE educators Previous documentation and accreditation decisions are not considered. If an institution receives the status of accreditation with stipulations, it must take action to satisfactorily address the stipulations within one year, and no follow up occurs beyond that next year until the next review.</p>	<p>Examine an institution and all its programs over time based on an on-going cycle of activities. Biennial reports are submitted by all educator preparation programs and used by both program reviewers and site visit team. Program Reviews are completed in the 4th year of the cycle and are used to inform the site visit. Program reviewers make preliminary findings on all program standards and recommendations regarding the site visit. Site visit team will have a copy of the previous team report and accreditation decision. COA members will be aware of previous accreditation decision.</p>
<p>4a: Accreditation Cycle and Activities: Revise the accreditation cycle from a single site visit once every 6 years, to a series of accreditation activities over the course of a 7 years</p>	<p>Site visit once every 6 years.</p>	<p>A 7 year cycle of three different activities that take place at regular intervals over the 7 years: Biennial Reports, Program Review, and Site Visit.</p>
<p>4b: Accreditation Cycle and Activities: Revise the cycle from a 3-4 day comprehensive site visit conducted every six years to a system that includes annual data collection by the institution or program sponsor;</p>	<p>No data collection is required between site visits.</p>	<p>Each program would be expected to collect data (contextual, demographic, and candidate competence data). The program would aggregate and analyze these data, use data to evaluate program effectiveness and make adjustments to the program as appropriate.</p>

Preferred Options	Current System (adopted 1995)	Proposed System
<p>4c:Accreditation Cycle and Activities: Require program sponsors to submit biennial reports to the COA;</p>	<p>No reports are submitted between site visits.</p>	<p>The institution would report summary data for each program for the current and prior year to the CTC. Each program would submit information describing how candidate competence is assessed in the program and how the candidates perform on those assessments. In addition, each report would include a brief statement of analysis and an action plan based on the analysis.</p>
<p>4d:Accreditation Cycle and Activities: Retain and revise the review of documents submitted by all credential programs in the 4th year of the 7 year cycle;</p>	<p>Program review is completed during the 3-4 day comprehensive site visit every 5-7 years.</p>	<p>Each program that is offered by an institution/program sponsor would submit an updated version of its approved program document including current syllabi. The update would detail all modifications in the program since its approval. The program is reviewed by trained reviewers. If questions or concerns, the COA may direct site visit to review one or more programs.</p>
<p>4e:Accreditation Cycle and Activities: Retain and revise a site visit in the 6th year of the 7 year cycle focusing on Common Standards and where needed, program standards;</p>	<p>The 3-4 day comprehensive site visit reviews all Common Standards.</p>	<p>Each institution or program sponsor would have an accreditation team visit the site in the sixth year of the accreditation cycle. Prior to the visit, the institution would submit a self-study that responds to the Common Standards. The institution would prepare for a site visit that focuses mainly on the Common Standards, but includes students, graduates, and faculty as well as other stakeholders from all programs that are sponsored by the institution. The site review team would be composed of 3 to 6 members that would focus on the Common Standards plus any program areas directed to be reviewed by COA as a result of the program review.</p>

Preferred Options	Current System (adopted 1995)	Proposed System
<p>4f: Accreditation Cycle and Activities: Use the 7th year in the cycle for required follow up.</p>	<p>All stipulations must be addressed within one year, after which time no activities are required.</p>	<p>If necessary, the institution and all its programs would begin to respond to the follow-up required by the COA. COA will state the timeline for response from the institution. Institutions must address all stipulations within one year, however, the timeline for COA follow up may extend beyond the one year.</p>
<p>5: Unit Accreditation and Program Approval: Develop a revised system that addresses unit accreditation but enhances program review.</p>	<p>Site team makes decisions regarding all program standards Site team makes decisions regarding unit standards Site team makes a recommendation about the accreditation of the institution as a whole, COA makes the accreditation finding</p>	<p>Program reviewers submit preliminary findings about all program standards, any remaining questions and a recommendation about reviewing the program during the site visit to COA. Site team either confirms the preliminary findings and makes decisions for all standards or may request a focused site visit to investigate any unexpected findings. Site team makes decisions regarding unit standards Site team makes a recommendation on the accreditation decision for the institution as a whole.</p>
<p>6: Establish consistency in the system by including all Credential and Certificate Programs in the Accreditation Process: Adopt the general principle that all programs that lead to a credential or certificate in California should be reviewed on a periodic basis and that the review process should be implemented in a manner that recognizes program differences but maintains comparable rigor across program types.</p>	<p>Currently, not all programs that a program sponsor may elect to offer are reviewed through the continuing accreditation system.</p>	<p>The COA and the Work Group suggest that the Commission adopt a broad policy statement saying that all credential programs are subject to review on a periodic basis under the accreditation system. The COA and the Work Group recognize that this recommendation has significant cost implications.</p>

Preferred Options	Current System (adopted 1995)	Proposed System
<p>6a: Designated Subjects Programs: Continue the initial program approval process for designated subject programs. Both Institution of Higher Education (IHE) and Local Educational Agency (LEA) sponsored programs should be reviewed through the accreditation system.</p>	<p>Currently, only IHE sponsored programs are reviewed through the accreditation system. About two thirds of the approved designated subjects programs are sponsored by a local education agency and are not included in the accreditation system.</p>	<p>All designated subjects credential programs should be included in the accreditation review process regardless of the entity that delivers the services.</p>
<p>6b: Professional Administrative Services Credential Programs The Commission should consider that both the Guidelines-based Administrative Services Credential programs and the Standards-based Administrative Services Credential programs be approved by the COA for ongoing accreditation.</p>	<p>The guidelines-based Administrative Services Credentials programs are currently subject to an initial staff review and approval by the Commission, while the standards-based administrative services credentials have been a part of the current on-going accreditation process reviewed by members of the BIR and subject to COA accreditation.</p>	<p>The COA and Work Group believe the inconsistency in the initial and on-going review process needs to be addressed. The COA and Work Group believe that, ultimately, while the process for reviewing these programs may be different, the process should be of comparable rigor.</p>
<p>6c: Fifth Year Programs: Include Fifth year programs in the accreditation system as other programs.</p>	<p>Currently Fifth Year programs are not reviewed under the Accreditation System</p>	<p>Include Fifth Year programs in the Accreditation System.</p>
<p>6d: Induction Programs Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system. For funded programs, the BTSA Task Force, under the direction of the COA would continue to coordinate the process, and the COA would accredit the program based on the site visit and other reports. The process should be of at least comparable rigor to the adopted accreditation process.</p>	<p>Currently, 149 induction programs have been approved by the Commission. In the past, the BTSA Task Force has implemented a Formal Program Review process whereby each BTSA program was reviewed on a four year cycle.</p>	<p>Now that completion of an induction program leads to a credential, the Work Group and COA believe that induction programs should be folded into the accreditation process. Under this option, the Work Group and COA envision the BTSA Task Force working with the COA to determine a process that serves accreditation purposes. A transition to a fully integrated and articulated accreditation process would be the goal.</p>

Preferred Options	Current System (adopted 1995)	Proposed System
<p>6e: Subject Matter Programs: Continue initial program approval for subject matter programs but convene a group to review and suggest revisions to the subject matter initial program approval process. In addition, collect data periodically from subject matter programs to ensure alignment with the K-12 content standards and support program improvement.</p>	<p>Currently subject matter programs are initially reviewed by a team of readers and then approved by the Commission. There has been no periodic review of the programs after the initial approval.</p>	<p>The collection of periodic data (CSET scores and course matrix showing alignment with K-12 academic content standards) will assure that programs continue to meet the adopted standards. But because subject matter programs are not housed within the education unit or offered by education faculty, it may not be appropriate to include the subject matter programs in the institution's accreditation decision.</p>
<p>7: Program Standard Options: Provide three program standard options: 1) California Program Standards; 2) National or Professional Program Standards; or 3) Alternate Program Standards. If national standards are used, comparability must be established and programs must address the California specific standards in addition to the national standards.</p>	<p>Institutions have the option of choosing among five standard options for programs: 1) California standards; 2) National or Professional Standards; 3) General Standards; 4) Experimental Standards, and 5) Alternative Standards.</p>	<p>Institutions would have three standard options: 1) California Program Standards; 2) National or Professional Program Standards; or 3) Alternate Program Standards. These alternate program standards would include experimental or research based and alternative standards. If national standards are used, comparability must be established and programs must address the California specific standards in addition to the national standards.</p>
<p>8: Accreditation Decisions-Program Findings: Modify the accreditation system to more clearly show individual program findings.</p>	<p>Under the current system, members of the review team examine each program credential area against the standards. These findings contribute to and are incorporated into the team's recommendation about the accreditation of the unit.</p>	<p>Program standard findings would be more clearly and explicitly included in the accreditation report. Reviewers will indicate their findings for each and every credential program and each standard within each program. These program standard findings may include: Standard Met, Met with Concerns, Met Minimally, and Not Met. The COA may choose to follow up on concerns raised with programs regardless of the accreditation status of the institution.</p>

Preferred Options	Current System (adopted 1995)	Proposed System
<p>9: Accreditation Decisions-Unit Findings: Revise the Unit Accreditation Findings to allow for the finding of full accreditation with required follow up.</p>	<p>Accreditation decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Accreditation -Accreditation with Stipulations -Denial of Accreditation 	<p>Accreditation decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Accreditation (Follow up may be required even if full accreditation) -Accreditation with Stipulations -Denial of Accreditation
<p>10: Selection of COA Members: Modify the selection process to reduce costs, prevent large turnover of COA members in the same year, and streamline the nominating panel process.</p>	<p>Currently the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> requires that 12 members be selected for their distinguished records of accomplishments in education. Six must be from postsecondary education and six shall be certificated professionals in public schools, school districts, or county offices of education in California.</p> <p>Appointment of members shall be from nominees submitted by a distinguished panel named by consensus of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation.</p> <p>Historically, consensus on the members of the nominating panel, bringing the panel together to review the applications, and interviewing the selected nominees have all been problematic and/or expensive.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Commission and the COA nominate two individuals each to serve on the nominating committee. Each body shall nominate one college or university member, and one elementary or secondary school member. 2. The terms of the Nominating Panel will be four years long and members of the panel may serve more than one term. 3. Change the length of the terms for COA members from 3-year terms to 4-year terms. 4. Stagger the COA members in the transition from the Accreditation Framework (1995) to the revised Framework (2005) such that there will be three new members appointed for four year terms in the first year.
<p>11: National Unit Accreditation: Continue national unit accreditation options as defined in the California Education Code and the <i>Accreditation Framework</i></p>	<p>Institutions seeking both state accreditation and voluntary national accreditation may do so through a “merged site visit” thus allowing program sponsors to prepare for one accreditation event and earn two distinct accreditations. In a merged visit, the NCATE team must have both out of state and California members.</p>	<p>The Work Group and the COA do not propose any significant changes to the National Unit Accreditation option.</p>
<p>12: National Program Accreditation: Clarify that all California programs must participate in the California accreditation process. California supports national program accreditation when the national</p>	<p>Current law states that national accreditation of a specific program may be substituted for state accreditation, if specific conditions are met, and delegates the nature of the conditions to the Framework. The current accreditation system supports programs that want to combine state and national accreditation. For example, a school counseling</p>	<p>The COA and the Work Group support the integration of national program accreditation with state accreditation when possible, but believe that all programs that prepare educators for California licensure must participate in the California accreditation system.</p>

Preferred Options	Current System (adopted 1995)	Proposed System
<p>program review can be coordinated with the California process.</p>	<p>program could coordinate its accreditation from a national professional organization, Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP), and the California state visit.</p>	
<p>13: Evaluation of the Accreditation System: Revise Section 8 of the Accreditation Framework to define an ongoing data collection process regarding the efficacy of the accreditation system. Define how modifications will be made in the future and when stakeholder input is required.</p>	<p>Modification of Section 8 of the Framework is significantly limited without changing California Education Code language. However, because the language related to evaluation (Section 8 A) refers to a particular point in time and tasks which the Commission has already completed, the COA and the Work Group believe this language may be modified. The same is not true for the language related to modification (Section 8 B).</p>	<p>The COA and the Work Group believe that evaluation of the accreditation process itself should reflect the same general principle adopted for the institutions and districts it accredits – that is, that there should be a system of on-going data collection, evaluation, reflection, and modification – to determine whether the system is working effectively.</p>
Implementation Issues		
<p>14: Training -- Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR): The COA should review and revise the content and process for BIR training to reflect the revised <i>Framework</i></p>	<p>In the past, the training for BIR members (the professional educators who conduct accreditation reviews and make up the pool of reviewers) has been conducted over 4 days and has been designed around the existing accreditation system.</p>	<p>The roles of the BIR members in the revised system would be differentiated. Some members would review initial program documents, others would participate as program reviewers, while still others would serve as site visit team members. The training must ensure quality in the reviews and consistency in the process.</p>
<p>15: Selection of the Review Teams: The COA should review and revise the guidelines for review team composition to reflect the revised <i>Framework</i>.</p>	<p>Currently the guidelines for determining the composition of review teams are contained in the <i>Accreditation Handbook</i> and are implemented by the Administrator with the involvement of the Consultant assigned to facilitate the review.</p>	<p>The current guidelines will need updating and revision to more appropriately address the changes in the new system. The revised guidelines will be included in the <i>Accreditation Handbook</i>.</p>
<p>16: Selection of Interviews and Site Visits: The COA should review and revise the guidelines for selection of site visits and interviews to reflect the revised <i>Framework</i>.</p>	<p>The current guidelines with respect to how sites and interviews are selected are contained in the <i>Accreditation Handbook</i>. It is the responsibility of the COA to make sure that Consultants and the Administrator of Accreditation are implementing the guidelines appropriately.</p>	<p>As such, a current review of the guidelines and modification to align with the revised system will be appropriate.</p>

Preferred Options	Current System (adopted 1995)	Proposed System
<p>17: Data Collection: Each institution submits a biennial web-based report particularly focused on a candidate competence standard. Periodically, the Commission can designate a specific standard area to be the focus for a designated time period, with appropriate advance notice to programs. These reports are used by the next site review team.</p>	<p>Collection and reporting of data is a key component of the proposed accreditation system. The current accreditation system has relied exclusively on site visits every 5-7 years to ascertain the quality and effectiveness of educator preparation.</p>	<p>The revised system being proposed complements seven-year site visits with reports on credential program outcomes every other year.</p>
<p>Topic 18: Standards Review Efforts: The Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation suggest that the revised accreditation system, if adopted by the Commission, would necessitate a limited review of particular aspects of the Commission's standards.</p>	<p>The Common Standards were adopted in 1995. Preconditions are not uniformly coordinated or consistent across all programs. The Experimental Program Standards were adopted in 1988. Blended Program Standards are currently a set of six standards that must be addressed in addition to the teacher preparation standards. There are different structures for the Commission's Standards: <i>Questions to Consider, Factors to Consider, and Required Elements.</i></p>	<p>Members of the Work Group and COA agree that a limited review of standards is essential for implementation of a revised accreditation system and voiced concern about the impact of any effort to revise existing standards upon the timeline for implementing a revised accreditation system.</p>

Projected Costs of the Preferred Options

Following is an estimate of the cost of the revised accreditation system as contrasted with the cost of the current system at full implementation. These costs reflect only the cost to the Commission, not the institutional costs related to a revised system. Because of the current fiscal condition of the Commission, it is possible that the Commission will have to pursue a Budget Change Proposal to support future accreditation activities. The estimated costs below reflect a “ramping up” to the full system. Estimated costs are provided through 2008-09 at which time the system should be at full implementation.

Table 4: Cost of Current Accreditation System, to the Commission, including Staffing*

Activity	Annual Cost	% of Cost	Staff	\$ estimate
COA	\$81,851	21 %	Administrator, 1 FTE	\$110,000
BIR Training	\$44,333	11 %	Consultants, 2 FTEs	\$300,000
Previsits	\$15,241	4 %	SSA, 1 FTE	\$80,000
Revisits	\$8,793	2 %	Secretary	\$50,000
Site Visits	\$244,592	62 %		
	\$394,810			\$440,000

* Based on 1998-2002 expenditures which included 13-14 site visits annually

The system proposed by the COA and the Work Group involves a cycle of different accreditation activities. In previous discussions among Commissioners there was a clear understanding that it is necessary to have two years of lead time prior to resumption of site visits. If the Commission adopts a revised accreditation system in Fall 2005, then a full schedule of site visits would be scheduled beginning in Fall 2007. But, data collection would begin in 05-06 for all institutions. Biennial reporting would begin in 05-06 for half the institutions and in 06-07 for the other half. Each institution will be placed in one of the years of the seven year cycle. Institutions on the 4th year of the cycle in 06-07 will be the first to participate in the revised program review process. Therefore, implementing a revised accreditation system will require a transition period to bring all institutions and program sponsors fully into the revised cycle of accreditation activities. Below are the assumptions that would guide the transition phase and a proposed transition budget.

Assumptions for the Transition:

- Technical Assistance may include regional meetings to introduce the system, individual meetings with institutions, meetings focused on the Biennial Report, meetings focused on the Program Review Process, and meetings focused on preparing for the newly configured site visit.
- BIR training will be extensive during the transition period. All current members will receive retraining and recruitment for new members will be carried out. A cadre of approximately 400 BIR members will be assembled.

- Biennial Reports will be submitted beginning with 05-06 for half the institutions. Expectations are clearly communicated and it is understood that this is the first report and may not be as complete as later reports. In 06-07, the other half the institutions submit their first Biennial Reports.
- Program Review will begin in 06-07 with all institutions that are on the “4th year” of the cycle.
- Focused, Further Information Needed, and Revisits would follow the review of Biennial Reports or Site Visits.
- Six 2-day COA meetings would begin in 06-07. The COA will have six NCATE visits, continued technical assistance, Biennial Reports, and the first 14 Program Reviews to work with. In 07-08 and thereafter, COA will have the full set of Biennial Reports, Program Reviews and Site Visits.

Table 5: Budget for Transition to Revised System¹

Activity	05-06	06-07	07-08
Technical Assistance	\$10,000	\$52,000	0
BIR Training	0	\$60,000	\$50,000
Program Review (4 th year)	0	\$65,000	\$65,000
Previsits, institutions with site visit in next fiscal year	\$10,000	\$16,000	\$16,000
Focused, Further Information Needed, and Revisits	0	\$10,000	\$17,000
Site Visits ² (6 th year) + scheduled NCATE visits ³	\$15,000	\$52,000	\$120,000
Technical Assistance Visits—volunteers/new sponsors ⁴	\$9,000	\$15,000	\$2,000
COA ⁵	\$12,000	\$80,000	\$80,000
	\$56,000	\$350,000	\$350,000

1. Does not include Induction programs. Subject Matter programs would be reviewed in the 4th year process in a manner yet to be determined.
2. Site Visits will begin in 06-07 with institutions that volunteer to be reviewed and a full slate of 15-16 site visits will take place in 07-08.
3. During the transition, NCATE visits—05-06 (1), 06-07 (6) and 07-08 (4)—program review will take place during the site visit per the NCATE partnership agreement. By fiscal year 08-09, the revised system will be in place for all NCATE visits and program review will take place two years prior to the site visit.
4. Ask 4-6 early volunteers or new institutions to take part in a technical assistance visit in Spring 06, and another 10 institutions to participate in a technical assistance visit in 06-07. The visits will provide feedback to the CTC and assist in preparing the institution for its accreditation visit. Institutions will then be placed on the regular accreditation schedule.
5. Reduced COA schedule in 05-06 since system is not fully implemented yet.

Revised System at Full Implementation (08-09 and after)*

Assumptions--Annually:

- 108 individual program sponsors
- 15-16 institutions on each year of the cycle—therefore every year there will be
 - 54 Biennial reports
 - 15-16 Program Reviews (4th year) with an average of about 8 programs each (126 programs)
 - 15-16 Site Visits (6th year)
- Staff reviews the Biennial Reports and reports to the COA.
- Eight Regional meetings for Program Review—(Sac, LA, SD, Bay Area, Central Valley—rotating locations) 252 reviewers @ \$200 on average for 1 day meetings. All reviewers must attend meetings, at least initially.
- Fifteen to sixteen site visits @ \$7,500 on average per site visit—staff plus team of 3-7 reviewers, on average.
- Six 2-day COA meetings—allows COA to review the Biennial Reports, the Program Reviews and make decision regarding a focused program visit. In addition, the COA will review Team Reports from the site visits and make accreditation decisions.

Table 6: Annual Budget for Revised Accreditation System at Full Implementation

Activity	Annual Cost	% of Cost	Staff	\$ estimate
BIR Training	\$50,000	14 %	Administrator, 1 FTE	\$110,000
Program Review (4 th year)	\$65,000	18 %	Consultants, 3 FTEs	\$300,000
Previsits site visit in next fiscal year	\$16,000	5 %	SSA, 1 FTE	\$80,000
Focused, Further Information Needed, and Revisits	\$27,000	8 %	Secretary	\$50,000
Site Visits (6 th year)	\$117,000	32 %		
COA	\$80,000	23 %		
	\$355,000			\$540,000

** Although, a full slate of accreditation visits will take place in 07-08, the NCATE merged visits will still include the program review process at the site visit—due to the fact that the document review for the 07-08 site visits will not take place during 05-06. This fact impacts the budget for the 07-08 fiscal year site visits.*

Important Consideration:

Please note these figures represent only the educator credential programs currently in the accreditation system and the inclusion of the LEA sponsored Designated Subjects Programs. Other programs are proposed for addition to make the review process consistent for all credential areas. The proposed programs, such as Induction and subject matter programs could have significant cost implications.

Attachment A

Accreditation Study Work Group
Matrix of Issues

Accreditation Study Work Group Topic, Issues and Options Matrix

I. Topics where the Accreditation Study Work Group has reached consensus on a recommendation to the COA

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Purpose of Accreditation “Framework - Introduction to the Framework”	Refine the purpose of accreditation for California’s educator preparation programs, taking into consideration the policy and budget environment in California and nationally. <i>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?</i>	Continue purposes as defined in <i>Accreditation Framework</i>
		Modify definition of purpose of accreditation *** • Purpose of accreditation: Ensure accountability; Adhere to standards; Ensure high quality and effective preparation programs; Support program improvement. • Essential Attributes: Description of the attributes of the accreditation system: <i>Professional Nature; Knowledgeable participants; Breadth and flexibility; Intensity, Efficiency and cost-effectiveness.</i>
Role of CTC and COA Framework: Sections 1 & 2 Handbook	The Commission’s vision statement is “To ensure that those who educate the children of this state are academically and professionally prepared.” One of the Commission’s goals is to: “Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators. “ The COA has responsibility for implementing the accreditation system, while the Commission establishes policies. The COA reports to the Commission on an annual basis. <i>Do the roles and responsibilities of the Commission and COA under the current accreditation system provide appropriate oversight of teacher education and maximum efficiency?</i>	Continue the roles of the Commission and COA as defined in the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> but improve communication between COA and Commission by a) On-going COA representative reports at Commission meetings as appropriate, but more frequently than annual reporting. COA will investigate and implement processes that will allow the Commission to better determine how its accreditation policies are being implemented.*** b) COA information or consent item on the agenda at each Commission meeting, or as appropriate
		Modify the role of the Commission in accreditation e) Commission ratification of accreditation decisions made by COA d) Eliminate COA, Commission makes all accreditation decisions e) COA initially accredits institutions instead of the Commission

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Unit Accreditation and Program Approval Framework: Section 5	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. <i>Does the current system need to be modified to ensure appropriate attention to both program and unit issues?</i>	Continue to accredit the institution with program approval embedded in the single accreditation process. Move back to a program approval system without any institution wide accreditation decision Develop a new system that addresses both unit accreditation AND enhanced program review in a different manner. (For more information on this proposed system, see topics 11-15 of this matrix.) ***
Accreditation as a single event or an on-going activity Framework: Section 5	Currently the accreditation system examines an institution every six years with a ‘snapshot.’ The COA decides on an accreditation finding and if that finding is Accreditation, the institution does not interact with the COA until the next review in six years. <i>Would an approach that allows historical data to be considered better support the purposes of an accreditation system?</i>	Maintain the current system with the snapshot approach Modify the system to reflect the fact that accreditation is an on-going activity. Accreditation should be viewed as an on-going cycle of activities focused on accountability, meeting the standards, and data driven decision making. The prior accreditation report and continuing data reports are considered in the accreditation system. ***
Accreditation Decisions Framework: Section 5	Current Framework includes three options—Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations, and Denial of Accreditation. Current Framework also requires all Stipulations to be cleared within one year. <i>Does this menu of options or the time frame for follow-up need to be modified in any way?</i>	Continue with the current accreditation options as described in the Accreditation Framework Modify the accreditation system to more clearly show individual program findings. Program Standard findings on standards will include Standard Met, Met with Concerns, Met Minimally, and Not Met. Revise the Unit Accreditation findings to include the finding of full accreditation for the educational unit with required follow-up. ***
National Unit Accreditation	Current law states that national accreditation of an educational unit may be substituted for state accreditation, if specific conditions are met. Conditions are set forth in the <i>Framework</i> . As the current accreditation system is implemented, national	Continue national unit accreditation options as defined in Ed Code and <i>Accreditation Framework</i> : Agreements and protocols with national accrediting bodies may need to be adjusted to accommodate the revised state accreditation system.***

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
<p>tion Framework: Section 7</p>	<p>accreditation separate from state accreditation has not taken place in California. <i>How or should national accreditation of the education unit integrate with state accreditation?</i></p>	<p>Replace California's accreditation process with national accreditation Eliminate national accreditation options Modify existing practice...</p>
<p>National Program Accreditation Framework: Section 7</p>	<p>Current law states that national accreditation of a specific program may be substituted for state accreditation, if specific conditions are met. Conditions are set forth in the <i>Framework</i>. As the current accreditation system is implemented, national accreditation separate from state accreditation has not taken place in California. <i>How or should national accreditation of individual preparation programs integrate with state accreditation?</i></p>	<p>Continue national program accreditation options as defined in Ed Code and Accreditation Framework, no change required Replace California's program approval process with national program accreditation or approval Eliminate national program options All California programs must participate in the California accreditation process. California supports national program accreditation when the national program review can be coordinated with the California process*** (National organizations may do the preliminary work of determining alignment of national standards to California standards, but COA will review all standards for comparability.)</p>
<p>Program Standard Options Framework: Section 3</p>	<p>Currently, there are five program standard options that institutions may choose among: California Standards, National or Professional Standards, General Standards, Experimental Standards, or Alternative Standards. <i>Do each of the five current options provide equivalent or adequate standards for accreditation activities? Should the options be modified or changed?</i></p>	<p>Continue with the current five program standard options Provide three program standards options: 1) California Program Standards, 2) National or Professional Program Standards, or 3) Alternate Program Standards. These alternate standards include experimental or research based and alternative standards. If national standards are used, comparability must be established and programs must address the California specific standards in addition to the national standards. *** Require all institutions to use 1) California or 2) National or Professional Program Standards Require all institutions to use California Program Standards only</p>

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Evaluation of the Accreditation System Framework: Section 8	Currently Section 8 of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> defines how the accreditation system is evaluated and modified. Because the law required a one time, external evaluation of the system and that evaluation has taken place, much of the current Section 8 would not apply to a revised accreditation system.	<p>Modify Section 8 of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> to define an ongoing data collection process regarding the efficacy of the accreditation system. Define how modifications will be made in the future and when stakeholder input is required.***</p> <p>Leave Section 8 of the Accreditation Framework as it is currently</p>
Selection of COA members Framework: Section 2	<p>The current selection process for COA members is cumbersome and costly.</p> <p><i>Can the selection process be simplified, still meet the requirements of the Education Code, and support the selection of quality COA members?</i></p>	<p>Keep current process with no modifications</p> <p>Modify the selection process to reduce costs, prevent large turnover of COA members in the same year, streamline the nominating panel process. ***</p>
Site Level Activity— Scope and Structure Framework: Section 5	<p>The current site visit reviews all standards—unit and program—through document review, interviews and a self-study at the institution.</p> <p><i>What should take place during the site level activity? Could the site level activity benefit from increased use of technology?</i></p>	<p>Continue with the current site visit as defined in the Accreditation Framework where both unit and program standards are examined.</p> <p>Move to a “focused site visit” that reviews only some standards or some programs.</p> <p>Review the unit through a site visit. Review all programs through biennial data collection and once per cycle document review prior to site activity. Program issues identified during the biennial report and document review can also be addressed during the site review.***</p>
Site Level Activity-Frequency Framework: Section 5	<p>Currently, institutions have a site visit every six years. (NCATE has moved to a seven year cycle with additional interim reporting mechanisms required during the interval.)</p> <p><i>What is the appropriate cycle for the future site level activity?</i></p>	<p>Continue with the six year cycle as defined in the Accreditation Framework</p> <p>Move to a seven year cycle but with biennial data collection and an interim activity in the fourth year of the cycle. Develop a plan for immediate intervention, if warranted, based on Biennial Report, Program Document Review. ***</p>

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Interim Review Activities Framework: Section 5	The BTSA program review process incorporates an informal peer review which occurs between formal site visits. The value of these activities for program improvement is widely understood in the BTSA community.	Standards-based review process that takes place in the interval between the site visits. The process could be focused on the unit or the programs, there are options for institutions, and the activity is required.**
	<i>What type of interim activities—unit or program focused—would support program improvement?</i>	Biennial report. Standards related data is collected annually. Programs report biennially. Reports are used by program review process and by the site team. ***
		No interim review activity
Use of Technology	Currently, the use of technology is not integrated into the accreditation system in any sort of systematic manner. <i>Would it be helpful to systematize and/or increase the use of technology in accreditation activities: annual reports, program documents, site visits, reports</i>	Leave the use of technology (type and level of) to the individual institution.
		Use technology to support the 1) biennial reports, 2) program documents, 3) site visits ***
Data Collection Framework: Section 5	Annual, bi-annual, or periodic data collection on programs and/or the unit. Information gathered could be used to inform, and possibly structure, the site visit.	Goal for institution to aggregate data, systematically review the data and use the data for program improvement*
	<i>What type of data should be collected and analyzed 1) during the site visit, and 2) in an interim activity, or annually? How should the data impact 1) the accreditation decision and 2) the focus of the site visit?</i>	Focus on candidate competence through pre and post-test, TPA scores, employer survey, candidate self-assessment*
	<i>What data will provide information on candidate competence?</i>	Each institution submits a biennial web based report particularly focused on a selected, specific standard area. For the initial cycles, this area will be candidate competence, evaluation and related assessments. Periodically CTC can designate a different standard area to be the focus of the next designated time period, with appropriate notice to programs of the change. These reports are used by the next site review team. ***
	The current Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) training was developed for the current accreditation system. If a new	COA, with interested stakeholders, will develop a training process during 05-06.*

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
BIR Training	accreditation system is adopted, a new training must be developed that is appropriate for the new system. The training must ensure quality in the reviews and consistency in the process.	COA with stakeholders will review and revise the content and process for BIR training to reflect the policies contained in the revised Accreditation Framework. ***
Selection of Review Teams	Currently, site review team size varies greatly due to the size of the institution and the number of programs in operation at the institution. <i>What should guide the composition of the review team in a revised accreditation system?</i>	COA with stakeholders will review and revise the guidelines for review team composition to reflect the policies contained in the revised Accreditation Framework. ***
		Use the current composition and selection guidelines. No review or change would be needed.
Selection of interviews and site visits	<i>How should sites and interviewees be selected to ensure a fair and unbiased representation of interviewees and to allow the review team to obtain an accurate understanding of the quality of an institution or district's credential programs?</i>	COA with stakeholders will review and revise the guidelines for selection of site visits and interviews to reflect the policies contained in the revised Accreditation Framework. ***
		Use the current selection guidelines. No review or change would be needed.
Specialized Credential Programs Framework: Section 5	In addition to Multiple and Single Subject Credentials, the Commission awards credentials in many specialized areas— Special Education, Pupil Personnel Services, Administrative Services, Designated Subjects, and Intern credentials. <i>Should there be any modifications to the accreditation system to support the review of these programs?</i>	Include specialized credential programs in the revised system. Review specialized programs through the biennial report and 4 th year program review process. If concerns are raised in the 4 th year program review process, include the specialized program in the site visit. ***
Certificate Programs Framework: Section 5	Certificate programs (CLAD/BCLAD, Early Childhood for example) have not previously been a part of the accreditation system, although Reading certificate is now a part of accreditation. <i>Should all the certificate programs be reviewed through the accreditation system process?</i>	Continue to approve certificate programs with no on-going program approval
		Review CTC approved certificate programs through the accreditation system in addition to the original program approval process. ***
	Subject matter programs are initially approved by a team of readers and there has been no ongoing review of the programs	Continue current initial program approval process and no further program review

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Multiple Subject-Subject Matter Programs	<p>after the initial approval. Multiple Subject Programs can be offered by an IHE to help candidates develop subject matter competence. Prior to NCLB, completion of a subject matter program waived the examination requirement. Currently completion of a program does not waive the examination requirement.</p> <p><i>Should the Multiple Subject subject matter programs be reviewed (on-going review) through the accreditation or some other process?</i></p> <p><i>Should a transition begin so that eventually the subject matter programs are reviewed through the accreditation system?</i></p>	<p>Continue current initial program approval and in addition collect data every seven years from programs, but not include in the institution's accreditation decision. Periodic data (CSET scores-contingent on the availability of meaningful score reports, course matrix showing alignment with K-12 academic content standards) will support the program in focusing on the K-12 content standards and program improvement and could result in further review. ***</p> <p>Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system.</p>
Single Subject-Subject Matter Programs	<p>Subject matter programs are initially approved by a team of readers and there has been no ongoing review of the programs after the initial approval. Single Subject Programs can be offered by an IHE to satisfy the subject matter requirement.</p> <p><i>Should the Single Subject subject matter programs be reviewed (on-going review) through the accreditation or some other process?</i></p> <p><i>Should a transition begin so that eventually the subject matter programs are reviewed through the accreditation system?</i></p>	<p>Continue current initial program approval process and no further program review</p> <p>Continue current initial program approval and in addition collect data every seven years from programs but do not include in the institution's accreditation decision. Periodic data (course matrix showing alignment with the K-12 academic content standards, program evaluation data and an update on program changes) will support the program in focusing on the K-12 content standards and program improvement and could result in further review.***</p> <p>Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner.*</p> <p>Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system</p>
Designated Subjects Programs Framework: Section 5	<p>Institutions of higher education and local education agencies may both offer designated subjects credential programs. Both types of programs are initially reviewed by a panel for initial program approval. Currently, only the IHE programs are reviewed through the accreditation system. <i>Should LEA sponsored designated subjects programs be reviewed through the accreditation system?</i></p>	<p>Continue the initial program approval process for designated subject programs. Only the IHE sponsored programs are reviewed through the accreditation system.</p> <p>Continue the initial program approval process for designated subject programs. Both IHE and LEA sponsored programs are reviewed through the accreditation system. ***</p>

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
5 th Year Programs	<p>Prior to SB 2042, the three Fifth Year courses were initially approved with no further review. The SB 2042 Fifth Year Programs are teacher preparation programs offered by institutions that have a Multiple Subject or Single Subject Preliminary Preparation Programs. One institution must recommend the candidate for the SB 2042 Professional Clear Credential as an alternative route to completion of induction. <i>Should 5th year programs be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i></p>	<p>Continue current initial program approval process with no further review</p> <p>Include 5th year programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner. Review should be equitable to the review process of Induction programs.**</p> <p>Include 5th year programs in the accreditation system as other programs. ***</p>
Induction Programs	<p>There are currently 149 Commission approved BTSA Induction Programs—these programs are funded through the Department of Education. In the past, the BTSA Task Force has implemented a Formal Program Review process to review the BTSA programs on a four year cycle. Now Induction Programs are the preferred path to earn the Professional Clear Credential and there could in the future be induction programs that are not BTSA programs—offered by IHEs or other local agencies. <i>Should Induction Programs be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i></p> <p><i>Should the goal be to begin a transition designed to fully integrate Induction Programs into the accreditation system?</i></p>	<p>Continue current initial program approval process and ongoing review with Formal Program Review with oversight by the BTSA Task Force for BTSA Induction programs.</p> <p>Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner. Review should be equitable to the review process of Fifth Year programs.**</p> <p>Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system. For funded programs, BTSA Task Force (under the direction of the COA) coordinates the process, and the COA accredits the programs based on site visit and other reports. Process should be of at least comparable rigor to the adopted accreditation process. ***</p>
Evaluation of the revised system #	<p>The proposed revised accreditation system is drastically different than the current accreditation system. <i>How can we be sure that the new system is increasing accountability? Fostering program improvement? Ensuring high quality preparation programs?</i></p>	<p>All elements of the revised accreditation system must be evaluated in a short but reasonable period of time to ensure implementation is move forward appropriately and that the new system is holding all program sponsors accountable. #</p>
2042 Required Elements	<p>Prior to SB 2042, the standards had “Factors to Consider” and the review teams were guided by the factors. The 2042 Standards (subject matter, teacher prep, induction and 5th year) have “Required Elements” and the reviewers are asked to hold the institution accountable for every element. <i>A concern has</i></p>	<p>Recommend that the Commission identify a small expert writing group to carefully examine the 2042 standards and evaluate and consider where changes are needed relative to the concept of ‘required elements’ versus ‘factors to consider.’ Product distributed for stakeholder review and feedback prior to adoption. ***</p>

~~Strikeout~~ Work group is no longer considering as an option
8/20/2005

*Work group is considering **Preliminary consensus ***Consensus!
Questions in *italics* are designed to focus the discussion

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
	<p><i>been expressed that the ‘required elements’ may be too prescriptive and contrary to efforts to move towards an outcomes-based accreditation mode. Should the required elements aspect of the SB 2042 standards be reviewed and revised?</i></p>	<p>Recommend that the “Required Elements” in the SB 2042 Standards be revised to “Factors to Consider” in keeping with the attribute of flexibility in the accreditation system</p> <p>No change to the current system, maintain Required Elements</p>
<p>Administrative Services Guideline based Programs</p>	<p>The current pathways to earn an Administrative Services Professional Credential include both standards-based programs and guideline based programs (in addition, AB 75 programs are approved by the CDE). The approval and review process for the two types of programs differ. <i>Should both types of programs be approved and reviewed under the same process?</i></p>	<p>Continue to use the current two pathways to the Tier II credential with the two program approval and review processes.</p> <p>Recommend the Commission consider that both the Guidelines-based programs and Standards-based programs be reviewed and approved by the COA for ongoing accreditation. The processes should be of equal rigor although not necessarily the same. ***</p>
<p>Experimental Program Standards</p>	<p>An institution may submit a program designed to meet the Experimental Program standards. These standards were approved in 1988. <i>Should the Experimental Program Standards be reviewed and revised?</i></p>	<p>Continue to use the currently approved Experimental Program Standards</p> <p>Recommend the Commission convene a group to review and suggest revisions to the Experimental Program Standards ***</p>
<p>Standards for Induction and 5th year programs</p>	<p>Currently Induction programs (LEA or IHE based programs) have to meet the Commission adopted Induction Standards which are 20 standards. Fifth Year programs (IHE based) must meet the Commission adopted Fifth Year of Study Standards which are four standards. The field perceives this as an inequity for the two routes to the MS and SS Professional Clear Credential. <i>Should the standards for Induction and 5th year of study programs be reviewed and possibly revised?</i></p>	<p>Standards for the Professional Clear MS and SS credential should be aligned to hold candidates to equally rigorous courses of study, although possibly different courses of study***</p> <p>Continue with the current Induction standards (20 standards) and Fifth Year standards (4 standards) for candidates to earn the Professional Clear MS or SS Credential.</p>

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Subject Matter Programs	<p>Currently, the process of submitting a program document and completing the review process is viewed as an arduous task. <i>Should subject matter programs be reviewed in a different manner that streamlines the process but still ensures program quality? Is there a way to facilitate candidate's satisfaction of subject matter requirements in fields such as math and science where there is a critical need for teachers?</i></p>	<p>Recommend the Commission convene a group to review and suggest revisions to the subject matter approval process. ***</p>
Pre-conditions	<p>Preconditions exist but are not coordinated, consistent or organized across all programs. <i>Should the Preconditions be reviewed and possibly made more consistent across all programs?</i></p>	<p>Recommend the Commission direct staff to review all Preconditions and develop recommendations for the Commission to ensure that Preconditions are appropriate and equitable for all types of programs. ***</p> <p>Preconditions do not need review or revision.</p>
Common Standards	<p><i>The Common Standards were adopted in 19 . Should the Common Standards be reviewed and possibly revised? Are there portions of the national standards that should or could be incorporated into the Common Standards?</i></p>	<p>Recommend the Commission convene a group to review and suggest revisions to the Common Standards. ***</p> <p>Maintain current Common Standards without review.</p>
Blended	<p>There are currently six program standards that all approved blended programs are required to meet. An institution that wants to offer an approved blended program must have both an</p>	<p>Continue to use the six Blended Program Standards as a separate set of standards that approved blended programs must submit to in addition to the subject matter and the teacher preparation standards.</p>

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Program Standards	<p>approved subject matter program and an approved teacher preparation program. Then the institution would submit an additional document that addresses the Blended Standards. The blended document is reviewed by readers, possibly readers that have not reviewed both the subject matter and the teacher preparation documents.</p> <p><i>Should the elements of the six Blended Program Standards be integrated within the preparation program standards and the blended program is viewed as a delivery mode or should the Blended Program Standards remain distinct with an additional approval process?</i></p>	<p>Recommend that the Commission infuse the requirements of the six Blended Program Standards into the specific program standards (MS, SS, and Ed Sp) so that if a program wants to offer a blended system of delivery (in a similar manner as the Intern program is a specific type of delivery system), then that program would address the blended standards within the basic program document. Institutions/Program Sponsors would submit biennial data reports with data disaggregated by delivery mode (blended, intern or traditional). ***</p>

II: Topics where the Work Group has not yet reached consensus

II. Topics where the Work Group has not yet reached consensus and would like to continue to work

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Specialized Credential Programs	<p>In addition to Multiple and Single Subject Credentials, the Commission awards credentials in many specialized areas— Special Education, Pupil Personnel Services, Administrative Services, Designated Subjects, and Intern credentials.</p> <p><i>Should there be any modifications to the accreditation system to support the review of these programs?</i></p>	<p>There are additional issues to consider related to specialized credential programs that are beyond the topic of the reviewing and revising the accreditation system. *** #</p> <p>The Work Group needs to discuss these issues more to offer specific options.</p>
Indicators of immediate intervention needed & steps of intervention	<p><i>When should an institution or program be asked to provide additional information to the COA? When should the COA schedule a focused site visit?</i></p>	<p>Indicators that immediate intervention is warranted include: 1) not submitting a report, 2) a report that is incomplete or inadequate, 3) the indication that an institution or program is not meeting standards. Steps in intervention include: CTC staff contacts the institution or program, issue is put on the COA agenda for discussion, COA schedules a focused site visit.</p>