

Plans for Accreditation Site Visits and COA Agenda Items for 2010-11 May 2010

Overview of this Report

This agenda items presents information regarding the 2010-2011 accreditation site visit schedule. In addition, this agenda item presents the first planning for other agenda items for the COA's consideration in the 2010-11 year. This information should be considered as the COA plans for its meetings in 2010-11.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item only. Based on the COA discussion, staff could bring an action item to a future meeting.

Background

There are 36 institutions in the Orange cohort. This includes 18 institutions that sponsor only BTSA Induction programs and are new to the accreditation system and 18 institutions that were previously in the accreditation system. All these institutions are scheduled for accreditation site visits in 2010-2011, but three of the institutions have requested a delay due to extenuating circumstances. The three institutions have been given a six month delay and will have an accreditation site visit in fall 2011 but remain in the Orange cohort. One institution is in the Yellow Cohort and had requested a delay last year and so their visit will take place in 2010-2011. Staff is conducting the Year-Out Pre-Visits with the institutions in the Orange cohort at this time.

The BTSA Cluster Region Directors (CRD) are scheduled to assist in the facilitation of the BTSA Induction only site visits. There is insufficient Commission staff to facilitate all 20 site visits to BTSA Induction programs. (Two induction programs also sponsor another educator preparation program and Commission staff are assigned to facilitate these two site visits.) The BTSA CRDs have completed the Board of Institutional Reviewer (BIR) training and as part of the BTSA State Leadership Team meetings will participate in calibration activities to understand the role of the state facilitator in Commission accreditation site visits. For the site visits where BTSA CRDs are facilitating the visit, a Commission staff member will be assigned to be the CRDs contact person for any questions before and during the visit.

2010-11 Site Visits

Institution	# approved programs	Site Visit Dates Week of
Fremont BTSA	1	January 30, 2011
Santa Rosa City BTSA	1	
Rialto BTSA	1	
Chapman University **	6	February 6-9, 2011
Cal Baptist University	8	February 27
SIA Tech BTSA	1	
Paramount USD BTSA	1	March 6, 2011
Alhambra USD BTSA	1	

Institution	# approved programs	Site Visit Dates Week of
Milpitas USD BTSA	1	
San Jose State University*	18	March 13, 2011
El Rancho USD BTSA	1	
The Master's College	2	March 27, 2011
Santa Barbara CEO	2	
Azusa USD BTSA	1	
St. Mary's College	9	April 3, 2011
University of the Pacific*	8	
University of LaVerne* (<i>initial</i>)	9	April 10, 2011
Butte COE	2	
Fontana USD BTSA	1	
West Contra Costa BTSA	1	
Kings COE BTSA	1	
Aspire BTSA	1	April 17, 2011
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo* (<i>initial</i>)	5	
Anaheim USD BTSA	1	May 1, 2011
Hayward USD BTSA	1	
Modesto City Schools BTSA	1	
Conejo Valley USD BTSA	1	May 9, 2011
Merced UHSD BTSA	1	
Antioch Santa Barbara	3	May 15, 2011
University of Phoenix	4	
Occidental College	2	
Cal State TEACH	1	October 2, 2011
UC Santa Barbara	4	October 23, 2011
CSU Sacramento	16	October 30, 2011

*Joint NCATE visits

**Joint TEAC Visit

Still to be scheduled: ASCA, SAIL

In addition, at this time, there are three re-visits scheduled for the 2010-11 year. It is possible that additional re-visits will be scheduled based on accreditation reports still to be presented to the COA in spring 2010.

2010-11 Re-Visits, as of May 6, 2010

Institution	Re-Visit Dates
Alliant University	Fall 2010
National Hispanic University	Spring 2011
CSU East Bay*	Spring 2011
Santa Clara University	Spring 2011

*Joint NCATE visits

Accreditation staff must have sufficient time to review and finalize the site visit team’s report prior to submitting it for COA action. Given the site visit dates for each institution, the table below indicates when each institutional team report would most likely be agendized for COA consideration. The three institutions in the Orange cohort with visits in Fall 2011 are not shown in the table below, nor are the three institutions that have not selected site visit dates yet.

Proposed Presentation Plan for Accreditation Visit and Re-Visit Reports to the COA

January 2011	April 2011	May 2011	June 2011
Alliant University	Fremont BTSA	The Master’s College	Aspire BTSA
	Santa Rosa City BTSA	West Contra Costa BTSA	Cal Poly San Luis Obispo* (<i>initial</i>)
	Rialto BTSA	Azusa USD BTSA	Anaheim USD BTSA
	Chapman University **	St. Mary’s College	Hayward USD BTSA
	Cal Baptist University	University of the Pacific*	Modesto City Schools BTSA
	SIA Tech BTSA	University of LaVerne* (<i>initial</i>)	Conejo Valley USD BTSA
	Paramount USD BTSA	Butte COE	Merced UHSD BTSA
	Alhambra USD BTSA	Fontana USD BTSA	University of Phoenix
	Milpitas USD BTSA	Santa Barbara CEO	Occidental College
	San Jose State University*	Kings COE BTSA	Antioch Santa Barbara
	El Rancho USD BTSA		

*Joint NCATE visit

**Joint TEAC visit

In 2010-11 more site visit reports will be presented to the COA than in past years. Many of these reports will be for institutions which offer only 1 educator preparation program. It might be necessary for the COA to consider an alternative process to reviewing and taking action on site visit reports.

Staff is proposing two possible ways to divide the responsibility for reviewing and taking action on site visit reports in 2010-2011:

- The COA could organize into two subcommittees. Each subcommittee would be comprised of 3 K-12 educators and 3 IHE educators. Each subcommittee would be responsible for reading and taking action on half of the reports that focus on only 1 educator preparation program. Each subcommittee would report to the full COA and the full COA would take the official action. The full COA would still hear and take action on all reports where the institution offers more than 1 educator preparation program.

- The COA could organize into two subcommittees. Each subcommittee would be comprised of 3 K-12 educators and 3 IHE educators. Each subcommittee would be responsible for reading and taking action on half of the accreditation site visit reports where the team recommendation is “Accreditation.” Each subcommittee would report to the full COA and the full COA would take the official action. The full COA would still hear and take action on all reports where the team recommendation is anything but full “Accreditation.”

If either of the options discussed above were implemented, staff would ensure that any institution for which a COA member must recuse him or herself would not be assigned to that COA member’s subcommittee. If COA members are absent, the subcommittee structure would be weakened because there would not be the 3 K-12 and IHE members present.

It should be considered that if the work of reviewing accreditation reports and coming to decisions were to be divided by the number of educator preparation programs the institution operates, staff would be able to organize the work early in 2010-2011 because it is known how many programs each institution sponsors. If the work is divided by the site visit team’s accreditation recommendation, the division of the responsibilities would not be possible until after each site visit concludes. It would be possible that most or even all reports scheduled for one COA meeting would need to be reviewed by the full COA if none of the institution’s reports had a team recommendation of “Accreditation.”

An additional possibility for dividing the accreditation site visit reports could be for COA to be divided into the two subcommittees described in the two options above. Each subcommittee would be responsible for half the accreditation reports at any one COA meeting. All accreditation reports would be presented to the assigned subcommittee on the first day of the COA meeting. Each subcommittee would hear the report and decide if it supports the team’s recommendation. For any reports where the team’s recommendation is not confirmed by the subcommittee, the full COA could hear that accreditation site visit report on the second day of the COA meeting. This division of the work could require a site visit team lead and institutional representatives to be available for both days of the COA meeting. For this reason alone, staff is not recommending this option.

If the COA were to elect to use one of the options described above, then each subcommittee would report out to the full COA and the full COA would take action to adopt the subcommittee’s decisions.

Based on the COA’s discussion, staff could develop and bring an action item to a future COA meeting with the procedures detailed as to how the COA will review and take action on accreditation reports in the 2010-2011 year.

Other COA Work in 2010-11

In addition, other topics need to be addressed by the COA in its meetings. The table on the following page provides a beginning list of the topics staff is planning to put on the agenda for the 2010-11 year. The table displays staff’s current thinking about the month for the COA meeting, length of the meeting, and planned agenda items for the meeting. This information should be considered as the COA plans for its meetings in 2010-11.

**Committee on Accreditation
2010-11 Planning**

August 3-4	October 22	January 19-20	April 21-22	May 25-26	June 23-24
1 ½ days	1 day	1-2 days	2 days	2 days	2 days
Agenda	Agenda	Agenda	Agenda	Agenda	Agenda
Minutes	Minutes	Minutes	Minutes	Minutes	Minutes
Program Approvals	Program Approvals	Program Approvals	Program Approvals	Program Approvals	Program Approvals
<u>Accreditation Reports:</u> None Debrief with Team Leads and Staff	<u>Accreditation Reports:</u> None	<u>Accreditation Reports:</u> Alliant University re-visit	<u>Accreditation Reports:</u> 11 site visit reports	<u>Accreditation Reports:</u> 10 site visit reports	<u>Accreditation Reports:</u> 10 site visit reports
Election of Co-Chairs			Biennial Reports		Biennial Reports
Annual Report	Annual Report				Update and evaluation of alternative process to establish institutional viability
Common Standards Rubric	Common Standards Rubric	Common Standards Rubric		Plan for Accreditation Activities in 11-12	
Admin Services Update	National/Professional Accreditation				Technical Assistance Visits
7 th Year Follow-Up Reports		Update on NCATE and TEAC	7 th Year Follow-Up Reports	7 th Year Follow-Up Reports	7 th Year Follow-Up Reports
Subject Matter pgms	Subject Matter Pgms	Subject Matter Pgms			
Work Plan for 09-10	Evaluation of the Accreditation System		Evaluation of the Accreditation System		Evaluation of the Accreditation System