

---

# 5D

## Information

### *Professional Services Committee*

### **Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation**

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents the 2010-11 Annual Accreditation Report from the Committee on Accreditation.

**Recommended Action:** For information only

**Presenters:** Cheryl Hickey, Administrator, Professional Services Division, Gary Kinsey and Carol Leighty, Co-Chairs, Committee on Accreditation, 2010-11

**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

December 2011

---

---

# Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation

---

---

## Introduction

This agenda item presents the *2010-11 Annual Accreditation Report* from the Committee on Accreditation (COA). Section I of the report describes the major accomplishments of the Committee's 2010-11 Work Plan, which is organized around the four identified purposes of accreditation. Section II of the report presents a summary of the accreditation actions taken in 2010-11. Section III provides the 2011-2012 Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation.

## Background

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

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

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

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

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

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

In establishing the COA, the Commission did not cede any of its policymaking authority over the preparation of educators or the accreditation of institutions. Under SB 655 (Chap. 426, Stats. 1993) and the *Accreditation Framework*, the Commission retains the exclusive authority and responsibility to adopt standards for educator preparation and to make all other policy decisions that govern the system of professional accreditation in education. The COA is responsible for implementing the Commission's policies, enforcing the Commission's preparation standards and annually reporting its activities to the Commission.

The Commission's accreditation system was on hiatus from December 2002 through the 2006-07 year. The Accreditation Study Work Group met during 2004-2006. As part of the group's

work, the purposes of the Commission's accreditation system were reviewed and adopted by the Commission in summer 2006.

Professional accreditation is the process of ascertaining and verifying the quality of each program that prepares individuals for state certification. In this context, state certification is the process of ascertaining and verifying the qualifications of each future member of the education profession. These two processes--professional accreditation and state certification share a common overarching objective--ensuring that those who teach and provide education services in California's public school system have the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be effective educators. Accreditation of educator preparation in California serves to achieve four purposes: to ensure accountability, ensure high quality and effective programs, to ensure adherence to standards and to support ongoing program improvement. (*Accreditation Framework*, page 1)

The Annual Report uses the four purposes of the accreditation system as the structure for Sections I and III:

1. ensure accountability to the public and to the profession
2. ensure program quality
3. ensure adherence to standards
4. foster program improvement

The attached *2010-11 Annual Accreditation Report* reviews the accreditation decisions made by the COA during 2010-11, including specific information about the Committee's decisions during 2010-11 to grant initial accreditation to new programs of professional preparation. The *Accreditation Report* also presents for information the 2011-12 Work Plan. The *2010-11 Annual Accreditation Report* was adopted by the COA on August 2, 2011.



COMMISSION ON  
TEACHER CREDENTIALING

---

*Ensuring Educator Excellence*

**Annual Accreditation Report of the Committee on  
Accreditation for 2010-2011**

**Presented to the  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
December 2011**

Dear Commissioners:

It is with personal and professional pleasure that, on behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation, we submit to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing the *2010-2011 Annual Accreditation Report* by the Committee on Accreditation in accordance with the provisions of the *Accreditation Framework*. This report presents an overview of the activities and accomplishments of the Committee in the past year and its proposed work plan for 2011-2012 as it implements the Commission's accreditation system.

The *Annual Accreditation Report* is organized to address the purposes of the accreditation system: ensure accountability to the public and to the profession, ensure program quality, ensure adherence to standards and foster program improvement. Each purpose is addressed within the report by noting what was accomplished in 2010-2011 and is also addressed in the proposed work plan for 2011-2012. We believe that aligning the *Annual Accreditation Report* to these purposes provides more useful information and assures integrity with the accreditation system.

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

Sincerely,

Gary Kinsey  
Committee Co-Chair

Carol Leighty  
Committee Co-Chair

# **The Committee on Accreditation 2010-2011**

## **Joyce Abrams**

Substitute Teacher/BTSA Support Provider  
Chula Vista Hills Elementary School  
Chula Vista Elementary School District

## **Ellen Curtis-Pierce**

Director, Chapman University Extended  
Education,  
Brandman University

## **Joseph Jimenez**

Consultant  
Tulare County Office of Education

## **Anne Jones**

Director, Teacher Education Programs  
University of California, Riverside

## **Gary Kinsey**

Associate Vice President and Director  
School of Education  
CSU, Channel Islands

## **Kiran Kumar**

Teacher, Language Arts  
Pomona Unified School District

## **Carol Leighty**

Retired Superintendent, Consultant  
Temecula Valley Unified School District

## **Sally Plicka**

BTSA Program Director  
Davis Joint Unified School District

## **Reyes Quezada**

Professor of Education  
University of San Diego

## **Iris Riggs**

Professor, Department of Science,  
Mathematics and Technology Education  
CSU, San Bernardino

## **Nancy Watkins**

Teacher, Valencia High School  
Placentia-Yorba Linda School District

## **Pia Wong**

Associate Dean, College of Education  
CSU, Sacramento

## **Committee Support Staff (Commission on Teacher Credentialing)**

Teri Clark, Director, Professional Services Division  
Cheryl Hickey, Administrator of Accreditation, Professional Services Division  
Katie Croy, Consultant, Professional Services Division  
Gay Roby, Consultant, Professional Services Division  
Rebecca Parker, Consultant, Professional Services Division  
Teri Ackerman, Analyst, Professional Services Division

# Table of Contents

<b>Section I: Accomplishments of the Committee in 2010-2011 .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession .....</b>	<b>1</b>
a) <i>Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation.....</i>	<i>1</i>
b) <i>Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission .....</i>	<i>2</i>
c) <i>Commission liaison .....</i>	<i>2</i>
d) <i>Press releases .....</i>	<i>2</i>
<b>Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality .....</b>	<b>2</b>
a) <i>Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs .....</i>	<i>2</i>
b) <i>Revise and finalize the Accreditation Handbook .....</i>	<i>3</i>
c) <i>Finalize the COA Accreditation Procedures Manual .....</i>	<i>3</i>
d) <i>Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide         Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the         Commission.....</i>	<i>3</i>
e) <i>Update members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR).....</i>	<i>3</i>
<b>Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards .....</b>	<b>4</b>
a) <i>Review and take action to grant initial institutional approval of new         credential programs .....</i>	<i>4</i>
b) <i>Conduct and review program assessment activities .....</i>	<i>4</i>
c) <i>Integrate Induction programs into the Commission’s accreditation system.....</i>	<i>4</i>
d) <i>Disseminate information related to the Commission’s Common Standards .....</i>	<i>4</i>
e) <i>Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation .....</i>	<i>4</i>
f) <i>Continue the discussion of how Subject Matter Programs can be included in the         accreditation system.....</i>	<i>4</i>
g) <i>Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing standards related to the         implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment .....</i>	<i>5</i>
<b>Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement .....</b>	<b>5</b>
a) <i>Collect, analyze, report on the second year of Biennial Reports submitted in         fall 2010 .....</i>	<i>5</i>
b) <i>Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.....</i>	<i>5</i>
c) <i>Continue partnership with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher         Education (NCATE) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies,         where appropriate .....</i>	<i>5</i>
d) <i>Develop an agreement detailing how the Commission’s accreditation system can         function in alignment with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).....</i>	<i>6</i>
e) <i>Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and         professional organizations with that of the state process .....</i>	<i>6</i>
<b>General Operations .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Section II: Summary of Accreditation Actions 2010-2011 .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<i>Professional Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Credential Preparation         Programs.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs .....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Inactive Status .....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Withdrawal of an Approved Program.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Reactivation of Inactive Program .....</i>	<i>19</i>

<b>Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2011-2012 .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and the Profession.....</b>	<b>20</b>
a) <i>Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation .....</i>	<i>20</i>
b) <i>Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission.....</i>	<i>20</i>
c) <i>Commission Liaison.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<b>Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality.....</b>	<b>20</b>
a) <i>Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs.....</i>	<i>20</i>
b) <i>Review and revise the Accreditation Handbook.....</i>	<i>21</i>
c) <i>Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<b>Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards.....</b>	<b>21</b>
a) <i>Review and take action to grant initial approval of new credential programs .....</i>	<i>21</i>
b) <i>Conduct and review program assessment activities .....</i>	<i>21</i>
c) <i>Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation. ....</i>	<i>21</i>
d) <i>Disseminate information related to the Commission’s Common Standards .....</i>	<i>21</i>
e) <i>Integrate Induction programs into the Commission’s accreditation system .....</i>	<i>21</i>
f) <i>Continue the discussion of how Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system.....</i>	<i>21</i>
g) <i>Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment. ....</i>	<i>22</i>
<b>Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement .....</b>	<b>22</b>
a) <i>Collect, analyze and report on the Biennial Reports submitted in fall 2011 .....</i>	<i>22</i>
b) <i>Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system .....</i>	<i>22</i>
c) <i>Continue partnership with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate.....</i>	<i>22</i>
d) <i>Monitor the agreement detailing how the Commission’s accreditation system can function in alignment with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).....</i>	<i>22</i>
e) <i>Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes .....</i>	<i>23</i>
<b>General Operations.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Appendix A: Accreditation Activities 2010-2011 .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Appendix B: Accreditation Activities 2011-2012 .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Appendix C: Cohort Listing .....</b>	<b>26</b>

## **Section I: Accomplishment of the 2010-2011 Committee's Work Plan**

On August 3, 2010 the Committee on Accreditation (COA) adopted the work plan for 2010-2011. Co-Chairs Nancy Watkins and Gary Kinsey presented this work plan to the Commission at the December 10, 2010 Commission meeting. The items that follow represent the key components of the 2010-2011 Work Plan for the COA and a summary of each task and its current status.

### **Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession**

- a) *Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation.* All Committee meetings were held in public with all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. The Commission's website was used to provide public access to agenda items, notification of meetings, and critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation. For 2010-11, the COA held meetings as follows:

August 3-4, 2010  
November 5, 2010  
January 20, 2011  
March 17-18, 2011  
April 21-22, 2011  
May 25-26, 2011  
June 23-24, 2011

All COA meetings were broadcast live over the internet. Except when technical difficulties occurred, all meetings were recorded and the video and/or audio archives are housed on the Commission website. Further, videoconference capability and Skype have been used as necessary so that individuals interested and/or actively involved in accreditation activities can participate from a videoconferencing center or from their local place of work. This use of technology-mediated communications has resulted in significant cost savings to the Commission.

#### *PSD E-news*

The *PSD E-news* was developed in 2008 and continued to be published on approximately a weekly basis throughout 2010-11. This electronic correspondence notifies over 300 individuals, including all approved institutions, of ongoing activities related to the Professional Services Division. Information on accreditation related activities such as standards development and revision work and technical assistance workshops are routinely distributed via this electronic communication tool.

#### *Program Sponsor Alerts*

A second new type of electronic communication was also established in 2008 that supplements the *PSD E-news*. Commission staff continued to use this resource frequently during the 2010-2011 year. The Program Sponsor Alert format addresses a specific issue, such as institutional responsibilities, implementation of inactive status for programs, or modification to preconditions for multiple and single subject programs. These Program Sponsor Alerts are sent via e-mail to the program contact and are archived at: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PS-alerts.html>.

*Assistance to the Field*

In 2010-2011 a variety of activities took place designed to share information about the revised accreditation system and its implementation. All technical assistance meetings were broadcast over the web and the audio archived for access by stakeholders at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/webcasts.html>. Highlights of the technical assistance activities are noted in the following table:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Technical Assistance Activity By Topic</b>
July 15, 2010	2010-11 Accreditation Site Visits: Preparing for the Site Visit
Sept. 16, 2010	Program Assessment
Nov. 17, 2010	BTSA Statewide Directors Meeting - Biennial Reports
Dec. 16, 2010	Biennial Report Technical Assistance
Jan 21, 2011	Adult Education Technical Assistance
Jan 25, 2011	Title II Webcast
Jan 31, 2011	Title II Webcast
Jan 31, 2011	Reading Specialist Technical Assistance
Mar. 23, 2011	Single Subject Program Technical Assistance
May 5, 2011	2011-12 Accreditation Site Visits Year Out Pre-visits (for joint CTC/NCATE visits)
May 13, 2011	2011-12 Accreditation Site Visits Year Out Pre-visits (for small/very small institutions)
May 23, 2011	2011-12 Accreditation Site Visit Year Out Pre-visits (for CTC only visits)

- b) *Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission.* The Committee on Accreditation presented its annual report to the Commission at the December 2010 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-12/2010-12-6D.pdf>). In addition, staff and Co-Chair Carol Leighty presented a comprehensive study session on accreditation to the Commission at its January 27, 2011 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-01/2011-01-2A.pdf>).
- c) *Commission liaison.* The liaison from the Commission is invited to attend each COA meeting. The liaison participates in discussions and brings the perspective of the Commission to the COA. In addition, the liaison then reports back to the Commission on the activities of the Committee. Commission Chair Ting Sun served in this role for the Commission and more recently, Commissioner Gahagan has attended COA meetings.
- d) *Press releases.* After each Committee on Accreditation meeting, the Commission released notices to the media related to the Committee's accreditation decisions at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/briefing-room/default.html>.

**Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality**

- a) *Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs.* This is one of the principal ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making legal decisions regarding the continuing

professional education accreditation of institutions and their credential programs. In the 2010-2011 academic year, accreditation site visits were held at 31 institutions - 10 institutions of higher education and 21 county offices of education and/or school districts. Six institutions were revisited in 2010-2011 to ensure sufficient progress in addressing issues identified in previous accreditation visits. A list of the institutions that had a site visit or revisit in 2010-2011 and the accreditation decisions made by the COA is included in Section II of this report.

- b) *Revise and finalize the Accreditation Handbook.* One of the major accomplishments of 2010-11 was to finalize the *Accreditation Handbook*. This document explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the Commission's accreditation system. Stakeholder review of the various chapters of the *Handbook* was completed and the document was placed on the Commission's website prior to the 2008-2009 accreditation site visits. Revisions were made to clarify provisions of the *Handbook* prior to finalization. Chapters of the *Accreditation Handbook* were formally adopted at COA meetings throughout 2010, with updates made in December 2010. This document will be reviewed annually and revised to ensure its accuracy and to refine the COA's procedures.
- c) *Finalize the COA Accreditation Procedures Manual*  
In April of 2010 the COA adopted its revised *Procedures Manual* governing the work of the COA. This manual now reflects the current accreditation system and the existing COA procedures. It will continue to be monitored and updated as needed.
- d) *Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission.* The COA received updates on Commission activities at each meeting. Examples of issues where the Commission sought advice from the COA include implementation of SBX5 1, the removal of the term "professional placement" in Common Standard 6, and revised language for Precondition 1 relating to non-regionally accredited institutions.
- e) *Update members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) so that each individual is prepared to participate in the revised accreditation system.* Staff worked with each member of the BIR who participated in initial program review, program assessment or accreditation site visits to assure the members understand the Commission's accreditation system, the revised Common Standards and Glossary, the Program Assessment process, and the revised site visit format.

In addition, in preparation for the 2010-11 accreditation site visits, the Commission scheduled accreditation updates via webinar format. These webinars were required for all BIR members participating as site visit reviewers this past year. Webinars were specific to the roles on the accreditation site visit team. Webinars were held for Common Standards, NCATE Unit Standards, and Program Sampling team members. To ensure reviewers were appropriately prepared for their specific role as members of accreditation teams, these webinars covered important updates such as report formats, schedule changes, focus of interviews, credential programs transitioning to newly adopted standards, and other such critically important matters.

### **Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards**

- a) *Review and take action to grant initial approval of new credential programs.* This is also one of the major ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Programs are placed on the COA agenda for initial program approval when reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met. A list of all credential programs approved in the 2010-11 year is included in Section II of this report.
- b) *Conduct and review program assessment activities.* Institutions in the Red cohort have already completed or will complete the program assessment process, while those in the Violet cohort began the process. (A cohort list, and the institutions in each cohort, is provided in Appendix C.)
- c) *Integrate Induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system.* The COA took action in January 2009 to transition Induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system beginning July 1, 2009. During the 2010-11 year, staff assisted the Cluster Regional Directors (CRDs) in preparing and conducting accreditation site visits to school districts and county offices of education. All approved Induction programs participated fully in program assessment, biennial reports, and site visits in accordance with their particular cohort schedule of accreditation activities. This first year of full integration of induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system represents a significant scope of work accomplished. Coordination of effort with Cluster Regional Directors, program directors, and leaders in the induction community proved essential to the success of this endeavor.
- d) *Disseminate information related to the Commission's Common Standards.* The plan for the 2010-11 year included the dissemination of the Common Standard descriptors which were intended to facilitate a more consistent understanding of the Common Standards. However, feedback from reviewers suggested that the Common Standards descriptors as drafted would not facilitate a better understanding of the Common Standard. As a result, the COA rescinded its adoption of the Common Standards descriptors and will continue to discuss this possibility in the 2011-12 year.
- e) *Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation.* Review teams conducted technical assistance visits to two institutions new to the accreditation process in preparation for a full accreditation site visit in the future. The institutions that hosted a technical assistance site visit in the 2010-11 year are included in Appendix A.
- f) *Continue the discussion of how Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system.* The Commission took action in fall 2006 that all programs which lead to an authorization to teach or provide services in California's public schools need to be reviewed through the Commission's accreditation system. The subject matter programs are the only programs that have not been integrated into the accreditation system. In 2010, the Commission revised the *Standards Common to All* that are required for all subject matter programs. These were streamlined in an effort to remove unnecessary barriers for potential program sponsors. However, the subject matter programs remain outside of the continuing accreditation process. Because of other more

critical priorities at this time and limited resources, staff believes that further discussion of this topic may take place during 2011-12, but any action on moving these into the accreditation process would likely not occur until 2012-13.

- g) *Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment.* During 2009-10, the Commission staff, the Committee on Accreditation, and the Teaching Performance Assessment Users Advisory Committee (UAC) began discussing more effective strategies for reviewing standards related to the Teaching Performance Assessment to ensure appropriate implementation. Among the changes that were recommended by the UAC were 1) the development of a specific subgroup of program assessment reviewers that are focused solely on the TPA-related standards; 2) the development of TPA-focused questions for program reviewers; and 3) the identification of sources of information for site visit reviewers to consider relative to the TPA. In 2010-11, Commission staff implemented these changes. A separate program assessment subgroup consisting of individuals who were both BIR-trained and experts in the teaching performance assessment models was identified. These individuals began reviewing the program responses to standards related to the TPA, thereby ensuring a minimum level of expertise and ensuring greater consistency in reviews for these standards across institutions. In addition, the tools developed to assist these reviewers on the site visit were used for the first time in 2010-11 and will continue to be updated and enhanced as needed.

#### **Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement**

- a) *Collect, analyze, and report on Biennial Reports submitted in fall 2010.* The 2010-2011 academic year was the fourth full year of implementation of the biennial report component of the revised accreditation system. All institutions in three of the seven cohorts (Orange, Blue and Violet) were required to submit candidate competence and performance data in their biennial reports in the fall of 2010. (A cohort list, and the institutions in each cohort, is provided in Appendix C.) The CTC feedback form was modified for institutions submitting in fall 2010 in order to more clearly indicate characteristics of an effective biennial report.
- b) *Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.* Staff and the COA continued to work to ensure that additional evaluation components are embedded into the system. An online evaluation form that team members, team leaders, and institutions complete at the conclusion of a site visit continued to be used successfully. A major focus was providing assistance to institutions as they prepared their biennial reports, both through on-site meetings and webcasts. In addition, staff reviewed several aspects of the accreditation system with the COA. For example, an agenda item presented information on program assessment and how standards less than fully aligned in the Program Assessment process were related to the team's findings on program standards at the site visit. Additional aspects of the accreditation system will continue to be reviewed by the institutions, members of the BIR, the COA and staff.
- c) *Continue partnership with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate.* The Partnership Agreement with NCATE was renewed in 2007 and is effective through 2014. The COA will continue monitoring the agreement to assure

that the implementation of the partnership results in appropriately addressing state issues in each joint NCATE-CTC visit and reducing duplication across the joint processes. The Commission has participated fully in the pilots of both the NCATE continuous improvement model and the transformational initiative model (the first institution to be reviewed under the transformational model was in November 2011).

In addition, the Commission conducted its first joint CTC/TEAC accreditation visit in 2010-11 (*see d below*). The Partnership Agreement with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) expires in 2012.

With the merging of NCATE and TEAC into the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), the Commission anticipates reviewing a new protocol. NCATE and TEAC have requested states to begin the process of developing new protocols with the unified entity. Therefore, in the coming months, the COA will begin discussion of the development of a California CAEP protocol.

- d) *Develop an agreement detailing how the Commission's accreditation system can function in alignment with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).* The COA took action in January 2010 to adopt the initial agreement with TEAC. The agreement is for two years and one institution, Chapman University, had a joint site visit in February 2011. The COA continued to monitor the agreement both before and after this first review to ensure that the process is efficient and effective. The COA completed the alignment matrix which identifies which concepts in the Commission's Common Standards were addressed by the TEAC Quality Principles and Standards of Program Capacity and which concepts were not explicitly addressed.
- e) *Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes.* Staff continued to work with stakeholders on an alignment with the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) standards to the Commission's adopted Speech-Language Pathology program standards. In November 2010, the COA adopted an alignment matrix which allowed programs sponsored by California institutions to submit a program proposal using the ASHA standards and addressing the concepts from the California standards that have been identified as not present in the ASHA standards.

### **General Operations**

In addition to the above mentioned items, the COA engaged in routine matters necessary for general operations of the Committee. This included the election of Co-Chairs, the adoption of a meeting schedule, and orientation of new members.

## Section II: Summary of 2010-2011 Accreditation Actions

This section of the report provides information on the actions taken by the COA during the 2010-2011 year.

### *Professional Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Credential Preparation Programs*

2010-2011 accreditation decisions were made based upon the written reports of the evidence gathered at the site visit, recommendations made by the team, and the COA interview of program leadership and the team lead. Teams reviewed documentation, interviewed a variety of constituencies (candidates, program completers, faculty, employers, administration, supervisors, advisory board members, etc.), deliberated and came to consensus on findings for all common standards, program standards, and an accreditation recommendation. Commission consultants, team leads and institutional representatives attended Committee on Accreditation meetings on site or through video or phone conference to present the results of the site visit report and respond to questions. Copies of the site visit team reports are available on the Commission's website at: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accreditation-reports.html>. The COA made the following accreditation determinations in 2010-11:

<b>COA Accreditation Decisions 2010-2011 Visits</b>	
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
Alhambra USD	Accreditation
Anaheim UHSD	Accreditation
Aspire Schools	Accreditation
Azusa USD	Accreditation
Butte COE	Accreditation
Conejo Valley USD	Accreditation
El Rancho USD	Accreditation
Fontana USD	Accreditation
Fremont USD	Accreditation
Hayward USD	Accreditation
Kings COE	Accreditation With Probationary Stipulations
Merced UHSD	Accreditation
Milpitas USD	Accreditation
Modesto City Schools	Accreditation
Paramount USD	Accreditation
Rialto USD	Accreditation With Major Stipulations
San Marcos USD	Accreditation
Santa Barbara CEO	Accreditation
Santa Rosa City Schools	Accreditation
SIA Tech Schools	Accreditation
West Contra Costa USD	Accreditation
Antioch, Santa Barbara	Accreditation With Stipulations
California Baptist University	Accreditation
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo	Accreditation With Stipulations
Chapman University	Accreditation

<b>COA Accreditation Decisions 2010-2011 Visits</b>	
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
Occidental College	Accreditation With Probationary Stipulations
San Jose State University	Accreditation With Stipulations
The Master's College	Accreditation With Stipulations
University of La Verne	Accreditation
University of Phoenix	Accreditation With Stipulations
University of the Pacific	Accreditation

In addition, the COA heard reports from those institutions that had a full visit in 2009-2010 in which stipulations needed addressing or follow up needed to occur. With respect to those institutions with stipulations in 2009-10, the COA made the following decisions in 2010-11:

<b>2010-2011 Accreditation Follow-Up</b>		
<b>Re-Visits</b>		
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>2009-10 Decision</b>	<b>2010-11 Re-Visit Decision</b>
Alliant University	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations	Accreditation
National Hispanic University	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation with Stipulations
Santa Clara University	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation
CSU, East Bay	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
William Jessup	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation
San Diego Christian	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation
<b>Submission of Documentation Addressing Stipulations</b>		
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>2009-10 Decision</b>	<b>2010-11 Decision</b>
CSU, Stanislaus	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Vanguard University	Accreditation with Technical Stipulations*	Accreditation
Whittier College	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation

\*visit occurred in 2008-09, "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations" is a term no longer in use.

#### *Analysis of Standards Decisions*

The Commission's revised Common Standards (2008) were utilized in all accreditation site visits in 2010-2011. For institutions that are also NCATE accredited, the NCATE Unit Standards and the four components of the Commission's Common Standards not addressed in NCATE standards are used for the site visit.

2010-11 was the first year when Induction programs sponsored by local education agencies (school districts and county offices of education) were fully integrated into the Commission's

accreditation system. Of the 31 site visits, ten were to institutions of higher education. The other 21 visits were to school districts and county offices of education.

A review of the year's site visit results serves as information for the COA and staff in determining needs of institutions for technical assistance meetings and as a guide for institutions as they prepare for site visits. The information regarding findings on the Common Standards from 2010-2011 is presented in the following table.

<b>Findings on the Common Standards 2010-2011 Accreditation Site Visits</b>			
<b>Summary of 31 site visits</b>	<b>Standard Findings</b>		
	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Standard 1: Education Leadership	24 77%	6 19%	1 3%
Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	26 84%	3 9%	2 6%
Standard 3: Resources	30 97%	1 3%	0
Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel	24 77%	7 23%	0
Standard 5: Admission	30 97%	0	1 3%
Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	28 90%	2 6%	1 3%
Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice	29 94%	1 3%	1 3%
Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors only for institutions offering first Tier preparation	8 80%	2 20 %	0
Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence	29 94%	0	2 6%

The two Common Standards that the fewest institutions fully met were Common Standard 1: Education Leadership, and Common Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel. Both LEA- based programs (Induction) and colleges/universities had the fewest fully met on Common Standard 1. LEAs (Induction programs) had the fewest institutions fully meet Common Standard 4. For the IHE, the second most problematic standard is Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment System.

A summary of the information gathered on each type of educator preparation program at the 31 site visits is presented in a series of tables below. Each type of credential program is noted separately. If a standard is not listed, all institutions which offer that program that were reviewed in 2010-11 met that standard. As with the information on Common Standards above, this information about program standards that were *Not Met* or were *Met with Concerns* guides the COA and staff in determining what additional technical assistance might be helpful to the field.

<b>Preliminary Multiple Subject Standards (10 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Design	1	
2: Collaboration in Governing the Program		1
4: Pedagogical Thought and Reflective Practice		1
7A: Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction		1
8A: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Multiple Subject (MS) candidates.		1
9: Using Computer-Based Technology in the Classroom	2	
12: Professional Perspectives Toward Student Learning and the Teaching Profession		1
13: Preparation to Teach Special Populations		1
14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom		2
15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork		
16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors	1	1
17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence	1	1
18: Implementation of the TPA: Candidate Preparation and Support		1

<b>Preliminary Single Subject Standards (9 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Design	2	
2: Collaboration in Governing the Program		1
4: Pedagogical Thought and Reflective Practice		1
8B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction for Single Subject Candidates	1	
9: Using Computer-Based Technology in the Classroom	2	
12: Professional Perspectives Toward Student Learning and the Teaching Profession		1
13: Preparation to Teach Special Populations		1
14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom		1
15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork		
16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors	1	1
17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence	1	1
18: Implementation of the TPA: Candidate Preparation and Support		1
19: Assessment of Candidate Performance	1	

<b>Induction Standards (21 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Rationale and Design	1	
2: Communication and Collaboration	2	
3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers	2	
4: Formative Assessment System		1
5: Pedagogy	1	1
6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students	1	

<b>Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Level I (7 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination	1	
15: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options	1	
16: Assessment of Candidate Performance	1	

<b>Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Level I (4 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination	1	
16: Assessment of Candidate Performance	1	

<b>Preliminary Administrative Services (4 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
7: Nature of Field Experiences	1	
9: Assessment of Candidate Competence	2	

In the following credential programs, all program standards were found to be met at each visit where the program was offered. The number in bold indicates the number of institutions that hosted site visits in 2010-11 where the identified program was offered.

Adapted Physical Education	<b>(1 site visit)</b>
California Teachers of English learners (CTEL)	<b>(1 site visit)</b>
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Level II	<b>(3 site visits)</b>
Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Level II	<b>(2 site visits)</b>
Professional Clear Administrative Services	<b>(1 site visits)</b>
Pupil Personnel Counseling: School Counseling	<b>(4 site visits)</b>
Pupil Personnel: Child Welfare and Attendance	<b>(1 site visit)</b>
Pupil Personnel: School Psychology	<b>(3 site visits)</b>
Pupil Personnel: School Social work	<b>(1 site visit)</b>
Reading Certificate	<b>(1 site visit)</b>
Reading Language Arts Specialist	<b>(2 site visits)</b>
Speech-Language Pathology	<b>(4 site visits)</b>
Teacher Librarian	<b>(1 site visit)</b>
Agricultural Specialist	<b>(1 site visit)</b>

During the 2010-11 accreditation site visits, 80 approved educator preparation programs were reviewed. Across all eighty programs, 28 program standards were *Met with Concerns* and 21

program standards were *Not Met*. The remainder of the program standards in the 80 programs were all found to be *Met*.

### ***Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs***

Institutions that would like a program to be considered for Initial Program Approval submit a document that indicates how the program will meet each of the standards along with supporting documents that serve as evidence to verify the claims made. A team of educators who have expertise in the program area and are trained for the review process read the document and consult with one another to determine whether standards are met. If the reviewers jointly agree that standards are met, it is so noted. If the review team agrees that standards are not sufficiently addressed, reviewers write specific information as to what is needed. This information is shared with the institution by Commission staff. The review process continues until all standards are found to be met. Only when all standards are found to be met, the Commission staff forwards the item to the COA agenda at the next scheduled meeting. Initial program approvals include programs that are new to the credential area. 2010-2011 Initial Program Approval actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation are listed in the tables below.

#### **Multiple Subjects Credential: Preliminary ( 1)**

Fortune School of Education (Mt. Diablo Unified School District)

#### **Single Subject Teacher Intern Credential: Preliminary ( 1)**

Pacific Technology School – Orange County, Magnolia Educational and Research Foundation

#### **General Education (MS/SS) Induction Program (5)**

Azusa Pacific University  
California School for the Deaf in Fremont  
Green Dot Public Schools (Animo Leadership)  
Partnership to Uplift Communities (PUC) BTSA Induction Program  
University of California, Los Angeles

#### **Bilingual Authorization (15)**

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona (Spanish, Cantonese and Mandarin)  
California State University, Channel Islands (Spanish)  
California State University, Chico (Spanish)  
California State University, Dominguez Hills (Spanish)  
California State University, Long Beach (Mandarin, Korean, Vietnamese and Spanish)  
California State University, Northridge (Spanish, Korean and Armenian)  
Holy Names University (Spanish)  
National Hispanic University (Spanish)  
San Jose State University (Spanish and Mandarin)  
Stanford University (Spanish)  
University of California, Santa Cruz (Spanish)  
United States University (Spanish)  
University of California, Davis (Spanish)  
University of California, San Diego (Spanish, Arabic, Cantonese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Vietnamese)  
University of San Francisco (Spanish)

**Career and Technical Education Credential (6)**

Los Angeles County Office of Education  
Metropolitan Education District (MetroEd)  
San Diego County Office of Education  
Tri-County Beginning Teacher Program (Sutter County Superintendent of Schools Office)  
University of California, Riverside Extension  
Ventura County Office of Education

**Education Specialist Credential Preliminary (3)**

Concordia University – Preliminary Education Specialist Credential Program: Mild/Moderate  
High Tech High – Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate District Internship  
Whittier College – Preliminary Mild/Moderate Disabilities

**Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder (8)**

California Lutheran University  
Capistrano Unified School District  
Dominican University of California  
El Dorado County Office of Education  
Holy Names University  
Orange Unified School District  
Whittier College  
Wiseburn School District – Project Optimal

**Education Specialist Added Authorization: Orthopedically Impaired (1)**

Ventura County Office of Education – Orthopedically Impaired

**Education Specialist Added Authorization: Traumatic Brain Injury (1)**

Wiseburn School District-Project Optimal

**Clear Education Specialist Induction (34)**

Alliant University  
Antioch Unified School District  
Aspire Public Schools  
Azusa Pacific University  
Butte County Office of Education  
California School for the Deaf  
California State University Northridge  
Capistrano Unified School District  
Conejo Valley Unified School District  
Contra Costa County Office of Education  
El Dorado County Office of Education  
Elk Grove Unified School District  
Marin County Office of Education  
Napa County Office of Education  
North State BTSA with Tehama County Department of Education serving as LEA  
Orange Unified School District  
Point Loma Nazarene University

### **Clear Education Specialist Induction (34)**

Riverside County Office of Education  
San Diego County Office of Education  
San Francisco State University  
San Joaquin County office of Education  
San Jose Unified School District  
San Juan Unified School District  
San Mateo County Office of Education  
San Mateo-Foster City School District  
San Ramon Valley Unified School District  
Santa Barbara County Education Office  
Stanislaus County Office of Education  
Touro University  
Tri County BTSA Induction Program  
Tustin Unified School District  
University of California, Los Angeles  
Vista Unified School District  
Yolo-Solano BTSA Induction Program

### **Pupil Personnel Services - School Counseling (2)**

Concordia University  
University of California, Los Angeles

### **Speech Language Pathology (1)**

Chapman University

### **Administrative Services Credential Preliminary (3)**

Argosy University  
Bay Area School of Enterprise (REACH Institute)  
Fortune School of Education (Mt. Diablo Unified School District)

### ***Transitioned Programs***

When the Commission adopts new and updated standards for existing credentials, institutions must transition from programs aligned to “old” standards to the newly adopted standards. A period of transition typically accompanies the adoption of new standards. When the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) adopted its updated Unit Standards, NCATE did not require all accredited institutions to submit a new proposal addressing the revised standards. Beginning with the Education Specialist standards revision, the Commission is implementing a standard transition process that parallels the NCATE process, requiring that all accredited institutions meet the revised standards as of a specific date. During the next regularly scheduled accreditation activity, the institution is to be evaluated against the updated standards. These programs are ‘transitioning’ to the updated standards. Provided below is the list of programs that transitioned in 2010-11.

### **Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Mild/Moderate Disabilities (21)**

Antioch University, Santa Barbara  
California Baptist University  
Chapman University

**Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Mild/Moderate Disabilities (21)**

Claremont Graduate University  
California State University, Channel Island  
California State University, Dominguez Hills  
California State University, Fresno  
California State University, Los Angeles  
California State University, Stanislaus  
California State University, Monterey Bay  
California State University, Northridge  
Humboldt State University  
National University  
Orange County Department of Education  
San Francisco State University  
San Joaquin Project Impact  
Touro University  
University of California, Riverside  
University of San Diego  
University of San Francisco  
University of the Pacific

**Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Moderate/Severe Disabilities (16)**

California Baptist University  
Chapman University  
Claremont Graduate University  
California State University, Dominguez Hills  
California State University, Fresno  
California State University, Los Angeles  
California State University, Monterey Bay  
California State University, Northridge  
California State University, Stanislaus  
Humboldt State University  
National University  
San Francisco State University  
San Joaquin Project Impact  
Touro University  
University of California, Riverside  
University of the Pacific

**Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing (2)**

California State University, Northridge  
National University

**Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Early Childhood Special Education (5)**

California State University, Los Angeles  
California State University, Northridge  
Mills College  
San Francisco State University  
San Joaquin Project Impact

**Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Visual Impairments (2)**

California State University, Los Angeles  
San Francisco State University

**Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Physical and Health Impairments (1)**

San Francisco State University

**Education Specialist – Added Authorization Autism Spectrum Disorders (12)**

California Baptist University  
California State University, Fresno  
California State University, Long Beach  
California State University, Northridge  
Humboldt State University  
Mills College  
Norte Dame de Namur University  
Point Loma Nazarene University  
San Francisco State University  
San Jose State University  
Stanislaus County Office of Education  
University of California, Santa Barbara

**Education Specialist – Added Authorization Orthopedically Impaired (1)**

San Francisco State University

**Education Specialist – Added Authorization Emotional Disturbance (3)**

California State University, Northridge  
Mills College  
University of California, Los Angeles Extension

**Speech Language Pathology (5)**

California State University, Fresno  
California State University, Fullerton  
San Francisco State University  
San Jose State University  
University of the Pacific

**Other Related Services Credential: Orientation and Mobility (1)**

California State University, Los Angeles

**Health Services School Nurse (1)**

Azusa Pacific University

**General Education MS/SS Clear Credential (12)**

Antioch University, Santa Barbara  
Azusa Pacific University  
California Lutheran University  
Fresno Pacific University

### General Education MS/SS Clear Credential (12)

Hebrew Union College  
 La Sierra University  
 Loyola Marymount University  
 Mount St. Mary's College  
 National Hispanic University  
 Point Loma Nazarene University  
 San Diego State University  
 University of California, Riverside

#### *Inactive Status*

Institutions may temporarily cease offering an approved program for a variety of reasons such as decreased need in the service area or changes in faculty with expertise in the area. In the past, once a program was approved, it was listed as approved on the Commission website even if the program was not being offered at the institution. At the May 2008 meeting, the COA took action to allow institutions to declare a program to be *Inactive*. A program may be declared inactive for a maximum of five years. The following institutions put the programs noted below on Inactive status in 2010-11.

<b>Professional Preparation Programs Entering Inactive Status in 2010-2011 (40)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
Butte County Office of Education	Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education, Adult Education and Special Subjects
Cajon Valley Union School District	General Education (MS and SS) Induction Program
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo	Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, Level II
CSU, Dominguez Hills	Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology
CSU, Los Angeles	Clinical Rehab Services: Audiology
Claremont Graduate University	Administrative Services Credential
Concordia University	Single Subject Intern Program
CSU, Fullerton	General Education Clear Credential
CSU, San Marcos	Education Specialist Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance
Dominican University of California	Clear Credential
Los Angeles Unified School District	Multiple Subject District Intern Program
Norwalk – La Mirada Unified School District	General Education (MS and SS) Induction Program
Notre Dame de Namur University	Reading Certificate and Reading Specialist Credential
Pacific Union College	Clear Credential
San Diego Unified School District	Single Subject Internship Credential Program
	Multiple Subject Internship Credential Program
	Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities District Internship (Level II) Program
San Francisco State University	Clinical Rehabilitative Services: Audiology Program
San Jose State University	Professional Administrative Services Credential Program
	School Nurse Program

<b>Professional Preparation Programs Entering Inactive Status in 2010-2011 (40)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
	Multiple Subject Internship
	Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing
	Clinical Rehab Services: Audiology Authorization
	Clinical Rehab Services: Special Class Authorization
	Multiple Subject Credential BCLAD Emphasis (Vietnamese)
Santa Clara University	General Education Clear Credential
	Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Level I, Intern Option and Level II Credentials
	Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education, Level I, Intern, and Level II Credentials
	Education Specialist: Early Childhood Certificate
	Reading Certificate and Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential
	Preliminary Multiple Subject, Intern Option
	Preliminary Single Subject, Intern Option
UC, Irvine	Multiple Subjects Intern Program
	BCLAD Program
UC, Berkeley	Reading Specialist Credential Program
University of Redlands	Clear Credential

### ***Withdrawal of an Approved Program***

For a variety of reasons, institutions may choose to no longer offer an approved program. Institutions are encouraged to formally seek a withdrawal of these programs thus removing the program from the Commission's accreditation system. The program is then no longer considered a Commission approved program. If an institution decides to offer a program in the future, it is a minimum of two years before a new program proposal will be accepted. The following institutions and programs selected this option in the 2010-2011 year.

<b>Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (20)</b>	
Alameda County Office of Education	Designated Subjects: Adult Education Credential
Bethany University	General Education Clear Credential
Brandman University	Education Specialist: Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	General Education Clear Credential
CSU, Sacramento	General Education Clear Credential
CSU, East Bay	General Education Clear Credential
CSU, Los Angeles	General Education Clear Credential
Imperial County Office of Education	Designated Subjects Programs: Adult Education, Career Technical Education, Special Subjects, Supervision and Coordination
La Sierra University	Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling

<b>Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (20)</b>	
Newport-Mesa Unified School District	General Education (MS and SS) Induction
Notre Dame de Namur University	General Education Clear Credential
Occidental College	Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Credentials
Saint Mary's College of California	Moderate/Severe Education Specialist, Level I and Level II Credential
UC, Riverside	Preliminary Administrative Services Credential
University of San Diego	School Nurse
University of the Pacific	Professional Administrative Services Credential
Vanguard University	General Education Clear Credential

***Reactivation of Inactive Program***

An inactive program may be re-activated only when the institution submits a request to the COA and the COA has taken action to reactive the program. If the program standards under which the program was approved have been modified, the institution or program sponsor must address the updated standards before the program may be re-activated.

**General Education Clear Programs (3)**

California State University, Fullerton  
Pacific Union College  
Santa Clara University

### **Section III:**

## **Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2011-2012**

### **Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession**

- a) *Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation.* All Committee meetings will continue to be held in public and all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. In addition, meetings will be transmitted via audio broadcast to allow any individual with access to the internet the ability to hear live or recorded broadcasts of all Committee meetings. The Commission's website will continue to be utilized fully to provide agenda items, notification of meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation. Meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

August 2-3, 2011  
October 27, 2011  
February 1-2, 2012  
March 14-15, 2012  
April 18-19, 2012  
May 30-31, 2012  
June 27-28, 2012

Additionally, in 2011-2012, the *PSD E-News*, Program Sponsor Alerts, and press releases will be routinely used to ensure a transparent accreditation process. Additionally, frequent technical assistance workshops on the various aspects of the accreditation process and procedures will also be provided to ensure broad understanding of accreditation requirements and expectations.

- b) *Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission.* The Committee on Accreditation will present its annual report to the Commission in the fall. Additional updates and reports to the Commission will be provided as necessary and appropriate throughout the year.
- c) *Commission Liaison.* Maintaining a liaison from the Commission to the COA continues to be a critical aspect of the current process. The Commission's liaison will continue to provide an important perspective to COA discussions and serve as an effective means of communication between the COA and the Commission.

### **Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality**

- a) *Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs.* This is one of the principal ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of institutions and their credential programs. In the 2011-2012 academic year, accreditation site visits are scheduled for 39 institutions in the Red cohort. This number is notably greater than past years because the BTSA Induction programs have joined the Commission's accreditation system. In addition, four (4) institutions will be revisited in 2011-12 to ensure sufficient progress in addressing issues identified in previous accreditation visits. A list of the institutions scheduled for a site visit in 2011-2012 is included in Appendix B.

- b) *Review and revise the Accreditation Handbook.* The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. The COA adopted its current version of the Accreditation Handbook in 2010. The COA will continue to refine the Handbook in 2011-12 to ensure it reflects current processes and procedures.
- c) *Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission.* Staff will continue to prepare agenda items for the COA on issues related to the Commission's work as directed by the Commission or as appropriate. The COA will continue to discuss issues referred to it by the Commission and provide guidance as appropriate.

### **Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards**

- a) *Review and take action to grant initial approval of new credential programs.* This is another one of the major ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Some of the decisions are made on the basis of expert review panel recommendations and some are made on the basis of staff recommendations. In all cases, programs will not be given initial approval until the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met.
- b) *Conduct and review program assessment activities.* In 2011-12, institutions in the Violet cohort will be completing the program assessment process, while those in the Indigo cohort will begin the process. (A cohort list and the institutions in each cohort is provided in Appendix C.)
- c) *Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation.* The COA will consider the issues identified by technical assistance review teams in their review of institutions new to the accreditation process in California. Review teams will provide technical assistance to these institutions in preparation for a full accreditation site visit. A list of institutions scheduled for a technical assistance site visit in the 2011-12 year is included in Appendix B.
- d) *Disseminate information related to the Commission's Common Standards.* Efforts to assist institutions in understanding the Commission's Common Standards will continue in 2011-12 through a variety of strategies.
- e) *Integrate Induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system.* The COA took action in January 2009 to transition Induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system beginning July 1, 2009. Commission staff will continue to work with the Cluster Regional Directors to refine, improve and streamline the processes related to accreditation of induction program.
- f) *Continue the discussion of how Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system.* With the Commission's action in fall 2006 that all programs leading to an authorization to teach or provide services in California's public schools need to be reviewed through the Commission's accreditation system, the subject matter programs are the only programs that have not been integrated into the accreditation

system. During 2011-12, Commission staff will work with the COA to determine when this work might be accomplished.

- g) *Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment.* During 2009-10, the Commission staff, the Committee on Accreditation, and the Teaching Performance Assessment Users Advisory Committee (UAC) began discussing more effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the Teaching Performance Assessment to ensure appropriate implementation. These strategies began being implemented in 2010-11 and this work will continue in 2011-12.

#### **Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement**

- a) *Collect, analyze, and report on the biennial reports submitted in fall 2011.* The 2011-2012 academic year will be the fourth full year of implementation of the biennial report component of the revised accreditation system. All institutions in the Red, Green, and Indigo cohorts are required to submit candidate competence and performance data in 2011. Institutions in the Violet, Yellow, and Blue cohorts will submit a biennial report by the end of 2012. A major focus of the effort will be to provide assistance to institutions as they prepare their biennial report and to analyze information from institutions to ensure appropriate responses to the requirements of the biennial report. (A cohort list, and the institutions in each cohort, is provided in Appendix C.)
- b) *Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.* As the various components of the system are implemented, staff and the COA will continue to work to ensure that additional evaluation components are embedded into the system. Continuing the implementation of an online evaluation form that team members, team leaders, and institutions complete at the conclusion of a site visit is critical. Additional work needs to be done to improve the information the Commission has about the efficacy of program assessment and biennial reporting. The COA had some discussions to this effect in 2010-11 and those conversations will continue in 2011-12.
- c) *Continue partnership with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate.* The Partnership Agreement with NCATE was renewed in 2007 and is effective through 2014. The COA will continue monitoring the agreement to make certain that the implementation of the partnership results in assuring that state issues are appropriately addressed in each joint NCATE-CTC visit and that the process reduces duplication. In June 2011, the COA had begun discussions about a revised protocol in light of the unification of NCATE and TEAC into the new organization, Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). However, subsequent direction from NCATE suggested they have temporarily halted the development of all new protocols until after the unification details have been worked out. The COA can continue its own discussion of aspects of a new protocol; however, action on the new protocol will have to wait until NCATE and TEAC (CAEP) are willing to entertain consideration of new protocols.
- d) *Monitor the agreement detailing how the Commission's accreditation system can function in alignment with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).* In 2009-10, the COA took action to adopt the initial agreement with TEAC. Chapman

University was the first institution in California that earned TEAC accreditation. Because of the unification of TEAC and NCATE, and because no other entity in California has indicated a desire to move toward TEAC accreditation, Commission activities in this area in 2011-12 will likely be limited. The Commission, however, will pay close attention to the NCATE/TEAC unification to determine if changes will need to be made related to any California processes to accommodate the TEAC-like processes that will be an option under the new CAEP organization.

- e) *Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes.* Should requests for analysis of the alignment of national and professional organization standards with those of the Commission be received, the COA will review the analysis, consistent with its responsibilities set forth in the Education Code, and determine issues of comparability.

### **General Operations**

In addition to the above mentioned items, the COA will engage in routine matters necessary for general operations of the Committee. This includes the election of Co-Chairs, the adoption of a meeting schedule, and orientation of new members.

## Appendix A 2010-2011 Accreditation Activities

*For a list of all institutions in each cohort, please see Appendix C*

### Biennial Reports

<b>Due Fall 2010</b>	Orange Cohort	Blue Cohort	Violet Cohort
<b>Due Fall 2011</b>	Red Cohort	Green Cohort	Indigo Cohort

### Program Assessment

Institutions Completing Program Assessment Process in 2010-11      Red Cohort

Institutions Beginning Program Assessment Process in 2010-11      Violet Cohort  
(Submissions Due in Fall 2011)

### Site Visits (Orange Cohort)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo</li> <li>- CalState TEACH*</li> <li>- Sacramento *</li> <li>- San Jose State</li> <li>- UC, Santa Barbara*</li> <li>- Antioch Univ. Santa Barbara</li> <li>- California Baptist University</li> <li>- Chapman University</li> <li>- Occidental College</li> <li>- St. Mary's College of California*</li> <li>- The Master's College</li> <li>- University of La Verne</li> <li>- University of Phoenix</li> <li>- University of the Pacific</li> <li>- Alhambra USD (401)</li> <li>- Anaheim Union HSD (502)</li> <li>- Aspire Public Schools (232)</li> <li>- Azusa USD (402)</li> <li>- Butte COE (103)</li> <li>- Conejo Valley USD (231)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- El Rancho USD (430)</li> <li>- Fontana USD (606)</li> <li>- Fremont USD (206)</li> <li>- Hayward USD (207)</li> <li>- Kings COE (309)</li> <li>- Merced Union HSD (322)</li> <li>- Milpitas USD (208)</li> <li>- Modesto City Schools (313)</li> <li>- Paramount USD (431)</li> <li>- Rialto USD (611)</li> <li>- San Marcos USD (531)</li> <li>- Santa Barbara CEO (223)</li> <li>- Santa Rosa City Schools (118)</li> <li>- School for Integrated Science and Technology (SIA Tech) (536)</li> <li>- West Contra Costa USD (124)</li> <li>- Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)*</li> </ul> <p style="margin-top: 20px;">* Visit delayed until Fall 2011 from Spring 2011</p> |
|--|---|

### Institutions with a Revisit

Alliant International University  
National Hispanic University  
Santa Clara University  
CSU, East Bay  
William Jessup  
San Diego Christian College

### Institutions with a Technical Assistance Site Visit

Hebrew Union College  
Boston Reed College

## **Appendix B**

### **2011-2012 Accreditation Activities**

*For a list of all institutions in each cohort, please see Appendix C*

#### **Biennial Reports**

<b>Due Fall 2011</b>	Red Cohort	Green Cohort	Indigo Cohort
<b>Due Fall 2012</b>	Violet Cohort	Yellow Cohort	Blue Cohort

#### **Program Assessment**

Institutions Completing Program Assessment Process in 2011-12      Violet Cohort

Institutions Beginning Program Assessment Process in 2011-12      Indigo Cohort

*(Submissions Due in Fall 2011)*

#### **Site Visits (Red Cohort)**

CalState TEACH	Contra Costa COE (204)
CSU, Dominguez Hills	Culver City USD (407)
CSU, Los Angeles	Davis Joint USD (104)
CSU, Sacramento	Dos Palos Oro Loma USD (323)
Sonoma State	Hanford ESD (321)
UC, Berkeley	Los Angeles USD (414/433)
UC, Los Angeles	Manteca USD (311)
UC, Santa Barbara	Marin COE (110)
UC, Santa Cruz	Oakland USD (212)
Concordia University	Orange USD (519)
Pacific Union	Placer COE (114)
Pepperdine	Pleasanton USD (230)
Pt. Loma Nazarene	Poway USD (521)
St. Mary's College	Redwood City (214)
University of San Diego	Riverside COE (612)
Arcadia USD (435)	Sutter COE (121)
Bay Area School for Enterprise (234)	Temple City USD (425)
Burbank USD (405)	Tulare City ESD (318)
Campbell USD (203)	Association of California School
Chula Vista ESD (505)	Administrators (ACSA)

#### **Institutions with a Revisit**

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo  
Occidental College  
Kings County Office of Education (309)  
Rialto USD (611)

#### **Institutions with a Technical Assistance Site Visit**

ICEF Public Schools/LAUSD  
Animo Leadership Charter HS (Green Dot)

## Appendix C

Cohort	RED	ORANGE	YELLOW
2011-12	Year 6 Site Visit	Year 7 7 <sup>th</sup> Year Follow-Up	Year 1 Biennial Report
	<b>CSU</b> Dominguez Hills (F)* Los Angeles (F)* Monterey Bay (S)* Sonoma State (S)*	<b>CSU</b> Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo(S)*! CalState TEACH Sacramento San Jose State (S)*	<b>CSU</b> Northridge (F)* San Diego State (F)* Stanislaus (S)*
	<b>UC</b> Berkeley Los Angeles Santa Cruz	<b>UC</b> Santa Barbara	<b>UC</b>
	<b>Private/Independent</b> Concordia University Pacific Union College Pepperdine University Point Loma Nazarene Univ (S)*! University of San Diego (F)*	<b>Private/Independent</b> Antioch Univ. Santa Barbara California Baptist University Chapman University~ Occidental College St. Mary's College of California The Master's College University of La Verne (S)*! University of Phoenix University of the Pacific (S)*	<b>Private/Independent</b> Biola University Fresno Pacific University Loyola Marymount University (S)* National Hispanic University San Diego Christian College Santa Clara University Touro University Whittier College William Jessup University
	<b>LEA</b> Arcadia USD (435) Bay Area School of Enterprise (REACH) (234) Burbank USD (405) Cajon Valley Union SD (506) Campbell Union SD (203) Chula Vista ESD (505) Contra Costa COE (204) Culver City USD (407) Davis Joint USD (104) Dos Palos Oro Loma JUSD (323) Temple City USD (425) Hanford ESD (321) Los Angeles USD (414/433/441-448) Manteca USD (311) Marin COE (110) Oakland USD (212) Orange USD (519) Placer COE (114) Pleasanton USD (230) Poway USD (521) Redwood City SD (214) Riverside COE (612) Sutter County SOS (121) Tulare City SD (318)	<b>LEA</b> Alhambra USD (401) Anaheim Union HSD (502) Aspire Public Schools (232) Azusa USD (402) Butte COE (103) Conejo Valley USD (231) El Rancho USD (430) Fontana USD (606) Fremont USD (206) Hayward USD (207) Kings COE (309) Merced Union HSD (322) Milpitas USD (208) Modesto City Schools (313) Paramount USD (431) Rialto USD (611) San Marcos USD (531) Santa Barbara CEO (223) Santa Rosa City Schools (118) School for Integrated Science and Technology (SIA Tech) (536) West Contra Costa USD (124)	<b>LEA</b> Anaheim City SD (501) Capistrano USD (504) Chino Valley USD (603) Clovis USD (303) Etiwanda SD (605) Lodi USD (109) Napa COE (111) Ontario-Montclair SD (609) Panama-Buena Vista Union SD (314) Pomona USD (420) Riverside USD (613) Rowland USD (421) Saddleback Valley USD (528) San Gabriel USD (422) Santa Clara USD (225) Santa Cruz COE (226) Sonoma COE (112) Stanislaus COE (317) Sweetwater Union HSD (526) Walnut Valley USD (428)
	<b>Other Sponsors</b>	<b>Other Sponsors</b> Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)	<b>Other Sponsors</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Site Visit</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2017-2018</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>

<b>GREEN</b>	<b>BLUE</b>	<b>INDIGO</b>	<b>VIOLET</b>
<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3 Biennial Report</b>	<b>Year 4 Program Assessment</b>	<b>Year 5 Biennial Report</b>
<b>CSU</b> Channel Islands East Bay (S)* San Bernardino (S)*	<b>CSU</b> Fullerton (F)*	<b>CSU</b> Bakersfield (F)* Cal Poly, Pomona Chico (S)* Humboldt Long Beach (S)* San Marcos (S)*	<b>CSU</b> Fresno (S)* San Francisco State (S)
<b>UC</b> None	<b>UC</b> Riverside	<b>UC</b> None	<b>UC</b> Davis Irvine San Diego
<b>Private</b> Cal Lutheran Univ. (F)* Mills College Notre Dame de Namur Univ. Patten University Simpson University Western Governors University Westmont College	<b>Private</b> Alliant International Univ. Argosy University Dominican University Drexel University Holy Names University Loma Linda University Phillips Graduate Institute Stanford University (S)* United States University Vanguard University	<b>Private</b> Azusa Pacific Univ. (S)* Bethany University Brandman University Fielding Graduate University Mount St. Mary's College University of Redlands University of San Francisco University of Southern California	<b>Private</b> Antioch Univ. Los Angeles Claremont Graduate Univ. Hebrew Union College Hope International Univ. La Sierra University National University (S)*! Pacific Oaks College
<b>LEA</b> Antioch USD (101) Bakersfield City SD (301) Castaic Union SD (432) Evergreen SD (229) Fairfield-Suisun USD (107) Fresno COE (304) Garden Grove USD (532) Hacienda La Puente USD (410) La Mesa-Spring Valley SD (512) Los Angeles COE (413) Madera COE (734) Merced COE (312) Montebello USD (417) Newark USD (205) Oceanside USD (517) San Bernardino City USD (614) San Diego COE (515/525) San Juan USD (117) San Mateo-Foster City SD (233) Santa Ana USD (533) Saugus Union SD (423)	<b>LEA</b> Bellflower USD (404) CA School of the Deaf/Fremont (238) Chaffey Joint Union HSD (602) Corona-Norco USD (604) Elk Grove USD (106) Encinitas Union SD (514) Escondido Union SD (508) Fresno USD (305) Glendale USD (409) Greenfield Union SD (306) Grossmont Union HSD (510) Kern High SD (308) Lawndale ESD (411) Long Beach USD (412) Magnolia Public Schools (538): Pacific Tech Schools, Orange Co. Mt. Diablo USD (210): Fortune School of Education Oak Grove SD (237) Palmdale SD (610) PUC Schools (437) San Luis Obispo COE (218) San Mateo COE (219) Tehama County DOE (113) Torrance USD (426) Tulare COE (319) Tustin USD (527) Vallejo City USD (123) Wiseburn SD	<b>LEA</b> Animo Leadership Charter HS (Green Dot) (438) Baldwin Park USD (403) Brentwood Union SD (108) Central USD (302) Fullerton SD (516) High Tech High (537) Lancaster SD (608) Madera USD (310) Metropolitan Education District Monterey COE (209) Ocean View SD (530) Orange County DOE (518) Pasadena USD (419) Placentia-Yorba Linda USD (520) Sacramento COE (115) San Diego USD (522) San Dieguito Union HSD (524) San Joaquin COE (315) San Jose USD (216) San Ramon Valley USD (222) Santa Clara COE Santa Monica-Malibu USD (424) Stockton USD (119) Tracy USD (120) Ventura COE (228) Visalia USD (320) Vista USD (529) West Covina USD (427) Westside Union SD (615)	<b>LEA</b> Antelope Valley Union HSD (601) Compton USD (434) Cupertino Union SD (236) El Dorado COE (105) Envision Schools (235) Escondido Union HSD (507) ICEF Public Schools/LAUSD (436) Imperial COE (511) Irvine USD (535) Keppel Union SD (607) Kern County SOS (307) Los Banos USD (325) Murrieta Valley USD (616) New Haven USD (211) Newport-Mesa USD (513)# Norwalk-La Mirada USD (418) Palo Alto USD (213) Palos Verdes Peninsula USD (416) Sacramento City USD (116) Salinas Union HSD San Francisco USD (215) Sanger USD (324) Selma USD (316) Sequoia Union HSD (227) Washington USD (125) Wm. S. Hart Union HSD (429)
<b>Other Sponsors</b>	<b>Other Sponsors</b>	<b>Other Sponsors</b>	<b>Other Sponsors</b> Boston Reed College
<b>28</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>