

---

# 3D

## Information

### *Professional Services Committee*

#### **Update on the Development of the Plan for the Implementation of SBX5 1**

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents information about SBX5 1, related to the development of a possible alternative process for entities that would like to offer educator preparation in California but do not hold regional accreditation.

**Recommended Action:** For information only

**Presenter:** Marilyn Errett, Administrator, Office of Governmental Relations, and Teri Clark, Administrator, 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 and performance of professional educators and for the accreditation of credential programs

April 2010



---

---

# Update on the Development of the Plan for the Implementation of SBX5 1

---

---

## **Introduction**

This agenda item presents information related to the development of the plan to implement SBX5 1 (Appendix A), signed by the Governor in January 2010. SBX5 1 requires the Commission to develop a process by June 1, 2010 that authorizes additional high quality alternative route educator preparation programs in the areas of science, technology, engineering, math, and career technical education, and allows the Commission to establish alternative criteria for approval of entities that are not regionally accredited. Commission staff provided verbal updates regarding SBX5 1 at the December 9-10, 2009, meeting and the January 28, 2010, meeting. At that time, staff relayed a work plan and timeline for working with the Committee on Accreditation and the Commission to develop the necessary process for institutional approval. This agenda item provides information on the progress to date of the work of the Committee on Accreditation subcommittee.

This item is presented in three parts. Part I presents background information on SBX5 1. Part II summarizes the Regional Accreditation process that institutions of higher education must complete to offer educator preparation in California, specifically what is involved in WASC Accreditation, and Part III presents information on the work by the Committee on Accreditation to develop an alternative process for entities that are not regionally accredited but are interested in offering educator preparation programs in California as is required by SBX5 1.

## **Part I—SBX5 1**

SBX5 1 (Chap. 2, Stats. 2010, Steinberg) was a Legislative Special Session bill containing various provisions intended to make California more competitive for federal Race to the Top education grant funding. The Governor signed the bill on January 7, 2010. As a part of the Legislature's 2009-10, Fifth Extraordinary Session on Education, the bill becomes law 90 days after signing. Although California was not selected for the first round of grant funding, the law will remain intact. SBX5 1 was a comprehensive bill covering many aspects of education in California. As it pertains to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission), the bill:

- States the intent of the Legislature to provide alternative routes to certification for those who want to teach science, technology, engineering, math and career technical education subjects in order to attract professionals with hands-on experience in the field.
- Establishes the Science, Technology, Engineering, Math (STEM) and Career Technical Education (CTE) Educator Credentialing Program for purposes of providing alternative routes to credentialing, in accordance with the guidelines for the federal Race to the Top Fund, that do not compromise state standards.
- Requires the Commission [in consultation with the Committee on Accreditation (COA)] to develop a process by June 1, 2010 that authorizes additional high-quality alternative

route educator preparation programs in the areas of science, mathematics and career technical education, provided by school districts, county offices of education, community-based organizations (CBO) and nongovernmental organizations (NGO).

- Requires the Commission to authorize CBO and NGO accredited by organizations recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation and the U.S. Department of Education, to initiate STEM and CTE Educator Credentialing Programs.
- Allows the Commission to establish alternative criteria for approval of entities not recognized by either the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) and the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE), as necessary.
- States that for the purposes of this Act, an independent college or university in California is not a CBO or NGO.
- Allows the Commission to charge a fee to CBO or NGO entities seeking approval to participate in the alternative route educator preparation programs.
- Requires alternative route educator preparation programs participants to electronically submit credential applications to the Commission.

The concept of allowing alternative, or nontraditional, program providers to offer educator preparation programs is not unique to SBX5 1. In November 2007, the Governor's Advisory Committee on Education Excellence issued their report "*Students First*" at the conclusion of their two-year exploration of changes and reforms in education (<http://www.everychildprepared.org/>). The advisory committee focused on four areas in education: governance, finance, teachers and administrators. The advisory committee also published a technical report. One of the recommendations in this report addressed expanding opportunities for credential programs by allowing multiple pathways including alternative, or non-traditional, program providers.

From the beginning of the Legislative discussions related to nontraditional program providers, it became clear that one piece of important quality assurance needed to be developed. While universities can ensure the Commission of their institutional viability through regional accreditation, such as accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), non-university based programs do not have access to this type of basic, institutional accreditation. SBX5 1 allows for Council for Higher Education Accreditation and U.S. Department of Education approval to parallel regional accreditation, but few, if any, non-university programs appear to be eligible. For institutions that do not meet the criteria of WASC, or CHEA and the USDOE, the Commission is given the responsibility of developing criteria to ensure institutional viability. Once an institution has met these initial criteria, the approval and accreditation process will be the same as for all other program providers. That is, an institution must submit a complete response to the Commission's Common Standards and the General Preconditions. After Commission review of the response to the Common Standards and General Preconditions, the entity earns Initial Institutional Approval. When an institution has been approved as an institution eligible to offer one or more educator preparation program, responses to the Program Standards for the type of educator preparation program(s) that the institution wishes to offer must be submitted and reviewed. Once the responses to the Program Standards are deemed by the expert review panel to appropriately address all standards, the program is

recommended to the COA for approval. Each entity that is approved through an alternative process to regional accreditation would still be required to address all adopted Preconditions, the Common Standards, and the Program Standards for the program(s) that the entity intends to offer.

### **Part II-Regional Accreditation**

Implementation of SBX5 1 calls for the Commission to develop an alternative process to regional accreditation. Regional Accreditation provides a level of assurance that the institution proposing to offer an educator preparation program has the institutional capacity to provide such services. It allows the Commission's accreditation system to focus on issues related to implementing effective and high quality educator preparation programs. The issues that are reviewed by the Commission's accreditation system are detailed in the Common and Program Standards. The accreditation system is based upon the assumption that an additional entity, typically one of the six regional accrediting agencies, has examined the institution as a whole and determined that basic issues of capacity to offer educational services are in place. This precursor review and approval process allows the Commission to have a reasonable assurance that students will receive the educational services promised by the institution. This precursor accreditation process allows the Commission's accreditation system to focus directly on the educational unit and its educator preparation processes. The challenge with SBX5 1 is to develop an alternative process that provides the same general level of reasonable assurance of institutional capacity as regional accreditation has done for institutions of higher education.

There are six regional accreditation bodies approved by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) and the United States Department of Education (USDOE). "*The Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities*, a subgroup of the *Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)*, is responsible for the evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of colleges and universities offering the baccalaureate degree and above in California, Hawaii, Guam and the Pacific Basin" (<http://www.wascsenior.org/>). WASC Accreditation is held by the majority of institutions of higher education that offer educator preparation in California. WASC accreditation is a multi-step process with ongoing components once regional accreditation has been initially earned.

The WASC process involves the IHE in self review over a number of years and two site visits. Below is a brief summary of the WASC accreditation process. Additional detail about the process is provided in Appendix B.

The WASC accreditation process begins with the submission of an application for Eligibility for WASC Accreditation. The institution must demonstrate the following commitments through a three stage process:

I. Submission of Institutional Proposal: The proposal is reviewed by a Proposal Review Committee and the committee is authorized to accept proposals that it believes will result in a review that will effectively demonstrate that an institution fulfills the two Core Commitments of accreditation.

II. Commitment to Institutional Capacity: The institution functions with clear purposes, high levels of integrity, fiscal stability, and appropriate organizational structures to fulfill its purposes.

III. Commitment to Educational Effectiveness: The institution evidences clear and appropriate educational objectives and design at the institutional and program level, and employs processes of review, including the collection and use of data, that assure delivery of programs and learner accomplishments at a level of performance appropriate for the degree or certificate awarded.

In addition to its two core commitments, WASC has four standards for Senior Colleges:

- I: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives
- II: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions
- III: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability
- IV: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

Each of the four WASC standards has a number of elements and specific criteria for review have been identified by WASC (Appendix C). The four standards, with the identified elements and criteria for review are examined during both site visits, but the focus differs for each. The Committee on Accreditation is still in the process of reviewing the differentiation between the two visits and their relevance to the task at hand. Additional information will be provided in the next Commission agenda item.

When a college or university elects to offer one or more educator preparation programs in California, the Education Code requires that the college or university be regionally accredited prior to taking action to approve the college or university as eligible to propose educator preparation programs. School districts, county offices of education, community-based or nongovernmental organizations are not eligible for regional accreditation from the WASC Senior Commission. At its January 2010 meeting the COA discussed the implications of a school district, county office of education, community-based or a nongovernmental organization sponsoring an educator preparation program. The COA has identified a significant difference in that IHEs must complete the regional accreditation process, while school districts, county offices of education, community-based or nongovernmental organizations do not.

### **Part III: Alternative Process(es) to Regional Accreditation Under Consideration by COA**

To develop an alternative to the IHE regional accreditation process, the COA convened a four member work group to study the topics that are reviewed through WASC's regional accreditation process. In order to first determine what might be needed in developing a process that could provide the Commission with the same assurances as regional accreditation, the Committee's work group began by reviewing the WASC standards to determine which aspects of these standards might be applicable as an alternative to regional accreditation. Following are three options currently under discussion by the COA. It is possible that one of these options, or a combination of them, will be recommended to the Commission as alternative criteria for entities not currently subject to regional accreditation.

***Option 1: Adaptation of Process Used by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)***

The work group met in February 2010. Using the WASC standards as a starting place, the work group first identified some of the elements of the current WASC standards not necessary for the Commission to review as part of an alternative to the regional accreditation process. The subcommittee made this determination either because the concept was deemed not critical to the effective operation of an educator preparation program, the concept is addressed in another WASC element or because the concept is adequately addressed in either the Commission's Common or Program standards.

Using the agreements reached by completing this first task, the work group then developed draft *Organizational Requirements* that could be used by the Commission to determine whether an organization has adequate fiscal and organizational structures to support the organization in offering educator preparation programs in California. Appendix D includes the WASC elements organized by those the COA work group proposes to include and omit from the draft *Organizational Requirements* that may be recommended to the Commission at its June 2010 meeting: The work group not only discussed which of the Criteria for Review from the WASC standards would be most appropriate for an alternative to the regional accreditation process for California, but reworded the statements in the WASC Criteria to develop California specific draft *Organizational Requirements*. Provided below are the *Organizational Requirements* proposed by the COA's work group and discussed at the April 14-15, 2010 COA meeting.

**Proposed Organizational Requirements to be Eligible to offer California Educator Preparation Programs**

**A: Articulating Organizational Goals and Addressing Educator Preparation Objectives**

The organization defines its educator preparation purposes and establishes objectives. The organization functions with integrity and autonomy.

- A. 1. The organization's formally approved statements of purpose and operational practices are appropriate for an educator preparation organization of high quality in California
- A. 2. The organization's objectives are clearly recognized and consistent with stated purposes. The organization develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and has a system of measuring student achievement, in terms of retention, completion, and student learning. Student achievement data are made public.
- A. 3. The organization demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, practices and programs.
- A. 4. The organization has educator preparation as a primary purpose regardless of political, corporate, or religious affiliations.
- A. 5. The organization exhibits integrity in its operations, as demonstrated by the implementation of appropriate policies, sound business practices, timely and fair re-

sponses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas.

- A. 6. The organization is committed to honest and open communication with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor, to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the organization, and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures.

**B: Commitment to Learning and Continuous Improvement to Achieve California Educator Preparation Objectives**

The organization achieves its educator preparation objectives. The organization maintains a sustained, evidence-based, evaluation system to ensure that high quality educator preparation objectives are met.

- B. 1. The organization's student learning outcomes and expectations for student attainment are clearly stated and widely shared among stakeholders and at the course, program and organizational levels. The organization's staff takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations.
- B. 2. The organization's educator preparation programs actively involve prospective educators in learning, ensure they meet high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.
- B. 3. The organization regularly identifies the characteristics of its candidates and assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences. The organization collects and analyzes prospective educator data, disaggregated by demographic categories and type of credential program. The data reflects a high level of achievement, satisfaction and positive climate.
- B. 4. The organization ensures that all candidates understand the requirements of their educator preparation programs and receive timely, useful, and accurate advisement.
- B. 5. The organization's planning processes identify and align program, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the educator preparation program. Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data from multiple sources.
- B. 6. Leadership and staff are committed to program improvement based on the results of evaluation and assessment data that is used throughout the organization.
- B. 7. Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the organization, are regularly involved in the assessment of educational programs.

### **C: Developing, Sustaining and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality Educator Preparation**

The organization sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educator preparation objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal, and information resources. These key resources promote the achievement of quality educator preparation.

- C. 1. The organization demonstrates that it employs an adequate number of instructional staff with commitment to educator preparation of high quality. The staff is sufficient in number, professional qualifications, and diversity to achieve the organization's educator preparation objectives.
- C. 2. Staff recruitment and evaluation practices are aligned with educator preparation objectives. For instructional staff, evaluation involves consideration of evidence of teaching effectiveness, including candidate's evaluations of instruction.
- C. 3. The organization maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported staff development activities designed to improve teaching and learning, consistent with its educator preparation objectives.
- C. 4. The organization annually provides unqualified independent financial audits sufficient to ensure long-term viability. Resources are aligned with educator preparation objectives.
- C. 5. The organization's information technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educator preparation purposes.
- C. 6. The organization has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over organizational integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer.
- C. 7. The chief executive officer of the educator preparation program shall possess a post baccalaureate degree or credential and experience in education. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators, including a chief financial officer, to provide effective educational leadership and management.

At the April 2010 Commission meeting staff will provide an oral update on the discussion related to the proposed *Organizational Requirements* held during the COA's April 2010 meeting.

#### ***Option 2: Accept Institutional Accreditation by NCATE as the Indicator of Institutional Capacity***

NCATE has accredited colleges and universities that offer educator preparation since 1954. In recent years, NCATE has been examining how an entity that prepares educators but is not a regionally accredited college or university could demonstrate that it meets the NCATE Unit Standards and therefore be accredited by NCATE.

As with most accrediting organizations, NCATE has a number of Preconditions that an entity must meet prior to being advanced for candidacy for accreditation. NCATE's Precondition #8 states "The institution is accredited, without probation or an equivalent status, by the appropriate institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education."

Precondition #8 provides an alternative for entities that are not regionally accredited. The alternative is known as 8.1.b and is provided in Appendix E. An entity which has earned NCATE accreditation would have demonstrated the fiscal and organizational characteristics, as defined in Precondition #8.1.b.

Staff has suggested that at its April 14-15, 2010 meeting the COA discuss whether accreditation by NCATE might be seen as satisfying the requirement of regional accreditation. Accreditation by NCATE would not be expected of entities which elect to offer educator preparation programs in California although staff has met with one out-of-state entity that is interested in offering teacher preparation in California. The entity is a candidate for NCATE accreditation and has a site visit scheduled for spring 2010. Staff will provide an oral update on the discussion held during the COA's April 2010 meeting about this possible option.

***Option 3: Adopt Precondition 8.1.b of National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) as the Indicator of Institutional Capacity***

Another option exists in that COA could discuss which aspects of Precondition 8.1.b. could be considered for use in California's alternative to regional accreditation process. As is described above, NCATE has begun to work with entities that are alternative providers—organizations that are not regionally accredited colleges or universities. NCATE has developed its own alternate requirement (Precondition 8.1.b.) for sponsors which are not regionally accredited institutions of higher education. It is possible that there may be one or more entities which are not eligible for regional accreditation, which would like to offer educator preparation in California, but are not interested in pursuing NCATE accreditation.

Staff has suggested that at its April 14-15, 2010 meeting the COA discuss NCATE's Precondition 8.1.b (Appendix E) and identify if any of the aspects of NCATE's Precondition for an alternative to regional accreditation should be considered for use in California, either in addition or in lieu of the draft *Organizational Requirements* listed on page 5-7 of this agenda item. Staff will provide an oral update on the discussion held during the COA's April 2010 meeting.

**Implementing an Alternative Process to Regional Accreditation**

Once the COA makes a recommendation to the Commission on the specific requirements an alternative sponsor must meet, the process through which the institution's proposal is evaluated must be developed. At this time, it seems that the prospective sponsor would submit documentation addressing the requirements adopted by the Commission. Once it is known that the documentation adequately addresses the adopted requirements, consideration will be given to whether an on-site review should take place. WASC conducts two separate on-site reviews: one focused on the capacity of the entity and the second review on the educational effectiveness of the entity and the expectations for student learning.

The following questions are currently under consideration in developing draft procedures for the review:

- a) Who should review the initial documentation? Staff, members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers, a different group of educators, or individuals with specialized expertise, such as certified public accountants.
- b) If an on-site visit should take place, what should the focus be for the visit and who should visit the entity?
- c) Should the process for the alternative to Regional Accreditation be revisited each time the entity moves through the accreditation cycle?

### **Development of Introductory Guide to the Process**

In addition to developing the process, Commission staff noted the need for developing an introductory guide for non-traditional providers interested in offering teacher preparation in California. Commission staff discussed the content of the introductory guide with the subcommittee and has contracted with the public relations firm, *Ross Campbell, Incorporated*, to complete the guide.

### **Next Steps**

Based on the Commission discussion, staff will prepare an item for further discussion by the COA subcommittee working on this topic and for the COA's May 2010 meeting.

The May COA agenda item will be an action item with specific recommendations regarding an alternative to regional accreditation identified. Once the COA takes action at its May 2010 meeting to recommend an alternative process to regional accreditation, the recommendation will be forwarded to the Commission for consideration and possible adoption at its June 3, 2010 meeting.

## **Appendix A**

### **Education Code 44227.2**

SEC. 5. Section 44227.2 is added to the Education Code, to read:

44227.2. (a) The Legislature hereby establishes the Science, Technology, Engineering, Math, and Career Technical Education Educator Credentialing Program for purposes of providing alternative routes to credentialing, in accordance with the guidelines for the federal Race to the Top Fund, authorized under the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5), that do not compromise state standards.

(b) No later than June 1, 2010, the commission, in consultation with the Committee on Accreditation established pursuant to Section 44373, shall develop a process to authorize additional high-quality alternative route educator preparation programs provided by school districts, county offices of education, community-based organizations, and nongovernmental organizations. Organizations participating in this project may offer educator preparation programs for any science, mathematics, and career technical education credential type issued by the commission if the organization meets the requirements for being authorized pursuant to criteria established by the commission.

(c) The commission shall authorize community-based or nongovernmental organizations accredited by an accrediting organization that is recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation and the United States Department of Education. The commission may also establish alternative criteria, if necessary, for project participants that are not eligible for accreditation by one of the accredited organizations.

(d) Participating organizations shall electronically submit credential applications to the commission.

(e) The commission may assess a fee on a community-based or nongovernmental organization that is seeking approval to participate in the program. For purposes of this section, an independent college or university in California is not a community-based or nongovernmental organization.

## **Appendix B**

### **Overview of WASC Accreditation Process**

The WASC process involves the IHE in self review over a number of years and two site visits. The IHE must submit an application for Eligibility for WASC Accreditation. The institution must demonstrate the following commitments through a three stage process:

I. Submission of Institutional Proposal: The proposal is reviewed by a Proposal Review Committee and the committee is authorized to accept proposals that it believes will result in a review that will effectively demonstrate that an institution fulfills the two Core Commitments of accreditation.

II. Commitment to Institutional Capacity: The institution functions with clear purposes, high levels of integrity, fiscal stability, and appropriate organizational structures to fulfill its purposes.

III. Commitment to Educational Effectiveness: The institution evidences clear and appropriate educational objectives and design at the institutional and program level, and employs processes of review, including the collection and use of data, that assure delivery of programs and learner accomplishments at a level of performance appropriate for the degree or certificate awarded.

Submitting an Institutional Proposal is the first stage of the WASC accreditation process. The proposal is reviewed by a Proposal Review Committee and the committee “is authorized to accept proposals that it believes will result in a review that will effectively demonstrate that an institution fulfills the two Core Commitments of accreditation.”

Once the Institutional Proposal has been accepted, the IHE moves to the second stage of the accreditation process and the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) is scheduled. The CPR is designed to enable the Commission to determine whether an institution fulfills the Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity and includes a site visit. After the CPR a number of actions may be taken by WASC. Three likely actions by WASC are 1) determine that the IHE fulfills the expectations and move the IHE to the third phase of the accreditation process: the Educational Effectiveness Review, 2) identify issues that still need to be addressed in the next stage of the review process based on the CPR but allow the IHE to move to the third stage of the accreditation process, or 3) determine that the IHE is not ready to move to the third stage of the accreditation process and request an interim report, special visit or impose a sanction. The first two options move the IHE to the third stage of the accreditation process.

The third stage of the WASC accreditation process is the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) which is usually scheduled eighteen to twenty-four months after a CPR that has found the IHE meeting WASC’s expectations. The EER is designed to ascertain the extent to which the IHE fulfills its Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness. An Educational Effectiveness Report is submitted and reviewed prior to the scheduling of a second site visit. The site visit is two to three days in length and a report is provided to the institution after the site visit. The institution responds to the report and both the site visit report and the institutional response are

provided to the accrediting commission. Three likely actions by WASC are 1) with positive reports from both the CPR and EER the IHE will be accredited for up to ten years if a reaccreditation or seven years for an initial accreditation 2) reaffirm accreditation with interim reporting or a special visit required, or 3) impose sanctions on the IHE.

In addition to its two core commitments, WASC has four standards for Senior Colleges:

- I: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives
- II: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions
- III: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability
- IV: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

Each of the four WASC standards has a number of elements and specific criteria for review have been identified by WASC (Appendix C). The four standards, with the identified elements and criteria for review are examined during both the CPR and EER. The focus differs for each review and site visit. Appendix D provides two documents from WASC which describe the focus of the CPR and EER for each of the four standards.

## **Appendix C**

### **WASC Standards at a Glance**

The full WASC standards are available at  
[http://www.wascenior.org/findit/files/forms/Handbook\\_of\\_Accreditation\\_2008\\_with\\_hyperlinks.pdf](http://www.wascenior.org/findit/files/forms/Handbook_of_Accreditation_2008_with_hyperlinks.pdf)

#### **Standard I: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives**

##### ***Institutional Purposes***

- 1.1 Formally approved, appropriate statements of purpose; define values and character
- 1.2 Clear objectives; indicators of achievement at institutional, program and course level; system to measure student achievement; public data on achievement
- 1.3 High performance, responsibility, accountability of leadership system

##### ***Integrity***

- 1.4 Academic freedom
- 1.5 Diversity: policies, programs and practices
- 1.6 Education as purpose; autonomy
- 1.7 Truthful representation to students/public; timely completion; fair and equitable policies
- 1.8 Operational integrity; sound business practices; timely and fair complaint handling; evaluation of performance
- 1.9 Honest, open communication with WASC; inform WASC of material matters; follow WASC policies

#### **Standard II: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions**

##### ***Teaching and Learning***

- 2.1 Programs appropriate in content, standards, level; sufficient qualified faculty
- 2.2 Clearly defined degrees admission and level of achievement for graduation
  - Undergraduate degree requirements
  - Graduate degree requirements
- 2.3 SLOs and expectations for student learning at all levels; reflected in policies, advising, information resources, etc.
- 2.4 Faculty responsibility for attainment of expectations for student learning
- 2.5 Students involved in learning and challenged; feedback provided
- 2.6 Graduates achieve stated levels of attainment; SLOs embedded in faculty standards for assessing student work
- 2.7 Systematic program review includes SLOs, retention/graduation, external evidence

##### ***Scholarship and Creative Activity***

- 2.8 Scholarship, creativity, curricular and instructional innovation valued and supported
- 2.9 Linkage among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service

##### ***Support for Student Learning***

- 2.10 Collection and analysis of disaggregated student data; achievement, satisfaction and climate tracked; student needs identified and supported

- 2.11 Co-curricular programs assessed
- 2.12 Timely, useful information and advising
- 2.13 Appropriate student services
- 2.14 Information to and treatment of transfer students (if applicable)

### **Standard III: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability**

#### ***Faculty and Staff***

- 3.1 Sufficient qualified personnel for operations and academics
- 3.2 Sufficient qualified and diverse faculty
- 3.3 Faculty policies, practices, and evaluation
- 3.4 Faculty and staff development

#### ***Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources***

- 3.5 Financial stability, clean audits, sufficient resources; realistic plans if deficits; budgeting, enrollment and diversified revenue
- 3.6 Sufficient information resources/library, aligned and adequate
- 3.7 Information technology coordinated and supported

#### ***Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes***

- 3.8 Clear, consistent decision-making structures and processes; priority on academics
- 3.9 Independent governing board with proper oversight; CEO hiring and evaluation
- 3.10 Full-time CEO; CFO; sufficient administrators and staff
- 3.11 Effective academic leadership by faculty

### **Standard IV: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement**

#### ***Strategic Thinking and Planning***

- 4.1 Reflection/planning with constituents; strategic with priorities and future direction; aligned with purposes; plan monitored and revised
- 4.2 Plans align academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technology
- 4.3 Planning informed by analyzed data and evidence of educational effectiveness

#### ***Commitment to Learning and Improvement***

- 4.4 Quality assurance processes; assessment and tracking; comparative data; use of results to revise/improve
- 4.5 Institutional research capacity; used to assess effectiveness/student learning; review of IR
- 4.6 Leadership and faculty committed to improvement; faculty assesses teaching and learning; climate and co-curricular objectives assessed
- 4.7 Inquiry into teaching learning leads to improvement in curricula, pedagogy and evaluation
- 4.8 Stakeholder involvement in assessment of effectiveness

## Appendix D

<b>WASC Criteria for Review</b>	
<b>Criteria <u>included</u> in the Proposed Organizational Requirements</b>	<b>Criteria <u>not included</u> in the Proposed Organizational Requirements</b>
<b>Standard I: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives</b>	
<p>1.1 Formally approved, appropriate statements of purpose; define values and character</p> <p>1.2 Clear objectives; indicators of achievement at institutional, program and course level; system to measure student achievement; public data on achievement.</p> <p>1.5 Diversity: policies, programs and practices</p> <p>1.6 Education as purpose; autonomy</p> <p>1.8 Operational integrity; sound business practices; timely and fair complaint handling; evaluation of performance.</p> <p>1.9 Honest, open communication with WASC; inform WASC of material matters; follow WASC policies</p>	<p>1.3 High performance, responsibility, accountability of leadership system</p> <p>1.4 Academic freedom</p> <p>1.7 Truthful representation to students/public; timely completion; fair and equitable policies</p>
<b>Standard II: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions</b>	
<p>2.3 SLOs and expectations for student learning at all levels; reflected in policies, advising, information resources, etc.</p> <p>2.5 Students involved in learning and challenged; feedback provided</p> <p>2.8 Scholarship, creativity, curricular and instructional innovation valued and supported</p> <p>2.11 Co-curricular programs assessed</p> <p>2.12 Timely, useful information and advising</p>	<p>2.1 Programs appropriate in content, standards, level; sufficient qualified faculty</p> <p>2.2 Clearly defined degrees re admission and level of achievement for graduation -Undergraduate degree requirements -Graduate degree requirements</p> <p>2.4 Faculty responsibility for attainment of expectations for student learning</p> <p>2.6 Graduates achieve stated levels of attainment; SLOs embedded in faculty standards for assessing student work</p> <p>2.7 Systematic program review includes SLOs, retention/graduation, external evidence</p> <p>2.9 Linkage among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service</p> <p>2.10 Co-curricular programs assessed</p>

<b>WASC Criteria for Review</b>	
<b>Criteria <u>included</u> in the Proposed Organizational Requirements</b>	<b>Criteria <u>not included</u> in the Proposed Organizational Requirements</b>
	2.13 Appropriate student services 2.14 Information to and treatment of transfer students (if applicable)
<b>Standard III: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability</b>	
3.2 Sufficient qualified and diverse faculty 3.3 Faculty policies, practices, and evaluation 3.4 Faculty and staff development 3.5 Financial stability, clean audits, sufficient resources; realistic plans if deficits; budgeting, enrollment and diversified revenue 3.8 Clear, consistent decision-making structures and processes; priority on academics 3.9 Independent governing board with proper oversight; CEO hiring and evaluation 3.10 Full-time CEO; CFO; sufficient administrators and staff	3.1 Sufficient qualified personnel for operations and academics 3.6 Sufficient information resources/library, aligned and adequate 3.7 Clear, consistent decision-making structures and processes; priority on academics 3.11 Effective academic leadership by faculty
<b>Standard IV: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement</b>	
4.5 Institutional research capacity; used to assess effectiveness/student learning; review of IR 4.6 Leadership and faculty committed to improvement; faculty assesses teaching and learning; climate and co-curricular objectives assessed 4.8 Stakeholder involvement in assessment of effectiveness	4.1 Reflection/planning with constituents; strategic with priorities and future direction; aligned with purposes; plan monitored and revised 4.2 Planning informed by analyzed data and evidence of educational effectiveness 4.3 Quality assurance processes; assessment and tracking; comparative data; use of results to revise/improve 4.4 Institutional research capacity; used to assess effectiveness/student learning; review of IR 4.7 Inquiry into teaching learning leads to improvement in curricula, pedagogy and evaluation

## **Appendix E**

### **Relevant NCATE Preconditions**

**NCATE Precondition #8. The institution is accredited, without probation or an equivalent status, by the appropriate institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.**

**8.1.a.** Current accreditation letter and/or report that indicates institutional accreditation<sup>[1]</sup> status.

OR

**8.1.b.** Providers ineligible for institutional accreditation must submit a clean audit, a business plan, and the answers to the following questions:

- a. What security measures are taken by the unit to ensure the security and integrity of student records?
- b. What documentation does the unit have to demonstrate that facilities are safe, secure, and healthy?
- c. What are the unit's policies that ensure the availability of information about governing board members, faculty, and administrators?
- d. What are the unit's policies related to requirements for degrees, certificates, and graduation; fees and other financial obligations of students; conflicts of interest; and non-discrimination and sexual harassment?
- e. Are the unit's support services sufficiently staffed by qualified personnel?
- f. What are the unit's policies related to faculty tenure, grievance, and discipline?
- g. What are the policies related to academic and intellectual freedoms?

**Non-university providers must also submit:**

1. Clean independent audits of a full set of financial statements of the legal entity offering educator preparation programs for the three years prior to submission of the "Intent to Seek NCATE Accreditation Form." The audits should meet the standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants or other appropriate accounting standards generally accepted in the U.S.
2. The legal entity's 990 Form (for non-profits) or corporate income tax returns (for for-profits) for the past year.
3. A business plan that focuses on the unit being accredited. The business plan should include:
  - o A business model that briefly describes the services to be delivered, the area to be served, the current and projected number of candidates, recruitment activities, a description of faculty, tuition costs, a budget narrative, etc.;
  - o The most current approved budget;
  - o Revenue and expense projections for the next two years, including funding streams, the length and percentage of funding from foundation grants, appropriated governmental funds, tuition, funds from elsewhere in the legal entity or its affiliates; costs of facility, payroll, maintenance, etc.;
  - o A one to two page narrative describing revenue and expenditure projections for the next 4 years;
  - o A one to two page narrative describing the relationship between the unit and the legal entity offering the educator preparation programs; and
  - o If tuition based, the tuition refund policy should the educator preparation programs be discontinued.
4. Annual tax statements. The Financial Review Committee will review these statements in the fall of each year and submit a report to the UAB detailing its findings.