

---

# 5G

## Action

### *Professional Services Committee*

---

## Implementation of the Accreditation System

**Executive Summary:** This item presents additional recommendations developed by the Accreditation Study Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation for consideration and action by the Commission. Further, this agenda item describes activities that staff, stakeholders, and the COA would engage in to implement the revised accreditation system.

**Recommended Action:** Approval of the recommendations proposed by the Accreditation Study Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation.

**Presenters:** Cheryl Hickey, Consultant, Teri Clark, Administrator, Lawrence Birch, Director, Professional Services Division.

#### Strategic Plan Goal: 1

#### Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

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



---

---

## **Implementation of the Accreditation System**

---

---

### **Introduction**

On August 1, 2006, the Commission took action to begin accreditation site visits in 2007-2008, endorsed priorities for the scheduling of accreditation site visits, and acted on the first six recommendations of the Accreditation Study Work Group (Work Group) and the Committee on Accreditation (COA). This agenda item can be found on the Commission's website at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2006-08/2006-08-6b.pdf>. The Commission directed staff to return to the September 2006 meeting with additional information on implementing the accreditation process, including additional recommendations for revising the system.

### **Background**

The Accreditation Study Work Group (Work Group) began working in June 2004 to review and suggest possible revisions to the Commission's accreditation system. The Work Group has communicated frequently with the COA during the review process. At the October 2005 Commission meeting, the Work Group and the COA presented their recommendations for revisions to California's educator preparation accreditation system to the Commission in an agenda item (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2005-10/2005-10-6C.pdf>).

At the April 2006 Commission meeting, Secretary of Education Alan Bersin asked the Commission to consider the nexus between national accreditation and California's system of accreditation. The Commission staff returned with additional information on the two national accrediting agencies: National Council for Teacher Education (NCATE) and Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) at the June 2006 Commission meeting and noted that additional information and dialogue with these two agencies would be necessary to respond appropriately to the Secretary's request.

As a result, the Commission's direction to staff in June 2006 was twofold. Recognizing that there are issues with respect to national accreditation needing further examination and discussion, the Commission directed staff to continue to investigate the nexus with national accrediting bodies and to report back to the Commission at an appropriate time. The Commission, concerned with ensuring an accreditation process was in place as soon as feasible, directed staff to bring an item back at the July-August 2006 meeting that would allow the Commission to consider and act upon the revisions presented by the Work Study Group, begin implementation of the accreditation system as soon as possible with site visits in 2007-08, and to prioritize those institutions that have never had a review since initial accreditation or those with the greatest period of time between site visits to be placed early in the accreditation site visit schedule.

### **Commission Action Taken in July-August 2006**

At the July-August 2006 meeting, the Commission took several important steps in implementing the revised accreditation system.

First, the Commission voted to implement accreditation site visits beginning in 2007-08. This action allows the Commission staff and the Committee on Accreditation to move forward with a plan of action to implement a revised system.

Second, the Commission voted to endorse the COA priorities for consideration in scheduling accreditation site visits for 2007-2008 and beyond. The Commission adjusted the proposed list of priorities to ensure that those institutions that have not had an accreditation visit of any kind following initial accreditation was the first priority of the Commission in implementing accreditation. As such, the revised priorities that were adopted by the Commission include the following:

- 1) Institutions/Program Sponsors that have not had an accreditation visit of any kind following initial institutional accreditation;
- 2) NCATE visits that are already scheduled;
- 3) Institutions/Program sponsors that have only had a formative visit;
- 4) Length of time since the last accreditation site visit, length of time since initial institutional accreditation;
- 5) Scheduling approximately an equal number of site visits per year;
- 6) Creating a balance in the size of teams needed each year;
- 7) Information reviewed as part of the interim reporting (biennial reports and program review).

Using this list of priorities, staff subsequently developed the schedule of accreditation site visits. It is provided as Attachment A to this item.

Third, the Commission voted to adopt six of the 18 recommendations of the Accreditation Study Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation. The six adopted recommendations were as follows:

- 1) To revise the *Accreditation Framework* to define the purposes of accreditation system. The purposes are to ensure accountability; to ensure high quality and effective preparation programs; to ensure adherence to credential standards; and to encourage and support ongoing program improvement.
- 2) To maintain the current roles and responsibilities of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation as defined in California Education Code Sections 44372 and 44373 (c) but improve the communication between the COA and the Commission.
- 3) To modify the system such that accreditation becomes an ongoing activity instead of a once every six year event. The ongoing cycle will be focused on accountability, meeting standards, and data driven decision making. Each institution's prior accreditation report and continuing data reports will be considered in the accreditation system.
- 4) To adopt an accreditation cycle and activities as follows:
  - (a) 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;
  - (b) 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;
  - (c) Require program sponsors to submit biennial reports to the COA
  - (d) Retain and revise the review of documents submitted by all credential programs in the 4<sup>th</sup> year of the 7 year cycle;

- (e) Retain and revise a site visit in the 6<sup>th</sup> year of the cycle focusing on Common Standards and where needed, Program Standards; and
  - (f) Use the 7<sup>th</sup> year in the cycle for required follow up.
- 5) To revise the system such that it addresses unit accreditation and enhances program review.
- 6) To establish consistency in the system by including all credential and certificate programs in the accreditation process. The Commission voted to approve this recommendation in concept, with the understanding that additional work needed to be done by staff and the stakeholders on implementation of this recommendation. The Commission credential areas for which this recommendation applies are Designated Subject Programs, Guidelines-based Professional Administrative Services Credential Programs, Fifth Year Programs, Induction Programs, and Subject Matter Programs. Numerous issues remain unresolved at this time with respect to full implementation of this recommendation.

The remainder of this agenda item focuses on seven additional recommendations of the Accreditation Study Work Group and the COA. As this work continues, still other recommendations will be brought to the Commission.

### **Recommended Revisions to the Accreditation System**

The section below describes seven recommendations as well as the rationale for the recommendations related to the revised accreditation system for consideration and action by the Commission at this time. These recommendations, in addition to the six approved by the Commission on August 1, 2006, are central to a revised accreditation system and will greatly assist in implementing site visits in 2007-08.

The first topic presented for consideration at this time is Topic 6 which was agreed to in concept by the Commission at the August 1, 2006 meeting.

#### ***Topic 6: Establish consistency in the system by including all Credentialing and Certificate Programs in the Accreditation process.***

As previously mentioned in this agenda item, at the July-August 2006 meeting, the Commission endorsed the concept that all educator preparation programs that lead to a credential or certificate should be included in the accreditation system. At the meeting, staff

indicated that because credential types had originated through various pieces of legislation and at different times, inconsistency exists in the manner in which credential programs are treated currently with respect to accreditation. The Accreditation Study Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation discussed the need to consider including the following credential areas under accreditation:

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

At the meeting, staff indicated that the request for Commission approval was limited to “in concept” only because there are significant implementation issues related to each of these areas. Additional work would need to be done to determine how to incorporate these into the accreditation system.

Of the five credential areas listed above, staff believes that it is possible to implement two of these areas in the earliest stages of the implementation of the revised accreditation system. These are presented for consideration at this time. The remainder will be brought before the Commission at a future Commission meeting. The two areas presented in this item are the Designated Subjects Programs and the Guidelines-Based Administrative Services Programs.

#### ***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 ongoing 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 ongoing 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 ongoing 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. At the time that this agenda item was prepared, there are eight Commission approved Guidelines-based Administrative Services credential program.

## ***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. Alternative standards may be used provided they are approved by the COA as comparable to California Program Standards. 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 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* (2006) 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.

The table below illustrates how the proposed revised selection and terms of the COA members could be phased in such that eventually, 3 new members would be appointed each year, allowing for a predictable, consistent, and manageable process.

**Table 1: COA Membership Transition Plan**

<b>06-07</b>	<b>07-08</b>	<b>08-09</b>	<b>09-10</b>	<b>10-11</b>
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

At the Commission's June 2006 meeting, the Commission did, in part, endorse this approach in that it approved moving forward in this manner to fill the one K-12 vacancy that existed. The filling of the vacancy at the subsequent August meeting does not in any way conflict with the implementation of this recommendation.

### ***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 ongoing data collection, evaluation, reflection, and modification – to determine whether the system is working effectively.

### ***Ongoing Work and Implementation Issues***

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 discussed and continue to address:

- ***Topic 14: Training -- Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR)***
- ***Topic 15: Selection of the Review Teams***
- ***Topic 16: Selection of Interviews and Site Visits***
- ***Topic 17: Data Collection***

In addition, in the coming months, the Committee on Accreditation and the stakeholders will continue to work on several areas that require additional stakeholder discussion. These include the following topics:

- ***Topic 6: Establish Consistency in the System by Including all Credential and Certificate Programs in the Accreditation Process.*** Additional work needs to be done with respect to the individual credential areas not currently covered by accreditation.
  - Topic 6c: Fifth Year Programs
  - Topic 6d: Induction Programs
  - Topic 6e: Subject Matter Programs
- ***Topic 18: Additional Work for Accreditation Study Work Group and the COA***

Topic 18 areas are related to the proposed changes to standards themselves. Because this was not within the original charge of the accreditation review process, stakeholders and the COA were reticent to begin work in this area. However, it became clear in discussions on accreditation that some standards required greater alignment with the process being proposed. At the October 2005 Commission meeting, the Commission directed staff to continue to work with stakeholders on

these issues. In particular, two areas in which work has begun include the Common, or Unit, Standards and the Experimental Program Standards. Because the Common Standards are central to the accreditation review, and because the Commission agreed to maintain a system that includes a unit review in addition to program review, a revised set of standards will be provided for Commission consideration in the near future. The timeframe for bringing proposed new Experimental Standards to the Commission is more flexible. A subgroup of the work group and COA are developing language for both of these sets of standards.

Additional recommendations were made about Preconditions, Blended Program Standards, and the “required elements” structure of SB 2042. Additional work on these topics will take considerable time and can be brought forward at a time that is appropriate in the future.

### **Recommendations:**

- 1) That the Commission act on the seven recommendations (6a, 6b, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 13) as presented by the Accreditation Study Work Group and the COA in this agenda item.

Upon Commission action on the additional seven recommendations presented at this time, staff will engage in the following accreditation activities and report back to the Commission:

- a) Staff will return, after discussions with COA, with suggested options for consideration by the Commission to implement Topic 2 which recommends that communication between the COA and the Commission be improved.
- b) Staff will return to the Commission as soon as possible with proposed language for a new *Accreditation Framework* for consideration and adoption by the Commission on those items where there is commission approval.
- c) Staff would continue to work with stakeholders on revisions to the Common Standards to more closely align with the objectives of the revised system such as candidate outcomes, and return as soon as possible on draft revised language for consideration by the Commission.
- d) Staff would continue to work on Topics 6c-6e, 11, and 12 with the COA and the stakeholders and return to the Commission for consideration and action when appropriate.
- e) Staff would continue to work with the stakeholders and, where appropriate, the Office of the Secretary of Education on determining the nexus between state accreditation and national accreditation.
- f) Staff would continue to work with the COA and stakeholders on the Experimental Program Standards, the Preconditions, Blended Standards and the required elements topics with the COA and stakeholders and return to the Commission for consideration, direction, and action when appropriate.
- g) Staff would work closely with COA and stakeholders to develop new processes and procedures on all aspects of the new accreditation system to be included in a revised *Accreditation Handbook* that is consistent with the accreditation policies the Commission has adopted.

## Attachment A

### Accreditation Activities by Cohort 2006-2014

Each institution of higher education and/or program sponsor is assigned to a cohort. There are seven cohorts. The chart below indicates the accreditation activities for each cohort over the next 8 years. After the seventh year, the cycle begins again with the same activities as the 2006-07 year.

Note: Information below the chart indicates the phased-in implementation of the system

Cohort	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue	Indigo	Violet
2006-2007	Report due <sup>1</sup>		Report due <sup>1</sup>	Program Review <sup>2</sup>		Site Visit <sup>2</sup>	Report due <sup>2,4</sup>
2007-2008		Report due	Program Review		Site Visit <sup>3</sup>	Report due <sup>4</sup>	Report due
2008-2009	Report due	Program Review		Site Visit <sup>3</sup>	Report due <sup>4</sup>	Report due	
2009-2010	Program Review		Site Visit	Report due <sup>4</sup>	Report due		Report due
2010-2011		Site Visit	Report due <sup>4</sup>	Report due		Report due	Program Review
2011-2012	Site Visit	Report due <sup>4</sup>	Report due		Report due	Program Review	
2012-2013	Report due <sup>4</sup>	Report due		Report due	Program Review		Site Visit
2013-2014	Report due		Report due	Program Review		Site Visit	Report due <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Begin collecting Biennial Reports on a voluntary basis.

<sup>2</sup> This accreditation activity will not take place in the 2006-07 year, except the NCATE site visits will take place as scheduled.

<sup>3</sup> Site Visit will include the program review since the revised Program Review will not have occurred two years prior to the site visit.

<sup>4</sup> The report due the year after the site visit will address issues raised during the site visit.

**This is the unofficial working draft of the schedule. All institutions and program sponsors will be notified by the Commission of the upcoming accreditation activities.**

Accreditation Cycle (Beginning 2006-2007)							
Cohort	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue	Indigo	Violet
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
06-07	Report due		Report due	Program Review		Site Visit	Report due
Site Visits	11-12	10-11	09-10	08-09	07-08	[06-07]	12-13
1	Ontario-Montclair SD	UCSB	National Hispanic	Western Governors	Sacramento COE (Project Pipeline)	[Mt. St Mary's]	Hope International
2	UCSC	St Mary's Col	JFK Univ	Simpson	Loma Linda	[USF]	UCI
3	UCB	Cal Baptist	Fresno Pacific	Notre Dame de Namur	UC Riverside	[University of Redlands]	UCSD
4	UCLA	Occidental	Santa Clara	Mills College	Argosy	[Bethany]	UCD
5	LAUSD	The Master's College	San Diego Christian	High Tech HS	Interamerican	[Humboldt St]	Claremont Grad
6	Chapman	Antioch <sup>#</sup>	Touro	CSU CI	Alliant	[USC]	Compton USD
7	Concordia	Cal State TEACH <sup>#</sup>	Whittier College	Westmont College	Vanguard	[San Joaquin COE]	New College
8	Pacific Union	University of Phoenix <sup>#</sup>	Stanislaus COE	San Diego Unified	Phillips Graduate	[CalPoly Pomona]	La Sierra
9	Pepperdine	Santa Barbara COE	William Jessup	Patten University	Holy Names		Pacific Oaks College
10	Pt. Loma	CSU Sac	Biola		Orange COE		
11					Dominican		
Formative site visit						CSU CI	
					William Jessup	High Tech HS	
					Touro	Western Govs	
NCATE Visits							
Site Visits	11-12	10-11	09-10	08-09	07-08	06-07	12-13
1	CSUDH: F	USD: F	CSUN: F	Cal Lutheran: F	CSUFul: F	APU: F	CSU Fr: S
2	CSULA: F	<i>University of La Verne: S*</i>	San Diego St: F	<i>CSUSB: S</i>	Stanford: S	CSUMB: F*	<i>National: S*</i>
3	<i>CSU Chico: S</i>	Sonoma St: S	<i>Cal Poly SLO: S*</i>	CSUEB: S	CSUBak: S	SF State: S	
4	<i>CSUMB: S</i>	UOP: S	LMU: S			CSUSM: S	
5			San Jose St: S			CSU Chico: S*	
6			CSUStan: S			CSULB: S	
<b>Calif</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>[8]</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>NCATE</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>
Site Visits	11-12 18-19	10-11 17-18	09-10 16-17	08-09 15-16	07-08 14-15	06-07 13-14	12-13 19-20

**Program Sponsors not already in the accreditation cycle:**

**Designated Subjects (11):**

Alameda COE  
 Butte COE  
 Contra Costa COE  
 Fresno COE  
 Imperial COE  
 Kern COE  
 LACOE  
 Mendocino COE

Metropolitan Education District, Santa Clara County  
 Santa Clara Unified SD  
 Salinas Adult School

**Administrative Services Guidelines Based (2):**

California Educational Leadership Alliance  
 Standards-Aligned Instructional Leadership (SAIL)

**BTSA Induction (~ 135)**

[ ] = no site visit in 06-07  
*Italics* = tentative NCATE visit

<sup>#</sup> previous visit formative

\* Initial NCATE  
 F= Fall visit, S= Spring visit

**This is the unofficial working draft of the schedule.**



