

Transition to a Revised Accreditation System/ Restart of Accreditation Visits

Professional Services Division

June 15, 2006

This item is to structure the discussion of the steps necessary to restart the accreditation system with the understanding that the Commission directed staff to return to the July 31-August 1, 2006 Commission meeting with an action item to that effect. In addition, the Commission directed staff to plan that site visits should begin with the 2007-2008 year. The tables below provide information for the discussion.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the COA adopt priorities for use in the scheduling of institutions for site visits in the revised accreditation system as they are placed in the seven year cycle.

Roles in Implementing the Accreditation System

Roles and Responsibilities in California's Accreditation System			
California Legislature	Commission	Committee on Accreditation	Commission Staff
↓	↓	↓	↓
State Law establishing the system	Sets Accreditation Policy within the system	Develops Accreditation Procedures	Implements the Policies and Procedures as defined in the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> and <i>Accreditation Handbook</i>
↓	↓	↓	
<i>Education Code</i> 44370-44374	<i>Accreditation Framework</i> (1993) To be revised	<i>Accreditation Handbook</i> (1997) To be revised	

In order to restart the Accreditation System a number of tasks need to be completed. Below is a table to begin the discussion on the number and type of tasks. The timeline is not linear, in that many tasks overlap while others must be done after an action by the Commission or the COA.

Restart the Accreditation System

Tasks to Restart the Accreditation System	Type of Decision	Required Action	Timeline
Adopt a revised accreditation process and take action to restart accreditation	Policy	Commission Action	August 2006
Revise Accreditation Framework	Procedure	COA and Staff work	Aug. 2006- Jan. 2007
Adopt revised Accreditation Framework	Policy	Commission Action	Sept. 2006- Jan. 2007
Revise Accreditation Handbook	Implementation	Staff work	Aug. 2006- April 2007
Adopt the revised Accreditation Handbook	Procedure	COA Action Report to Commission	April 2007- June 2007
Develop priorities for the new accreditation schedule	Procedure	COA Action, Report to Commission	June 2006
Develop the schedule based on priorities, assign each institution to a year in the cycle	Implementation	Staff work, Report to COA and Commission	August 2006
*Develop clear guidelines for -Biennial reports -Program review in 4 th year -site visits	Implementation	Staff work COA Action	June 2006- June 2007
*Develop training for BIR members	Implementation	Staff work COA Action	June 2006- June 2007
Provide technical assistance to program sponsors	Implementation	Staff work	Sept. 2006- June 2007

* Portions of this task are addressed at a policy level and will be included in the revised *Accreditation Framework*, other portions are procedural and will be included in the *Accreditation Handbook* which is developed based on the adopted policy.

Priorities for Consideration in Scheduling Accreditation Visits

1. NCATE visits that are already schedule
2. Institutions/Program Sponsors that have not had an accreditation visit of any kind
3. Institutions/Program Sponsors that have only had a formative visit
4. Recency of the last site visit
5. Approximately equal number of site visits per year
6. Creating a balance in the size of teams needed each year

Implementation Principles for Discussion

- All institutions/program sponsors begin implementation of the accreditation system at the same time, on the assigned step of the cycle. But the level of implementation of the activities at that step of the cycle will be phased in over the early years of the system.
- When new standards are adopted, we expect everyone to begin implementing the new standards at the same time. Evidence will be reviewed at the next site visit and through the other activities in the accreditation system.
- No separate review of revised program documents when new standards are adopted. The program sponsor is responsible for providing a program that meets the adopted standards.
- A panel of reviewers will be brought together and an initial review of revised program documents will be completed. With the information, the program sponsor will be responsible for providing a program that meets the adopted standards.