Draft of Annual Report of the COA
October 2015

Overview of this Report

This agenda item presents the *Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation 2014-15 for* COA consideration and approval.

Staff Recommendation

This is an action item. The Commission staff seeks approval of the report. Any suggested edits and comments can be incorporated into the report before it is presented to the Commission in December 2015.

Background

California Education Code and the *Accreditation Framework* require the COA to provide the Commission with a report on accreditation activities on an annual basis. Typically, the two Co-Chairs present the *Annual Report* at a fall meeting of the Commission. The current schedule is for the previous COA chairs to present the report at the December 3-4, 2015 Commission meeting.

Next Steps

Upon adoption of the report, the Commission staff will ensure that comments and suggestions made during this discussion are incorporated into the version that will be presented to the Commission. In addition, appropriate appendices will be added to the document. The COA chairs can review the final version before it goes to the Commission to ensure that the comments were incorporated appropriately. The report will then be presented by COA chairs at the December 2015 Commission meeting and then placed on the Commission's website in the reports section.

DRAFT

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, we submit to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing 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 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 year. We continue to offer our collective expertise and assistance to the Commission in this important effort to make the accreditation system leaner, more focused on essential aspects, and outcomes based. 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

Robert Frelly
Director of Music Education
Chapman University

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

Kenneth Lopour
Assistant Principal
Los Alamitos High School

Anna W. Moore
Regional Director
Monterey County Office of Education

Reyes Quezada
Professor of Education
University of San Diego

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

Jose Rivas
Teacher
Lennox Mathematics, Science and Technology Academy

Kelly Skon
District Coordinator of Secondary Instruction
Saddleback Valley Union School District

Nancy Watkins
Assistant Principal
Valencia High School
Placentia-Yorba Linda School District

Yvonne White
Science Teacher
San Leandro Unified School District

Pia Wong
Chair, Department of Teaching Credentials
California State University, Sacramento

Table of Contents
(TO BE COMPLETED ONCE DOCUMENT IS FINALIZED)

Introduction .....

Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2013-14

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

Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality x

Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards.....x

Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement.....x

General Operations x

Section II: Summary of Accreditation Activities 2014-15 x

COA Accreditation Decisions .....

Institutions Meeting All Standards.....

Institutions with All C.S. and P.S. met .....

Institutions in 7th Year Follow Up .....

Analysis of Standards Findings on C.S. .....

Analysis of Findings on Program Standards .....

Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee in 20145-2016 xx

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

Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality……..... xx

Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards…….....xx

Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement…….....xx

General Operations…….....xx

Appendix A: Accreditation Activities 2014-15 and 2015-16…… xx

Appendix C: Accreditation Activities At a Glance 2015-16..... xx

Appendix D: Institutions by Cohort…… xx

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 data 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: 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 provide expertise in credential areas. Site visits also include in-depth interviews of graduates, candidates, employers, and program faculty and administrators. Accreditation recommendations are made by the team for final action by the Committee on Accreditation. The Commission is assisted in the work 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 2013-14. 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, 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, 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 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
11/7/2014	2014-15 Team Lead Preparation - Second Tier Programs Only
11/13/2014	2014-15 Team Lead Preparation
3/11-12/2015	Title II Webcast
10/13-15/2015	California Credential Analysts and Counselors

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 Commission's liaison to the COA was 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. A system was established to track reviewer assignments and credit institutions for in-kind services.

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 FPPC 5A-2 April 2015 (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 August 2014 meeting (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-10/2014-10-2I.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 using technology, rather than being present in person, to join in on discussions and to provide guidance as needed. This action reduced the cost involved in the review while continuing to ensure a sufficient length of time for a thorough review.

Review and Revise the Accreditation Handbook. The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system established by the Commission. The COA made several important revisions to the *Handbook* in 2014-15 including the following.

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 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 language for both revisions at its February 2015 meeting and language for inclusion *Chapter 8: Accreditation Decisions: Options and Implications* in the Accreditation Handbook was revised accordingly.

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 COA receives in final form, the institution will be provided with a summary document. Relieving a team of having to have all the narrative in place before the end of the visit would allow 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 as well as 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.

R*eceive 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. 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, eight surveys developed and drafted by the Outcomes and Survey Task Group are listed below:

- 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/Induction Education Specialist Survey
- Master Teacher Survey
- Employer Survey

In addition there is 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 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 many of these documents to be completed, it does extend the time for reviewers to complete their work and results 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.

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. This new system provides 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 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 was 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.

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 (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. 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.

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 II:
Summary of 2014-15 Accreditation Activities

This section of the report provides more detailed information about elements 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 team, and the COA interview of program leadership and the team lead. Teams reviewed documentation, interviewed a variety of constituencies (candidates, program completers, faculty, employers, administration, supervisors, etc.), deliberated, and came to consensus on findings for all common standards, program standards, and an accreditation recommendation. Commission consultants, team leads, and institutional representatives attended Committee on Accreditation meetings to present the results of the site visit report and respond to questions. Copies of the site visit team reports are available on the Commission's website at: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accreditation-reports.html. The COA made the following accreditation determinations in 2014-15:

COA Accreditation Decisions 2014-15 Visits	
Program Sponsor	**Accreditation Decision**
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

COA Accreditation Decisions 2014-15 Visits	
Program Sponsor	**Accreditation Decision**
Pasadena Unified School District	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District	Accreditation
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.

Institutions Receiving Accreditation with all Common and Program Standards Met 2014-15 Visits	
Program Sponsor	**Number of Programs**
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

Institutions Receiving Accreditation with all Common and Program Standards Met 2014-15 Visits	
Program Sponsor	**Number of Programs**
Stockton Unified School District	2
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 7th 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:

2014-2015 Accreditation Follow-Up		
Revisits		
Program Sponsor	**2013-2014 Decision**	**2014-2015 Revisit Decision**
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
Submission of Documentation Addressing Stipulations		
Program Sponsor	**2013-14 Decision**	**2014-15 Decision**
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 Standard Decisions

Common Standards

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

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 induction 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.

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	-
General Education (MS/SS) Induction Standards (24 site visits)	**Met with Concerns**	**Not Met**
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	-

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

Preliminary Education Specialist Program Standards 1-16 (13 site visits)	**Met with Concerns**	**Not Met**
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	-

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

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

Clear Education Specialist Induction Standards (17 site visits)	**Met with Concerns**	**Not Met**
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	-

Preliminary Administrative Services (13 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
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	-

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

**The above DS: Special Subjects standards less than fully met represent the same institution.*

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

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

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

Designated Subjects: Supervision and Coordination (1 Site Visit)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
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.*

CTEL (3 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
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.*

In the following credential programs, all program standards were found to be met. The number in bold indicates the number of institutions that hosted site visits in 2012-13 where the identified program is offered.

All Standards Found to be Met – 2014-2015 Site Visits	
Program	**Number of Site Visits**
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

Initial Approval of New Credential Programs (IPR)

Institutions that would like a program to be considered for Initial Program Approval submit a document that indicates how the program will meet each of the Commission-adopted program standards along with supporting documents that serve as evidence to verify the claims made. In addition, the institution submits a response to all relevant program specific preconditions that are reviewed by Commission staff as well as a Common Standards document (or a Common Standards addendum if the institution has recently submitted Common Standards). 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 forwards the item, along with a paragraph about the program written by the institution, to the COA agenda at the next scheduled meeting. Initial program approvals include programs that are new to the credential area. Initial Program Approval actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation in 2014-15 are listed in the tables below.

New Programs Approved (45)	Institutional Sponsor
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 in Special Education--Early Childhood Special Education (Intern)	Los Angeles County Office of Education
	Tulare County Office of Education
Adaptive Physical Education	Point Loma Nazarene University
Designated Subjects: Adult Education	Sonoma County Office of Education
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

New Programs Approved (45)	Institutional Sponsor
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
	West Contra Costa Unified School District
Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education	Tulare County Office of Education
General Education (MS/SS) Induction	California State University, Northridge
	Ceres Unified School District
	San Diego State University
	South San Francisco Unified School District
Preliminary Administrative Services	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
Multiple Subject Intern	Los Angeles County Office of Education
	Sacramento County Office of Education
	Tulare County Office of Education
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

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.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (61 programs)		
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 Ed
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
CSU Humboldt	National University	University of Redlands
CSU Long Beach	Notre Dame de Namur University	University of San Diego
CSU Los Angeles	Orange County Dept. 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 Ed	

Clear Guidelines-based Adminstrative Services Credential (to Clear Administrative Services Induction) (22)	
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 Commission. The following programs noted below were declared to be in an Inactive status in 2014-15.

Programs Entering Inactive Status (38)	
Institution	**Program**
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
	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. Three institutions/four programs selected this option in the 2013-14 year.

Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (26 institutions, 49 programs)	
Institution	**Program**
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)
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
	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 re-activated only when the institution submits a request to the COA and the COA has taken action to reactive the program. If the program standards under which the program was approved have been modified, the institution or program sponsor must address the updated standards before the program may be re-activated. During 2014-15, 9 programs previously deemed inactive requested and received reactivation and is once again a fully approved program operating in California.

Reactivation Requests in 2014-15 (9)	
Institution	**Program**
Azusa Pacific University	Education Specialist: Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance
Burbank Unified School District	General Education (MS/SS) Induction
Chapman University	Single Subject Intern
CSU Monterey Bay	Multiple Subjects 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.

Institutions Newly Approved to Offer Educator Preparation in California (IIA)
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.

Institutions No Longer Eligible to Offer Educator Preparation	
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.
National Hispanic University	Closing 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 transmitted via audio broadcast to allow any individual with access to the Internet the ability to hear live or recorded broadcasts of all Committee meetings. The Commission's website will continue to be utilized fully to provide agenda items, notification of meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation. Meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

August 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. 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 professional education accreditation of 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 work 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 be 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 2016.

Continue the discussion of how Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system. Revised subject matter requirements for Mathematics and English to align with the Common Core necessitate that approved subject matter programs in these disciplines revise their coursework. The Commission 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.

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. 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 focus of aligning and streamlining the accreditation of other national and state organizations will be centered on completing the discussions about, and completing, the partnership agreement, with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

Continue Development and Implementation of the Revised Accreditation System

COA will continue to serve a critical role in the development and implementation of the accreditation system where appropriate. A major undertaking for 2015-16 will be the development of a revised Accreditation Handbook. This Handbook will explicate the processes and procedures of the new system and discussions around the adoption of the new Handbook will take place throughout Spring 2016.

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 modifications that were made by institutions as a result of stipulations placed upon the institution after the accreditation visit in 2013-14. Institutions with stipulations have one year to satisfactorily address all stipulations. Institutions may be provided with additional time if the COA believes the institution has made sufficient progress in addressing the stipulations and if the nature of the changes necessary warrant additional time. Below is a brief summary of some of the deficiencies identified by the site visit review teams and the actions taken to address the stipulations. Accreditation reports do not have a consistent format so the summaries here also vary in style. 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

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	Yes	No
California State University, Monterey Bay	Major	Yes	Yes
Hebrew Union College	Major	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

Institutions with Probationary Stipulations

Institution	**Accreditation Decision**
Pacific Oaks College	August 2014: Probationary Stipulations with Revisit May 2015: Revisit June 2015: Accreditation with Stipulations

Pacific Oaks College offers the Multiple Subject program with Intern and the Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate with Intern. The accreditation team found that POC did not fully meet 5 of the 9 Common Standards. Four were **Met with Concerns** and 1 was **Not Met**. While POC's Multiple Subject program met all 19 standards, its Education Specialist Program: Mild/Moderate only met two standards with nine standards **Met with Concerns** and 11 standards **Not Met**. The COA issued six stipulations, including required quarterly reports and a revisit, and prohibited the institution from offering new programs until the stipulations were

Institution	Accreditation Decision
Pacific Oaks College	August 2014: Probationary Stipulations with Revisit May 2015: Revisit June 2015: Accreditation with Stipulations

fully addressed. The stipulations were:

1) *Pacific Oaks College must provide a clear description and supporting documentation to address all Program Standards for the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate credential program found to be Met with Concerns or Not Met. For each standard, this information must include:*
   - *A succinct description and supporting evidence of how and when candidates demonstrate competency in standard requirements*
   - *How scoring rubric(s) and other measures directly relate to each of the required program standards and how the measures are used to determine candidate competency with inclusion of evidence such as candidate work samples*
2) *The institution must notify all candidates, including Education Specialist candidates, in writing of the probationary status.*
3) *The institution must provide an action plan and quarterly reports to COA.*
4) *The institution must respond to all concerns identified in the adopted accreditation team report and all stipulations specified in the COA action, and submit, within one year, a written seventh year report with appropriate documentation that demonstrates how all concerns and stipulations have been addressed.*
5) *Pacific Oaks College is to prepare for a focused revisit by the team lead and consultant and, as required, members of the accreditation team to collect evidence of actions to address the stipulations noted above. Cost of the revisit will be paid by Pacific Oaks College as is required by the Cost Recovery regulations.*
6) *No new programs will be approved by the COA until the stipulations above are fully addressed and are removed.*

Some of the major improvements that were identified during the revisit:

- Implementation of TaskStream as the repository and report generator for all collection and reporting of candidate, cooperating teacher, field supervisor, and faculty evaluation data.
- Accurate and definitive reports regarding candidate retention and graduation.
- Signature assignments that align with the CTC standards have been developed.
- An addition of seven credit hours in the Dual Multiple Subject/ Education Specialist Mild Moderate program.
- Three new courses for the Preliminary Education Specialist program were created
- Data generated from new processes and courses were evaluated.
- All syllabi have been recreated to align with CTC standards and include assignments and assessments that will provide evidence of candidate achievement of the standards.
- Sytematized accurate tracking of candidate retention and graduation/

Institution	Accreditation Decision
Pacific Oaks College	August 2014: Probationary Stipulations with Revisit May 2015: Revisit June 2015: Accreditation with Stipulations

- New full-time and adjunct faculty evaluation processes were implemented.
- Annual assessment of candidate learning is taking place.
- Orientation and training procedures for all candidates, cooperating teachers, field supervisors and faculty on practicum and directed teaching requirements and procedures have been developed.
- Criteria for field placements and cooperating teachers were established.
- Criteria and requirements for placements, cooperating teachers, and field supervisors are clear and stated in the Directed Teaching Handbook and Student Practicum Handbook.
- Evaluation processes are in place but had not yet been implemented, so evidence was unavailable to support the effectiveness.
- Orientation sessions are offered each semester for candidates, field supervisors, cooperating teachers about to begin directed teaching.
- Candidates are now provided with research-based explicit instruction integrated throughout three courses to meet the needs of all students in the area of language and literacy, including those who have no communication skills.
- In revised course work, candidates now complete a functional behavior assessment of a student who has social, emotional, communication, and/or academic challenges
- Full-time faculty are reviewed annually; new adjunct faculty are observed each semester.
- The School of Education's first annual program review has been held and a comprehensive program review schedule has been developed to coincide with the Commission's assessment and review cycle.
- Starting Fall 2014, sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, and gender diversity training was made mandatory for all current and new SOE full-time faculty and staff and gender diversity was incorporated in new faculty and staff orientation.

Result of Revisit in May 2015

As a result of improvements completed prior to the May 2015 revisit, Pacific Oaks received **Accreditation with Stipulations**. The remaining stipulations that must still be addressed within six months are: 1) Pacific Oaks College is to submit evidence demonstrating that it meets Education Specialist Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students. The institution is to follow with data related to this standard in the institution's next Biennial Report; and 2) Pacific Oaks College is to address Education Specialist for Mild/Moderate Program Standard 6: Case Management.

Issues still to be resolved:

- The system was working but was not as complete as is necessary for truly robust

Institution	Accreditation Decision
Pacific Oaks College	August 2014: Probationary Stipulations with Revisit May 2015: Revisit June 2015: Accreditation with Stipulations

analysis of candidate achievement and program effectiveness. Pacific Oaks will continue to train and follow up as needed.

- Though faculty are not yet producing original scholarship, they are attending conferences and workshops to improve and maintain currency of skills.
- Candidates are now appropriately placed by the Credential Analyst.
- 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.
- At the revisit, team members found that the program does not yet: 1) identify how the candidates demonstrate the ability to participate as a team member/case manager for the IEP/transition process, and 2) that case management was not part of any courses in the program.
- 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. At the revisit, the team was unable to determine how/if the new process is being implemented successfully.

Institutions with Major Stipulations

Institution	Accreditation Decision
California State University Monterey Bay	April 2014: Major Stipulations April 2015: Revisit June 2015: Stipulations Removed

California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) is an NCATE/CAEP institution which offers Multiple and Single Subject with Intern credential programs, Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe credential programs, and an Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization. The team reviewed each of the NCATE/Common Standards and the two Common Standards not reflected in the NCATE standards and determined that Common Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence (NCATE Standard 1) was **Not Met** and Common Standard 3: Resources (NCATE Standard 6) and Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance were **Met with Concerns**.

For CSUMB's programs, the site visit team found that all program standards were **Met** except for the following:

Institution	Accreditation Decision
California State University Monterey Bay	April 2014: Major Stipulations April 2015: Revisit June 2015: Stipulations Removed

- Multiple Subject Program–Standards 2, 14, and 15 were **Met with Concerns**
- Single Subject Program—Standards 1, 8, 12, and 15 were **Met with Concerns**
- Education Specialist Program Standards—Standards 7, 9, 13, were **Met with Concerns;** Standards 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 14 were **Not Met**
- Education Specialist: Mild Moderate—Standard 3 was **Met with Concerns,** Standards 2 and 6 were **Not Met**
- Education Specialist: Moderate Severe—Standard 5 was **Not Met**
- Autism Spectrum Disorders: Added Authorization—Standard 1 was **Not Met**

Summary of Issues

Common Standard 3: Resources - CSUMB's school of education does not have sufficient budgetary resources to replace retired tenure track faculty, resulting in remaining faculty filling multiple roles, and increased hiring of part-time faculty.

Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance - While most advising materials reviewed were consistent and accurate, various materials describing the coursework requirements for the Multiple and Single Subjects credential year-long residency program gave inconsistent information about what was required of candidates during the summer "prerequisite" phase. In addition, some Single Subject candidates reported receiving inconsistent information from advisors, both with regard to the summer prerequisites and other program requirements.

Common Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence - Assessment of candidate competencies in the Education Specialist credential program relied significantly on tasks completed during program coursework. Based on the documentation provided, and on interviews during the site visit, reviewers were unable to determine that candidate competency was assessed in all areas required by program standards.

Resolutions

Searches had been 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 FT faculty hiring is complete. Other actions included:

- Institutional support for added flexibility in salary negotiations
- Initiation of a strategic planning process for guiding College of Education development
- Evaluation of fieldwork supervision procedures for all programs and adoption of changes to strengthen and improve candidate/intern support during field experiences
- Leadership from a new Dean and Department Chair promoting stronger collaboration

across the unit as well as improvements in program operation

- Institutional leadership confirmed the university's commitment to providing resources to ensure the effective operation of the College and its programs

Steps were taken to centralize and strengthen overall advising and support services for candidates in all programs.

A review of all Education Specialist credential program standards found less than fully met at the 2014 site visit determined that all of those standards are now **Met**. The site visit decision on this common standard was based solely on the findings for these program standards, so Common Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence is now also determined to be **Met**.

Summary of Issues and Resolution for Program Standards

Multiple Subjects

Issues:

Inconsistent understanding of program expectations on the part of the cooperating teacher

Coursework scheduling interfered with candidates' participation in particular fieldwork experiences

Uneven support by cooperating teachers and inconsistent access to teaching experiences that allowed candidates to practice and refine instructional skills

Resolutions:

- 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
- Program coursework now begins at 4:00 p.m. or later
- Documentary evidence for this standard included all of the cooperating teacher information outlined in the narrative for Standard 2 above

Single Subjects

Issues:

- No evidence to confirm that signature assignments were accurately measuring the required competencies
- Different sections of the content area course appeared to vary somewhat in scope and depth according to subject area
- Unevenness of program implementation was found in the area of preparation to teach English learners and candidates were not provided an opportunity to demonstrate or implement English language instruction in their co-teaching or intern teaching experience

Institution	Accreditation Decision
California State University Monterey Bay	April 2014: Major Stipulations April 2015: Revisit June 2015: Stipulations Removed

- Principals were not aware of the minimum state requirements for participating as a cooperating teacher and there was no evidence to indicate that cooperating teachers are being assigned who do meet these requirements

Resolutions:

- Aligned tasks and rubrics 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
- Revised course content and assignments across subject areas to encompass depth and breadth of candidate preparation in each subject area
- Revised course work and field experiences to infuse learning about and working with English learners
- 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
- New procedures are now consistently followed to ensure that all individuals serving as cooperating teachers meet, or in most cases exceed, minimum state requirements

Education Specialist

Issues:

- Unclear how program provided instruction in understanding and acceptance of differences in religion, gender identity/expression, and sexual orientation
- Unclear how program provided the opportunity for candidates to demonstrate knowledge of building social networks for students with disabilities such as with parents, primary caregivers, general education teachers, co-teachers, related services personnel, administrators and trans-disciplinary teams
- Unclear how program provided opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge of required statewide assessments and local, state, and federal accountability systems
- Unclear how assignments provided candidates with opportunities to demonstrate competency in transitions for students with learning disabilities
- Unclear how candidates demonstrated the ability to participate effectively as a team member and/or case manager for the IFSP/IEP/transition planning process, from pre-referral interventions, assessment, and implementation of instruction
- Unclear how listening and speaking in the area of reading/literacy was addressed in the program
- Program did not clearly articulate how assignments provided candidates with opportunities to demonstrate competency in teaching English learners

Institution	Accreditation Decision
California State University Monterey Bay	April 2014: Major Stipulations April 2015: Revisit June 2015: Stipulations Removed

- *Unclear how candidates demonstrated competency for collaboration or co-teaching.*
- *Unclear how candidates demonstrated competency in understanding and utilizing universal precautions designed to protect the health and safety of the candidates themselves or in working collaboratively with other professionals to ensure healthy learning environments*

Resolutions:

- Now includes attention to understanding and acceptance of differences in religion, gender identity/expression and sexual orientation
- 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
- Candidates are now provided opportunities in three courses to acquire and demonstrate knowledge of required statewide assessments and local, state and federal accountability systems
- Three different assessments now provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate competency in transitions for students with learning disabilities
- Program made significant improvements to coursework and practicum requirements and adopted an extensive IEP rubric
- Candidates now have several assignments on vocabulary development such as developing three language arts lessons involving phonemic awareness, phonics/ spelling, fluency, and vocabulary development
- 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
- Program curriculum now identifies appropriate and inappropriate 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
- All the requirements for creating healthy environments were addressed through assignments, assessments, and observations by clinical supervisors

Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Issues:

- Unclear how candidates demonstrated competency for assessing students' communication, career, and community life skill needs and monitor their progress or how to assist students participating in state-mandated accountability measures
- Unclear how candidates demonstrated their ability to use a variety of grouping structures in the program coursework other than fieldwork

Institution	Accreditation Decision
California State University Monterey Bay	April 2014: Major Stipulations April 2015: Revisit June 2015: Stipulations Removed

- Unclear how candidates demonstrated their understanding of case management practices and strategies for students with mild/moderate disabilities and for those referred for special education services

Resolutions:

- 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
- 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
- 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

Moderate/Severe Disabilities

Issue:

- Unclear how one set of "end of module responses" could address all competencies in regard to movement, mobility, sensory and specialized health care

Resolutions:

- 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

Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization

Issue:

- Program did not clearly articulate how candidates were provided with opportunities to demonstrate competency in understanding ASD

Resolution:

- 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

Institution	Accreditation Decision
Hebrew Union College	April 2014: Major Stipulations June 2015: Accreditation with Stipulations

Hebrew Union College (HUC) offers Multiple Subject and Clear Credentials. Twelve candidates are accepted into the program each year. HUC's program is an in-residence program, where candidates are assigned to a specific Jewish day school for a year's tenure. They begin work in the classroom from the beginning of the academic year, increasing classroom responsibility on a regular/weekly basis until they are responsible for whole class instruction by the end of the academic year.

Summary of Stipulations

Stipulation 1
The institution must submit documentation that shows that the institution is in compliance with Precondition 6 (now #10 in 2014 preconditions) and 8.

Improvements:
HUC provided information about its faculty participation in the public school system for Precondition 8. However, Commission staff noted that the depth of experiences varied significantly and that the institution should ensure that each faculty member have an appropriate level of participation to address the intent of this precondition.

HUC revised advising materials to ensure that all candidates are aware of the requirement to demonstrate subject matter competency prior to student teaching. Upon submission of admission materials, potential candidates are now given written information regarding the need to meet subject matter requirements before whole class student teaching. During orientation, this information is reviewed and questions answered. The program director then monitors each candidate's status and notes when they are eligible for student teaching.

Stipulation 2
Hebrew Union College will submit a report to the Commission by June 1, 2014 that provides the following information:

a. *a list of all currently enrolled candidates with information on whether they have satisfied the subject matter requirement and where they are with respect to the fieldwork component of the program*
b. *a list of admitted candidates (those that will begin in the summer of 2014 and beyond) and whether they have satisfied subject matter competence requirement*
c. *evidence that all current and incoming admitted candidates have been informed of the subject matter competency requirement*
d. *evidence that all candidates who have not satisfied the subject matter requirement and who had been in student teaching in the public schools have been removed from their student teaching assignment until such time that they have satisfied the subject matter*

Institution	Accreditation Decision
Hebrew Union College	April 2014: Major Stipulations June 2015: Accreditation with Stipulations

requirement

Hebrew Union College provided this required report in June 2014.

Stipulation 3
The institution is to provide an update on documentation of the processes, procedures and protocols related to both programs that have been established and will be monitored and maintained in the future.

The institution submitted an updated series of tables listing four categories of processes, procedures and protocols that ware now being documented on an ongoing cyclical basis.

Stipulation 4
The institution is to develop and implement a unit-wide assessment system and apply that system across unit programs. The system is to include data collection related to unit outcomes, as well as use of that data for unit improvement.

Hebrew Union College provided documentation on the development of a unit-wide assessment system including processes and procedures for collecting, analyzing, and using data for program improvement. However, no assessment tools or assessment results were provided.

Stipulation 5
The institution is to provide documentation that candidates:

a. *Complete observations in hard-to-staff and/or low performing schools*
b. *Complete a full-day teaching assignment of at least two weeks, commensurate with the authorization of the recommended credential*

Commission staff believed that HUC had adequately addressed this stipulation by: 1) establishing relationships with public schools near their three campus locations, 2) requiring observations in hard to staff and/or low performing schools and tracking those observations, and 3) requiring a complete full-day teaching assignment of at least two weeks.

Based on the information provided above, the Committee on Accreditation decided to change the accreditation decision from **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** to **Accreditation with Stipulations**. Additional information will be provided the COA within one year on Stipulations 4 and 5 in order to remove all stipulations.

Accreditation with Stipulations

Institution	Accreditation Decision
National University	March 2014: Stipulations March 2015: Revisit April 2015: Stipulations Removed

National University, an NCATE/CAEP institution. The initial site visit took place at National University's main campus in San Diego, California.

Common Standards

The decision of the team regarding the six NCATE standards was that all standards were **Met** for NCATE. For California, ***Standard 3: Field Experiences*** and ***Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources*** were **Met with Concerns**. The decision of the team regarding the parts of California's two Common Standards that are required of NCATE-accredited institutions is that both standards are **Met**.

Program Standards

For the 22 credential programs, all program standards were **Met** except for the following:

- Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Standard 14 was **Met with Concerns.**
- General Education (MS/SS) Clear Credential Standard 3 was **Not Met.**
- Administrative Services Tier II Standard 8 was **Met with Concerns**.

Summary of Stipulations and Major Improvements for Common Standards at the Revisit

Due to the fact that the program standards that were not fully met were addressed in the stipulations, the following improvements addressed both Common and Program standard issues.

Stipulation 1
That the institution provide evidence that, based on clear criteria, it carefully selects, trains and monitors the mentors who provide support to candidates in the General Education Clear Credential program. In addition, the individuals who provide support need to be assessed and provided feedback on their work with the candidate, and only those who meet the program's established criteria are retained as mentors.

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

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.

Institution National University	**Accreditation Decision** March 2014: Stipulations March 2015: Revisit April 2015: Stipulations Removed

Stipulation 2

That the institution provide evidence that systems are in place that ensure that all candidates in clinical practice have the range of placements and experiences that meet the Commission's requirements.

- 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.
- 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.

Stipulation 3

That the institution provide evidence that the leadership in the School of Education has developed sufficiently robust oversight and monitoring processes and that the operational processes are faithfully implemented.

At the revisit, the team found that the university now has a unified focus that is shared among the administration, faculty, and staff.

- **Oversight** -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.

- **Monitoring & Operational Process** - 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.

- **Current Status -** 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.

Institution Claremont Graduate University	Accreditation Decision April 2014: Stipulations April 2015: Stipulations Removed

Claremont Graduate University (CGU) serves over 100 candidates across nine educator preparation programs.

The decision of the team regarding Common Standards was that all Common Standards were **Met** except Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership, Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation, Common Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice, and Common Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors, which were **Met with Concerns**.

For the program standards, all standards were met with the exception of General Education and Clear Education Specialist Induction Program Standard 1: Program Rationale and Design; and General Education and Clear Education Specialist Induction Program Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration, which were **Met with Concerns.**

Summary of Stipulations and Major Improvements

Stipulation 1
The institution must provide evidence that a system has been implemented to monitor the credential recommendation process.

- 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 credential recommendations. (i.e Credential Completion survey – a final step in the credential filing process).
- An auditing system has been activated to allow the Data and Evaluation Coordinator to assess the accuracy of the credential monitoring system. The Data and Evaluation Coordinator selects a random sample of candidates equal to 20% of enrolled candidates (up from 10% in its first trial), compares the candidates' files against information in a database maintained by the Credential Analyst, and prepares a report of all audit findings for submission to the Director of Teacher Education.

Stipulation 2
The institution must create and implement a unit assessment and evaluation system that is articulated with the different program assessment processes to inform unit evaluation and improvement efforts.

Institution	Accreditation Decision
Claremont Graduate University	April 2014: Stipulations April 2015: Stipulations Removed

- A Unit Assessment system was developed 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.
- 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.
- CGU has modified its surveys to collect data that can be used to assess mission and vision goals.

Stipulation 3

The institution must establish collaborative partnerships with intern and induction program stakeholders and ensure that the stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of the General Education and Education Specialist Intern programs, the General Education Induction program, and the Clear Education Specialist Induction program.

- CGU has restructured its 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

Stipulation 4

The university must develop and implement a uniform system that allows for training, orienting and evaluating district employed supervisors in the intern program.

- CGU has established a clear set of roles and responsibilities for district employed site support providers (SSP), CGU supervisors, and interns, and begun the process of creating four training modules for SSPs which include assignments, feedback opportunities and support resources.
- District MOUs were revised to 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.
- An Intern Principal Professional Development Plan survey and Advisory

Institution Claremont Graduate University	Accreditation Decision April 2014: Stipulations April 2015: Stipulations Removed
Course/Instructor Evaluation were developed to support the review and revision of intern professional development plans and evaluate the effectiveness of supervision.	

Institution Antioch University	Accreditation Decision August 2014: Stipulations June 2015: Stipulations Removed

Antioch University was approved by the Commission to offer educator preparation programs in California in May 1999 as a single university. The university offered programs at campuses in Los Angeles and Santa Barbara. In November 2007, Antioch Los Angeles and Antioch Santa Barbara were each approved as independent campuses eligible to offer educator preparation in California. In 2011, Antioch Los Angeles and Antioch Santa Barbara received guidance from the federal government which indicated that the university needed to be accredited by only one regional accrediting body. The Commission granted Initial Institutional Approval to the merger of the two Antioch California campuses in June 2012. The campuses offer the following professional preparation programs:

- Preliminary Multiple Subject
- Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Disabilities, with Internship
- General Education (Multiple Subject and Single Subject) Clear

The Santa Barbara campus also offers a dual certification option for early deciders who wish to earn both the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Preliminary Education Specialist credentials.

The decision of the team regarding the Common and Program Standards was that all Common Standards were **Met** except for Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership, and Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation, which were **Not Met.** All Program Standards were **Met.**

The overall accreditation decision was Accreditation with Stipulations with submissions of quarterly reports to update the COA on its progress. Because three of the stipulations were in regard to submissions of quarterly reports (which were provided), only two stipulations are summarized below.

Summary of Stipulations and Major Improvements

Stipulation 1
That within three months of the accreditation decision, Antioch University provide staff with a timeline and a plan for the integration of the governance and evaluation system of the strands at the two campuses into a unit level system.

Institution	Accreditation Decision
Antioch University	August 2014: Stipulations June 2015: Stipulations Removed

The following are efforts and activities to address this stipulation. Antioch University now has:

- Joint evaluations of credential faculty and chairs
- Combined Annual Credential Program Reviews
- Combined Reports to CTC
- Monthly unit meetings
- Monthly campus and unit leadership conference calls with the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs
- Established a common cost center
- Established a Joint Advisory Board

Stipulation 2
That the institution provides evidence of the implementation of a unit level governance structure for each credential program.

To address this stipulation, Antioch University:

- Hired an external consultant
- Integrated unit data for the Biennial Report
- Created (or in the process of creating) means of collecting data through a(n):
    - Principal Survey
    - Exit Survey
    - Course Evaluation Form
    - Common project measuring application of social justice using a formal rubric
    - Using commonalities of TPE measures from both CalTPA and PACT

Institution	Accreditation Decision
Los Banos USD	June 2014: Stipulations June 2015: Stipulations Removed

Los Banos is the sponsor of a General Education Induction Program. The decision of the site visit team regarding the Common and Program Standards was that all Common Standards were **Met** except for Common Standard: 2 Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation and Common Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel, which were **Met with Concerns.** All program standards were **Met,** with the exception of Program Standards 3 and 6 which were **Met with Concerns**. The team proposed four stipulations which Los Banos USD addressed.

Summary of Stipulations and Major Improvements

Institution	Accreditation Decision
Los Banos USD	June 2014: Stipulations June 2015: Stipulations Removed

Stipulation 1

The institution is to develop and implement a unit-wide assessment system. The system is to include data collection related to unit and program outcomes, using that data for unit and program improvement.

To address this stipulation, a comprehensive assessment system was developed featuring:

- Input information from a variety of stakeholder groups
- Assessments gathered from late August through late May
- A variety of tools, including surveys, tracking records, and face-to-face conversations
- Identification of how the assessment data will be used for program and unit improvement
- Templates and forms for assessments

Stipulation 2

The institution is to develop and implement both a selection process and a retention process for support providers using well-defined criteria consistent with their assigned responsibilities in the program and addressing the requirements found in Common Standard 4.

A collaborative system was developed for the selection of support providers that includes:

- A written application with a narrative explanation of why they would like to be a support provider
- A written recommendation from the applicant's site administrator
- A verification of teaching experience by the credential analyst
- An informal meeting with program and district personnel to discuss support provider roles and responsibilities
- Initial and ongoing training

Accompanying the selection process is a monitoring process of support provider interaction with the participating teacher and program personnel which includes:

- Mentor time logs
- Completion of formative assessment documents
- Corrective feedback documentation
- Protocol for changing Support Providers
- Drop-in visits by the program director during Support Provider-Participating Teacher meetings

The retention process has not yet been fully implemented as it has not been in place for a full year of Support Provider service at this time.

Stipulation 3

The institution is to develop a professional development system that meets the individual needs of the program's candidates and employs professional development providers who are selected

Institution	Accreditation Decision
Los Banos USD	June 2014: Stipulations June 2015: Stipulations Removed

and prepared consistent with the providers' assigned responsibilities in the program.

To address this stipulation:

- Los Banos USD organized 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.
- A two-year plan of professional development sessions was created, presented by experts within the Los Banos Unified School District.
- The Los Banos USD professional development system provides for release time for participating teachers to either observe lessons by another district teacher or schedule demonstration lessons in their own classroom.

Stipulation 4

The institution is to develop and implement a system to ensure that all candidates have assignments that include settings where they can demonstrate the skills and knowledge required in the areas of diversity, English learners and students with special needs.

To address this stipulation, Los Banos USD:

- Developed a protocol that ensures all new placements for teachers are screened for the possible inclusion of English learner and special populations students
- Now trains site administrators and credential analysts in the new protocol.
- As a follow up to this protocol, the program director now monitors each participating teacher's formative assessment documents to verify that lessons are being differentiated for all student populations.

Institution	Accreditation Decision
La Sierra University	June 2014: Stipulations June 2015: Stipulations Removed

La Sierra University's (La Sierra) School of Education is one of the five academic units in the University and houses five approved credential programs. The decision of the team regarding the nine Common Standards was that all Common Standards are met with the exception of Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership, which was **Met with Concerns** and Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation, which was **Not Met.**

For the five credential programs reviewed, the team found that all program standards were met with the exception of one standard for the Multiple/Single Subjects credential program, which was **Not Met.**

Institution	Accreditation Decision
La Sierra University	June 2014: Stipulations June 2015: Stipulations Removed

Summary of Stipulations and Major Improvements:

Stipulation 1

That the School of Education at La Sierra University will provide evidence that a unit-wide assessment system has been developed and effectively implemented. The system should include data collection related to unit goals and systematic use of that data for evaluation of candidate performance and unit operations.

- La Sierra implemented the use of LiveText as a unit-wide assessment system. Instructors in School of Education courses now require candidates to submit course signature assignments on LiveText, where rubrics for evaluating the signature assignments also appear.
- A number of training workshops on signature assignments and assessments for School of Education faculty and adjunct contract teachers were conducted by the School of Education's Assessment Coordinator. Adjuncts in the School Psychology and Counseling department were trained one-on-one by the program director. LiveText personnel also met with faculty and conducted workshops.
- The School of Education assessment calendar was reviewed in the School of Education chairs' meetings and monthly faculty meetings. Examples of scheduled assessment agenda items included 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

Stipulation 2

That the School of Education provide evidence that it has developed a credential recommendation process that ensures that all candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements and that there is a formal system for monitoring the credential recommendation process.

The credential recommendation process has now been standardized across the school, as follows:

- Departmental program coordinators evaluate candidate progress on the credential checklist at two points: pre-practicum and when the program is complete. Program coordinators communicate with the candidate to address any deficiencies.
- Once the candidate has completed the program and all requirements have been met, the department sends a letter to the credential analyst, along with the candidate's checklist, verifying completion.
- The credential analyst evaluates the checklist independently to verify completion.

- The credential analyst supports and guides the candidate in applying for the credential.
- The credential analyst reports data annually to the School of Education faculty on the status of credential completions in the School of Education and the functioning of the credential recommendation process.

Stipulation 3

That the School of Education provide evidence that the Single Subject credential program provides substantive instruction and supervised practice that effectively prepares each candidate for a single subject credential to plan and deliver content specific instruction.

- A customized practicum has now been implemented for each 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. The Single Subject content areas for candidates in Fall 2014 included Math, Science, and History/Social Science.
- The collaboration between the methods expert and the candidate in each methods course continues during the time that the candidate observes in a master teacher's classroom for 15 hours.

For each course, the newly-implemented process includes the following:

- Candidates observe single subject pedagogy in the classroom of a master teacher credentialed in the single subject content area for a minimum of 15 hours.
- Under the supervision of the single subject credentialed master teacher, the candidate teaches lessons for a minimum of five hours.
- The methods expert mentor continues to support the candidate during the practicum placement.

Methods experts mentors are carefully screened by the C&I faculty to ensure that they are experts in their respective discipline, and that they have pedagogical expertise in the single subject content.

- 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.
- 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.

Each quarter, candidates receive personalized placements with methods experts mentors and master teachers, and are assigned a university supervisor who has expertise in pedagogy.

Altogether, each Single Subject candidate now receives 226 hours of individual support prior to

Institution La Sierra University	Accreditation Decision June 2014: Stipulations June 2015: Stipulations Removed
student teaching.	