

---

# 7F

## Information

### *Professional Services Committee of the Whole*

### **Implementation of the Accreditation System**

---

**Executive Summary:** This item presents an update on the activities staff has been engaged in to implement the revised accreditation system as recommended by the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the Accreditation Study Work Group and as approved by the Commission. This agenda item also describes the activities that staff, the COA, and the Work Group still need to complete and the accreditation related issues that will be brought before the Commission at a future Commission meeting.

**Recommended Action:** No action is necessary at this time.

**Presenter:** Teri Clark, Administrator of Accreditation; Cheryl Hickey, Consultant, 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.

November-December 2006



---

---

## Implementation of the Accreditation System

---

---

### **Introduction**

This item describes the recent activities that staff, the Committee on Accreditation (COA), and members of the Accreditation Study Work Group have undertaken to move forward to implement the Commission's actions with respect to a revised accreditation system. In addition, this agenda item describes several aspects of the new accreditation system that will be brought to the Commission for its consideration at a future Commission meeting.

### **Background**

The Accreditation Study Work Group began working in June 2004 to review and suggest revisions to the Commission's accreditation system for educator preparation. At the October 2005 Commission meeting, the Work Group and the COA presented their recommendations for revisions to the Commission in an agenda item. This agenda item is available on the Commission's website at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2005-10/2005-10-6C.pdf>.

After gathering extensive feedback from the field, the Commission took action in the summer and fall of 2006 that allows a full range of accreditation activities to take place. 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 Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation. The August Commission agenda item can be found at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2006-08/2006-08-6b.pdf>. On September 14, 2006, the Commission approved an additional seven recommendations of the Work Group and the COA. This agenda item can be found at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2006-09/2006-09-5G.pdf>.

### **Recent Accreditation Activities**

Since the Commission met on September 13 and 14, 2006, Commission staff, members of the Committee on Accreditation, and members of the Accreditation Study Work Group have continued to work on various aspects of the revised accreditation system. The section below describes these activities.

#### *General Communication with the Field*

Since the last Commission meeting in September, staff has utilized a variety of measures to communicate with the field to inform them that the Commission has taken action to begin accreditation reviews in 2007-08 and to describe the revised accreditation system.

Two Accreditation Update sessions were held at the Credential Counselors and Analysts of California (CCAC) annual conference in early October. Staff presented an overview of the Committee on Accreditation (COA) recommendations that Commission has approved and those aspects that are still in process. In addition, staff described the various activities of the

accreditation cycle and explained the cohort approach taken to describe what an institution or program sponsor would be expected to do throughout the seven years of the cycle.

Executive Director Janssen and Professional Services Division Director Larry Birch also discussed the changes in accreditation at the California Council for Teacher Education meeting in October. In addition, staff has also taken the opportunity to discuss the revised process with various Legislative Staff members during recent visits to the Commission and with the Secretary of Education's Office.

In order to reach as broad an audience as possible, the accreditation link on the Commission webpage has been updated. The web page includes the September letter to the field (discussed below), the description of the revised accreditation cycle, a list of accreditation activities by cohort, Commission agenda items, and contact information. Staff will continue to update this website to ensure that all those interested in the Commission activities in this area have ready access to information.

Staff is also planning general informational and technical assistance meetings to assist institutions and program sponsors better understand the changes included in the revised system. It is anticipated that these meetings will be scheduled for the spring of 2007 and will be held in several locations throughout the state. In order to make the most efficient use of these meetings, staff intends to include information about both accreditation and the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment.

Staff will continue to provide multiple ways of communicating with stakeholders and interested parties about this matter.

#### *Communication with institutions/programs sponsors*

An important priority during this period of transition to the new revised accreditation system is clear and timely communication specifically to the institutions and program sponsors who are affected.

In September, a letter was sent to Deans, Directors of Teacher Education and other program sponsors from Larry Birch, Director of the Professional Services Division. The letter included information on the status of accreditation, the schedule for resuming accreditation visits in 2007-2008, the variety of activities that will take place throughout the seven year cycle leading to a site visit, guidelines for the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 visits, and the cohort to which the college/university or program sponsor has been assigned.

In January, a letter will be sent to the three cohort groups scheduled for biennial reports in 2006-2007. Biennial reports in spring of 2007 will be voluntary. Each institution in the three cohort groups will be asked to consider submitting a data report for one of its approved programs. The revised system calls for the biennial data reports to include information primarily on candidate outcomes. Staff is working with the Accreditation Study Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation to define the specifications of the biennial reports so that the reports can be used as both a tool for the institutions and a communication to the Commission regarding program success, challenges and results. The purpose of this voluntary submission is to provide

institutions and program sponsors, the COA, members of the Work Group, and staff with the opportunity to test run the template, determine whether it yields the kinds of information that is useful to accreditation, and modify the process these reports will go through within the revised system. Feedback from institutions that volunteer to participate will be critically important.

Additional communication to program sponsors will include letters to specific cohort groups with more complete information regarding the parameters of and procedures for program review, formative visits, and site visits. Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that sponsor Designated Subjects programs will receive specific information regarding their inclusion in the accreditation system and guidelines for their preparation and participation. The plan for correspondence follows:

**2006-2007**

<b>Information regarding</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Projected Date for Correspondence</b>
Formative Site Visits	CSU, Channel Islands High Tech High School Western Governors University	December 2006
Voluntary Biennial Reports	Red, Yellow, Blue and Cohorts	January 2007

**2007-2008**

<b>Information regarding</b>	<b>Target Audience</b>	<b>Projected Date for Correspondence</b>
Site Visits	Blue Cohort (16 institutions)	January 2007
Inclusion in the accreditation system	LEA Based Designated Subjects Programs	January 2007
Program Review	Yellow Cohort (14 institutions)	Spring 2007
Biennial Reports	Orange, Green and Violet Cohorts	Spring 2007
Formative Site Visits in Spring 2008	William Jessup University Touro University	Spring 2007

**Ongoing Work and Implementation Issues**

*Accreditation Framework Language*

Although the Commission has approved numerous recommendations thus far to establish a revised accreditation system, a formal document outlining the Commission's a policy on accreditation still needs to be adopted. This document is the Commission's *Accreditation Framework*. Staff is currently working with the COA and members of the Accreditation Study Work Group to draft appropriate and clear *Accreditation Framework* language for Commission consideration. Several drafts have already been reviewed and changes and edits continue on this complex document. Several stakeholders and COA members are asking small focus groups to provide feedback on various drafts to ensure that the language used is clear, easy to follow and that any confusing or ambiguous language is eliminated. A proposed *Framework* will be placed on the Commission's agenda early in 2007 for information and then action. Completing a proposed draft *Accreditation Framework* is a high priority over the next couple of months.

### *Standards Revisions*

The Committee on Accreditation and the stakeholders continue to work on proposed changes to the Commission's standards. Those recommendations previously referred to as "Topic 18" are particularly critical and will likely come before the Commission early in 2007. Because this was not within the original charge of the accreditation review process, stakeholders and the COA had been reticent to begin work in this area prior to Commission direction. However, it became clear in discussions on accreditation that some standards need to be modified to provide better alignment with the revised process. 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.

### *Revised Common Standards*

In September 2006, a subgroup of the Accreditation Study Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation, together with several staff members, met at CSU Dominguez Hills to review the current set of Common Standards and to suggest possible changes to the standards. The Common Standards are those standards that address larger institution wide issues such as leadership, faculty, resources, and governance. It has been determined that the currently adopted Common Standards are not sufficiently aligned to the objectives of the revised accreditation system. The proposed revised standards developed at the meeting at CSU Dominguez Hills were discussed by the Committee on Accreditation at their October 2006 meeting and it was determined that further discussion and revision was necessary. Staff is currently in the process of revising the proposed standards again for future discussion by the stakeholders and the COA to determine if they accomplish the objectives of the revised accreditation system. Because the Common Standards are central to the accreditation review a revised set of standards will be provided for Commission consideration in the near future.

### *Experimental Program Standards*

Like the Common Standards, a subgroup of the Committee on Accreditation and the Accreditation Study Work Group is currently reviewing the Experimental Program Standards for consideration by the Commission. In the past, the Experimental Program option has been utilized by a very small number of institutions. One of the primary objectives of the subgroups working on the Experimental Program Standards is to create a better environment so that more institutions would consider utilizing this option, thereby building the scholarship in and around educator preparation in this state. The concept is to allow for new delivery methods, while ensuring that candidates emerging from these programs have the same knowledge, skills, and abilities as other program candidates.

In September and early October, the subgroup met and developed a set of principles that would guide the development of the standards and outline expectations for Experimental Programs. Using that set of principles, the group drafted a set of proposed new standards. The COA and members of the Accreditation Study Work Group reviewed these draft standards and a revised draft is being developed based upon the comments received.

### *Other recommendations*

The Commission staff will continue to work with the COA and stakeholders to address the three credential and certificate areas under the sixth recommendation to establish consistency in the

system by including all Credential and Certificate Programs in the Accreditation Process. These areas are:

- Topic 6c: Fifth Year Programs
- Topic 6d: Induction Programs
- Topic 6e: Subject Matter Programs

Additional recommendations were made about Preconditions, Blended Program Standards, and the “required elements” structure of SB 2042. Of these topics, staff is working on ensuring a revised set of preconditions for all educator credential programs. These likely will be brought before the Commission for action at the same time as the Common Standards modification.

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. Some of these include:

- ***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***

Data collection is particularly important and many of these issues will be worked on during the discussions surrounding the development and test run of the biennial reports.

### **Next Steps and Future Commission meetings**

In sum, steady progress continues to be made to implement a revised accreditation system.

- a) Staff will return, after discussions with the 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.
- c) Staff will 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 will 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 will 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 will 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 will work closely with the 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.

# **APPENDIX A**

## **Accreditation Activities**

**2007-2008  
and  
2008-2009**

# Accreditation Activities 2007-2008

## Site Visits (Blue)

### California Accreditation Visits

Sacramento COE (Project Pipeline)  
Loma Linda University  
UC Riverside  
Argosy University  
InterAmerican College  
Alliant University  
Vanguard University  
Phillips Graduate Institute  
Holy Names University  
Orange COE  
Dominican University

### Combined NCATE Visits

#### Fall 2007

CSU, Fullerton

#### Spring 2007

Stanford University  
CSU, Bakersfield

### Formative Site Visits

William Jessup University  
Touro University

## Program Review (Yellow)

National Hispanic University  
John F. Kennedy University  
Fresno Pacific University  
Santa Clara University  
San Diego Christian University  
Touro University  
Whittier College  
Stanislaus COE

William Jessup University  
Biola University  
CSU, Northridge  
San Diego State University  
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo  
Loyola Marymount University  
San Jose State University  
CSU, Stanislaus

## Reports Due

### (Orange)

UC Santa Barbara  
Saint Mary's College  
California Baptist University  
Occidental College  
Antioch University  
Cal State TEACH  
University of Phoenix  
Santa Barbara COE  
CSU, Sacramento  
University of San Diego  
University of La Verne  
Sonoma State University  
University of the Pacific

### (Green)

Western Governors University  
Simpson University  
Notre Dame de Namur University  
Mills College  
CSU, Channel Islands  
Westmont College  
San Diego USD  
Patten University  
California Lutheran University  
CSU, San Bernardino  
CSU, East Bay

### (Violet)

Hope International University  
UC Irvine  
UC San Diego  
UC Davis  
Claremont Graduate University  
Compton USD

New College of California  
La Sierra University  
Pacific Oaks College  
Fresno State University  
National University

### (Indigo)

**The report due the year after the site visit will address issues raised during the site visit. Since the 2006-2007 site visits will not take place (except for the NCATE merger visits), the report due the year after the site visit will also not be required.**

Mount Saint Mary's College  
University of Redlands  
University of San Francisco  
Bethany University  
University of Southern California  
San Joaquin COA  
Cal Poly, Pomona

CSU, Monterey Bay  
Azusa Pacific University  
San Francisco State University  
CSU, San Marcos  
CSU, Chico  
CSU, Long Beach

## **Accreditation Activities 2008-2009**

### **Site Visits (Green)**

**Site visit will include the program review since the Revised Program Review will not have occurred two years prior to the site visit.**

#### **California Accreditation Visits**

Western Governor's University  
Simpson University  
Notre Dame de Namur University  
Mills College  
High Tech High School  
CSU, Channel Islands  
Westmont College  
San Diego USD  
Patten University

#### **Combined NCATE Visits**

##### **Fall 2008**

California Lutheran University

##### **Spring 2009**

CSU, San Bernardino  
CSU, East Bay

### **Program Review (Orange)**

UC Santa Barbara  
California Baptist University  
The Master's College  
Cal State TEACH  
Saint Mary's College  
Occidental College  
Antioch University

University of Phoenix  
CSU, Sacramento  
UC, Davis  
University of LaVerne  
Sonoma State University  
University of the Pacific

## Reports Due

### (Red)

Ontario-Montclair School District  
UC Santa Cruz  
UC Berkeley  
UCLA  
Los Angeles USD  
Chapman University  
Concordia University  
Pacific Union University  
Pepperdine University  
Point Loma Nazarene University  
CSU, Dominguez Hills  
CSU, Los Angeles  
Chico State University  
CSU, Monterey Bay

### (Yellow)

National Hispanic University  
John F. Kennedy University  
Fresno Pacific University  
Santa Clara University  
San Diego Christian University  
Touro University  
Whittier College  
Stanislaus COE  
William Jessup University  
Biola University  
CSU, Northridge  
San Diego State University  
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo  
Loyola Marymount University  
San Jose State University  
CSU, Stanislaus

### (Indigo)

Mount St. Mary's University  
University of Redlands  
Humboldt State University  
San Joaquin COE  
Azusa Pacific University  
San Francisco State University  
Chico State University

University of San Francisco  
Bethany University  
University of Southern California  
Cal Poly, Pomona  
CSU, Monterey Bay  
CSU, San Marcos  
CSU, Long Beach

### (Blue)

**The report due the year after the site visit will address issues raised during the site visit**

Sacramento COE (Project Pipeline)  
Loma Linda University  
UC Riverside  
Argosy University  
InterAmerican University  
Vanguard University  
Dominican University  
Loma Linda University

Argosy University  
Alliant University  
Phillips Graduate Institute  
Orange COE  
CSU Fullerton  
Stanford University  
CSU, Bakersfield