

---

# 2C

## Information

### *Educator Preparation Committee*

#### Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents the 2014-15 Annual Accreditation Report from the Committee on Accreditation.

**Policy Question:** Does this Annual Report provide sufficient information about the Commission's Accreditation activities for 2014-15?

**Recommended Action:** For information only

**Presenter:** Cheryl Hickey, Administrator, Professional Services Division.

#### 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.

---

---

# Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation

---

---

## Introduction

This agenda item presents the *2014-15 Annual Accreditation Report* from the Committee on Accreditation (COA). Section I of the report describes the major accomplishments of the Committee's 2014-15 Work Plan, which is organized around the four identified purposes of accreditation as defined in the *Accreditation Framework*. Section II of the report presents a summary of the accreditation actions taken in 2014-15. Section III provides the 2015-2016 Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation. And finally, Section IV provides a summary of actions by institutions to address stipulations placed upon them as a result of accreditation reviews in 2013-14.

## 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 attached *2014-15 Annual Accreditation Report* reviews the accreditation decisions made by the COA during 2014-15, including specific information about the Committee's decisions during 2014-15 to grant initial accreditation to new programs of professional preparation. The report also presents information about the 2015-16 Work Plan, in particular highlighting the significant and continuing work to strengthen and streamline the Commission's accreditation system. The *2014-15 Annual Accreditation Report* was adopted by the COA on October 1, 2015. The *COA Annual Accreditation Report* is structured to reflect the four purposes of the accreditation system as defined in the *Accreditation Framework*.



**The Committee on Accreditation's  
Annual Accreditation Report to the  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
2014-2015**

Dear Commissioners:

It is with personal and professional pleasure that, on behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation (COA), we submit to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) the *2014-2015 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 over the past year and its proposed work plan for 2015-2016 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 2014-15 and in the proposed work plan for 2015-16. We believe that aligning the *Annual Accreditation Report* to these purposes provides evidence of the integrity of the accreditation system.

The COA shares with the Commission the goal of having a strong accountability system that encourages excellence and holds educator preparation programs to high standards. The membership of COA is encouraged by the recent progress made by the Commission to strengthen and streamline the accreditation process and welcome the opportunity to assist in the transition to the revised accreditation system. We continue to offer our collective expertise and assistance to the Commission in this important effort to ensure a rigorous and robust system of accreditation that places a greater emphasis on outcomes. The Committee stands ready to assist the Commission in achieving the goal of a high quality teacher in every classroom.

Sincerely,

Reyes Quezada  
Committee Co-Chair

Kenneth Lopour  
Committee Co-Chair

**The Committee on Accreditation  
2014-2015**

**Deborah Erickson**

Professor and Dean  
School Of Education  
Point Loma Nazarene University

**Margo Pensavalle**

Professor of Clinical Education  
Director of Evaluation and Accreditation  
University of Southern California

**Robert Frelly**

Director of Music Education  
Chapman University

**Jose Rivas**

Teacher  
Lennox Mathematics, Science and  
Technology Academy

**Gary Kinsey**

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

**Kelly Skon**

District Coordinator of Secondary STEM  
Saddleback Valley Unified School District

**Kenneth Lopour**

Assistant Principal  
Los Alamitos High School

**Nancy Watkins**

Assistant Principal  
Valencia High School  
Placentia-Yorba Linda School District

**Anna W. Moore**

Regional Director II  
Sonoma County Office of Education

**Yvonne White**

Science Teacher  
Oakland Unified School District

**Reyes Quezada**

Professor of Education  
University of San Diego

**Pia Wong**

Chair, Department of Teaching Credentials  
California State University, Sacramento

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee’s Work Plan in 2013-14 .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession.....	2
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality .....	4
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards.....	6
Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement.....	7
General Operations .....	9
<b>Section II: Summary of Accreditation Activities 2014-15 .....</b>	<b>10</b>
COA Accreditation Decisions .....	10
Institutions Meeting All Standards.....	11
Institutions in 7 <sup>th</sup> Year Follow Up .....	12
Analysis of Standards Decisions .....	13
<b>Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee in 2015-2016.....</b>	<b>26</b>
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and the Profession .....	26
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality.....	27
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards.....	28
Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement.....	28
General Operations .....	31
<b>Section IV: Improvements Made in 2014-15 by Institutions with Stipulations.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Appendix A: CTC Accreditation Cohorts .....</b>	<b>44</b>

## **Introduction: Summary of Activities of the Current Accreditation System**

The Commission's current *Accreditation Framework* was adopted by the Commission in 2006. The accreditation system is the primary means by which the Commission ensures quality in educator preparation in California. The system is designed as a 7 year cycle comprised of three major components or activities: 1) biennial reports, 2) program assessment, and 3) site visits. Each of the over 260 Commission-approved institutions has been assigned a color cohort which identifies which component or activity is expected of those institutions in any given year. Biennial reports are submitted for those cohorts in Year 1, 3, and 5; program assessment has been conducted in year 4; site visits in year 6; and finally, follow up is required in Year 7. Below is a summary description of each of the three components.

*BIENNIAL REPORTS:* Educator preparation programs collect and analyze data on candidate competence and program effectiveness annually for the purpose of informing program improvements. In addition, programs report the results every other year of the cycle. Reports are reviewed by Commission staff and used by accreditation teams to inform accreditation decisions.

*PROGRAM ASSESSMENT:* Programs provide a narrative describing how the program is aligned to each of the Commission adopted program standards for the particular credential area. The program sponsor reports on indicators of candidate competence such as performance on assessments and feedback from employers. The report also includes program updates and provides a data-based rationale for any program changes. Reports are reviewed by trained educators with expertise in the credential area, are summarized by staff, and then reported to the Committee on Accreditation.

*SITE VISITS:* All data are provided to a trained team of evaluators. Team members are experts in the credential areas being reviewed. Site visits also include in-depth interviews of graduates, candidates, employers, and program faculty and administrators. The team makes accreditation recommendations for final action by the Committee on Accreditation.

The Commission is assisted in the implementation of the accreditation system by the Committee on Accreditation. This body is comprised of twelve members of the education community – 6 from postsecondary education and 6 K-12 practitioners. While the Commission sets policy for accreditation, the COA implements the accreditation system and makes accreditation decisions for institutions offering educator preparation in California.

This report presents information about the accreditation system, the COA decisions, and the three major components for the academic year 2014-15. The items that follow represent the key components of the 2014-2015 accreditation activities for the COA and a summary of each task and its current status.

## Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2014-2015

The items that follow represent the key components of the 2014-2015 accreditation activities for the COA and a summary of each task and its current status. In addition to its normal activities, during the 2014-15 year the Professional Services Division has been working diligently on the *Strengthening and Streamlining the Commission's Accreditation System* project.

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

*Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation.* The COA held meetings on the following dates:

August 7-8, 2014

October 3, 2014

February 19, 2015

April 30-May 1, 2015

June 24-26, 2015

All Committee meetings were held in public and all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. In addition, meetings were 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 was utilized fully to provide agenda items and notification of meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation.

As a continuing cost saving measure and to ensure access for all participants, phone conferencing and Zoom, a videoconferencing program, were used, where possible and appropriate, in order that those located in various regions of California who are involved in accreditation activities could participate without travel.

*PSD News.* The PSD E-news, developed in 2008, continued to be distributed weekly. This electronic notification reaches over 1,700 individuals including all approved institutions, to inform them of accreditation-related activities such as information regarding standards development and revision, technical assistance opportunities, and notification of requests for stakeholder input.

*Program Sponsor Alerts.* Program Sponsor Alerts (PSA) continued to be used to provide important and timely information on specific topics of interest to program sponsors. The Commission staff used this resource frequently in the 2014-2015 year, issuing seven PSAs. The seven PSAs issued from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015 are as follows:

PSA Number	Issue Date	Title
<a href="#">14-06</a>	August 22, 2014	Revised Education Specialist Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) approved by the Commission
<a href="#">14-07</a>	September 12, 2014	Process for Multiple and Single Subject Teacher Preparation Programs
14-08 (Superseded by <a href="#">PSA 15-04</a> )	October 21, 2014	Program Sponsor Responsibilities – Updating Contact Information Electronically
<a href="#">14-09</a>	December 4, 2014	Automatic Withdrawal of Inactive Programs
<a href="#">15-01</a>	March 25, 2015	One-time Implementation Funding for Clear Induction Administrative Services Programs
<a href="#">15-02</a>	March 26, 2015	Preparing for Annual Accreditation Fees – Inactive Status and Withdrawal Deadlines
<a href="#">15-03</a>	March 26, 2015	Revised Language for Standard 4 of the Preliminary Education Specialist: Visual Impairment Credential Programs: Braille Competency and Braille Literacy Instruction

The PSA is used to address a specific issue such as requirements for transition to new standards and has served the Commission and the field well. Program Sponsor Alerts will continue to be used to provide information to the field.

*Technical Assistance to the Field.* In 2014-15, activities continued that were designed to share information about the accreditation system and its implementation. Because staff work was refocused on meeting with stakeholders on the Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation project, fewer formalized technical assistance meetings were held than in recent years. These meetings were held both in person and via the web. All webinars were broadcast live and also archived for access by stakeholders at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/meetings.html>. Technical Assistance included the following:

Date	Technical Assistance Activity
July 14, 2014 July 28, 2014 August 11, 2014	Administrative Services Think Tank Meetings
September 18-19, 2014 March 26-27, 2015	CEEDAR(Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform) Center Meetings
October 13-15, 2014	California Credential Analysts and Counselors
November 7, 2014	2014-15 Team Lead Preparation - Second Tier Programs Only
November 13, 2014	2014-15 Team Lead Preparation
December 11, 2014	Teacher Credentialing and the 7-Year Cycle
March 11-12, 2015	Title II Webcast

*Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission.* COA Co-Chairs Reyes Quezada and Kenneth Lopour presented the COA annual report to the Commission at the December 2014 Commission Meeting. This can be accessed at the following link:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-12/2014-12-agenda.html>.

*Commission Liaison.* The Commission's liaison provides an important perspective to COA discussions and serves as an effective means of communication between the COA and the Commission. For the 2014-15 year, the liaison to the COA was Commissioner Haydee Rodriguez.

*Implementation of a Fee Recovery System for Certain Accreditation Activities and Annual Accreditation Fee.* The Commission adopted a cost recovery plan, and associated regulations (effective October 2013), for the review of new programs and for accreditation activities outside the typical accreditation cycle. In the 2014-15 year, the system for tracking reviewer assignments and credit institutions for in-kind services was strengthened.

In addition, in 2014-15, the Commission adopted an Annual Accreditation Fee structure based on the size of an institution and the number of programs it offers. The Commission wrote and adopted emergency regulations (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Division 8, Sections 80693 and 80694) detailing the accreditation fee authority at the June 2014 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-06/2014-06-3A.pdf>), which were then approved by the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and became effective in August 2014. Subsequently, the Commission submitted and approved those same regulations (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Division 8, Sections 80693 and 80694) as permanent at its October 2014 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-10/2014-10-21.pdf>). The OAL approved those regulations in January 2015, and those regulations became effective as of April 1, 2015.

## **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. Thirty-seven institutions were reviewed in 2014-15 resulting in the following decisions:

- 25 institutions Accredited (4 with a required 7th year report)
- 9 institutions Accredited with Stipulations
- 1 institutions Accredited with Major Stipulations
- 1 institution Accredited with Probationary Stipulations
- 1 institution Denied Accreditation

Three institutions that were accredited with Stipulations in 2013-14 addressed all stipulations, and the COA changed their status to Accreditation in 2014-15. Two additional institutions addressed some stipulations and continued to work on addressing the remaining stipulations. A list of the institutions that had a site visit, revisit or addressed stipulations via reports in 2014-2015 is included in Section II of this report.

The Commission continued to pay close attention to ensuring cost effectiveness in reviews. In particular, the number of team members continued to be kept to a minimum number of reviewers required 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) were reduced by one day for a total of three days, two nights, instead of four days and three nights. A large number of these visits were conducted by team leads with CTC consultants participating virtually, rather than being present in person. Consultants joined in on discussions and to provide guidance as needed via technology. This action reduced the cost involved in the review while continuing to ensure a sufficient length of time for a thorough review.

*Newly Adopted or Revised Accreditation Procedures.* The COA has adopted several new or revised procedures during the 2014-15:

*Allowing closure of programs*

Over the course of time, the Commission had indicated its desire to not only be able to close an institution if warranted, but to also be allowed to close individual programs within institutions when warranted. The COA acted to allow for the closure of program(s) within the stipulations for an institution. At the October 2014 COA meeting, draft handbook language was presented to COA members detailing the steps involved in operationalizing the closure of an individual program within an institution (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2015-02/2015-02-item-10.pdf>).

The COA approved this revised procedure at its February 2015 meeting and also approved language for inclusion in *Chapter 8: Accreditation Decisions: Options and Implications* in the *Accreditation Handbook*.

*Leaving the Accreditation Report Summary with the Institution*

At the October 2014 COA meeting, staff proposed and the COA approved the revised process of exit reports left at the institution at the end of an accreditation site visit (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-10/2014-10-item-12.pdf>).

Rather than a full narrative that is a draft of the report that the COA receives in final form, the institution will be provided with a summary document. Relieving a team of having to have complete the narrative portion of the report before the end of the visit allows the team more time for deliberation and careful consideration of all the evidence presented by the institution. In addition, this approach provides team members and staff consultants additional time to edit the report prior to providing it to the institution.

*Automatic Withdrawal of Programs after Being Inactive for 5 Years*

At the October 2014 COA meeting, staff proposed and the COA approved adding a section to the *Accreditation Handbook* in *Chapter 3: Institutional and Program Approval* that clarifies that institutions will be notified of any inactive programs that are nearing the five year maximum for inactive status and provided an opportunity to determine whether to request reactivation or withdrawal of the program. Further, the *Handbook* language clarifies that should the Commission not receive a communication from the institution of its intention, the program will be automatically withdrawn.

### *Processes Related to Program Sponsor Changes*

The COA adopted procedures for addressing changes in structure and affiliation of program sponsors. Examples of these situations are when an entity wishes to separate from an approved institution to offer its own program, or if an institution wants to offer or “adopt” a program currently offered by another institution. The process involved was clarified so that institutions have a better understanding about what needs to take place to formalize these new relationships.

*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 continued to receive updates on Commission activities at each meeting. Recent updates have included changes to the Administrative Services Credential and updates on the progress being made on the Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation project.

*Continue Efforts to Develop Surveys for Use in Accreditation.* For a number of years the Commission has conducted surveys related to Intern and Induction programs. These surveys were used as a resource while planning for the development of new program completer surveys. In the spring of 2013, Commission staff worked with stakeholders to develop and pilot the first survey for Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist program completers. Additional effort was 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. After analyzing responses to the pilot survey, the survey was revised and a second year of surveys was conducted in 2014-15. Programs were asked to encourage their graduates to participate. The Commission is also in the process of developing additional surveys to be completed by candidates completing other credential programs.

As part of the Accreditation Streamlining and Strengthening project, the following surveys are in various phases of development and implementation:

- Preliminary Multiple Subject Completer Survey
- Preliminary Single Subject Completer Survey
- Preliminary Education Specialist Completer Survey
- Preliminary Administrative Services Completer Survey
- Clear/Induction Multiple and Single Subject Survey
- Clear Education Specialist Induction Survey
- Master Teacher Survey
- Employer Survey

In addition an Administrative Services Induction Completer survey will be ready for completers from the new Administrative Services Clear Induction programs starting in spring-summer 2017.

### **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. Some of the decisions are made on the basis of expert review panel recommendations and some are made on the basis of staff recommendations. Forty-eight (48) programs were granted initial approval during 2014-2015.

*Conduct and review program assessment activities.* In 2014-15, institutions in the Blue cohort were working to complete the program assessment process for documents submitted at the end of 2013. In addition, staff continued to coordinate the review for the program assessment documents that were submitted in fall 2014. Staff facilitated six program assessment sessions during the 2014-2015 year throughout the state bringing nearly seventy readers together to review documents. Fresno Pacific University and San Mateo/Foster City School District hosted reading sessions and assisted in the recruitment of program assessment readers. Even with the assistance of hosting institutions, low reader turn out required the vast majority of the documents reviewed to take 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 the review of many of these documents to be completed, it did extend the time for reviewers to complete their work and resulted in greater wait time for institutions to receive the results of the review.

*Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation.* Due to limited staff resources during 2014-2015, Technical Assistance visits did not occur specifically for these institutions. Technical assistance to these institutions took place along with those efforts taking place for all other institutions in the same cohort.

*Disseminate information related to the Commission's Common Standards and Program Standards.* In 2014-15, each of the seven Accreditation cohorts continued to be assigned a consultant to provide technical assistance throughout the accreditation process. The 2014-15 year was the second year using the cohort assignment system to provide timely information regarding the accreditation activities specific to each cohort.

#### *Transition to Newly Adopted Standards*

California's Administrative Services Credential programs continued their transition throughout the 2014-15 year. Sixty-one preliminary and twenty-three guidelines-based clear programs submitted transition plans outlining how their programs will be meeting the elements of the new program standards. Thirteen standards-based programs earned approval to sponsor new clear induction administrative services through the Initial Program Review process. Six new institutions gained approval in the 2014-15 year to sponsor administrator induction programs. Currently there are 61 preliminary and 46 clear induction administrative services credential programs in the state approved by the Commission.

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

*Collect, analyze, and report on Biennial Reports submitted in fall 2014.* Biennial Reports were submitted for all programs in the Indigo, Red, and Yellow cohorts during fall 2014. Indigo cohort members who chose to submit their Biennial Reports in fall 2013 provided an addendum in fall 2014, while the rest of the cohort submitted full Biennial Reports. Staff reviewed all Biennial

Reports that were submitted and provided written feedback at the program and unit level. Technical assistance was also provided to individual institutions that were in need. This occurred via phone and video conference and was led by the consultant assigned to the institution's accreditation cohort.

Biennial Report templates were revised to be more streamlined and provide clearer direction to institutions and direct them toward providing more specific information focusing on candidate competency, fieldwork, and program effectiveness. The COA reviewed the new Biennial Report template at its June and August meetings in 2014. The streamlined template was provided as an optional pilot to institutions in the Indigo, Red, and Yellow cohorts for fall 2014 submission.

Cohort consultants assigned to the Indigo, Red, and Yellow cohorts met with institutions via Google Hangout and phone conference to orient them to the streamlined template, provide technical assistance, and gather initial feedback. Submissions using the new template were reviewed and information provided to the COA in fall 2014. The new template was revised based on feedback from institutions and consultants and is now a required format for Biennial Reports due from the Blue and Orange cohorts in 2015.

Prior to the redesigned template and technical assistance provided to institutions it sometimes took staff well beyond 90 days to review and return feedback. Various factors contributed to this extended timeline including the large volume in the number of programs requiring feedback, lack of consistency in the format and content of the reports, and staff workload including the lack of dedicated staff time to review these documents. In the fall of 2014 the average time to provide feedback was successfully reduced to an average of 45 days. This was accomplished by revising the process for reviewing the reports, revising expectations about dedicated time for review, and the manner in which the second reviewer and administrator provide input and revisions to the feedback.

*Noting Late Document Submission.* At its August 2014 meeting, the COA requested information regarding institutions that have not met the accreditation timelines. Providing a report on timelines and due dates and institutions that have not complied with the due dates has become a standard agenda item for the COA. Staff began the reports with the Indigo Biennial Report submission which was due September 15, 2014 and has continued reporting for each meeting since. This information has improved the COA's understanding of the scope and size of institutions that have not complied.

*Continue implementation of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.* Site visit surveys were provided to site visit team leads, team members, institutions, and consultants. Analysis of 2014-15 site visit evaluation data is currently underway. Improvements to the system based upon those data will be considered by the COA in January 2016.

*Continue partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) (formerly the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)) and efforts to collaborate with other national*

*accrediting bodies, where appropriate.* With the unification of TEAC and NCATE into CAEP, and the adoption of new national educator preparation standards, the COA worked with staff and stakeholders to develop a new Partnership Agreement with CAEP. Various versions of the draft agreement were presented to the COA throughout 2014-15. Clarification by CAEP of one aspect of one CAEP standard in particular for post baccalaureate granting institutions caused significant delays in reaching full agreement. At the time of the writing of this report, what is expected to be the final version is undergoing review and approval by Commission leadership. (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-08/2014-08-item-12.pdf>). The COA voted to adopt the CAEP Agreement as presented to the COA.

*Board of Institutional Reviewer's (BIR) Training.* Training was held twice in the 2014-15 year, preparing 52 additional trainees. Prospective BIR members filed a letter of intent, letter of recommendation, and a writing sample. For 2014-15 the training remained relatively the same as the last couple of years with participants completing four online modules that focus on explaining the various accreditation activities, followed by a two-day onsite training. Training was held in Santa Ana on October 27-28, 2015 for 26 people and in Ontario on January 29-30, 2015 for 27 people. No BIR trainings were scheduled for spring 2015 in order to refocus attention on redesigning the BIR training to align with the revised accreditation system that will be fully implemented in 2017-18.

### **General Operations**

In addition to the above mentioned items, the COA engaged 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.

## Section II: Summary of 2014-15 Accreditation Activities

This section of the report provides more detailed information about results of the 2014-15 Work Plan with a focus on accreditation activities.

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

2014-15 accreditation decisions were made based upon the written reports of the evidence gathered at the site visit, recommendations made by the site visit 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. CTC 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 2014-15:

<b>COA Accreditation Decisions 2014-15 Visits</b>	
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
Animo Leadership/Green Dot Charter Schools	Accreditation
Argosy University	Accreditation with Stipulations
Azusa Pacific University	Accreditation with Stipulations
Baldwin Park Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations
Brandman University	Accreditation
Brentwood Union School District	Accreditation
California Polytechnic University, Pomona	Accreditation
California State University, Long Beach	Accreditation
Central Unified School District	Accreditation
California State University, Bakersfield	Accreditation
California State University, Chico	Accreditation
California State University, San Marcos	Accreditation
Cupertino Union High School District	Accreditation
Fielding Graduate University	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations
High Tech High School	Accreditation with Stipulations
Humboldt State University	Accreditation
Lancaster School District	Accreditation
Madera Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations
Metropolitan Education District	Denial of Accreditation
Mount St. Mary’s College	Accreditation with Stipulations
Pasadena Unified School District	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District	Accreditation

<b>COA Accreditation Decisions 2014-15 Visits</b>	
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
Sacramento County Office of Education	Accreditation
San Diego Unified School District	Accreditation
San Dieguito Union High School District	Accreditation
San Ramon Valley Unified School District	Accreditation
Santa Monica Malibu Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations
Stockton Unified School District	Accreditation
Teachers' College of San Joaquin/San Joaquin County Office of Education	Accreditation
Tracy Unified School District	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations
University of Redlands	Accreditation with Stipulations
University of San Francisco	Accreditation
Ventura County Office of Education	Accreditation
Visalia Unified School District	Accreditation
Vista Unified School District	Accreditation
West Covina Unified School District	Accreditation
Westside Union School District	Accreditation

***Institutions Meeting All Standards***

The institutions listed in the table below hosted an accreditation site visit in 2014-15 which resulted in the team determining that the institution had met all Common and program standards for all programs offered by the institution.

<b>Institutions Receiving Accreditation with All Common and Program Standards Met 2014-15 Visits</b>	
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>Number of Programs</b>
Animo Leadership/Green Dot Charter Schools	1
Brandman University	10
Brentwood Union School District	2
California State University, Long Beach	17
Central Unified School District	1
California State University, Bakersfield	7
California State University, San Marcos	11
Lancaster School District	2
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District	1
San Diego Unified School District	2
San Dieguito Union High School District	2
San Ramon Valley Unified School District	2
Stockton Unified School District	2

<b>Institutions Receiving Accreditation with All Common and Program Standards Met 2014-15 Visits</b>	
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>Number of Programs</b>
Teachers' College of San Joaquin/San Joaquin County Office of Education	14
Ventura County Office of Education	8
Visalia Unified School District	1
West Covina Unified School District	2

***Institutions in 7<sup>th</sup> Year Follow Up***

In addition, in 2014-15, revisits were conducted for institutions assigned stipulations as a result of site visits conducted in 2013-2014 and documentation of changes were received from those institutions with stipulations that did not require a revisit. After these revisits and reviews of submitted reports, the COA made the following decisions:

<b>2014-2015 Accreditation Follow-Up</b>		
<b>Revisits</b>		
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>2013-2014 Decision</b>	<b>2014-2015 Revisit Decision</b>
National University	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Claremont Graduate University	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
California State University, Monterey Bay	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation
Pacific Oaks College	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations	Accreditation with Stipulations
<b>Submission of Documentation Addressing Stipulations</b>		
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>2013-14 Decision</b>	<b>2014-15 Decision</b>
Antioch University	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Hebrew Union College	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation with Stipulations
Los Banos Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
La Sierra University	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation

### ***Analysis of Standards Decisions***

In the following credential programs, all program standards were found to be met in the identified program. The number in the right column indicates the number of institutions that hosted site visits in 2014-15 where the identified program had all standards met.

<b>All Program Standards Found to be Met – 2014-2015 Site Visits</b>	
<b>Program</b>	<b>Number of Institutions</b>
Bilingual Authorization	5
Adapted Physical Education	5
Agricultural Specialist	2
Speech and Language Pathology	4
Reading Certificate (Added Authorization)	3
Reading Specialist	1
Added Authorization in Special Education--Emotional Disturbance	1
Teacher Librarian	2
School Nurse	1
Designated Subjects: Adult Education	1
Added Authorization in Special Education--Orthopedic Impairments	1
Preliminary Education Specialist-Language and Academic Development	1
Preliminary Education Specialist-Early Childhood Special Education	1
Added Authorization in Special Education--Early Childhood Special Education	2
Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work	1
Math Instructional Added Authorization	1
Preliminary Education Specialist Program (Standards 1-16)	13
Preliminary Education Specialist--Moderate to Severe Disabilities	10
Added Authorization in Special Education--Autism Spectrum Disorder	8
Clear Standards-based Administrative Services	4
Clear Guidelines-based Administrative Services	3

### ***Findings for Common and Program Standards***

The Commission's revised Common Standards (2008) and all appropriate credential program standards were utilized in the accreditation site visits in 2013-14.

### ***Common Standards***

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. The information regarding findings on the Common Standards from 2014-2015 is presented in the following table.

Findings on the Common Standards 2014-2015 Accreditation Site Visits (37 institutions, including NCATE institutions)	Standard Findings		
	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 1: Education Leadership	29	7	1
Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	28	3	6
Standard 3: Resources	33	4	0
Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel	29	7	1
Standard 5: Admission	36	0	1
Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	36	0	1
Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice	32	4	1
Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors*	15	2	2
Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence	35	1	1

\*Institutions with only second tier programs were not reviewed for Standard 8 as it does not apply.

### **Program Standards**

A summary of the information gathered on all educator preparation programs with determinations of *Met with Concerns* or *Not Met* are presented in the tables below. If a standard is not listed, all institutions 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 Multiple Subject Standards (13 site visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom	1	-
15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork	1	-
19: Implementation of the Teacher Performance Assessment	2	-

Preliminary Single Subject Standards (13 site visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
8: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject Specific Content Instruction	1	-
14: Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork	1	-
15: Qualifications for Individuals who Provide School Site Support	1	-
19: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment	2	-

<b>General Education (MS/SS) Induction Standards (24 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Rationale and Design	1	-
2: Communication and Collaboration	3	-
3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers	2	3
6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students	1	-

<b>General Education (MS/SS) Clear Standards (2 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers	1	-

<b>Preliminary Education Specialist Program Standards 1-16 (13 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination	1	
4: Assessment, Program Planning and Instruction	1	
5: Assessment of Students	1	-
9: Preparation to Teach Reading/Language Arts	1	-
16: Assessment of Candidate Performance	1	-

<b>Preliminary Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing (1 visit)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination	-	1
3: Candidate Communication Skills	1	-
10: Transition and Transitional Planning	1	-

<b>Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling (5 visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
20: Career Development	1	-
31: Fieldwork	1	-

<b>Clear Education Specialist Induction Standards (17 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Rationale and Design	1	-
2: Communication and Collaboration	1	-
3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers	1	1
7: Education Program Specialist Induction Program Menu	1	-

<b>Preliminary Administrative Services (13 Site Visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
2: Program Coordination	-	1
5: Role of Schooling in a Democratic Society	1	-
6: Opportunities to Learn Instructional Leadership	1	-
7: Nature of Field Experiences	1	-
8: Guidance, Assistance and Feedback	1	-
9: Assessment of Candidate Performance	1	-
11: Student Learning and Professional Growth	1	-
12: Organizational Management for Student Learning	1	-
14: Personal Ethics and Leadership Capacity	1	-
15: Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Understanding	1	-

<b>Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology (5 Site Visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
8: Self-Esteem and Personal and Social Responsibility	1	-
16: Supervision and Mentoring	1	-

<b>Designated Subjects: Special Subjects (2 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Program Standards 1-16	0*	16*

\*The above DS: Special Subjects standards less than fully met represent the same institution. The institution was subsequently denied accreditation.

<b>Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education (3 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Program Standards 1-2, 4-16		15*
Program Standard 3	1*	

\*The above DS: CTE standards less than fully met represent the same institution. The institution was subsequently denied accreditation.

<b>Designated Subjects: Supervision and Coordination (1 Site Visit)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
2. Planning, Organization and Management of Designated Subjects Programs	1*	
4. Fiscal and Regulatory Concepts	1*	

\*The above DS: SS standards less than fully met represent the same institution.

<b>California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) (3 Site Visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Philosophy, Design, and Coordination		1*
2: Equity and Diversity		1*
3: Evaluation and Assessment of Candidates		1*
4: Language Structure and Use		1*
5: First-and Second Language Development and Their Relationship to Academic Achievement		1*
6: Assessment of English Learners		1*
7: Foundations of English Language/Literacy Development and Content Instruction		1*
8: Approaches and Methods for English Language Development and Content Instruction		1*
9: Culture and Cultural Diversity and Their Relationship to Academic Achievement		1*
10: Culturally Diverse Instruction		1*

*\*The above CTEL standards less than fully met represent the same institution.*

### **Initial Approval of New Credential Programs (IPR)**

Institutions seeking Initial Program Approval for new credential programs 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, and a Common Standards document (or a Common Standards addendum if the institution has recently submitted Common Standards). In addition, the institution submits a response to all relevant program specific preconditions that are reviewed by Commission staff. 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. When all standards are found to be met and all relevant preconditions are determined to be addressed, Commission staff includes the item, along with a paragraph about the program written by the institution, in the COA agenda at the next scheduled meeting. Initial Program Approval actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation in 2014-15 are listed in the tables below.

<b>New Credential Programs Approved (46)</b>	
<b>Credential Program</b>	<b>Institutional Sponsor</b>
Added Authorization in Special Education-- Autism Spectrum Disorder	Los Angeles County Office of Education
	Tulare County Office of Education
Added Authorization in Special Education-- Early Childhood Special Education	California State University Bakersfield
	Los Angeles County Office of Education
	Tulare County Office of Education
	University of La Verne
Added Authorization --Adaptive Physical Education	Point Loma Nazarene University
Clear Administrative Services (Induction)	Los Angeles Unified School District
	Monterey County Office of Education
	National University
	Point Loma Nazarene University
	San Diego State University
	Santa Barbara County Education Office
	Touro University
	Tulare County Office of Education
Clear Education Specialist Induction	Alhambra Unified School District
	California State University, Monterey
	California State University, Long Beach
	Cupertino Unified School District
	Los Angeles County Office of Education
	Los Banos Unified School District
	National University
	Oak Grove School District
	Rialto Unified School District
	Santa Ana Unified School District
	Santa Monica Malibu Unified School District
	Tulare County Office of Education
General Education (MS/SS) Induction	West Contra Costa Unified School District
	California State University, Northridge
	Ceres Unified School District
	San Diego State University
Preliminary Administrative Services	South San Francisco Unified School District
	Tulare County Office of Education
Preliminary Education Specialist-- Mild to Moderate (Intern)	Los Angeles County Office of Education
	Tulare County Office of Education
Preliminary Education Specialist-- Moderate to Severe (Intern)	Los Angeles County Office of Education
	Tulare County Office of Education
Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern	Los Angeles County Office of Education

<b>New Credential Programs Approved (46)</b>	
<b>Credential Program</b>	<b>Institutional Sponsor</b>
	Sacramento County Office of Education
	Tulare County Office of Education
Preliminary Single Subject Intern	Los Angeles County Office of Education
	Sacramento County Office of Education
	Tulare County Office of Education
Reading Certificate (Added Authorization)	California State University, Bakersfield
Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education	Tulare County Office of Education
Designated Subjects: Adult Education	Sonoma County Office of Education

### ***Transitioned Programs***

In 2014-15 institutions continued to transition their existing programs from prior standards to newly adopted standards. During 2014-15 all Administrative Services Credential programs were in the process of transitioning to new standards. Preliminary administrative services programs were required to transition by September 1, 2015 and all Clear Guidelines based programs must have transitioned to the Clear Administrative Services Credential standards by July 1, 2015. Provided below is the list of programs that transitioned in 2014-15.

<b>Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (61 programs)</b>		
Alliant University	CSU San Francisco	Saint Mary's College
Argosy University	CSU San Jose	San Diego County Office of Education
Azusa Pacific University	CSU San Luis Obispo	San Diego State University
Brandman University	CSU San Marcos	Santa Barbara County Education Office
Cal Baptist University	CSU Sonoma	Santa Clara County Office of Education
Cal Lutheran University	CSU Stanislaus	Santa Clara University
Concordia University	Fielding Graduate University	Simpson University
CSU Bakersfield	Mt. Diablo USD/Fortune School	Teachers' College of San Joaquin
CSU Channel Islands	Fresno Pacific University	Touro University
CSU Chico	Hope International University	UC Berkeley
CSU Dominguez Hills	La Sierra University	UC Irvine
CSU East Bay	Loyola Marymount University	UC Los Angeles
CSU Fresno	Madera County Office of Education	University of La Verne
CSU Fullerton	Mills College	University of Phoenix

<b>Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (61 programs)</b>		
CSU Humboldt	National University	University of Redlands
CSU Long Beach	Notre Dame de Namur University	University of San Diego
CSU Los Angeles	Orange County Department of Education	University of San Francisco
CSU Northridge	Pepperdine University	University of the Pacific
CSU Pomona	Pt. Loma Nazarene University	University of Southern California
CSU Sacramento	Bay Area School of Enterprise/REACH	
CSU San Bernardino	Sacramento County Office of Education	

<b>Clear Guidelines-based Administrative Services Credential (to Clear Administrative Services Induction) (22 programs)</b>	
Association of California School Administrators	Sacramento County Office of Education
Azusa Pacific University	San Diego County Office of Education
El Dorado County Office of Education	San Mateo County Office of Education
Fresno County Office of Education	Santa Clara County Office of Education
Kern County Superintendent of Schools	Santa Clara University
Los Angeles County Office of Education	Shasta County Office of Education
Merced County Office of Education	Stanislaus County Office of Education
Orange County Department of Education	Teachers' College of San Joaquin
Placer County Office of Education	Tulare County Office of Education
Bay Area School of Enterprise/REACH	University of California Irvine
Riverside County Office of Education	Ventura County Office of Education

***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 COA and Administrator of Accreditation. The following programs noted below were declared to be in an Inactive status in 2014-15.

<b>Programs Entering Inactive Status (38)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
Alliant University	Preliminary Administrative Services Credential
Azusa Pacific University	California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)
California Polytechnic University Pomona	Reading Certificate (Added Authorization)
California Polytechnic University	Added Authorization in Special Education: Autism Spectrum Disorder
California State University San Marcos	Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential
	Reading Certificate (Added Authorization)
Capistrano Unified School District	Added Authorization in Special Education: Autism Spectrum Disorder
Claremont Graduate University	Added Authorization in Special Education: Autism Spectrum Disorder
	Education Specialist Level II Mild to Moderate Disabilities
	Education Specialist Level II Moderate to Severe Disabilities
California State University Channel Islands	Preliminary Single Subject (Physical Education only)
	Multiple Subject Intern Credential Program
California State University Long Beach	Preliminary Single Subject Teaching (Industrial and Technology Education)
California State University Riverside	Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance
California State University Fullerton	School Nurse: Special Teaching Authorization
Dominican University of California	General Education (Multiple Subject/Single Subject) Clear
Fresno Pacific University	Preliminary Education Specialist-Physical and Health Impairments
	Level II Education Specialist--Physical and Health Impairments
	Level II Education Specialist--Early Childhood Special Education
	Level II Education Specialist--Mild-to Moderate Disabilities
	Level II Education Specialist--Moderate to Severe Disabilities
	Added Authorization in Special Education-Early Childhood Special Education
	Added Authorization in Special Education-Autism Spectrum Disorder

<b>Programs Entering Inactive Status (38)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
	Added Authorization in Special Education-Resource Specialist
Lawndale Elementary School District	General Education (MS/SS) Induction
Madera County Office of Education	Added Authorization in Special Education: Autism Spectrum Disorder
Notre Dame de Namur University	Clear Administrative Services
Ontario-Montclair School District	Added Authorization in Special Education: Autism Spectrum Disorder
San Francisco State University	Clear Administrative Services Credential (Standards-Based)
San Joaquin County Office of Education	Added Authorization in Special Education-Autism Spectrum Disorder
	Clear Education Specialist Induction
	Preliminary Administrative Services
Sonoma State University	Added Authorization in Special Education: Autism Spectrum Disorder
University of San Francisco	Preliminary Administrative Services
University of California Riverside	Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling
	Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance
University of California Berkeley	Preliminary Single Subject Intern Experimental Program
University of San Diego	Preliminary Administrative Services--Intern option

***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.

<b>Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (49 programs)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
Azusa Pacific University	General Education (MS/SS) Clear
Boston Reed College	Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential Program
Cajon Valley Union School District	General Education (MS/SS) Induction Program
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	Preliminary Administrative Services (Experimental Program)

<b>Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (49 programs)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
Castaic Union School District	General Education (MS/SS) Induction
Chapman University	General Education (MS/SS) Clear
	Preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching--Intern option
	Preliminary Administrative Services-Intern option
California State University, Sacramento	Preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching--Intern option
California State University, San Bernardino	General Education (MS/SS) Clear
	Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work
	School Nurse Services Credential Program
	School Nurse Services: Special Class Authorization
California State University San Marcos	Single Subject Teaching--Intern option
California State University Chico	Added Authorization in Special Education: Autism Spectrum Disorder
California State University, Northridge	Speech-Language Pathology Services Special Class Authorization
Holy Names University	Added Authorization in Special Education: Autism Spectrum Disorder
Humboldt State University	Added Authorization in Special Education:-Autism Spectrum Disorder
	Clear Administrative Services
	Preliminary Single Subject Teaching-(Business only
	Reading Certificate (Added Authorization)
Mills College	Clear Guidelines-Based Administrative Services
	Preliminary Administrative Services--Intern Option
Mount St. Mary's College	Added Authorization in Special Education-Emotional Disturbance
Notre Dame de Namur University	Preliminary Education Specialist-Mild to Moderate Disabilities
Sacramento County Office of Education	Designated Subjects: Special Subjects
	Designated Subjects: Supervision and Coordination
	Designated Subjects: Adult Education
San Diego Unified School District	Added Authorization in Special Education:-Autism Spectrum Disorder
San Francisco State University	Education Specialist: Physical and Other Health Impairments
	Clinical Rehabilitative: Audiology

<b>Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (49 programs)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
	Other Related Ed Specialist Services: Speech Language Pathology, Special Class Authorization only
San Joaquin County Office of Education	Designated Subjects: Preliminary Career Technical Education
	Designated Subjects: Clear Career Technical Education
	Added Authorization in Special Education-Early Childhood Special Education
	General Education (MS/SS) Induction
	Clear Guidelines-Based Administrative Services
Santa Clara Unified School District	Designated Subjects: Supervision and Coordination
	Designated Subjects: Special Subjects Credential
University of Redlands	General Education Clear
	California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)
	Speech-Language Pathology: Special Class Authorization
University of California, Los Angeles	Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling
	Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling--Intern option
University of California, Santa Cruz	Multiple Subject Teaching—Intern Option
University of San Diego	Preliminary Education Specialist-Deaf and Hard of Hearing
	Education Specialist-Deaf and Hard of Hearing Intern option
	California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)
University of San Francisco	Clear Standards-based Administrative Services

### ***Reactivation of Inactive Program***

An inactive program may be reactivated 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 reactivated. During 2014-15, ten programs previously deemed inactive requested and received reactivation and are once again fully approved programs operating in California.

<b>Reactivation Requests in 2014-15 (10)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
Azusa Pacific University	Education Specialist: Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance
Burbank Unified School District	General Education (MS/SS) Induction

<b>Reactivation Requests in 2014-15 (10)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
Chapman University	Single Subject Intern
CSU Monterey Bay	Multiple Subject Intern
CSU Bakersfield	Preliminary Administrative Services
CSU San Marcos	Reading as Language Arts Specialist Credential Program
	Reading Certificate Program
Greenfield Union School District	General Education (MS/SS) Induction
Los Angeles Unified School District	Multiple Subject Intern
University of California, Irvine	Multiple Subject Intern

***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. During the 2014-15, there were four institutions that were granted Initial Institutional Approval.

<b>Institutions Newly Approved to Offer Educator Preparation in California (IIA)</b>
Ceres Unified School District
Fremont Union High School District
South San Francisco Unified School District
Summit Public Schools

***Institutions that are No Longer Approved Program Sponsors***

During 2014-2015, five institutions ceased to be Commission-approved program sponsors. Institutions lose Initial Institutional Approval when they withdraw all of their Commission approved programs or are denied accreditation.

<b>Institutions No Longer Eligible to Offer Educator Preparation</b>	
Cajon Valley Union School District	Withdrew its only program, February 2015
Castaic Union School District	Withdrew its only program, June 2015
ICEF Public Schools (LAUSD)	Withdrew its only program, November 2014
Metropolitan Education District	Denied Accreditation in June 2015 and closed in September 2015
National Hispanic University	Closed Educator Preparation in August 2015

### Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2015-16

The work plan for the Commission and COA for 2015-16 is divided between two accreditation activities. In addition to completing the work of the current accreditation system (biennial reports, program assessment and 2015-16 accreditation site visits), the Commission, staff and the Committee on Accreditation will also continue the work begun in 2014 to revise the accreditation system and will begin the process of transitioning to the revised accreditation system.

For 2015-16, 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 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 14, 2015

October 1, 2015

January 28, 2016

March 10-11, 2016

April 28-29, 2016

June 23-24, 2016

The Committee's schedule reflects the workload of a full schedule of site visits this upcoming spring.

Continuing in 2015-16, the *PSD ENews*, Program Sponsor Alerts, and press releases will be routinely used to ensure a transparent accreditation process.

*Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission.* The Committee on Accreditation will present its annual report to the Commission in December 2015. 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 and an annual accreditation fee system.* The Commission adopted a cost recovery plan, and regulations, for the review of new programs and for accreditation activities outside the typical accreditation cycle in

October 2013. Particular attention will continue to be paid to effective implementation of a fiscal process to invoice institutions, refining processes to ensure timeliness of reviews, and to maintaining procedures to keep track of reviewer assignments to credit institutions for in-kind assistance in order to waive fees for initial program review.

In addition, in 2014, the Commission implemented an annual accreditation fee. The current year, 2015-16, is the second year of implementation of the annual accreditation fees and the Commission will continue to ensure accurate information for institutions, maintain a system of invoicing, and process revenue that is received for the purposes of supporting the accreditation system.

## **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 accreditation of education institutions and their credential programs. Accreditation site visits continue as scheduled for the Blue cohort in 2015-16, with the vast majority of site visit reviews taking place in the spring of 2016. In addition, the Commission will complete the program assessment review process for those institutions that have begun the process in preparation for upcoming site visits and also continue the review of biennial reports for two cohorts.

While accreditation site visits for the Blue cohort will continue throughout spring 2016, as a result of the recommendations of the six accreditation task groups, activities will also begin to transition to a newly revised 7 year accreditation cycle once revised standards have been adopted, the data warehouse is launched and the *Accreditation Framework* is updated. Under the proposed plan, 2015-16 and 2016-17 would be program development and transition years in which staff begins providing technical assistance to institutions regarding any related data gathering and new reporting requirements.

*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. Given the upcoming revisions to the Accreditation cycle, it is anticipated that during 2015-16 Commission staff will begin revising the *Accreditation Handbook* to align with new policies and procedures, once the Commission has had the opportunity to review and adopt a new *Accreditation Framework* that reflects the revised accreditation system.

*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. It is anticipated with the efforts of Accreditation work groups that this function will continue to be critically important in 2015-16.

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

*Review and take action to grant initial approval of new program sponsors.* In June 2015, the Commission approved a temporary moratorium on Initial Institutional Approvals. The moratorium is a result of the work by the Commission to streamline and strengthen the current accreditation system. It is anticipated that once a new process for Initial Institutional Approval is adopted, the Commission will be updating the *Accreditation Frameworks*, the *Accreditation Handbook* and implementing the revisions in early spring 2016.

*Review and take action to grant initial program approval for 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 only being given initial approval when the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met. This review process will continue in 2015-16. Additional resources available as the result of cost recovery and annual accreditation fees should continue to assist in ensuring greater timeliness of reviews by allowing the Commission 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.* The Green cohort submitted program assessment documents in fall of 2014 and reviewers are completing these reviews. (A cohort list is provided in the Appendix.) Since 2016-17 is being dedicated to the development and transition of the policies and procedures surrounding the new Accreditation system, program assessment submissions by the Yellow cohort will occur fall 2017.

*Continue the discussion of how Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system.* Revised subject matter requirements for Mathematics and English Language Arts to align with the Common Core necessitated that approved subject matter programs in these disciplines revise their coursework. The Commission required 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. The next major changes will be in the science programs in order to align with the Next Generation Science Standards.

*Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment.* During the April 2015 Commission meeting, revised Teaching Performance Assessment Program-level Implementation standards 17-19 were adopted. These standards will become operational at such time and the Commission-approved TPA models have been updated. Technical assistance for preliminary teacher preparation programs will begin after the TPA models have been revised and re-approved by the Commission.

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

*Collect, analyze, and report on the biennial reports submitted in fall 2015.* The 2014-2015 academic year is the seventh full year of implementation of the biennial report component of the

revised accreditation system. All institutions in the Blue and Orange cohorts are required to submit candidate competence and performance data in fall 2015.

Among the 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. In the summer of 2014, the COA worked on revising the biennial report template and a new template which was released as a pilot. Following the implementation of the 2014 template, it was determined that consistency and quality of the data submitted was improved. It was also concluded that further updates to the instructions on how to complete the template might better assist an institution when preparing the biennial report. As a result the template along with instructions and a guidance rubric have been revised and made available to institutions submitting biennial reports in fall 2015 submissions.

Biennial reports will continue to be submitted and reviewed by staff in 2015-16. However, submission of candidate assessment and program effectiveness will be changing as a result of recommended revisions to the 7 year reporting cycle. Additional discussions will take place in 2015-16 about the submission of data, the use of data for accreditation purposes, and the processes and procedures related to the development and implementation of the Data Warehouse.

*Continued implementation of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.* The COA will continue 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 2015. Improvements to the system based upon those data can then be considered by the COA in summer 2015.

*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 was effective through 2014 and then a temporary agreement was put in place until the details of a new agreement could be resolved. Since 2014 the COA and the Commission have continued to work with CAEP to develop a new partnership agreement. Over the course of 2014-15, most aspects of the agreement were resolved, with one issue outstanding. This issue is related to CAEP Standard 3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity. It is expected that the final aspects of an agreement will be resolved in the fall of 2015.

*Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes.* At this point in time the work that will be done to determine alignment with other national and state organizations will be centered on completing

the discussions about the partnership agreement with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

### **Continue Development and Implementation of the Revised Accreditation System**

In 2015-16, the Committee on Accreditation will serve to assist in the continued development of the various aspects of the new accreditation system. A brief summary of the continued efforts to develop the system include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. *Provide guidance on the revision of the Accreditation Framework.* The *Accreditation Framework* is the Commission's accreditation policy document. The Committee stands ready to assist staff in providing critical feedback in various drafts of the *Framework* for Commission consideration and adoption.
2. *Revise the Accreditation Handbook* - A major undertaking for 2015-16 will be to revise the *Accreditation Handbook*. The *Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the new system and discussions around the adoption of the new *Handbook* will take place throughout spring 2016.
3. *Development of numerous accreditation resources once the revised Common Standards, preliminary teaching standards, teaching performance expectations, and induction standards are adopted.* Upon adoption of new standards, a wide array of work needs to take place to ensure that all accreditation materials are updated, program sponsor alerts and coded correspondences are drafted and issued, and staff is trained on the revisions and new expectations.
4. *Continued development of the Accreditation Warehouse and Data Dashboards.* With the implementation of the contract for services, the development of the accreditation warehouse and data dashboards will be an important focus in 2015-2016.
5. *Continued refinement and implementation of surveys for the following constituencies:*
  - a. Preliminary Multiple Subject Completer Survey
  - b. Preliminary Single Subject Completer Survey
  - c. Preliminary Education Specialist Completer Survey
  - d. Preliminary Administrative Services Completer Survey
  - e. Clear/Induction Multiple and Single Subject Completer Survey
  - f. Clear Education Specialist Induction Completer Survey
  - g. Master Teacher Survey
  - h. Employer Survey

In addition, significant work will need to be done in 2015-16 to ensure that consistent policies and procedures are established regarding the manner in which the survey results are used in accreditation.

6. *Next generation of performance assessments* – Although the development of the next generation of teaching performance assessments and the development of administrator performance assessments is a Commission effort and not a Committee on Accreditation

effort, the Committee will be monitoring these developments for their nexus with the accreditation system and developing protocols for the use of these data in the accreditation system.

7. *Refocus and redesign the Board of Institutional Training.* With a greater focus on outcomes and less on program documentation and narrative, some significant retooling of the Board of Institutional Reviewer, team lead, and team member trainings must take place in 2015-16 and into 2016-17. New training must be developed for new reviewers and an updated training must take place to bring veteran reviewers up to speed on changes in process and policies.
8. *Establish a calendar and design technical assistance efforts.* The Commission has adopted a transition to the new system that includes a development and transition year (2016-2017) that allows for significant technical assistance. The Commission staff, in association with the field, will determine how best to focus these efforts to ensure that all institutions understand and are prepared to participate in the new accreditation system in 2017-18.
9. *Establishing and implementing processes and procedures for identifying exceptional programs.* Building on the discussions that have taken place thus far, the Commission will continue to explore a variety of options to ensure that those institutions with particularly strong or innovative programs are able to be recognized and share their experiences and accomplishments with the broader education community. The Committee on Accreditation will provide feedback on the system as it develops and in its early implementation.

### **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.

## Section IV: Improvements Made in 2014-15 by Institutions with Stipulations

This section documents some of the improvements that were made by institutions as a result of stipulations placed upon them as a result of the accreditation review in 2013-14. Institutions with stipulations have one year to satisfactorily address all stipulations. Institutions may be provided with additional time if the COA has determined that the institution has made sufficient progress in addressing the stipulations and if the nature of the changes necessary warrant additional time. This section includes a brief summary of those institutions with site visits in 2013-2014 that resulted in stipulations and of the resulting decisions after action was taken by the institution to address the stipulations.

The table below summarizes the COA decisions at the time of the original visit and one year later.

### ***Accreditation Actions in 2015 for Institutions with Stipulations in 2014***

Institution	Stipulation Level in 2014	Revisit in 2015	Full Accreditation in 2015
Pacific Oaks College	Probationary Stipulations	Yes	*No
California State University, Monterey Bay	Major Stipulations	Yes	Yes
Hebrew Union College	Major Stipulations	No	*No
National University	Stipulations	Yes	Yes
Claremont Graduate University	Stipulations	No	Yes
Antioch University	Stipulations	No	Yes
Los Banos USD	Stipulations	No	Yes
La Sierra University	Stipulations	No	Yes

*\*Some of the original stipulations from the 2014 visit have been removed.*

Of the above eight institutions with stipulations, six addressed the deficiencies identified by the site visit team to the satisfaction of the COA. The COA removed all stipulations and granted full accreditation to these six institutions. Two of the six institutions addressed some of the stipulations, but the COA determined that further work needed to continue on other stipulations. These two institutions, Pacific Oaks College and Hebrew Union College continue to work closely with Commission staff in addressing the COA concerns.

The information that follows provides a summary of the types of improvements that each institution with stipulations have made. Additionally, each institution's accreditation report contains a greater level of detail and may be accessed at: [https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmp/accreditation/accreditation\\_reports.html](https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmp/accreditation/accreditation_reports.html)

## Summary Reports of Institutions with Probationary Stipulations

Institution	Accreditation Decision
Pacific Oaks College	August 2014: Probationary Stipulations with Revisit May 2015: Revisit June 2015: Accreditation with Stipulations
<p>The original 2014 site visit report for Pacific Oaks College (POC) can be found in its entirety here: <a href="http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-08/2014-08-item-09.pdf">http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-08/2014-08-item-09.pdf</a>.</p>	
<p><b>Summary of Actions Taken:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of TaskStream as the repository and report generator for all collection and reporting of candidate, cooperating teacher, field supervisor, and faculty evaluation data.</li> <li>• Development and availability of accurate and definitive reports regarding candidate retention and graduation.</li> <li>• Development of Signature Assignments that align with the CTC standards.</li> <li>• Strengthening of the Dual Multiple Subject/Education Specialist Mild Moderate program by adding seven credit hours.</li> <li>• Strengthening of the Preliminary Education Specialist program by creating three new courses.</li> <li>• Evaluating data generated from new processes and courses.</li> <li>• Revising all syllabi to align with CTC standards and include assignments and assessments providing evidence of candidate achievement of the standards.</li> <li>• Systematized accurate tracking of candidate retention and graduation.</li> <li>• Implementation of evaluation processes for new full-time and adjunct faculty.</li> <li>• Implementation of annual assessment of candidate learning.</li> <li>• Development and implementation of new orientation and training procedures for all candidates, cooperating teachers, field supervisors and faculty on practicum and directed teaching requirements.</li> <li>• Establishment of criteria for field placements and cooperating teachers.</li> <li>• Including clear and explicit criteria and requirements for placements, cooperating teachers, and field supervisors in the Directed Teaching Handbook and Student Practicum Handbook.</li> <li>• Integrated research-based explicit instruction throughout three courses to meet the needs of all students in the area of language and literacy, including those who have no communication skills.</li> <li>• Development of a functional behavior assessment of a student who has social, emotional, communication, and/or academic challenges in coursework.</li> <li>• Implementation of new reviews annually for Full-time faculty and each semester for new adjunct faculty.</li> <li>• Development and initial implementation of the School of Education’s first annual program review and comprehensive program review schedule to coincide with the Commission’s assessment and review cycle.</li> </ul>	

<b>Institution</b> Pacific Oaks College	<b>Accreditation Decision</b> August 2014: Probationary Stipulations with Revisit May 2015: Revisit June 2015: Accreditation with Stipulations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instituting new policy beginning in Fall 2014 requiring all current and new full-time faculty and staff to participate in sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, and gender diversity training and incorporated gender diversity within the new faculty and staff orientation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Issues still to be resolved:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The system was working but was not as complete as is necessary for truly robust analysis of candidate achievement and program effectiveness. Pacific Oaks will continue to train and follow up as needed.</li> <li>• Though faculty are not yet producing original scholarship, they are attending conferences and workshops to improve and maintain currency of skills.</li> <li>• Candidates are now appropriately placed by the Credential Analyst.</li> <li>• At the revisit, there was still no evidence that the program provides opportunities for using formal assessments for candidates to evaluate students' needs and strengths. There was also a lack of evidence that candidates acquire knowledge and skills necessary to assess students in a comprehensive manner. The team members were unable to find evidence that candidates have knowledge of required statewide assessments and local, state and federal accountability systems.</li> <li>• Starting spring 2015, it is now mandatory that administrators, faculty, and supervisors for all evaluations of fieldwork supervisors, cooperating teachers, and field placements to be completed in TaskStream.</li> </ul>	

***Institutions with Major Stipulations***

<b>Institution</b> California State University Monterey Bay	<b>Accreditation Decision</b> April 2014: Major Stipulations April 2015: Revisit June 2015: Stipulations Removed
<p>The original 2014 site visit report for California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) can be found in its entirety here: <a href="http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-04/2014-04-item-11.pdf">http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-04/2014-04-item-11.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Summary of Actions Taken:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Searches conducted to fill full-time faculty positions. The institution provided resources needed to retain experienced adjunct faculty and lecturers during the search process. Some existing faculty roles were restructured to enable faculty to focus more exclusively on instruction; additional restructuring is planned when full time faculty hiring is complete.</li> <li>• Institutional support for added flexibility in salary negotiations</li> <li>• Initiation of a strategic planning process for guiding College of Education development</li> </ul>	

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
California State University Monterey Bay	April 2014: Major Stipulations April 2015: Revisit June 2015: Stipulations Removed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of fieldwork supervision procedures for all programs and adoption of changes to strengthen and improve candidate/intern support during field experiences</li> <li>• Leadership from a new Dean and Department Chair promoting stronger collaboration across the unit as well as improvements in program operation</li> <li>• Institutional leadership confirmed the university’s commitment to providing resources to ensure the effective operation of the College and its programs</li> <li>• Steps were taken to centralize and strengthen overall advising and support services for candidates in all programs.</li> </ul> <p><i>Multiple Subjects</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All procedures are clearly and consistently described in program documents, cooperating teacher agreements, and materials used in orientations and pairs trainings. Cooperating teachers now have a clear understanding of program requirements of their roles/responsibilities as co-teachers.</li> <li>• Program coursework now begins at 4:00 p.m. or later.</li> <li>• Documentary evidence for this standard included all of the cooperating teacher information outlined in the narrative for Standard 2.</li> </ul> <p><i>Single Subjects</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tasks and rubrics aligned with requirements and the program also instituted a process for reviewing individual candidate progress relative to TPEs midway through the program for goal-setting purposes and prior to program exit for reviewing candidate progress relative to those goals.</li> <li>• Revising course content and assignments across subject areas to encompass depth and breadth of candidate preparation in each subject area.</li> <li>• Revising coursework and field experiences to infuse learning about and working with English learners.</li> <li>• Districts wishing to hire interns from CSUMB programs must now provide evidence that placement sites meet linguistic diversity criteria—or indicate the means by which they will ensure that interns have opportunities to develop proficiency working with English Learners.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New procedures are now consistently followed to ensure that all individuals serving as cooperating teachers meet, or in most cases exceed, minimum state requirements.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Education Specialist</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Now includes attention to understanding and acceptance of differences in religion, gender identity/expression and sexual orientation.</li> <li>• Candidates now develop an Individualized Transition Plan in conjunction with parents, primary caregivers, and general education teachers and candidates are provided the opportunity to demonstrate knowledge of building social networks for students with disabilities.</li> </ul>	

<b>Institution</b> California State University Monterey Bay	<b>Accreditation Decision</b> April 2014: Major Stipulations April 2015: Revisit June 2015: Stipulations Removed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities are provided in three courses to acquire and demonstrate knowledge of required statewide assessments and local, state and federal accountability systems.</li> <li>• Three different assessments now provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate competency in transitions for students with learning disabilities.</li> <li>• Program made significant improvements to coursework and practicum requirements and adopted an extensive IEP rubric.</li> <li>• Candidates now have several assignments on vocabulary development such as developing three language arts lessons involving phonemic awareness, phonics/ spelling, fluency, and vocabulary development.</li> <li>• Program has made significant improvements in strengthening the focus on the preparation to teach English learners and assignments were added so that all candidates now have opportunities to work with English learners.</li> <li>• Program curriculum now identifies examples of effective consultation and collaboration in Case Studies and candidates are observed by their University Supervisors who assess candidates' co-teaching and collaborative practices.</li> <li>• Requirements for creating healthy environments were addressed through assignments, assessments, and observations by clinical supervisors.</li> </ul> <p><i>Mild/Moderate Disabilities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates now required to select and implement evidence-based practices with a student as part of their Curriculum Development/Adaptation Project; additional syllabi and rubrics have been updated to clearly indicate the focus, use and assessment of candidate competency with evidence-based practices.</li> <li>• Courses now have clearly-articulated requirements that candidates must meet in order to demonstrate competency and are assessed on their use of evidence-based practices</li> <li>• Assessments such as the "Individualized Transition Plan Assignment" and "Life Center Education Lesson Assignment and Assessment" now provide opportunities for candidates to exhibit competency of this standard. Evidence provided by assessments in three different courses also provided evaluation of the candidate's proficiency.</li> </ul> <p><i>Moderate/Severe Disabilities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Various requirements are now clearly addressed in coursework across the entire range of moderate to severe disabilities through a total of six modules that address the specialized needs of Moderate/Severe students.</li> </ul> <p><i>Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several modules now deal specifically with the challenges of language, social skills, behavior and processing for students with autism, and how to identify these characteristics in students and candidate competencies are now assessed at the end of every module through a variety of means.</li> </ul>	

<b>Institution</b> California State University Monterey Bay	<b>Accreditation Decision</b> April 2014: Major Stipulations April 2015: Revisit June 2015: Stipulations Removed
<b>Institution</b> Hebrew Union College	<b>Accreditation Decision</b> April 2014: Major Stipulations June 2015: Accreditation with Stipulations

The original 2014 site visit report for Hebrew Union College (HUC) can be found in its entirety here: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-04/2014-04-item-26.pdf>

**Summary of Actions Taken:**

- Information about its faculty participation in the public school system provided.
- Revisions made to advising materials and orientation to ensure that all candidates are aware of the requirement to demonstrate subject matter competency prior to student teaching and have the opportunity to ask questions.
- Program director monitors each candidate's status and notes when they are eligible for student teaching.
- Submission of the required report to the Commission was completed in in June 2014.
- Submission of an updated series of tables listing four categories of processes, procedures and protocols that were now being documented on an ongoing cyclical basis.
- Development of a unit-wide assessment system including processes and procedures for collecting, analyzing, and using data for program improvement. No assessment tools or assessment results have been provided.
- Establishment of relationships with public schools near their three campus locations.
- Requiring observations in hard to staff and/or low performing schools and tracking those observations.
- Requiring a complete full-day teaching assignment of at least two weeks.

Additional information will be provided the COA within one year on Stipulations 4 and 5 in order to remove all stipulations.

**Accreditation with Stipulations**

<b>Institution</b> National University	<b>Accreditation Decision</b> March 2014: Stipulations March 2015: Revisit April 2015: Stipulations Removed
---	--

The original 2014 site visit report for National University can be found in its entirety here: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-04/2014-04-item-29.pdf>

**Summary of Actions Taken:**

- Development of a website providing mentors with training and support materials. It contains: 1) a Power Point presentation for training; 2) information about the content of

<b>Institution</b> National University	<b>Accreditation Decision</b> March 2014: Stipulations March 2015: Revisit April 2015: Stipulations Removed
<p>each course, as well as all contact information for each course lead and the program lead; and, 3) the mentor handbook and other resources to support the mentors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After the final course, candidates are asked to provide feedback regarding their mentor and the mentor is asked to give feedback about the General Education Clear Credential program through surveys. To further strengthen mentor/mentee relationships, mentors are now invited to the candidates' presentation of their portfolios at the end of the program.</li> <li>• Work Plan to determine the best methodology for data collection was developed. A form was constructed requiring each University Support Provider (USP) to provide information about each student teacher's individual classroom composition and in the Fall of 2014, the new system was implemented.</li> <li>• Collection and verification of demographic data for all field experiences was implemented. Accountability is more rigorous and the focus on diversity of placements is enhanced and documented for each candidate and requires that TPE-focused feedback be developed and shared with the candidate.</li> <li>• The Dean, Interim Associate Dean, Department Chairs, Program and Course Leads, and Statewide Coordinators of Clinical Practice are responsible for the oversight of processes delineated in Stipulations 1 and 2. The Accreditation Steering Committee meeting provides oversight and monitors the implementation of the Work Plan.</li> <li>• The Interim Associate Dean meets with Clear Credential Program Lead for a monthly update of tasks addressing Stipulation 1. The Dean also meets with the Statewide Coordinator of Student Teaching for updates on the work to address Stipulation 2. These meeting dates are recorded and on the website.</li> <li>• The Dean and interim Associate Dean discuss the current status of the Work Plan on a weekly basis. Communication with the Department Chairs occurs during the individual Chair meetings and the monthly Accreditation Steering Committee meetings. As issues are identified, viable solutions are discussed and implemented on an as-needed basis.</li> </ul>	

<b>Institution</b> Claremont Graduate University	<b>Accreditation Decision</b> April 2014: Stipulations April 2015: Stipulations Removed
<p>The original 2014 site visit report for Claremont Graduate University (CGU) can be found in its entirety here:  <a href="http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-04/2014-04-item-27.pdf">http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-04/2014-04-item-27.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Summary of Actions Taken:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes to the credential monitoring system were made to significantly improve file transparency, ensure important checks and balances, and to facilitate the ease of information sharing with candidates and authorized staff and increased oversight of all</li> </ul>	

<b>Institution</b> Claremont Graduate University	<b>Accreditation Decision</b> April 2014: Stipulations April 2015: Stipulations Removed
<p>credential recommendations. (i.e Credential Completion survey – a final step in the credential filing process).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of an auditing system to allow the Data and Evaluation Coordinator to assess the accuracy of the credential monitoring system by selecting a random sample of candidates equal to 20% of enrolled candidates (up from 10% in its first trial), and comparing the candidates’ files against information in a database maintained by the Credential Analyst. Audit findings are submitted to the Director of Teacher Education.</li> <li>• Development of a Unit Assessment system to formalize the use of the substantial program and unit data being collected. A clear and thorough matrix for gathering and analyzing unit assessment is present that illustrates data collected related to each Common Standard, includes attention to the need for analysis of the data, and the resulting actions triggered by the analysis.</li> <li>• Data Retreat days are scheduled each semester to facilitate formal review of Unit- and Program-level data regarding candidate competencies, program effectiveness, and completer performance, with retreat follow-up sessions occurring, as necessary, to focus on specific programs.</li> <li>• Modifications of surveys to collect data that can be used to assess mission and vision goals.</li> <li>• Restructure of advisory groups. In addition to the Unit Advisory Council that meets twice per year, the new structure includes Program Advisory Teams that meet two to three times per year, are now led by at least one Credential Coordinator from the specific program and include stakeholder and expert representation that is appropriately diverse. Program Advisory Teams are invited to attend the meetings of the Unit Advisory Council. The Unit Advisory Council provides input on Unit data</li> <li>• Establishing a clear set of roles and responsibilities for district employed site support providers (SSP), CGU supervisors, and interns.</li> <li>• Currently creating four training modules for SSPs which include assignments, feedback opportunities and support resources.</li> <li>• Revising district MOUs include expectations for all clinical/field placement activities, representative attendance at the Unit Advisory Council, and communication between CGU and district employers as a result of collaboration between CGU and its district partners facilitated through Unit Advisory Council meetings.</li> <li>• Development of an Intern Principal Professional Development Plan survey and Advisory Course/Instructor Evaluation to support the review and revision of intern professional development plans and evaluate the effectiveness of supervision.</li> </ul>	

<b>Institution</b> Antioch University	<b>Accreditation Decision</b> August 2014: Stipulations June 2015: Stipulations Removed
--	---

The original 2014 site visit report for Antioch University can be found in its entirety here:

<b>Institution</b> Antioch University	<b>Accreditation Decision</b> August 2014: Stipulations June 2015: Stipulations Removed
<p><a href="http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-08/2014-08-item-10.pdf">http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-08/2014-08-item-10.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Summary of Actions Taken:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint evaluations of credential faculty and chairs.</li> <li>• Combined Annual Credential Program Reviews.</li> <li>• Combined Reports to CTC.</li> <li>• Monthly unit meetings.</li> <li>• Monthly campus and unit leadership conference calls with the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.</li> <li>• Established a common cost center.</li> <li>• Established a Joint Advisory Board.</li> <li>• Hiring of an external consultant.</li> <li>• Integrating unit data for the Biennial Report</li> <li>• Creating means of collecting data through a(n):           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Principal Survey.</li> <li>○ Exit Survey.</li> <li>○ Course Evaluation Form.</li> <li>○ Common project measuring application of social justice using a formal rubric.</li> <li>○ Using commonalities of TPE measures from both CalTPA and PACT.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

<b>Institution</b> Los Banos USD	<b>Accreditation Decision</b> June 2014: Stipulations June 2015: Stipulations Removed
<p>The original 2014 site visit report for Los Banos Unified School District can be found in its entirety here: <a href="http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-06/2014-06-item-23.pdf">http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-06/2014-06-item-23.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Summary of Actions Taken:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of a comprehensive assessment system featuring:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Input information from a variety of stakeholder groups.</li> <li>○ Assessments gathered from late August through late May.</li> <li>○ A variety of tools, including surveys, tracking records, and face-to-face conversations.</li> <li>○ Identification of how the assessment data will be used for program and unit improvement.</li> <li>○ Templates and forms for assessments.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Development of a collaborative system for the selection of support providers that includes:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Written application with a narrative explanation of why they would like to be a support provider.</li> <li>○ Written recommendation from the applicant's site administrator.</li> <li>○ Verification of teaching experience by the credential analyst.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

<b>Institution</b> Los Banos USD	<b>Accreditation Decision</b> June 2014: Stipulations June 2015: Stipulations Removed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ An informal meeting with program and district personnel to discuss support provider roles and responsibilities.</li> <li>○ Initial and ongoing training.</li> <li>● Development of a monitoring process of support provider interaction with the participating teacher and program personnel which includes:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mentor time logs.</li> <li>○ Completion of formative assessment documents.</li> <li>○ Corrective feedback documentation.</li> <li>○ Protocol for changing Support Providers.</li> <li>○ Drop-in visits by the program director during Support Provider-Participating Teacher meetings.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Development of a retention process which has not yet been fully implemented as it has not been in place for a full year of Support Provider service at this time.</li> <li>● Professional development around the Induction Program Standards 5 and 6 that outline curricular areas of growth for beginning teachers. Program Standard 4 is addressed at every professional development session as the formative assessment tools document the work completed in standards 5 and 6.</li> <li>● Creating a two-year plan of professional development sessions to be presented by experts within the Los Banos Unified School District.</li> <li>● Providing release time professional development participating teachers to either observe lessons by another district teacher or schedule demonstration lessons in their own classroom.</li> <li>● Development of a protocol that ensures all new placements for teachers are screened for the possible inclusion of English learner and special populations students.</li> <li>● Training of site administrators and credential analysts in the new protocol.</li> <li>● Program director now monitors each participating teacher's formative assessment documents to verify that lessons are being differentiated for all student populations.</li> </ul>	

<b>Institution</b> La Sierra University	<b>Accreditation Decision</b> June 2014: Stipulations June 2015: Stipulations Removed
<p>The original 2014 site visit report for Lia Sierra University can be found in its entirety here: <a href="http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-06/2014-06-item-22.pdf">http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-06/2014-06-item-22.pdf</a>.</p> <p><b>Summary of Actions Taken:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Implementation of LiveText as a unit-wide assessment system. Candidates are required to submit course signature assignments on LiveText, where rubrics for evaluating the signature assignments also appear.</li> <li>● Training workshops on LiveText, signature assignments, and assessments for faculty and adjunct contract teachers were conducted by the School of Education's Assessment</li> </ul>	

<b>Institution</b> La Sierra University	<b>Accreditation Decision</b> June 2014: Stipulations June 2015: Stipulations Removed
<p>Coordinator. Adjuncts in the School Psychology and Counseling department were trained one-on-one by the program director.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The School of Education chairs' meetings and monthly faculty meetings include review of the assessment calendar. Examples of scheduled assessment agenda items include the following: Review and updating of Strategic Initiatives, review of enrollments, analysis of where growth occurred, and planning for continued growth of cohorts, review of LiveText data analysis for the 2014-2015 school year, with recommendations made for the September faculty meeting prior to the new school year.</li> <li>• Standardization of the credentials recommendation process across the institution.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Departmental program coordinators evaluate candidate progress on the credential checklist at two points: pre-practicum and when the program is complete. Coordinators communicate with the candidate to address any deficiencies.</li> <li>○ After program completion and requirements have been met by the candidate the department sends a letter to the credential analyst, along with the candidate's checklist, verifying completion.</li> <li>○ Credential analyst evaluates the checklist independently to verify completion.</li> <li>○ Credential analyst supports and guides the candidate in applying for the credential.</li> <li>○ Credential analyst reports data annually to the School of Education faculty on the status of credential completions functioning of the credential recommendation process.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Implementation of a customized practicum for each single subject candidate by pairing the candidate with a methods expert mentor who meets individually with the candidate to discuss subject specific pedagogy prior to the candidate's lab placement.</li> <li>• Collaboration between the methods expert and the single subject candidate in each methods course continues during the time that the candidate observes in a master teacher's classroom for 15 hours.</li> <li>• Candidates now observe single subject pedagogy in the classroom of a master teacher credentialed in the single subject content area for a minimum of 15 hours.</li> <li>• Candidates teach lessons for a minimum of five hours under the supervision of the master teacher.</li> <li>• Methods expert mentors continue to support the candidates during the practicum placement.</li> <li>• Methods experts mentors are carefully screened by the Curriculum and Instruction faculty to ensure that they are experts in their respective discipline, and that they have pedagogical expertise in the single subject content.</li> <li>• Master teacher selections involve the same screening but have the further requirement of being credentialed in the single subject with three years successful teaching experience.</li> </ul>	

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
La Sierra University	June 2014: Stipulations June 2015: Stipulations Removed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Occasionally, the role of methods expert and master teacher may be filled by the same individual, if that person meets the requirements of both roles.</li> <li>• Each quarter, candidates receive personalized placements with methods experts mentors and master teachers, and are assigned a university supervisor who has expertise in pedagogy.</li> <li>• Single Subject candidate now receives 226 hours of individual support prior to student teaching.</li> </ul>	

## Appendix A

### CTC Accreditation Cohorts by Institution (2014-15)

<b>California State University (23)</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
Cal Poly, Pomona!*	Indigo	CSU Monterey Bay*S	Violet
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo*S	Orange	CSU Northridge*F	Yellow
CalState TEACH	Orange	CSU Sacramento	Orange
CSU Bakersfield*F	Indigo	CSU San Bernardino*S	Green
CSU Channel Islands	Green	CSU San Marcos*S	Indigo
CSU Chico*S	Indigo	CSU Stanislaus*S	Yellow
CSU Dominguez Hills*F	Red	Humboldt State University	Indigo
CSU East Bay*S	Green	San Diego State University*F	Yellow
CSU Fresno*S	Violet	San Francisco State University	Violet
CSU Fullerton*F	Blue	San Jose State University*S	Orange
CSU Long Beach*S	Indigo	Sonoma State University*S	Red
CSU Los Angeles*F	Red		

<b>University of California (8)</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
UC Berkeley	Red	UC Riverside	Blue
UC Davis	Violet	UC San Diego	Violet
UC Irvine	Violet	UC Santa Barbara	Orange
UC Los Angeles	Red	UC Santa Cruz	Red

<b>Independent Institutions (56)</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
Academy of Art	Orange	Notre Dame de Namur University	Green
Alliant International University	Blue	Pacific Oaks College	Violet
Antioch University	Violet	Pacific Union College	Red
Argosy University	Indigo	Patten University	Green
Azusa Pacific University*S	Indigo	Pepperdine University	Red
Bard College	Blue	Phillips Graduate Institution	Blue
Biola University	Yellow	Point Loma Nazarene University*S	Red
Brandman University*S!	Indigo	St. Mary's College of California	Orange
California Baptist University	Orange	San Diego Christian College	Yellow
California Lutheran University*F	Green	Santa Clara University	Yellow
Chapman University~	Orange	Simpson University	Green
Claremont Graduate University	Violet	Stanford University*S	Blue

<b>Independent Institutions (56)</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
Concordia University	Red	Teachers College of San Joaquin	Indigo
Dominican University of California	Blue	The Master's College	Orange
Drexel University#	Blue	Touro University	Yellow
Fielding Graduate University	Indigo	United States University	Blue
Fresno Pacific University	Yellow	University of La Verne*S	Orange
Hebrew Union College	Violet	University of Phoenix	Orange
Holy Names University	Blue	University of Redlands	Indigo
Hope International University	Violet	University of San Diego*F	Red
Humphreys College	Green	University of San Francisco	Indigo
La Sierra University	Violet	University of Southern California!*	Violet
Loma Linda University	Blue	University of the Pacific*S	Orange
Loyola Marymount University*S	Yellow	Vanguard University	Blue
Mills College	Green	Western Governors University	Yellow
Mount St. Mary's College	Indigo	Westmont College	Green
National Hispanic University	Yellow	Whittier College	Yellow
National University!*	Violet	William Jessup University	Yellow

<b>Other Program Sponsors (Districts/County Offices/Other) (168)</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
Assoc. of CA School Admin/ASCA	Orange	Montebello USD (417)	Green
Alhambra USD (401)	Orange	Monterey COE (209)	Indigo
Anaheim City SD (501)	Yellow	Mt. Diablo USD (210): Fortune School of Education	Blue
Anaheim Union HSD (502)	Orange	Murrieta Valley USD (616)	Violet
Animo Leadership Charter HS (438)	Indigo	Napa COE (111)	Yellow
Antelope Valley Union HSD (601)	Violet	New Haven USD (211)	Violet
Antioch USD (101)	Green	Newark USD (205)	Green
Arcadia USD (435)	Red	Norwalk- La Mirada USD (418) #	Violet
Aspire Public Schools (232)	Orange	Oak Grove SD (237)	Blue
Azusa USD (402)	Orange	Oakland USD (212)	Red
Bakersfield City SD (301)	Green	Ocean View SD (530)	Indigo
Baldwin Park USD (403)	Indigo	Oceanside USD (517)	Green
Bay Area School of Enterprise/REACH (234)	Red	Ontario-Montclair SD (609)	Yellow
Bellflower USD (404)	Blue	Orange County DOE (518)	Indigo
Brentwood Union SD (108)	Indigo	Orange USD (519)	Red
Burbank USD (405) #	Red	Palmdale SD (610)	Blue
Butte COE (103)	Orange	Palo Alto USD (213)	Violet

<b>Other Program Sponsors (Districts/County Offices/Other) (168)</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
Cajon Valley Union SD (506) #	Red	Palos Verdes Peninsula USD (416)	Violet
California School of the Deaf/Fremont (238)	Blue	Panama-Buena Vista Union SD (314)	Yellow
Campbell Union SD (203)	Red	Paramount USD (431)	Orange
Capistrano USD (504)	Yellow	Pasadena USD (419)	Indigo
Castaic Union SD (432)	Green	Placentia-Yorba Linda USD (520)	Indigo
Central USD (302)	Indigo	Placer COE (114)	Red
Chaffey Joint Union HSD (602)	Blue	Pleasanton USD (230)	Red
Chino Valley USD (603) #	Yellow	Pomona USD (420)	Yellow
Chula Vista ESD (505)	Red	Poway USD (521)	Red
Clovis USD (303)	Yellow	PUC Schools (437)	Blue
Compton USD (434)	Violet	Redwood City SD (214)	Red
Conejo Valley USD (231)	Orange	Rialto USD (611)	Orange
Contra Costa COE (204)	Red	Riverside COE (612)	Red
Corona –Norco USD (604)	Blue	Riverside USD (613)	Yellow
Culver City USD (407)	Red	Rowland USD (421)	Yellow
Cupertino Union SD (236)	Violet	Sacramento City USD (116)	Violet
Davis Joint USD (104)	Red	Sacramento COE (115)	Indigo
Dos Palos Oro Loma Joint USD (323)	Red	Saddleback Valley USD (528)	Yellow
El Dorado COE (105)	Violet	San Bernardino City USD (614)	Green
El Rancho USD (430)	Orange	San Diego COE (515/525)	Green
Elk Grove USD (106)	Blue	San Diego USD (522)	Indigo
Encinitas Union SD (514)	Blue	San Dieguito Union HSD (524)	Indigo
Envision Schools (235)	Violet	San Francisco USD (215)	Violet
Escondido Union SD (508)	Blue	San Gabriel USD (422)	Yellow
Escondido Union HSD (507) #	Violet	San Joaquin COE (315)	Indigo
Etiwanda SD (605)	Yellow	San Jose USD (216)	Indigo
Evergreen SD (229)	Green	San Juan USD (117)	Green
Fairfield-Suisun USD (107)	Green	San Luis Obispo COE (218)	Blue
Fontana USD (606)	Orange	San Marcos USD (531)	Orange
Fremont USD (206)	Orange	San Mateo-Foster City SD (233)	Green
Fresno COE (304)	Green	San Mateo COE (219)	Blue
Fresno USD (305)	Blue	San Ramon Valley USD (222)	Indigo
Fullerton SD (516)	Indigo	Sanger USD (324)	Violet
Garden Grove USD (532)	Green	Santa Ana USD (533)	Green
Glendale USD (409) #	Blue	Santa Barbara CEO (223)	Orange
Greenfield Union SD (306) #	Blue	Santa Clara COE	Blue
Grossmont Union HSD (510)	Blue	Santa Clara USD (225)	Yellow
Hacienda La Puente USD (410)	Green	Santa Cruz COE (226)	Yellow

<b>Other Program Sponsors (Districts/County Offices/Other) (168)</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
Hanford ESD (321)	Red	Santa Monica-Malibu USD (424)	Indigo
Hayward USD (207)	Orange	Santa Rosa City Schools (118) #	Orange
High Tech High (537)	Indigo	Saugus Union SD (423)	Green
Imperial COE (511)	Violet	Selma USD (316)	Violet
Inner City Education Foundation (ICEF)/LAUSD (436)	Violet	Sequoia Union HSD (227)	Violet
Irvine USD (535)	Violet	School for Integrated Academics and Technology/SIA Tech (536)	Orange
Keppel Union SD (607) #	Violet	Shasta COE	Green
Kern County SOS (307)	Violet	Sonoma COE (112)	Yellow
Kern High SD (308)	Blue	Stanislaus COE (317)	Yellow
King Chavez (539) #	Green	Stockton USD (119)	Indigo
Kings COE (309)	Orange	Sutter County SOS (121)	Red
La Mesa-Spring Valley SD (512)	Green	Sweetwater Union HSD (526) #	Yellow
Lancaster SD (608)	Indigo	Tehama County DOE (113)	Blue
Lawndale ESD (411)	Blue	Temple City USD (425)	Red
Lodi USD (109) #	Yellow	Torrance USD (426)	Blue
Long Beach USD (412)	Blue	Tracy USD (120)	Indigo
Los Angeles COE (413)	Green	Tulare City SD (318)	Red
Los Angeles USD (414/443/441-448)	Red	Tulare COE (319)	Blue
Los Banos USD (325)	Violet	Tustin USD (527)	Blue
Madera COE	Green	Vallejo City USD (123)	Blue
Madera USD (310)	Indigo	Ventura COE (228)	Indigo
Magnolia Public Schools (538): Pacific Tech Schools-Orange County #	Blue	Visalia USD (320)	Indigo
Manteca USD (311)	Red	Vista USD (529)	Indigo
Marin COE (110)	Red	Walnut Valley USD (428)	Yellow
Merced COE (312)	Green	Washington USD (125)	Violet
Merced Union HSD (322)	Orange	West Contra Costa USD (124)	Orange
Metropolitan Education District	Indigo	West Covina USD (427)	Indigo
Milpitas USD (208)	Orange	Westside Union SD (615)	Indigo
Modesto City Schools (313)	Orange	Wiseburn SD	Blue
		Wm S Hart Union HSD (429)	Violet

\*CAEP Visit (F= Fall Visit; S= Spring Visit) != Initial Visit (3-digit) = LEA Induction # = Inactive