
2F

Information

Professional Services Committee

Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents the 2012-13 Annual Accreditation Report from the Committee on Accreditation.

Policy Question: Does this Annual Report provide sufficient information about the Commission's Accreditation activities for 2012-13?

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenters: Cheryl Hickey, Administrator, Professional Services Division, Anne Jones, Co-Chair, Committee on Accreditation, 2012-13

Strategic Plan Goal:

II. Program Quality and Accountability

- ◆ Effectively and efficiently monitor program implementation and outcomes and hold all approved educator preparation programs to high standards and continuous improvement through the accreditation process.

December 2013

Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation

Introduction

This agenda item presents the *2012-13 Annual Accreditation Report* from the Committee on Accreditation (COA). Section I of the report describes the major accomplishments of the Committee's 2012-13 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 2012-13. Section III provides the 2013-2014 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 adopted *Accreditation Framework* states the following:

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 structure of the COA Annual Report is in keeping with the four purposes of the accreditation system as defined in the *Accreditation Framework*.

The attached *2012-13 Annual Accreditation Report* reviews the accreditation decisions made by the COA during 2012-13, including specific information about the Committee's decisions during 2012-13 to grant initial accreditation to new programs of professional preparation. The *Accreditation Report* also presents information on the 2013-14 Work Plan. The *2012-13 Annual Accreditation Report* was adopted by the COA on October 10, 2013.



COMMISSION ON
TEACHER CREDENTIALING

Ensuring Educator Excellence

**The Committee on Accreditation's
Annual Accreditation Report to the
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
2012-2013**

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 *2012-13 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 2013-14 as it implements the Commission's accreditation system.

The *Annual Accreditation Report* is organized to address the purposes of the accreditation system: ensure accountability, ensure high quality programs, ensure adherence to standards and foster on-going improvement. Each purpose is addressed as the report notes what was accomplished in 2012-13 and in the proposed work plan for 2013-14. We believe that aligning the *Annual Accreditation Report* to these purposes provides evidence of the integrity of the accreditation system.

As is evident in the report, the Commission's resource constraints have had a significant impact on the ability of the Commission to ensure that institutions are implementing in accordance with Commission adopted standards. We are encouraged by the support of the Commission to continue accreditation activities for 2013-14, particularly the reinstatement of site visits. This is necessary not only to uphold the mission of ensuring educator excellence but also to maintain California's stature as a national leader in adopting and enforcing high standards. The COA welcomes the opportunity to continue to seek cost efficient and effective means to streamline accreditation while maintaining a robust accreditation system. We look forward to continuing to work in partnership with the Commission to review processes and procedures and to continue to improve and refine a strong accountability system for educator preparation programs in California.

The Committee stands ready to assist the Commission in achieving the goal of a high quality teacher in every classroom.

Sincerely,

Anne Jones
Committee Co-Chair

Joseph Jimenez
Committee Co-Chair

The Committee on Accreditation

2012-2013

Joyce Abrams
Substitute Teacher
Chula Vista Elementary School District

Deborah Erickson
Professor and Dean
Point Loma Nazarene University

Emelina Emaas
High School Teacher
BTSA Support Provider
Sacramento City USD

Joseph Jimenez
Induction Consultant
Tulare County Office of Education

Anne Jones
Associate Dean and
Director, Education Programs
University Extension
University of California, Riverside

Gary Kinsey
Associate Vice President of Academic
Affairs and Director of the School of
Education
California State University, Channel Islands

Kiran Kumar
Substitute Teacher
National Board Certified Teacher
Early Adolescence/English Language Arts
Pomona Unified School District

Kenneth Lopour
Assistant Principal
Orange 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
Chair, Department of Teaching Credentials
College of Education
California State University, 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
Catherine Kearney, Consultant, Professional Services Division
Gay Roby, Consultant, Professional Services Division
Geri Mohler, Consultant, Professional Services Division
Teri Ackerman, Analyst, Professional Services Division

Table of Contents

Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee’s Work Plan in 2012-13

Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession	1
a) <i>Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation.</i>	1
b) <i>PSD E-news</i>	1
c) <i>Program Sponsor Alerts</i>	2
d) <i>Assistance to the Field.....</i>	2
e) <i>Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission</i>	2
f) <i>Commission Liaison</i>	2
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality	2
a) <i>Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs.....</i>	3
b) <i>Revise and maintain the Accreditation Handbook</i>	3
c) <i>Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested... ..</i>	3
d) <i>Train new members and update current members of the Board of Institutional Review (BIR)</i>	3
e) <i>Develop and pilot a program completer survey</i>	4
f) <i>Discuss which standards provide most leverage.....</i>	4
g) <i>Develop a fee recovery system.....</i>	4
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards	4
a) <i>Review and take action to grant initial institutional approval of new credential programs</i>	4
b) <i>Conduct and review program assessment activities.....</i>	5
c) <i>Integrate Induction programs into the Commission’s accreditation system</i>	5
d) <i>Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation</i>	5
e) <i>Disseminate information related to the Commission’s Common Standards</i>	5
f) <i>Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment.....</i>	6
g) <i>Continue the discussion of how the Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system.....</i>	6
d) <i>Work stakeholders to develop a more streamlined and targeted site visit</i>	6
Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement	6
a) <i>Collect, analyze, report on the second year of biennial reports submitted in fall 2012</i>	6
b) <i>Continue development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.....</i>	6
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>	7
d) <i>Monitor the agreement detailing how the Commission’s accreditation system can function in alignment with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).....</i>	7
e) <i>Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state process.....</i>	7
General Operations	7
Section II: Summary of Accreditation Activities 2012-13	8
<i>Professional Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Credential Preparation Programs.....</i>	8
<i>Analysis of Standard Decisions</i>	9
<i>Technical Assistance Site Visits</i>	9
<i>Initial Approval of New Credential Programs</i>	10
<i>Transitioned Programs</i>	12

<i>Inactive Status</i>	13
<i>Withdrawal of an Approved Program</i>	14
<i>Reactivation of Inactive Program</i>	14
<i>Initial Institutional Approval</i>	15
<i>Institutions that are no longer approved program sponsors</i>	15
Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee in 2013-2014	16
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and the Profession	16
<i>a) Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation</i>	16
<i>b) Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission</i>	16
<i>c) Commission Liaison</i>	16
<i>d) Implementation of a cost recovery system for certain accreditation activities</i>	17
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality	17
<i>a) Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs</i>	17
<i>b) Review and revise the Accreditation Handbook</i>	17
<i>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</i>	17
<i>d) Continue to develop and pilot surveys</i>	17
<i>e) Discuss which standards provide the most leverage</i>	18
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards	18
<i>a) Review and take action to grant initial approval of new credential programs</i>	18
<i>b) Conduct and review program assessment activities</i>	18
<i>c) Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation</i>	18
<i>d) Disseminate information related to the Commission's Common Standards</i>	19
<i>e) Integrate induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system</i>	19
<i>f) Continue the discussion of how Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system</i>	19
<i>g) Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment</i>	19
<i>h) Develop a more streamlined and targeted site visit model</i>	19
Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement	20
<i>a) Collect, analyze and report on the biennial reports submitted in fall 2013</i>	20
<i>b) Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system</i>	20
<i>c) Continue Partnership with CAEP (formerly the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and TEAC) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate</i>	20
<i>d) Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes</i>	21
General Operations	21
Appendix A: Accreditation Activities for 2012-13 Adopted by Commission in June 2012	22
Appendix B: Accreditation Activities 2012-13 and 2013-14	24
Appendix C: Accreditation Activities At a Glance 2013-14	27
Appendix D: Institutions by Cohort	28

Section I:
Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2012-2013

Due to the Commission's significant fiscal constraints, some key aspects of the Commission's accreditation system were postponed or adjusted to ensure that the agency remained solvent for the fiscal year. On June 14, 2012, the Commission approved 14 recommendations related to implementation of the Commission's accreditation system in 2012-13. The intent of these recommendations was to implement a work plan for the 2012-13 year that allowed as much accreditation activity to continue to take place as possible within the fiscal reality. Part of this work plan included the postponement of nearly all accreditation site visits for one year <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-06/2012-06-6B.pdf>. A list of the 14 recommendations adopted by the Commission is included as Appendix A.

The items that follow represent the key components of the 2012-2013 accreditation activities for the COA and a summary of each task and its current status.

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

Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation. As a result of the majority of accreditation site visits being postponed for one year, the Committee on Accreditation adopted a schedule of meetings that reflected this reduction in activity. Instead of the more typical 13 day meeting schedule (6 2-day meetings and 1 one-day meeting) the Committee's meeting schedule for 2012-13 consisted of five one-day meetings. To further economize, the COA's meeting in April 2013 was held via conference call (properly noticed to conform with the Bagley Keene Open Meeting Act). The COA held meetings as follows:

August 16, 2012
October 18, 2012
February 7, 2013
April 17, 2013
June 27, 2013

All Committee meetings were held in public and all meeting agendas were posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. In addition, meetings were transmitted via audio broadcast and video webcast to allow any individual with access to the Internet the ability to hear live or recorded broadcasts of all Committee meetings. Except where technical difficulties occurred, agenda items and the video and audio archive of the meetings are housed on the Commission website. The Commission's website was 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.

Videoconference and Skype have continued to be used, where possible and appropriate, in order that those located in various regions of California who are involved in accreditation activities could participate from a videoconferencing center thus reducing costs to the Commission.

PSD-News. The PSD E-news was developed in 2008 and was distributed on nearly a weekly basis throughout 2012-13. This electronic correspondence notifies 1,500 individuals (up from 1,300 a year ago), including all approved institutions, of on-going 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 communication tool. In 2012-13, this responsibility was transferred to a consultant with oversight by administrators in the Professional Services Division.

Program Sponsor Alerts. Established in 2008, Program Sponsor Alerts (PSA) provide important and timely information on specific topics of interest to program sponsors. The Commission staff continued to use this resource frequently during the 2012-2013 year, issuing 13 PSAs. The Program Sponsor Alert format addresses a specific issue, such as institutional responsibilities, implementation of inactive status for programs, or modification to preconditions for preparation programs. This form of communication has served the Commission and the field well and it will continue to be used routinely in the foreseeable future.

Assistance to the Field. In 2012-2013 a variety of activities took place designed to share information about the current accreditation system and its implementation. All technical assistance meetings were broadcast through the web and the broadcast archived for access by stakeholders at: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/webcasts.html>. These included the following:

Date	Technical Assistance Activity By Topic
June 2013	Revised Adapted Physical Education Standards
March 2013	Title II Webcast
March 2013	Interns and English Learners
November 2012	Year Out Previsit for Violet Cohort NCATE Institutions Year Out Previsit for Violet Cohort, Non NCATE Institutions

In addition, workshops were held at the Credential Counselors and Analysts of California annual conference in October 2012. These included specific workshops for those new to accreditation (Accreditation 101) and workshops for those who would be undergoing an accreditation site visit in the near future.

Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission. COA Co-Chairs Anne Jones and Nancy Watkins, on behalf of the Committee on Accreditation, presented its annual report to the Commission at the December 2012 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-12/2012-12-4A.pdf>).

Commission Liaison. Commissioner Louise Stymeist served in this role until the end of her term on the Commission. 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.

Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality

Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs. This is the principal, ongoing task of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing accreditation of institutions and their educator preparation and credential programs. In the 2012-2013 academic year, the Commission's budget situation severely impacted the Commission's ability to carry out its accreditation function. Action taken in June 2012 by the Commission postponed all accreditation site visits previously scheduled for 2012-13 to 2014. The exception to this was to

Bard College, an institution for which the Commission had specifically required an accreditation visit as a condition of its initial institutional approval.

The accreditation activities work plan adopted by the Commission in June 2012 included the recommendation that the Commission continue with any scheduled revisits and special site visits in 2012-13. As a result, the Commission did complete the review of stipulations for 7 institutions. These institutions had site visits in 2011-12 that resulted in stipulations. The Commission's accreditation system requires that institutions with stipulations address the areas of concern within one year. As such, the Commission's follow up of these institutions took place as planned. Of those seven institutions, one institution was revisited in 2012-13 to ensure sufficient progress in addressing issues identified in previous accreditation visits. Another six institutions were reviewed through documentation and evidence and did not require an on-site revisit by an accreditation team. A list of the institutions that had a site visit or revisit in 2012-13 is included in Section II of this report.

Revise and Maintain the Accreditation Handbook. The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. The COA completed a comprehensive review and update of the *Accreditation Handbook* in 2012. These updated chapters are posted on the website currently. In April 2012, the COA adopted a new chapter addressing the accreditation revisit. This was a topic that the COA believed was insufficiently addressed in the previously adopted version of the *Accreditation Handbook*.

Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide the Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested. The COA received updates on Commission activities at each meeting. Examples of topics discussed for 2012-13 include updates on the work related to the Commission's consideration of recommendations from the Teacher Preparation Advisory Panel, preparation to teach English learners, potential changes to Intern programs, and potential changes to the Administrative Services credential.

Train new members of the Board of Institutional Review (BIR) and update current members. Although the Commission adopted a workplan that included a postponement of accreditation site visits, the need for reviewers for both program assessment documents, initial program review, and eventually, for the restart of accreditation site visits necessitated that the Commission continue to train new members of the Board of Institutional Review. A total of two BIR trainings took place in 2012-13: one in southern California and one in northern California. However, the Commission did so in a much different manner than in the past. For 2012-13, the Commission's training adopted the new online/in person hybrid model that was piloted in 2011-12.

The Commission staff developed online training modules to cover approximately half of the accreditation information historically covered in two days of a four-day training. Those registered for the BIR trainings were required to complete the online trainings prior to coming to a shortened 2-day in person training. The face to face aspect of the training included a focus on practicing BIR skills such as interpreting standards, interview practice, strategies for developing a well written accreditation report, as well as clarifying topics covered in the online training modules. Feedback from participants continues to indicate that this model of training where parts are done at the prospective reviewer's convenience while retaining a shortened in person training is effective. Participants appreciate the fact that the shortened face to face training has now allowed some to participate that otherwise would not have been able to with a four day training. Staff has continued to refine the training in order to meet the needs of reviewers and the

feedback suggests that the training is very effective at this time. Conducting trainings in this manner has resulted in significant cost savings to the Commission while maintaining the quality and effectiveness of the training experience. In addition, to limit expenses, the BIR trainings were regionalized in 2012-13, focused on serving those who could commute to and from the training without the need for lodging or airfare.

Because site visits were postponed for 2012-13, team lead and site visit member refresher training was also postponed until site visits resumed. These will be held early in 2014 in order to prepare for the site visits that will take place in spring 2014.

Develop and Pilot a Program Completer Survey. The Commission's adopted activities for 2012-13 included the development of a pilot program completer survey to collect data that can be used in the accreditation process. The Commission staff, working with a small group of stakeholders and interested individuals with experience in survey research, developed a survey that was piloted in the spring of 2013 to those individuals recommended for a preliminary credential. The data collection period closed in August of 2013 and the current effort is centered on examining the results of the pilot, evaluation of the questions used, and discussion of the future of such efforts as a means of gathering data for accreditation. In addition, work continues on the development of additional survey instruments to be completed by mentor and master teachers, and employers as well as at the point of completion of induction, and credential renewal.

Discuss which standards provide the most leverage in terms of program analysis and quality improvements based on data. Among the accreditation activities included in the work plan adopted by the Commission in June 2012 was a recommendation to discuss with the Commission which standards provide the most leverage in terms of program analysis and quality improvement. The COA began this discussion at its August 2012 meeting. This topic continues to be discussed as some foundational work prior to the next standards writing panel is scheduled to begin its work in 2014. COA notes that this recommendation is particularly challenging given the importance of all the standards to quality improvement.

Examine additional potential revenue sources to support the accreditation system by developing a fee recovery system for certain accreditation activities. Among the recommendations approved by the Commission in June 2012 was a recommendation to adopt a fee recovery system for revisits and other activities that exceed the regularly scheduled accreditation activities. This same concept was included in the State Budget for 2012-13 and the Commission adopted such a fee recovery system in September 2013. Emergency regulations were subsequently approved by the Office of Administrative Law. Work continues on implementation of the cost recovery plan.

Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards

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. In all cases, programs are only presented to the COA for initial approval once the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met. A list of the 52 credential programs approved in the 2012-13 year is included in Section II of this report.

Conduct and review program assessment activities. In 2012-13, institutions in the Indigo cohort were working to complete the program assessment process. However, the Commission's action to postpone some accreditation activities impacted this activity. Reviewers continued to

complete the review of those programs in the indigo cohort, and the vast majority of these reviewed took place remotely – with reviewers being sent the documents and the reviewers devoting time on their own schedule, at their homes or offices, working via technology with their program assessment partner. While this approach allowed many of these documents to be completed, it extended the time for reviewers to complete their work and resulted in greater wait time for institutions to receive the results of the review. In addition, the Commission’s action on the 2012-13 work plan resulted in a deferral of document submissions for the Blue cohort. Those in the Blue cohort submitted their documents in the fall of 2013. Those programs that have completed program assessment in 2012-13 are included in Appendix B.

During 2012-13, the Commission also had considerable workload in the Education Specialist area with respect to program assessment. Institutions transitioning to new program standards are provided one year of operation under the new standards prior to submitting a program document. Thirty-six Education Specialist program documents were reviewed in 2012-13 for alignment with the new Education Specialist program standards as the timeline for transitioning many of these programs occurred during 2012-13. Many of these documents were reviewed in two special program assessment review sessions that were made possible through support by the California Department of Education using funds devoted to special education.

Integrate Induction programs into the Commission’s accreditation system. 2012-2013 was the fourth year for inclusion of Induction programs into the Commission’s accreditation system. The Commission’s action in June 2012 postponed visits for all credential programs including induction. Those programs scheduled for a site visit in 2012-13 have been rescheduled for 2013-14. All cohorts continue to submit Biennial Report and program assessment documents.

Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation. The COA typically considers the issues identified by technical assistance review teams in their review of institutions new to the accreditation process in California. Review teams provide technical assistance to these institutions in preparation for a full accreditation site visit. However, because the Commission acted to postpone accreditation site visits, no technical assistance site visits took place in 2012-13. At the time of the writing of this annual report, it is unknown whether the Commission will have the resources to conduct technical assistance visits for these institutions in 2013-14.

Disseminate information related to the Commission’s Common Standards. Ensuring that institutions understand the requirements contained in the Common Standards continued to be an important function during the 2012-13 year. Discussions continued to take place with Commission staff and Cluster Regional Directors, and with the COA on the Common Standards, particularly on Common Standard 2, which has been a difficult standard for institutions to understand. For Common Standard 2, the COA worked to adopt a new template for the Biennial Report Part B, the institutional report, to assist institutions in reporting on unit level data and program improvement efforts at the unit level. 2013-14 will be the first year for use of the new template by institutions. The COA will review the submissions to determine if this effort is effective.

Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment. Because of the highly technical nature of the teaching performance assessment, beginning in 2010 the Commission began to use a small group of experts in three approved models of the teaching performance assessment to review

institutional responses to all standards applicable to the TPA. This strategy was continued in 2012-13 and was generally successful in ensuring the documentation indicated that the programs were designed to meet the standards. In addition, site visit teams scheduled for 2013-14 reviewing a program implementing the TPA will be comprised of at least one individual who had a good understanding of the requirements for the TPA implementation. Commission staff would like to continue to work on additional strategies to ensure that site visit teams are appropriately trained to understand the various complexities of TPA implementation.

Continue the discussion of how the subject matter programs can be included in the accreditation system. Subject matter programs continue to be outside the ongoing accreditation cycle. Resource constraints prohibit integration of these programs into the accreditation system for the foreseeable future.

Work with stakeholders and the Committee on Accreditation to develop a more streamlined and targeted site visit that is cost effective, rigorous, and focused on the essential attributes of high quality educator preparation programs. The 2012-13 accreditation activities adopted by the Commission in June 2012 included a focus on reconsidering the current site visit model. This resulted in the Commission staff focusing its attention on the development of a pilot survey which could possibly identify areas that could be eliminated or further focus a team's attention while at the site. In addition, numerous conversations have taken place regarding various options that could be considered in the future to focus less attention on "inputs" and more attention on "outcomes." These conversations are just at the beginning stages, are highly complex, and will continue with the COA and the Commission in 2013-14.

Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement

Collect, analyze, and report on biennial reports submitted in fall 2012. The 2012-2013 academic year was the sixth full year of implementation of the biennial report component of the revised accreditation system. All institutions in three of the seven cohorts (Yellow, Blue, and Violet) were required to submit candidate competence and performance data in their biennial reports in the fall of 2012. A list of all institutions required to submit biennial reports is included in Appendix B. The CTC feedback form was refined to more clearly indicate beneficial aspects of the biennial report that tied to the data and to program standards for institutions submitting in fall 2012. Calibration of reviewers on data submitted in the biennial report will continue to be important in 2013-14. Timeliness of reviews is also an important focus for the 2013-14 year.

Also included among the 14 recommendations adopted by the Commission in June 2012 was a recommendation to increase the consistency and comprehensiveness of the data collected, analyzed, and reported on for each type of educator preparation program. The recommendation noted that the initial focus for technical assistance efforts in this area would be on the development, analysis, and use of teaching performance assessment data within the biennial reports followed by data provided for the site visit. The fact that the COA was only afforded five one-day meetings made it difficult to discuss this topic to the extent desired. This conversation is ongoing.

Continue development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system. The primary source of data about the accreditation system comes at the culmination of the site visit. Institutional representatives, team members, and team leads are surveyed to determine what aspects of the accreditation system worked well and which ones need improvement. With the postponement of site visits in 2012-13, no new data was available. The Commission staff is working to ensure that

the evaluation tool available to institutions, team members, and team leads for spring of 2014 is informative and provides the Commission with data to improve the accreditation process. The evaluation data from site visit teams and institutions will be reviewed and discussed with the COA in summer 2014.

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 Partnership Agreement with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) was scheduled to expire in 2012. In 2011-12, the COA approved modifications to the NCATE Partnership.

With the unification of NCATE and TEAC into the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), the Commission used 2012-13 to closely monitor the unification process and the development of new national (CAEP) standards. Commission staff monitored the developments and attended the annual state clinic hosted by CAEP. In addition, Commission staff submitted comments to the CAEP board on the proposed standards and their potential impact on California institutions. CAEP standards were adopted in August of 2013. With this adoption, the Commission has begun the process of examining the alignment with the Commission's adopted standards, and determining the appropriate partnership agreement for 2014 and beyond.

Monitor the 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. Although the TEAC partnership agreement expired in 2012, the unification of TEAC and NCATE into CAEP make renegotiation of a TEAC protocol no longer necessary.

Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes. During 2012-13, the Commission staff completed a crosswalk of the Commission adopted Pupil Personnel Services School Social Work standards with that of the Council on Social Work Education and Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (CSWE-EPAS). This adopted alignment matrix is added to those previously adopted including those for the American Speech Language Hearing Association (ASHA), the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), and the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP).

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 2012-13 Accreditation Activities**

This section of the report provides more detailed information about elements of the 2012-13 Work Plan pertaining to accreditation activities.

Professional Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Credential Preparation Programs

2012-13 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, 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 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 2012-13:

COA Accreditation Decisions 2012-13 Visits	
Program Sponsor	Accreditation Decision
Bard College	Accreditation with Stipulations

In addition, in 2012-13, a review of 7 institutions with stipulations resulting from a site visit in 2011-12 was conducted. In addition, the COA requested a 7th year report for an additional 2 institutions with reviews in 2011-12 that earned full accreditation. After these revisits and reviews, the COA made the following decisions:

2012-13 Accreditation Follow-Up		
Revisits		
Program Sponsor	2011-12 Decision	2012-13 Revisit Decision
UCLA	Accreditation w/Stipulations	Accreditation
Submission of Documentation Addressing Stipulations		
Program Sponsor	2011-12 Decision	2012-13 Decision
High Tech High*	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
CSU Sacramento	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation* *
REACH	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation** *
Burbank USD	Accreditation (7 th Year Report)	Accreditation
Temple City USD	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Pacific Union College	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation with Stipulations
UC Berkeley	Accreditation (7 th Year Report)	Accreditation
Pepperdine University	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation

*Initial site visit took place in 2010-11

**Due to the lack of a quorum, action was formally taken in August 2013

***Action was formally taken in August 2013

Analysis of Standard Decisions

The Commission's revised Common Standards (2008) and all appropriate credential program standards were utilized in the accreditation site visits in 2012-13.

Typically, 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 prepared for site visits. However, because only one site visit was conducted in 2012 as a result of Commission direction, this data is extremely limited and therefore do not yield any useable information for this purpose. The information regarding findings on the Common Standards from the one spring 2012 site visit is presented in the following table.

Findings on the Common Standards 2011-2012 Accreditation Site Visits			
	Standard Findings		
	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 1: Education Leadership		1	
Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation		1	
Standard 3: Resources	1		
Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel	1		
Standard 5: Admission	1		
Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	1		
Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice		1	
Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors		1	
Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence	1		

A summary of the information gathered on the single subject preliminary educator preparation program at this year's site visit is presented in the table below. If a standard is not listed, the institution met that standard. As with the information about the Common Standards, this information about 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.

Preliminary Single Subject Standards (1 site visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
2: Communication and Coordination	1	
8: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject Specific Content Instruction	1	
13: Preparation to Teach Special Populations	1	

Technical Assistance Site Visits

Technical Assistance site visits are conducted with new programs two years after receiving initial institutional approval from the Commission. Because of the Commission's fiscal constraints, no technical assistance site visits took place in 2012-13.

Initial Approval 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 Commission-adopted program 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 standards documents 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 met, reviewers request specifically what additional information is needed. This feedback is shared with the institution by the CTC staff. In addition, the institution submits a response to all relevant program specific preconditions and Common Standards (or a Common Standards addendum if the institution has recently submitted a full Common Standards document) that are reviewed by Commission staff. When all standards are found to be met and all relevant preconditions are determined to be addressed, Commission staff forwards the item, along with a paragraph about the program written by the institution, to the COA to be included on the agenda for the next scheduled meeting. The 2012-2013 Initial Program Approval actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation are listed in the tables below.

Preliminary Single Subject (2)
Academy of Art University (Art)
William Jessup University (English)

General Education (MS/SS) Induction (1)
King-Chavez Academy of Excellence

Bilingual Authorization (3)
California State University, Fullerton (Korean)
California State University, Los Angeles (Spanish, Korean, Cantonese, Mandarin, and Filipino [Tagalog])
Chapman University (Spanish)

Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Disabilities (1)
Biola University

Preliminary Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Disabilities (1)
Whittier College

Preliminary Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing (1)
Mount Saint Mary's College

Clear Induction Education Specialist (19)
Antelope Valley Union High School District
California State University, Bakersfield
California State University, Fullerton
Corona-Norco Unified School District
Fremont Unified School District
Fresno County Office of Education
High Tech High
Kern High School District
Lancaster School District
Long Beach Unified School District
Los Angeles Unified School District
Merced Union High School District
Mt. Diablo Unified School District
Poway Unified School District
Santa Clara Unified School District
Selma Unified School District
San Marcos Unified School District
Tulare City School District
Westside Union School District

Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder (2)
National Hispanic University
San Diego Unified School District

Education Specialist Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education (3)
California Baptist University
Brandman University
Wiseburn School District

Education Specialist Added Authorization: Deaf and Blind (1)
San Diego County Office of Education

Education Specialist Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance (1)
San Diego County Office of Education

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (2)
San Diego County Office of Education
University of Southern California

Clear Administrative Services (11)
El Dorado County Office of Education
Fresno County Office of Education
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Merced County Office of Education
Orange County Department of Education

Clear Administrative Services (11)
Sacramento County Office of Education
San Joaquin County Office of Education
Shasta County Office of Education
Stanislaus County Office of Education
Teachers College of San Joaquin
Ventura County Office of Education

Designated Subjects: Adult Education (3)
Davis Unified School District
Los Angeles County Office of Education
San Diego County Office of Education

Teacher Librarian Services Credential: Special Class Authorization (1)
Fresno Pacific University

Transitioned Programs

In 2012-13 institutions continued to transition their existing programs from prior standards to newly adopted standards. Beginning with the Education Specialist standards revision, the Commission implemented a standard transition process that parallels the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) process, which required that all accredited institutions meet the revised standards as of a specific date. This process was used successfully when the NCATE adopted its updated Unit Standards. When an institution has transitioned to new standards it is now required to submit updated standards within one year, or during the next regularly scheduled program assessment if it falls within an acceptable time frame. The institution is then evaluated against the updated standards. Provided below is the list of programs that transitioned in 2012-13.

Added Authorization: Adapted Physical Education (2)
California State University, Los Angeles
San Jose State University

Speech-Language Pathology Services (1)
California State University, Northridge

Speech-Language Pathology: Special Class Authorization (1)
California State University, Northridge

Teacher Librarian Services Credential (3)
California State University, Long Beach
Fresno Pacific University
San Jose State University

Reading Certificate (21)
California Lutheran University
California State University, Fresno
California State University, Fullerton
California State University, Los Angeles

Reading Certificate (21)
California State University, Northridge
California State University, Sacramento
California State University, San Bernardino
California State University, San Marcos
California State University, Stanislaus
Fresno Pacific University
Loyola Marymount University
National University
Point Loma Nazarene University
San Francisco State University
San Jose State University
St. Mary's College of California
University of California Irvine
University of California Riverside
University of California San Diego
University of San Francisco
University of Southern California

Reading and Language Arts Specialist (13)
California State University, Fresno
California State University, Fullerton
California State University, Los Angeles
California State University, Northridge
California State University, Sacramento
California State University, San Bernardino
California State University, San Marcos
California State University, Stanislaus
Loyola Marymount University
San Francisco State University
St. Mary's College of California
University of California Riverside
University of La Verne

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. Inactive status does not excuse an institution from accreditation activities. All inactive programs must participate in accreditation activities in a modified manner as determined by the Commission. The following programs noted below were declared to be in an Inactive status in 2012-13.

Professional Preparation Programs Entering Inactive Status in 2012-13 (13)	
Institution	Program
UC Davis	Reading Certificate
California State University, San Bernardino	Ed Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders
	Ed Specialist Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education
Humboldt State University	Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Internship
University of Southern California	PPS: School Counseling
University of California Irvine	Single Subject Intern: English
	Single Subject Intern: Math
	Single Subject Intern: Science
	Single Subject Intern: Spanish
Sweetwater UHSD	General Education (MS/SS) Induction
Burbank USD	General Education (MS/SS) Induction
Greenfield Union SD	General Education (MS/SS) Induction
Magnolia Public Schools: Pacific Technology School-Orange County	General Education (MS/SS) Induction

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. A minimum of two years is required before an institution may submit a new program proposal for the program that has been withdrawn. Three institutions withdrew four programs in the 2012-13 year.

Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (4)	
Institution	Program
Salinas Union High School District	Designated Subjects: Adult Education
Stanford University	CTEL
Western Governors University	Multiple Subject Intern
	Single Subject Intern

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 re-activate 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. During 2012-13, only one program previously deemed inactive requested and received reactivation and is once again a fully approved program operating in California.

Reactivation Requests in 2012-2013	
Institution	Program
San Jose State University	Multiple Subject Intern Program

Initial Institutional Approval

The Committee on Accreditation does not have authority to approve the eligibility of institutions to offer educator preparation programs in California. Rather, initial institutional approval is within the purview of the Commission. Once the Commission determines that an institution is eligible to offer educator preparation in California, the program proposals by those institutions are brought forward to the COA for its consideration and action. The institutions granted initial institutional approval by the Commission in 2012-13 are listed below:

Institutions Granted Initial Institutional Approval by the Commission 2012-13	
Institution	Program
Academy of Art University	Single Subject Art Program
King-Chavez Academy of Excellence	General Education (MS/SS) Induction
Shasta County Office of Education	Clear Administrative Services

Institutions that No Longer are Approved Program Sponsors

If an institution closes or if an institution withdraws all of its educator preparation programs, the institution would cease to be a Commission approved program sponsor. During 2012-13, there were no institutions that ceased to be a Commission-approved program sponsor.

**Section III:
Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2013-14**

On June 14, 2012, the Commission approved 14 recommendations related to implementation of the Commission's accreditation system in 2012-13. This discussion was precipitated by the Commission's challenging fiscal situation in which staff has determined that the operational funding is insufficient in 2012-13 to implement the accreditation system as designed. The Commission was faced with the difficult decision of having to postpone all accreditation site visits for one year. <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-06/2012-06-6B.pdf>.

Accreditation site visits and all accreditation activities have resumed in 2013-14, however, the Commission's fiscal challenges continue into this current fiscal year. The Commission is committed to continuing accreditation activities in the most cost effective manner possible, while seeking possible long term remedies to ensure that the Commission can carry out its mandate in future years. For 2013-14, the COA identifies the following priorities.

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

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 7, 2013
October 10-11, 2013
February 6-7, 2014
April 24-25, 2014
June 26-27, 2014

To economize, the August 2013 meeting was held via conference call (with proper notice pursuant to the Bagley Keene Open Meeting Law). Unlike the 2012-13 year, the Committee's schedule has been adjusted to reflect the workload of a full schedule of site visits this upcoming spring.

Continuing in 2013-14, the *PSD ENews*, 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.

Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission. The Committee on Accreditation will present its annual report to the Commission in December 2013. Additional updates and reports to the Commission will be provided as necessary and appropriate throughout the year.

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.

Implementation of a fee recovery system for certain accreditation activities, pending approval by the Office of Administrative Law. As previously discussed, the Commission adopted a cost recovery plan, and associated emergency regulations, for the review of new programs and for accreditation activities outside the typical accreditation cycle. The Commission staff will work toward approval of the (nonemergency) regulations and on procedures to ensure the implementation of this plan. Particular attention will need to be paid to ensuring a fiscal process to invoice institutions, refining processes to ensure timeliness of reviews, and to establishing a procedure to keep track of reviewer assignments to credit institutions for in kind assistance in order to waive fees for initial program review.

Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality

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. Accreditation site visits resume in 2013-14.

Attention is being paid to ensuring cost effectiveness in reviews. In particular, the number of team members has been reduced to the essential number of reviewers to complete the task. In addition, all site visits with one or two similar programs (such as General Education Induction and Clear Education Specialist Induction) are reduced by one day for a total of three days, two nights instead of four days, three nights. Experience over the past couple of years with accreditation illustrate that this length of time is sufficient for institutions with a small number of programs, all of which have been found in program assessment to be preliminarily aligned. This action will reduce cost involved in the review while still ensuring a sufficient length of time for a thorough review.

Review and revise the Accreditation Handbook. The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. The COA completed a comprehensive review and update of the *Accreditation Handbook* in 2012. The Commission staff does not anticipate a wholesale review and revision of the *Handbook* during the 2013-14 year, however, revisions and additions may occur as necessary.

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.

Continue efforts to develop surveys for use in accreditation. As previously discussed, the Commission's adopted activities for 2012-13 include the development of a pilot program complete survey to collect data that can be used in the accreditation process. The Commission staff worked with stakeholders to develop and pilot the first of these surveys in the spring of 2013. Additional effort will be made during the 2013-14 year to examine the use of the data collected during the pilot, determine how it might be brought to scale, and used for accreditation purposes in the future. In addition, the Commission plans to further develop additional surveys

to be completed by candidates completing induction programs, master and mentor teacher, and employers.

Discuss which standards provide the most leverage in terms of program analysis and quality improvements based on data. The Commission's adopted activities for 2012-13 included a recommendation that the COA discuss with the Commission which standards provide the most leverage in terms of program analysis and quality improvements based on data. The COA began this discussion at its August 2012 meeting. It was noted that this recommendation is particularly challenging due to the view that all of the standards are important to quality programs. The COA will continue to explore this topic in greater depth in 2013-14. This conversation will help inform the Commission as it begins its work on the development of the next iteration of the Multiple and Single Subject teaching credential standards in 2014.

Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards

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 will only be given initial approval when the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met. This review process will continue in 2013-14 despite budget constraints. Depending on the response of reviewers and institutions to the cost recovery plan, most reviews are expected to be conducted remotely with reviewers communicating with one another via technology. However, there are significant drawbacks to this approach, most importantly the amount of time it takes to provide feedback to the institution. The adoption of the cost recovery plan should assist in ensuring greater timeliness of reviews by allowing the Commission some resources to bring reviewers together for some dedicated review time, as well as encouraging the participation of additional reviewers from the in kind contribution option.

Conduct and review program assessment activities. In 2013-14, institutions in the Blue cohort will begin the program assessment process. The Blue cohort was originally scheduled to submit documents in the fall of 2012, however, the action taken by the Commission in June 2012 included the postponement of the submission of these documents until fall of 2013. (A cohort list is provided in Appendix C.)

In addition, the Commission continues to complete the workload associated with the transition of Education Specialist documents for programs that transitioned to the revised standards. As previously discussed, institutions transitioning to new program standards are provided one year of operation under the new standards prior to submitting a program document, unless he timelines are acceptable for submission during the regular program assessment period. Thirty-six program assessment documents were reviewed in 2012-13 for alignment with the new Education Specialist program standards; more remain for review and will be completed in 2013-14.

Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation. The COA typically considers the issues identified by technical assistance review teams in their review of institutions new to the accreditation process in California. Review teams provide technical assistance to these institutions in preparation for a full accreditation site visit. It is still unclear at this time whether the resources are available to conduct the one technical assistance site visit scheduled for 2013-14. Because site visits are a higher priority than technical assistance visits, the administrators in the Professional Services Division will make this determination later in the fiscal year, when actual expenditures are known for site visits.

Disseminate information related to the Commission's Common Standards and Program Standards. Efforts to assist institutions in understanding the Commission's Common and Program Standards will continue in 2013-14 through a variety of strategies. Common Standard 2 will continue to be a primary focus of these efforts. As standards are revised and adopted by the Commission, such as the Administrator Preparation Standards, webinars will be made available to the field to assist them in understanding the changes that these new standards require.

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 programs.

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. Due to budget constraints, this work is not scheduled to take place in 2013-14. However, revised subject matter requirements for Mathematics and English to align with the Common Core necessitate that approved subject matter programs in these disciplines revise their coursework. The Commission has requested all approved subject matter programs in Mathematics and English Language Arts to resubmit their alignment matrices by June 2014 to demonstrate alignment with the newly adopted SMRs.

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 continued through 2012-13. Discussions about how well these strategies are working will continue to be part of the streamlining discussion about accreditation in general. Additional strategies are necessary to recruit individuals with expertise in the teaching performance assessment models to assist in related accreditation activities. Further training will be considered to better prepare site visit team members reviewing the implementation of the teaching performance assessment.

Work with stakeholders and the Committee on Accreditation to develop a more streamlined and targeted site visit model that is cost effective, rigorous, and focused on the essential attributes of high quality educator preparation. The 2012-13 accreditation activities adopted by the Commission in June 2012 included a focus on reconsidering the current site visit model. Although some of the activities listed in this work plan could result in a more cost effective, streamlined site visit (such as the use of a program completer survey), the COA will continue to work with the Commission and discuss this topic throughout 2013-14.

Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement

Collect, analyze, and report on the biennial reports submitted in fall 2013. The 2012-2013 academic year will be the sixth full year of implementation of the biennial report component of the revised accreditation system. All institutions in the Orange, Green, and Indigo cohorts are required to submit candidate competence and performance data in Fall 2013. The recommendations adopted by the Commission in June 2012 included the recommendation to continue with the biennial report submission, review, and feedback for all institutions as currently scheduled for 2012-13.

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.)

Also included among the 14 recommendations adopted by the Commission in June 2012 was a recommendation to increase the consistency and comprehensiveness of the data collected, analyzed and reported on for each type of educator preparation program. The recommendation noted that the initial focus for technical assistance efforts in this area would be on the development, analysis, and use of teaching performance assessment data within the biennial reports followed by data provided for the site visit. COA anticipates spending considerable time in 2013-14 on this topic assisting staff and experts in each of the credential areas in identifying and employing strategies to assist the field in this regard across all credential areas.

The COA will attempt to bring together individuals to determine whether experts from the field should review biennial reports. This pilot was scheduled for the 2012-13 year, but due to budget constraints and limited staff time, was not able to be implemented. The purpose, as described in the June 2012 Commission agenda item is to develop a process for building capacity within preparation programs to think deeply about candidate assessment data, the analysis of the data, and the use of data to drive program improvement.

Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system. With site visits resuming in 2013-14, the COA plans to refine the evaluation tool that is used by site visit reviewers, team leads, and institutions to evaluate the accreditation system. This data will be collected over the course of the year, with a review of the data taking place in the summer of 2014. Improvements to the system based upon those data can then be considered by the COA in Fall of 2014. Additional work will be undertaken to improve the information the Commission has about the efficacy of program assessment and biennial reporting.

Continue partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (formerly the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council) 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 through 2013-14 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. With the unification of TEAC and NCATE into CAEP, and the adoption of new national educator preparation standards, the COA will first determine the alignment of the new standards with the Commission's Common Standards. Once that task is completed, the COA can begin to work on the development of the new Partnership Agreement with CAEP.

Because the current Partnership Agreement depends heavily on the fact that the NCATE standards and the Commission adopted Common Standards are closely aligned, it is unclear at this time what aspects of the Partnership Agreement could remain and which would need to be significantly revised. The adoption of the new CAEP standards could significantly alter the way in which the Commission and CAEP operate joint reviews. Discussions will take place throughout 2013-14 year by COA, and perhaps, the Commission itself, as this issue develops further.

Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes. As previously mentioned, during 2012-13, the COA adopted the standards crosswalk illustrating alignment between the PPS: School Social Work standards and the Council on Social Work Education Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (CSWE-EPAS) 2008. In 2013-14, it is unlikely further work will continue on additional alignments.

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
Recommendations Related to Implementing the
Commission's Accreditation System in 2012-13
Adopted by the Commission – June 2012

1. **Continue with the Biennial Report submission, review and feedback for all approved institutions as currently scheduled for 2012-13.** Submission dates have been selected by the institutions, with the first round of submissions currently arriving at CTC.
2. **Develop and implement a pilot where program directors/leaders come to the CTC (or another central location) to review Biennial Reports, with an initial focus on one type of educator preparation program to facilitate the pilot activities.** The purpose of the pilot would be to develop a process for building capacity within the preparation program to think deeply about candidate assessment data, the analysis of the data, and using data to drive program improvement.
3. **Increase the consistency and comprehensiveness of the data collected, analyzed, and reported on for each type of educator preparation program.** An efficient process would be to work with program sponsors to help them work with and incorporate data in future reports, possibly through a webinar. The initial focus for technical assistance efforts would be on the development, analysis, and use of teaching performance assessment data within the biennial reports, and the subsequent focus would be on the use of performance assessment data within the site visit process to help focus the visit on candidate outcomes and program quality issues.
4. **Continue with the Program Assessment process for all institutions in the Violet and Indigo cohorts.** This will allow the programs sponsored by the institutions in the Violet and Indigo cohorts to complete the review, and redesign if necessary, of each approved program. In addition, program assessment for Education Specialist programs that have transitioned will also be important.
5. **Postpone the beginning of Program Assessment for institutions in the other five cohorts by one year.** The Blue cohort would submit in Fall 2013 rather than Fall 2012 and each of the other cohorts would be deferred by one year as well.
6. **Discuss with the Commission which standards provide the most leverage in terms of program analysis and quality improvements based on data.** A list of key essential standards would serve to focus programs on a smaller number of higher impact, essential standards than is presently the case.
7. **Provide technical assistance for program-specific groups to discuss and build understanding of the Commission's Common and program standards and clarify the essential attributes in the adopted standards.** Webinars could be a part of these activities and the webinar would be archived for later reference.
8. **Postpone all initial site visits scheduled for 2012-13 until 2013-14, and postpone subsequent visits by one year.** Use the 2012-13 year to provide technical assistance for institutions in preparation for the site visit (i.e., developing Preconditions reports, support for developing Common Standards narratives and electronic exhibits that are streamlined but allow an institution the ability to demonstrate ways it addresses the Commission's standards. Work to help all institutions scheduled for visits in 13-14 to be efficiently prepared for the site visit programs.

9. **Conduct the scheduled accreditation revisits and special site visit scheduled for 2012-13.** When prudent, decrease the size of the team and/or the length of the visit to complete the visits in an economical yet rigorous manner.
10. **Develop and pilot a program completer survey to collect data that can be used in the accreditation process.** The survey would provide information relative to both the Common and program standards and could focus the site visit beginning with the visits in 2013-14.
11. **Work with stakeholders and the Committee on Accreditation to develop a more streamlined and targeted site visit model that is cost effective, rigorous, and focuses on the essential attributes of high quality educator preparation.** Discussions could take place with the COA over the course of 2012-13 and if it is determined that a revision to the site visit model, a pilot could occur in 2013-14.
12. **Develop a fee recovery system for accreditation revisits and other activities that exceed the regularly scheduled accreditation activities.** Use the 2012-13 year to explore whether a fee recovery system is appropriate for any part of accreditation.
13. **Continue to review program proposals in 12-13 through a distance reading process.** CTC staff would monitor and mediate the work between readers and between readers and the program.
14. **Develop a fee recovery system whereby new programs and new institutions would be assessed a fee to cover the cost for reviewing the new program or institutional proposal.** Use the 2012-13 year to explore whether a fee recovery system is appropriate for any part of accreditation.

**Appendix B
Accreditation Activities 2012-13 and 2013-14**

Biennial Reports Submitted in Fall 2012

YELLOW COHORT	BLUE COHORT	VIOLET COHORT
California State University		
Northridge	Fullerton	Fresno
San Diego State		San Francisco State
Stanislaus		Monterey Bay
University of California		
	Riverside	Davis
		Irvine
		San Diego
Private/Independents		
Biola University	Alliant International University	Antioch University
Fresno Pacific University	Bard College	Argosy University
Loyola Marymount University	Dominican University of CA	Claremont Graduate University
National Hispanic University	Drexel University	Hebrew Union College
San Diego Christian College	Holy Names University	Hope International University
Santa Clara University	Loma Linda University	La Sierra University
Touro University	Phillips Graduate Institute	National University
Whittier College	Stanford University	Pacific Oaks College
William Jessup University	United States University	University of Southern California
	Vanguard University	
Local Education Agencies		
Anaheim City SD	Bellflower USD	Antelope Valley Union HSD
Capistrano USD	CA School for the Deaf	Compton USD
Chino Valley USD	Chaffey Joint Union HSD	Cupertino Union SD
Clovis USD	Corona-Norco USD	El Dorado COE
Etiwanda SD	Elk Grove USD	Envision Schools
Lodi USD	Encinitas Union SD	Escondido Union HSD
Napa COE	Escondido Union SD	ICEF Public Schools/LAUSD
Ontario-Montclair SD	Fresno USD	Imperial COE
Panama-Buena Vista Union SD	Glendale USD	Irvine USD
Pomona USD	Greenfield Union SD	Keppel Union SD
Riverside USD	Grossmont Union HSD	Kern County SOS
Rowland USD	Kern High SD	Los Banos USD
Saddleback Valley USD	Lawndale ESD	Murrieta Valley USD
San Gabriel USD	Long Beach USD	New Haven USD
Santa Clara USD	Magnolia Public Schools: Pacific Technology School--Orange County	Norwalk-La Mirada USD
Santa Cruz COE	Mt. Diablo USD: Fortune School of Education	Palo Alto USD
Sonoma COE	Oak Grove SD	Palos Verdes Peninsula USD
Stanislaus COE	PUC Schools	Sacramento City USD
Sweetwater Union HSD	San Luis Obispo COE	Salinas Union HSD-Adult School
Walnut Valley USD	San Mateo COE	San Francisco USD
	Tehama County DOE	Sanger USD
	Torrance USD	Sequoia Union HSD
	Tulare COE	Selma USD

YELLOW COHORT	BLUE COHORT	VIOLET COHORT
	Tustin USD	Washington USD
	Palmdale SD	Wm. S. Hart Union HSD
	Vallejo City USD	
	Wiseburn SD	
Other Sponsors		
		Boston Reed College

Biennial Reports Due Fall 2013 (Data from 2011-2012 and 2012-2013)		
ORANGE COHORT	GREEN COHORT	INDIGO COHORT
California State University		
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo	Channel Islands	Cal Poly, Pomona
CalState TEACH	East Bay	Chico
Sacramento	San Bernardino	Humboldt
San Jose State		Long Beach
		San Marcos
University of California		
Santa Barbara		
Private/Independents		
California Baptist University	Cal Lutheran University	Azusa Pacific University
Chapman University	Humphreys College	Brandman University
St. Mary's College of CA	Mills College	Fielding Graduate University
The Master's College	Notre Dame de Namur University	Mount St. Mary's College
University of La Verne	Patten University	Teachers College of San Joaquin
University of Phoenix	Simpson University	University of Redlands
University of the Pacific	Western Governors University	University of San Francisco
	Westmont College	
Local Education Agencies		
Alhambra USD	Antioch USD	Animo Leadership Charter HS (Green Dot)
Anaheim Union HSD	Bakersfield City SD	Baldwin Park USD
Aspire Public Schools	Castaic Union SD	Brentwood Union SD
Azusa USD	Evergreen SD	Central USD
Butte COE	Fairfield-Suisun USD	Fullerton SD
Conejo Valley USD	Fresno COE	High Tech High
El Rancho USD	Garden Grove USD	Lancaster SD
Fontana USD	Hacienda La Puente USD	Madera USD
Fremont USD	La Mesa-Spring Valley SD	Metropolitan Education District
Hayward USD	Los Angeles COE	Monterey COE
Kings COE	Madera COE	Ocean View SD
Merced Union HSD	Merced COE	Orange County DOE
Milpitas USD	Montebello USD	Pasadena USD
Modesto City Schools	Newark USD	Placentia-Yorba Linda USD
Paramount USD	Oceanside USD	Sacramento COE
Rialto USD	San Bernardino City USD	San Diego USD
San Marcos USD	San Diego COE	San Dieguito Union HSD
Santa Barbara CEO	San Juan USD	San Joaquin COE
Santa Rosa City Schools	San Mateo-Foster City SD	San Jose USD
School for Integrated Science and Technology (SIA Tech)	Saugus Union SD	San Ramon Valley USD

ORANGE COHORT	GREEN COHORT	INDIGO COHORT
West Contra Costa USD	Santa Ana USD	Santa Clara COE
	Shasta COE	Santa Monica-Malibu USD
		Stockton USD
		Tracy USD
		Ventura COE
		Visalia USD
		Vista USD
		West Covina USD
		Westside Union SD
Other Sponsors		
ACSA		

Program Assessment

Institutions completing Program Assessment in 2012-13: Violet Cohort and Indigo Cohort

Institutions Beginning Program Assessment (resumption of PA) in 2013-14: Blue Cohort

2013-14 Site Visits (Violet Cohort)

Antelope Valley Union HSD	Murrieta Valley USD
Antioch University	National University
Claremont Graduate University	New Haven USD
Compton USD	Pacific Oaks College
CSU Fresno	Palo Alto USD
CSU Monterey Bay	Palos Verdes Peninsula USD
San Francisco State University	Sacramento City USD
Cupertino Union SD	Salinas Union HSD-Adult School
El Dorado COE	San Francisco USD
Envision Schools	Sanger USD
Hebrew Union College	Selma USD
Hope International University	Sequoia Union HSD
ICEF Public Schools/LAUSD	UC Davis
Imperial COE	UC Irvine
Irvine USD	UC San Diego
Kern County SOS	University of Southern California
La Sierra University	Washington USD
Los Banos USD	Wm. S. Hart Union HSD

Appendix C
2013-2014 Accreditation Activities at a Glance
For a list of all institutions in each cohort, please see Appendix D

Biennial Reports		
Due Fall 2013	Orange Cohort	Green Cohort
Program Assessment Documents Due		
Blue Cohort		
Institutions with a Site Visits		
Violet Cohort		
Institutions with a Revisit		
Bard College CSU Dominguez Hills		
Institutions with a Technical Assistance Visit		
California School for the Deaf <i>(resources may not be available for technical assistance visits)</i>		

**Appendix D
Cohort Membership by Institution**

Cohort	RED	ORANGE	YELLOW
2012-2013	Year 7 7th Year Follow-Up	Year 1 --	Year 2 Biennial Report
	CSU	CSU	CSU
	Dominguez Hills Los Angeles Sonoma State	Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo CalState TEACH Sacramento San Jose State	Northridge San Diego State Stanislaus
	UC	UC	UC
	Berkeley Los Angeles Santa Cruz	Santa Barbara	--
	LEA	LEA	LEA
	Arcadia USD Bay Area School of Enterprise/REACH Burbank USD Cajon Valley Union SD Campbell Union SD Chula Vista ESD Contra Costa COE Culver City USD Davis Joint USD Dos Palos Oro Lomo JUSD Hanford ESD Los Angeles USD Manteca USD Marin COE Oakland USD Orange USD Placer COE Pleasanton USD Poway USD Redwood City SD Riverside COE Sutter County SOS Temple City USD Tulare City SD	Alhambra USD Anaheim Union HSD Aspire Public Schools Azusa USD Butte COE Conejo Valley USD El Rancho USD Fontana USD Fremont USD Hayward USD Kings COE Merced Union HSD Milpitas USD Modesto City Schools Paramount USD Rialto USD San Marcos USD Santa Barbara CEO Santa Rosa City Schools School for Integrated Science and Technology/SIA Tech West Contra Costa USD	Anaheim City SD Capistrano USD Chino Valley USD Clovis USD Etiwanda SD Lodi USD Napa COE Ontario-Montclair SD Panama-Buena Vista Union SD Pomona USD Riverside USD Rowland USD Saddleback Valley USD San Gabriel USD Santa Clara USD Santa Cruz COE Sonoma COE Stanislaus COE Sweetwater Union HSD Walnut Valley USD
	Private/Independent	Private/Independent	Private/Independent
	Concordia University Pacific Union College Pepperdine University Point Loma Nazarene University of San Diego	California Baptist University Chapman University St. Mary's College of Calif. The Master's College University of La Verne University of Phoenix University of the Pacific	Academy of Art Biola University Fresno Pacific University Loyola Marymount University National Hispanic University San Diego Christian College Santa Clara University Touro University Whittier College William Jessup University
	Other Sponsors	Other Sponsors	Other Sponsors
		ACSA	
Total	35	34	32
Site Visit	2019-2020	2018-2019	2017-2018

Cohort	GREEN	BLUE	INDIGO	VIOLET
2012-2013	Year 3 Biennial Report	Year 4 --	Year 5 Biennial Report	Year 6 --
	CSU	CSU	CSU	CSU
	Channel Islands East Bay San Bernardino	Fullerton	Bakersfield Cal Poly, Pomona Chico Humboldt Long Beach San Marcos	Fresno San Francisco State Monterey Bay
	UC	UC	UC	UC
	--	Riverside	--	Davis Irvine San Diego
	LEA	LEA	LEA	LEA
	Antioch USD Bakersfield City SD Castaic Union SD Evergreen SD Fairfield-Suisun City SD Fresno COE Garden Grove USD Hacienda La Puente USD King Chavez La Mesa-Spring Valley SD Los Angeles COE Madera COE Merced COE Montebello USD Newark USD Oceanside USD San Bernardino City Schools San Diego COE San Juan USD San Mateo-Foster Santa Ana USD Saugus Union SD	Bellflower USD CA School for the Deaf Chaffey Joint Union HSD Corona-Norco USD Elk Grove USD Encinitas Union SD Escondido Union SD Fresno USD Glendale USD Greenfield Union SD Grossmont Union HSD Kern High SD Lawndale ESD Long Beach USD Magnolia Schools: Pacific Technology Mt. Diablo USD/Fortune School Oak Grove SD Palmdale SD PUC Schools San Luis Obispo COE San Mateo COE Tehama County DOE Torrance USD Tulare COE Tustin USD Vallejo City USD Wiseburn SD	Animo Leadership Charter HS: Green Dot Baldwin Park USD Brentwood Union SD Central USD Fullerton SD High Tech High Lancaster SD Madera USD Metropolitan Education District Monterey COE Ocean View SD Orange County DOE Pasadena USD Placentia-Yorba Linda USD Sacramento COE San Diego USD San Dieguito Union HSD San Joaquin COE San Jose USD San Ramon Valley USD Santa Clara COE Santa Monica-Malibu USD Stockton USD Tracy USD Ventura COE Visalia USD West Covina USD Vista USD West Covina USD Westside Union SD	Antelope Valley Union HSD Compton USD Cupertino Union SD El Dorado COE Envision Schools Escondido Union HSD ICEF Public Schools (LAUSD) Imperial COE Irvine USD Keppel Union SD Kern County SOS Los Banos USD Murrieta Valley USD New Haven USD Newport-Mesa USD Norwalk-La Mirada USD Palo Alto USD Palos Verdes Peninsula USD Sacramento City USD San Francisco USD Sanger USD Selma USD Sequoia Union HSD Washington USD Wm. S. Hart Union HSD

	Private/Independent	Private/Independent	Private/Independent	Private/Independent
	Cal Lutheran Univ. Humphreys College Mills College Notre Dame de Namur Univ. Patten University Simpson University Western Governors Univ. Westmont College	Alliant International University Bard College Dominican University Drexel University Holy Names University Loma Linda University Phillips Graduate University Stanford University United States University Vanguard University	Azusa Pacific University Brandman University Fielding Graduate University Mount St. Mary's College Teachers College of San Joaquin University of Redlands University of San Francisco	Antioch University Argosy University Claremont Graduate University Hebrew Union College Hope International Univ. La Sierra University National University Pacific Oaks College University of Southern California
	Other Sponsors	Other Sponsors	Other Sponsors	Other Sponsors
	--	--	--	Boston Reed
Total	32	39	42	42
Site Visit	2016-2017	2015-2016	2014-2015	2013-2014