Discussion of Proposed Framework Changes
October 2015

Overview of this Report
This agenda item begins the discussion of changes that will need to take place with respect to the Accreditation Framework to reflect changes as a result of the streamlining and strengthening the accreditation process.

Staff Recommendation
This is an information item and no action is needed at this time.

Background

The Accreditation Framework is the document that is adopted by the Commission that establishes the policy for accreditation. The COA then is charged with implementation of that Commission policy. The current Accreditation Framework, included in the appendix, was adopted in 2007 as a result of the previous revision work related to accreditation and is currently reflected in the activities of the current accreditation system.

Staff is to begin working on a draft new Accreditation Framework that will be presented to the Commission in December 2015 for information and February 2016 for action.

This item provides an opportunity for COA to provide input regarding potential changes to the Framework prior to it being presented for information to the Commission at the December 2015 Commission meeting.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

Ensuring Educator Excellence

Accreditation Framework

Educator Preparation in California

Adopted by the Commission
December 2007
Updated with revised Common Standards December 2008

Table of Contents

The *Accreditation Framework*
Educator Preparation for California

Introduction **1**

The Purposes of Professional Educator Program Accreditation 1

Key Attributes of Accreditation of California's Educator Preparation Program 2

Section 1: Authority and Responsibilities of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing **5**

A. Responsibilities Related to Accreditation Policies 5

B. Responsibilities Related to the Accreditation System 5

C. Responsibilities Related to the Committee on Accreditation 6

Section 2: Functions of the Committee on Accreditation **7**

A. Functions of the Committee on Accreditation 7

B. Membership of the Committee on Accreditation 8

C. Appointment of the Committee on Accreditation 9

Section 3: Accreditation Standards **10**

Category I. Common Standards 10

Category II. Program Standards 10

Section 4: Initial Accreditation Policies **12**

A. Responsibility for Two Phases of Initial Accreditation 12

B. Policies for Initial Approval of Programs. 12

C. Integration of New Programs into Accreditation Cycle 12

Section 5: Continuing Accreditation Policies **14**

Overview of Accreditation Cycle 14

Accreditation Cycle Activities 14

1. Ongoing Data Collection by the Institution/Program Sponsors 14
2. Biennial Reports 14
3. Program Assessment 15

Table of Contents *(continued)*

4. Site Visit 16

Accreditation Reports, Recommendations and Decisions 19

Appeals 20

Complaints about Credential Program Quality 21

Section 6: Board of Institutional Reviewers 22

A. Board of Institutional Reviewers 22

B. Team Structure, Size and Expertise 23

C. Organization of Continuing Accreditation Activities 23

D. Training, Orientation and Evaluation 23

E. Role of Staff 24

Section 7: Articulation Between National and State Accreditation 26

A. Merged California National Accreditation Reviews of an Education Unit 26

B. Independent National Accreditation of an Education Unit 26

C. National Accreditation of a Credential Program 26

Section 8: Evaluation and Modification of the Framework 27

A. Evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework* 27

B. Modifications of the *Accreditation Framework* 27

Appendix A: Accreditation Activities Summary Charts and Cohort List by Institution 28

Appendix B: Common Standards 34

Appendix C: California Education Code 43

Appendix D: Glossary 47

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

Joyce Abrams	Teacher Chula Vista Elementary School District
Frederick Baker	Professor Emeritus California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Lynne Cook	Dean, College of Education California State University, Dominguez Hills
Diane Doe	Educational Consultant
Irma Guzman Wagner	Dean and Professor Emeritus, College of Education California State University, Stanislaus
Dana Griggs	Administrative Coach San Bernardino Superintendent of Schools
Edward Kujawa	Dean of Education Dominican University of California
David Madrigal	Principal Antioch Unified School District
Karen O'Connor	Teacher Poway Unified School District
Ruth Sandlin	

	Chair, Educational Psychology California State University, San Bernardino
Sue Teele	Director of Education Extension University of California, Riverside
Donna Uyemoto	Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources Dublin Unified School District

ACCREDITATION STUDY WORK GROUP

Representing the Independent California Colleges and Universities	
Ellen Curtis-Pierce Assistant Provost for Teacher Education Office of the Provost, Chapman University	Terrance Cannings, Dean School of Education California Lutheran University
Representing the California State University	
Beverly Young (Work Group Co-Facilitator) Assistant Vice Chancellor, Teacher Education and Public School Programs, Office of the Chancellor, California State University Mary Sandy, Associate Director, Teacher Education and Public School Programs, Office of the Chancellor, CSU	Iris Riggs Associate Dean, Division of Teacher Education College of Education, CSU San Bernardino
Representing the University of California	
Diane Mayer Associate Dean for Professional Programs UC Berkeley, Graduate School of Education	Barbara Merino Director of Teacher Education UC Davis, School of Education
Representing the Association of California School Administrators Sharon Robison, Consultant	***Representing the California School Boards Association*** Luan Rivera, Past President, CSBA Ramona Unified School District
Representing the Cal. Teachers Association Joyce Abrams, Chula Vista Elementary School District	***Representing the Cal. Federation of Teachers*** Sue Westbrook Senior Vice President, ECK-12 Council
Representing Commission-Approved Subject Matter Preparation Programs Claire Palmerino	***Representing Commission-Approved Induction Programs*** Linda Childress BTSA Director, RIMS (Riverside,

Associate Dean College of Humanities and Social Sciences CSU Fullerton	Inyo, Mono, San Bernardino Counties) BTSA
Representing Commission-Approved Internship Program	
Mary Lewis, Administrator Alternative Certification and Teacher Support Los Angeles Unified School District	Margaret S. Fortune, Executive Director Project Pipeline
Representing the Committee on Accreditation	
Ed Kujawa (Work Group Co-Facilitator), Dean Dominican University of California	Lynne Cook, Dean, School of Education, CSU Dominguez Hills
Dana Griggs, Administrative Coach, San Bernardino Superintendent of Schools	Karen O'Connor, Teacher, Poway Unified School District
Sue Teele (alternate), Director of Education Extension, University of California, Riverside	Diane Doe (alternate), Education Consultant

The *Accreditation Framework*

Educator Preparation for California

Introduction

This *Framework* addresses the accreditation of colleges, universities and local education agencies that prepare teachers and other educators for state certification and professional practice in California public schools. Accreditation is the primary assurance of quality in the preparation of professional educators, and as such, is an essential purpose of the Commission. It provides an important quality assurance to the education profession, the general public, and the accredited institutions. This Introduction to the *Framework* articulates the purposes of the accreditation system in the field of educator preparation.

The Purposes of Professional Educator Program Accreditation

Professional accreditation is the process of ascertaining and verifying the quality of each program that prepares individuals for state certification. In this context, state certification is the process of ascertaining and verifying the qualifications of each future member of the education profession. These two processes--professional accreditation and state certification share a common overarching objective--ensuring that those who teach and provide education services in California's public school system have the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be effective educators. Accreditation of educator preparation in California serves to achieve four purposes: to ensure accountability, ensure high quality and effective programs, to ensure adherence to standards and to support ongoing program improvement. Each purpose is more fully articulated below.

A primary purpose of the professional accreditation system is to ensure accountability to the public, the students and the education profession that educator preparation programs are responsive to the educational needs of current and future students. Only an accredited educator preparation program may recommend a candidate for a license to teach in California. The general public has a compelling interest in accreditation decisions that are part of the public education system in California. The expertise and experience of the accreditors should be credible to the general public and the education profession in California.

A second purpose of accreditation is to ensure that educator preparation programs are high quality and effective and provide education and experiences consistent with the knowledge and skills required of an educator serving the needs of the diverse population in the California public schools. The Commission has statutory responsibility for adopting accreditation standards which describe levels of quality that it deems to be acceptable for quality assurance. Standards should not focus on purely technical or operational aspects of educator preparation, but should enable trained reviewers with professional expertise to ascertain whether an educator preparation program is characterized by acceptable levels of quality as defined in the standards.

The Accreditation system is oriented to issues of quality. During a review, reviewers obtain evidence that relates to the educational quality of preparation programs and policies governing the programs. Through experience, expertise and training, the reviewers are skilled at discerning the important from the unimportant in educator preparation. The findings and recommendations of accreditation reviewers focus on important matters of quality in the preparation of educators.

Accreditation decisions hinge on findings that are evidence-based, educationally significant and clearly related to quality-oriented standards.

A third purpose of the accreditation system is to ensure adherence to standards. The standards are designed to ensure that each educator's preparation is appropriate to the requirements of professional service in public schools. California's educator preparation programs are designed to meet the appropriate Commission approved program standards, which are aligned with the state adopted academic content and performance standards for K-12 students. Through the accreditation system, sponsors of educator preparation programs must provide evidence that their programs meet all standards.

Finally, the fourth purpose of the accreditation system is to support program improvement. Accreditation standards, reviews and decisions contribute to improvements in the preparation of educators. The quality of an institution/program sponsor's policies, practices and outcomes improve as its faculty, administrators, and students strive to meet accreditation standards. The institution/program sponsor's offerings also benefit from the quality orientation of the accreditation system. When these effects of accreditation fall short, however, specific accreditation decisions provoke needed improvements. For improvements to occur, the accreditation system must identify and describe weaknesses in the quality of an institution's/program sponsor's offerings in preparing professionals to serve the needs of California's diverse student population.

Key Attributes of Accreditation of California's Educator Preparation Programs

The key attributes described below function within the four purposes of accreditation. These attributes pertain to the development of program standards, the initial program approval process, and the subsequent reviews and accreditation of educator preparation programs.

First Attribute: The Professional Character of Accreditation. Professional educators should hold themselves and their peers accountable for the quality of professional education. Professionals should be involved intensively in the entire accreditation process. They should create accreditation standards, conduct accreditation reviews, and make accreditation decisions. Participants in these aspects of accreditation should have experience, expertise and training that are appropriate for their specific roles in accreditation. In each step of accreditation, decisions should emerge from consultative procedures, and should reflect the consensus of the professional participants.

Second Attribute: Knowledgeable Participants. The effectiveness of the accreditation system relies on the quality of the decision making at each step in the process. Quality assurances are provided initially through the participation of individuals who possess knowledge, skills and broad expertise and who participate in the system in various roles, including policy development, policy implementation, program assessment, system support technical management, and professional preparation. In order to fulfill these roles effectively, participants must receive appropriate training, evaluation and feedback that enables them to understand the underlying principles and purposes of the system as well as how to enact each of these roles effectively in meeting the needs of all learners in California's schools.

Third Attribute: Breadth and Flexibility. For institutions/program sponsors to be effective in a dynamic state like California, they must be creative and responsive to the changing needs of prospective educators and the communities and students they serve. In a society as diverse as California, universities, colleges, and other program sponsors vary substantially in their missions and philosophies. Accreditation should not force institutions/program sponsors to conform to prescribed patterns unless these conventions have a firm basis in principles of educational quality, effectiveness and equity. The accreditation system should accommodate breadth and flexibility within and among institutions/program sponsors to support improvement.

Accreditation standards should be drawn so different institutions/program sponsors can meet them in a variety of acceptable ways. There are effective and ineffective forms of educator preparation; accreditation should differentiate between them. There are also multiple ways of effectively educating prospective educators acceptably; accreditation should not favor any of these over the others. Standards should describe levels of quality and effectiveness without stipulating how institutions/program sponsors are to comply. Explanations of the standards should clarify their meaning without making the standards overly restrictive. The training of accreditation reviewers should, moreover, emphasize the importance of understanding diversity and creativity between institutions/program sponsors.

Fourth Attribute: Intensity in Accreditation. Accreditation should focus with intensity on key aspects of educational quality and effectiveness. While allowing and encouraging divergence, the process should also be exacting in assembling key information about critical aspects of educational quality and effectiveness. The scope of accreditation should be comprehensive, and the information generated by the review processes should be sufficient to yield reliable judgments by professional educators.

Accreditation standards should encompass the critical dimensions of educator preparation. In order to recommend an institution/program sponsor for accreditation, experienced professional reviewers should be satisfied that the institution/program sponsor provides a comprehensive array of excellent learning opportunities and assurances that future educators have demonstrated that they have attained the knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to be effective professionals. Accreditation decisions should be based on information that is sufficient in breadth and depth for the results to be credible and dependable. Accreditation reviewers should understand the components of the program under review and the types of standards-based evidence that substantiate its overall quality and effectiveness. To find out if broad, quality-oriented standards are met, and to make reliable judgments and sound recommendations, reviewers need to assemble a considerable body of data that is collectively significant.

Fifth Attribute: Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness. An accreditation system should fulfill its purposes efficiently and cost-effectively. Review procedures, decision processes and reporting relationships should be streamlined and economical. Participants' roles should be clearly defined, and communications should be efficient.

There are costs associated with establishing standards, training reviewers, assembling information, preparing reports, conducting meetings and checking the accuracy of data and the fairness of decisions. Containing these costs is an essential attribute of accreditation, but

efficiency must not undermine the capacity of accreditors to fulfill their responsibilities to the public and the profession. Accreditation costs, which are borne by institutions/program sponsors and the accrediting body, should be reviewed periodically by the Commission in relation to the key purposes of accreditation.

Section 1
Authority and Responsibilities of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Pertaining to the accreditation of educator preparation, the authority and responsibilities of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing include the following.

A. Responsibilities Related to Accreditation Policies

1. **Adopt and Modify the *Accreditation Framework.*** Pursuant to *Education Code* 44372(a), the Commission has the authority and responsibility to adopt an *Accreditation Framework*, "which sets forth the policies of the Commission regarding the accreditation of educator preparation in California". The present document is the adopted *Accreditation Framework.* *Education Code* 44372(i) establishes that the Commission may modify the *Framework* in accordance with Section 8 of the *Framework*. Modifications occur in public meetings after the Commission considers relevant information provided by the Committee on Accreditation, institutions/program sponsors, Board of Institutional Review members, the Commission's staff, and other concerned individuals. The Commission determines when a policy modification takes effect.

2. **Establish and Modify Standards for Educator Preparation.** Pursuant to *Education Code* Section 44372(b), the Commission has the authority and responsibility to establish and modify standards for educator preparation in California.

B. Responsibilities Related to the Accreditation System

1. **Initial Institution/Program Sponsor Approval.** In accordance with *Education Code* Sections 44227(b) and 44372(c) and Section 4 of this *Framework*, the Commission determines the eligibility of an institution/program sponsor that applies for initial approval and that has not previously prepared educators for state certification in California. The Commission recognizes institutions/program sponsors that meet the Commission established criteria. This approval by the Commission establishes the eligibility of an institution/program sponsor to submit specific program proposals to the Committee on Accreditation.

2. **Hear and Resolve Accreditation Appeals.** The Commission hears appeals of accreditation decisions, which must be based on evidence that accreditation procedures or decisions were "arbitrary, capricious, unfair, or contrary to the policies of the Commission or the procedural guidelines of the Committee on Accreditation" *Education Code* Section 44374(e). The Commission resolves each appeal, and the Executive Director communicates the Commission's decision to the Committee on Accreditation, the accreditation team, and the affected institution/program sponsor.

3. **Allocate Resources Annually for Accreditation Operations.** The Commission annually allocates resources for accreditation operations to implement this *Accreditation Framework.* Consistent with the Commission's general practice, staff assignments to accreditation operations are made by the Executive Director, in accordance with state budgets, laws and regulations.

4. **Review and Sponsor Legislation Related to Accreditation.** The Commission reviews legislative proposals to amend the *Education Code* related to the accreditation of educator preparation institutions/program sponsors. As the need arises, the Commission sponsors legislation related to accreditation, after considering the advice of the Commission's professional staff, the Committee on Accreditation, educational institutions, program sponsors and professional organizations.

C. Responsibilities Related to the Committee on Accreditation

1. **Establish a Nominating Panel.** In collaboration with the Committee on Accreditation, the Commission establishes a Nominating Panel to solicit and screen nominations and recommend educators to serve on the Committee on Accreditation.

2. **Appoint the Committee on Accreditation.** Pursuant to *Education Code* 44372(d) and Section 2 of this *Framework,* the Commission appoints members and alternate members of the Committee on Accreditation for specific terms. The Commission selects the Committee members and alternate members from nominees submitted by the Nominating Panel. The Commission ensures that the Committee on Accreditation is professionally distinguished and balanced in its composition, but does not appoint members to represent particular institutions, organizations or constituencies.

3. **Address Issues and Refer Concerns Related to Accreditation.** The Commission considers issues and concerns related to accreditation that it identifies, as well as those brought to the Commission's attention by the Committee on Accreditation, postsecondary institutions, the Commission's staff, or other concerned individuals or organizations. At its discretion, the Commission may refer accreditation issues and concerns to the Committee on Accreditation for examination and response.

4. **Review Annual Reports by the Committee on Accreditation.** The Commission reviews an *Annual Accreditation Report* submitted by the Committee on Accreditation. *The Annual Report* includes, but is not limited to, information about the dimensions and results of the accreditation process.

Section 2
Functions of the Committee on Accreditation

The functions, membership and appointment of the Committee on Accreditation are set forth in *Education Code* Section 44373 and this section of the *Framework.*

A. Functions of the Committee on Accreditation

1. **Comparability of Standards.** In accordance with Section 3 of this *Framework*, the Committee determines whether standards submitted by institutions/program sponsors under Option 2 (National or Professional Program Standards) or Option 3 (Experimental Program Standards), taken as a whole, provide a level of program quality comparable to standards adopted by the Commission under Option 1 (California Program Standards). If the Committee determines that the proposed standards are collectively comparable in breadth and depth, when taken as a whole, to the Commission-adopted standards, the Committee on Accreditation may approve the proposed standards as Program Standards in California.

2. **Initial Approval of Programs.** The Committee on Accreditation reviews proposals for the initial accreditation of programs submitted by institutions/program sponsors that have been determined to be eligible by the Commission. New programs of educator preparation may be submitted under Options One, Two, or Three as defined in Section 3 Category II (Program Standards) of this *Framework*. If the Committee on Accreditation determines that a program meets all applicable standards, the Committee on Accreditation grants initial approval to the program.

3. **Continuing Accreditation Decisions.** After reviewing the recommendations of accreditation teams, the Committee makes decisions about the continuing accreditation of educator preparation institutions/program sponsors and programs, consistent with Section 5 of this *Framework*. Pertaining to each institution/program sponsor, the Committee makes one of three decisions: Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations, or Denial of Accreditation.

4. **Accreditation Procedures.** Consistent with the terms of Section 5, the Committee recommends appropriate guidelines for reports as well as other accreditation materials and exhibits to be prepared by institutions/program sponsors. The Committee also adopts guidelines for all accreditation activities, which emphasize the use of narrative, qualitative explanations of team recommendations. The Committee may provide additional guidance to institutions/program sponsors, site visit teams and the Executive Director regarding accreditation procedures. The procedural guidelines of the Committee are published by the Commission as an *Accreditation Handbook.*

5. **Monitor the Accreditation System.** The Committee monitors the performance of accreditation teams and oversees other activities associated with the accreditation system.

6. **Communication With and Reporting to the Commission.** The Committee provides updates on accreditation decisions, activities, implementation matters or other items on an "as needed" basis to ensure the Commission is kept well apprised of the effectiveness of its accreditation policies and procedures.

7. **Evaluation of Accreditation Policies and Practices.** The Committee shares responsibility with the Commission for the on-going evaluation and monitoring of the effectiveness of the accreditation system. Evaluation and monitoring of the system as well as modification to that system will be conducted in a manner consistent with Section 8 of this Framework.

8. **Conduct Business in an Open, Transparent Manner.** The Committee conducts its business and makes its decisions in meetings that are open to the public, except as provided by statute. All meeting agendas, team reports, and final accreditation decisions will be available on the public on the Commission's website.

B. Membership of the Committee on Accreditation

1. **Membership Composition.** The Committee consists of twelve members. Six members are from postsecondary education institutions, and six are certificated professionals in public schools, school districts, or county offices of education in California. Selection of members is based on the breadth of their experience, the diversity of their perspectives, and "their distinguished records of accomplishment in education" (*Education Code* Section 44373-a). All members serve as members-at-large. No member serves on the Committee as a representative of any organization, institution/program sponsor, or constituency. To the maximum extent possible, Committee membership is balanced according to ethnicity, gender, geographic regions and across credentials awarded by the Commission. The Committee includes members from the public K-12 school system, and from public and private postsecondary institutions. The elementary and secondary school members include certificated administrators, teachers, and at least one member involved in a professional educator preparation program. The postsecondary members include administrators and faculty members, both of whom must be involved in professional educator preparation programs.

2. **Membership Criteria.** The criteria for membership on the Committee are: evidence of achievement in the education profession; recognized professional or scholarly contributions in the field of education; recognition of excellence by peers; experience with and sensitivity to issues of human diversity; distinguished service in the field of educator preparation; knowledge of issues related to the preparation and licensing of education professionals; length of professional service; and possession of appropriate educational degrees and professional credentials.

3. **Membership Orientation and Training.** Members of the Committee will receive an orientation and training to adequately prepare them to effectively carry out their roles and responsibilities on the Committee on Accreditation.

C. Appointment of the Committee on Accreditation

1. **Nominating Panel.** A Nominating Panel of four distinguished members of the education profession in California identifies and nominates individuals to serve on the Committee on Accreditation. The Nominating Panel is comprised of two educators appointed by the Committee on Accreditation and two educators appointed by the Commission. Each entity will appoint one college or university member and one K-12 public school member to the Nominating Panel. The terms of Nominating Panel members are four years. Members of the Panel may not serve more than one term.

2. **Nomination of Committee Members.** To select members for the Committee on Accreditation, a vacancy notice is posted on the Commission website and nominations are solicited, in writing, from a broad base of professional organizations, agencies, institutions, and individuals in education. Each nomination must be submitted with the consent of the individual. A written endorsement from the nominee's employer confirming understanding of and agreement to the nominee's participation on the Committee must be submitted (The Commission provides travel, per diem, and substitute reimbursement, if needed). The nominee's professional resume must be submitted. Self-nominations are not accepted.

3. **Selection of Committee Members.** Based on the membership criteria and the principles of balanced composition set forth in this section, the Nominating Panel screens the professional qualifications of each nominee and recommends for appointment at least two highly qualified nominees for each vacant seat on the Committee. The Commission selects and appoints the members and alternate members of the Committee by selecting from the nominations submitted by the Panel.

4. **Terms of Appointment.** The Commission appoints members of the Committee on Accreditation to four-year terms. A member may be re-nominated and re-appointed to a second term of four years. A member may serve a maximum of two terms on the Committee. Terms of appointment shall commence on July 1, or the date of the appointment, whichever is later, and shall expire on June 30.

5. **Committee Vacancies.** When a seat on the Committee becomes vacant prior to the conclusion of the member's term, the Executive Director fills the seat for the remainder of the term by appointing a replacement from the list of alternate members.

6. **Transition of Committee Membership.** In the first year of the implementation of the revised *Framework*, three new members will be appointed to the Committee for four year terms. Nine members of the prior Committee will continue to serve: three for one additional year, three for two additional years, and three for three additional years. Each subsequent year, three additional members will be appointed to the Committee. These changes will transition the membership from the *Accreditation Framework (1995)* to the revised *Framework* (2007).

Section 3
Accreditation Standards

There are two categories of accreditation standards for institutions/program sponsors that prepare professional educators in California: 1) Common Standards and 2) Program Standards. An accredited institution/program sponsor is expected to satisfy the standards in both categories.

Category I. Common Standards relate to aspects of program quality that are the same for all educator preparation programs. This category includes standards relevant to the overall leadership and climate for educator preparation at an institution/program sponsor, as well as standards pertaining to quality features that are common to all programs. An institution/program sponsor responds to each Common Standard by providing pertinent information, including information about individual programs.

Category II. Program Standards address the quality of program features that are specific to a credential, such as curriculum, field experiences, and knowledge and skills to be demonstrated by candidates in the specific credential area. Different options may be exercised by different credential programs at an institution/program sponsor. Options that are selected will be the basis for the review of specific programs and will guide the selection and orientation of program reviewers. Pertaining to each program, the institution/program sponsor responds to each standard in the selected option by providing program-specific information for review by the program reviewers. When institutions/program sponsors prepare for initial program approval and continuing accreditation activities, they may consider the following options for program-specific standards.

- **Option 1. California Program Standards.** The Commission relies on panels of experts from colleges, universities and schools to develop standards for specific credential programs. These panels are guided by current research findings in the field of the credential and the California K-12 academic content standards. They also consider standards developed by appropriate national and statewide professional organizations. If the national or professional standards are found to be appropriate for California, a panel may recommend that the Commission adopt them in lieu of developing new standards or revising the Commission's existing standards. After reviewing the recommendations of advisory panels and other experts, the Commission adopts California Program Standards for the initial and continuing accreditation of credential preparation programs. When revised program standards are adopted, institutions/program sponsors may be required to meet the new set of California Program Standards.

- **Option 2. National or Professional Program Standards.** California institutions may propose program standards that have been developed by national or state professional organizations. Such a proposal may be submitted to the Committee on Accreditation with a statement of the institution's reasons for requesting this option and the requested National or Professional Program Standards. If the Committee determines that the requested standards, taken as a whole, provide a level of professional quality comparable to the standards adopted by the Commission under Option 1 (California Program Standards), the Committee approves the proposed standards for use as Program Standards in the initial or continuing accreditation

of credential program. If the Committee determines that the requested standards do not adequately address one or more aspects of California Standards (Common and/or Program), the Committee may approve the requested standards but also require the institution/program sponsor address the missing portions of the California Standards.

- **Option 3. Experimental Program Standards**. For initial accreditation, an institution may present an experimental, pilot, or exploratory program that meets the Experimental Program Standards adopted by the Commission pursuant to *Education Code* Section 44273. Experimental, pilot, or exploratory programs are designed to allow for the examination of focused research questions intended to contribute to the body of knowledge around key aspects of the field of education including the identification of model strategies, delivery methods, and programs that lead to improved teaching and learning. Institutions that sponsor experimental, pilot, or exploratory programs must have a research component that examines how the program contributes to the development of quality teaching and specifically, the acquisition and mastery by teacher candidates of appropriate performance expectations, such as the Teaching Performance Expectations for the Multiple and Single Subject Credentials. In addition, experimental, pilot, or exploratory programs are required to report their findings on a biennial basis to the Commission. Upon consultation with the institution and with the Committee on Accreditation, the Commission retains the authority to determine whether the findings support continuance of the experimental, pilot, or exploratory program under the experimental standards.

Section 4
Initial Accreditation Policies

This section governs the initial recognition of institutions and approval of programs.

A. Responsibility for Two Phases of Initial Accreditation

1. **Initial Institution/Program Sponsor Approval.** A postsecondary education institution or local education agency (LEA) or other entity that is not currently preparing educators for California's public schools must submit an application to the Commission for initial eligibility to submit programs. The application must indicate evidence of accreditation by either the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) or another of the regional accrediting bodies. In the case of an application from a Local Education Agency (LEA) or other entity, the governance board's approval or sponsorship of the program must be noted. The Commission may establish additional procedures and criteria for the initial approval of institutions/program sponsors to prepare and recommend candidates for state credentials in education.

2. **Initial Approval of Programs.** The Committee on Accreditation decides the initial approval of new credential or certificate programs at an eligible institution/program sponsor. New credential or certificate program proposals by institutions/program sponsors that have been determined to be eligible by the Commission must fulfill preconditions established by state law and the Commission, the Common Standards, and the appropriate set of Program Standards. Descriptions of new programs include evidence of involvement in program design and planning by elementary and secondary school practitioners and members of diverse local communities.

B. Policies for Initial Approval of Programs

1. **Review of New Programs**. Prior to being presented to the Committee on Accreditation for action, new programs proposed by eligible program sponsors are reviewed in relation to the Common Standards in Appendix 2 and the selected Program Standards as specified in Section 3 of this *Framework*. The Committee on Accreditation considers recommendations by the staff and/or the external reviewers regarding the approval of each proposed program.

C. Integration of Institutions/Program Sponsors into Accreditation Cycle. After initial approval of programs, the institution/program sponsor will be notified of its assignment to a specific cohort schedule. The institution/program sponsor will then participate in accreditation activities at the scheduled times.

a. Accreditation Activities. Institutions/program sponsors will complete Biennial Reports according to their cohort schedule. They will complete a Program Assessment eighteen months after initial program approval.

b. Technical Assistance Site Visit. Two years prior to the scheduled Site Visit, a Technical Assistance Site Visit will be made to the institution/program sponsor. The purpose of the Technical Assistance Site Visit is to prepare new institutions or program sponsors for the Committee on Accreditation Site Visit that will follow (to provide an opportunity for a limited review of all approved programs by a small team of experts in the field) and to provide feedback to the institution/program sponsor based upon that limited review.

Section 5
Continuing Accreditation Policies

This section outlines the Commission's policies for institutions/program sponsors that have been approved to offer educator preparation credential programs and are seeking continuing accreditation. The specific procedures and requirements for implementing these policies are included in the *Accreditation Handbook.*

Overview of the Accreditation Cycle

Contained in this *Framework* are the goals for the Commission's accreditation system. Under this system, accreditation is an on-going process that fosters greater public accountability, continuous attention to program improvement, adherence to standards, and high quality programs. The accreditation system and its interrelated set of activities of Biennial Reports, Program Assessment, Site Visits, and follow up throughout the 7 year cycle – is designed to support these goals.

The major components of the seven year accreditation cycle include:

1) Ongoing Data Collection by the Institution/Program Sponsor
2) Biennial Program Reports in years one, three, and five.
3) Program Assessment in year four
4) Institutional Site Visit in year six
5) Follow Up on areas of concern in year seven and beyond, if necessary

Accreditation Cycle Activities

The following section describes the various activities within the accreditation cycle in general terms. Specific procedures and requirements about all aspects of the accreditation cycle are set forth in the *Accreditation Handbook.* Charts illustrating the various activities in the 7 year accreditation cycle can be found in Appendix C.

1. Ongoing Data Collection by the Institution/Program Sponsor

Each institution/program sponsor is required to collect data for each approved credential and certificate program related to candidate competence and program effectiveness on an annual basis. Further, it is an expectation that all CTC accredited institutions or program sponsors will use these data to inform programmatic decision-making.

2. Biennial Report

The accreditation system requires that the institution provide evidence, through submission of the Biennial Report that it is collecting, analyzing, and using data for programmatic decision making. The Biennial Report process will include the submission of contextual information, candidate assessment, a brief statement of analysis, an action plan based on the analysis, and an institutional summary identifying trends across the programs or critical issues. The Biennial Report will be reviewed, may result in further questions or review, and will be part of the documentation made available to the program and site visit reviewers. The specific activities related to the Biennial Report are as follows:

Submission, Review and Feedback

a. **Submission.** Each institution/program sponsor must annually collect data and submit biennial reports. The data collection and submission must be related to the Commission standards. All program reports from the institution are submitted together with an institutional summary. The institutional summary identifies trends across the programs or critical issues for the program sponsor. The specific requirements of these reports are defined in the *Accreditation Handbook.*

b. **Review**. Commission staff review the Biennial Report. Commission staff evaluates the Biennial Report for completeness and sufficiency. If the report is not submitted, is incomplete or is inadequate, Commission staff will contact the institution/program sponsor. If the report has been submitted but the data do not demonstrate measures of candidate competence or have deficiencies, the Committee on Accreditation and Commission staff will request additional information from the institution/program sponsor. Data review procedures are set forth in the *Accreditation Handbook*. Staff will report on the Biennial Report to the COA.

c. **Feedback.** Institutions/Program Sponsors will be notified of receipt and review of the Biennial Report. Based on review of the Biennial Report, the Committee on Accreditation may request additional information or schedule a site visit prior to the scheduled time period for a site visit to the institution/program.

3. Program Assessment

In the 4th year of each cohort cycle, an institution/program sponsor prepares and submits a Program Assessment document for each approved program. The specific activities related to Program Assessment are as follows:

a. **Program Assessment Document**. Each institution/program sponsor ensures that each approved program that is offered by an institution/program sponsor prepares and submits a Program Assessment Document. The document includes the following elements: 1) the most recently approved program document which includes modifications in the program since its approval, 2) current course syllabi and faculty vitae, 3) information on assessments used at key points in the program in order to determine candidate competence. The specific procedures and requirement for the Program Assessment Document are included in the *Accreditation Handbook.*

1. **Review**. Trained reviewers will determine whether the standards for each program area continue to be met. If there are questions, or more

information is needed, Commission staff will communicate with an institution or program sponsor to request additional information. A professional dialogue will then take place between program sponsors and reviewers (facilitated through CTC staff) in order to ascertain the most complete sense of candidate competence and the ongoing program improvement efforts that are made. This process allows for a more complete understanding of the program prior to determining the findings.

2. **Preliminary Report of Findings.** Trained members of the BIR serve as readers and consider all information and come to "preliminary findings" for all program standards as well as recommendations and questions for the site visit. Program Standard findings are 'Standard Met', 'Met with Concerns', and 'Not Met'. Document review procedures are set forth in the *Accreditation Handbook*.

3. **Use of Results.** The report from the readers is forwarded to the Committee on Accreditation. Readers submit any outstanding questions or areas of concern to the Committee on Accreditation and the Committee will ensure that the site review team investigates the issue(s). The Committee on Accreditation reviews the program reports, preliminary findings, and questions/areas of concern to assist in determining the size and composition of the site review team.

   The preliminary findings of the reviewers will influence the size, scope, and nature of the 6th year site visit. If reviewers find no issues or concerns through program assessment, it may be determined that it is unnecessary to review the program in detail at the site visit. If reviewers identify issues that warrant further review or if questions remain unanswered at the conclusion of the Program Assessment, the 6th year site visit may include a more detailed review of such programs.

Specific documentation required in the Program Assessment is set forth in the *Accreditation Handbook*.

4. Site Visit

An accreditation team visits each institution/program sponsor in the sixth year of the accreditation cycle. The institution/program sponsor prepares for a site visit that focuses mainly on the Common Standards, but may include any program areas identified in advance by the Committee on Accreditation (COA) as a result of the program assessment process. The Biennial Reports, Program Assessment Documents and Preliminary Report of Findings will be made available to the site review team. The site visit will result in an accreditation recommendation for consideration and action by the COA.

Preparation for Site Visit

a. **Preliminary Program Assessment Report of Findings.** No less than twelve months before the scheduled site visit, Program Assessment reviewers will submit the preliminary findings on program standards and any additional questions or areas of concern to the Committee on Accreditation. The Program Assessment reviewers make a recommendation to Committee on Accreditation whether the issue(s) needs to be further reviewed at the site visit.

b. Preliminary Report. Ten to twelve months before the scheduled site visit, institutional/program sponsors submit a Preliminary Report to the Commission. This brief report describes the institutional mission and includes information about institutional demographics, special emphasis programs, and other unique features of the institution/program sponsor. The institution/program sponsor includes its response to accreditation preconditions established by state laws and the Commission.

c. **Determination by the Committee on Accreditation.** The Committee on Accreditation uses the Preliminary Report, along with the preliminary findings from the Program Assessment, to determine the type, size and complexity of the programs to be reviewed and the structure, size and expertise of the site visit review team to be selected. All institutions/program sponsors will be subject to a Common Standards review, and the Committee on Accreditation will make case by case determinations, based on the findings of the Program Assessment, as to which programs will be subject to a more detailed review during the site visit at an institution.

d. Self Study. No fewer than 60-90 days before the site visit, the institution/program sponsor submits its Institutional Self-Study which focuses on the Common Standards to the team and the Commission. In responding to each applicable standard, the self-study report should emphasize quality considerations, educational rationales, and thoughtful program analyses.

On-site Activities

1. **Collection of Information**. The accreditation site visit team, composed of 3 to 7 members, focuses its review primarily on the Common Standards and on any specific programs designated by the Committee on Accreditation that require additional review at the site visit. In addition, the site visit team is responsible for reviewing evidence that will substantiate and confirm or contradict the preliminary findings of the Program Assessment.

The site visit team gathers information about the quality of the education unit and credential programs at the institution/program sponsor from a variety of sources representing the full range of stakeholders, including written documents and interviews with representative samples of significant stakeholders. The site visit team will gather all relevant information related to all the Common Standards and the standards applicable to the program areas under review. During the site visit, each program in operation participates fully in the interview schedule. The Committee on Accreditation may add additional members to the team with expertise in the specific program areas(s) identified as needing additional study during the site visit. Data collection procedures are set forth in the *Accreditation Handbook.*

2. **Procedural Safeguards.** The accreditation site visit team provides ample opportunities during the site review for representatives of the institution/program sponsor to (a) be informed about areas where the standards appear not to be fully satisfied, and (b) supply additional information pertaining to those standards. These opportunities include, at a minimum, a meeting at approximately mid-visit between representatives of the team and the institution's/program sponsor's credential programs, after which additional written information or interviews are utilized by the team in reaching its conclusions.

3. **Focused Site Visit and a Specialized Credential Program Team**. It is possible that the site visit team may uncover a program concern or issue not previously identified by the Program Assessment. When this occurs, the team may recommend a Focused Site Visit addressing the concerns or issues that have arisen if the accreditation site visit team determines that the team lacks expertise to make sound decisions for a particular program. In such a situation, the Focused Site Visit is scheduled to resolve the uncertainty before the accreditation team's final report and recommendation is submitted to the Committee on Accreditation. In this event, there would be no accreditation recommendation until after the Focused Site visit has been completed.

4. **Exit Interview and Report.** The accreditation site visit team conducts an exit interview with representatives of the institution/program sponsor, at which time the team presents its draft report for the Committee on Accreditation. Such a report will include the findings on all Common Standards, all program standards, and an accreditation recommendation. As noted in the previous section, it is possible that the site visit team may uncover a program concern or issue not previously identified by the Program Assessment reviewers. When this occurs, the site visit team may recommend a follow up focused program review of the concerns or issues that have arisen. In this event there would be no accreditation recommendation until after the focused

review has been completed. If further review is needed of program experts not currently on the site review team, the accreditation status recommendation is not reported during the exit interview. The Committee on Accreditation will review the site visit team report prior to making an accreditation decision.

Accreditation Reports, Recommendations and Decisions

a. **Accreditation Team Reports.** Each accreditation site visit team makes its report and recommendations to the Committee on Accreditation. Accreditation site visit team reports indicate whether each applicable standard is met, include summary findings and a recommendation to the Committee, and may include professional recommendations for consideration by the institution/program sponsor.

b. **Accreditation Team Recommendations.** An accreditation site visit team recommends *Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations,* or *Denial of Accreditation.* The team makes its recommendation based on the overall quality of the education unit and the credential programs at the institution/program sponsor. The team does not recommend separate accreditation decisions for each program. The team may recommend Accreditation but recommend required follow-up for the institution and/or one or more of its programs. Alternatively, a team may recommend Accreditation with Stipulations, which may (if adopted by the Committee on Accreditation) require the institution/program sponsor to provide evidence that the program(s) has made modifications that address the stipulation(s). The Committee on Accreditation may require additional progress reports from the institution/program sponsor beyond one year even if the stipulations have been removed. The Committee on Accreditation has discretion to allow an institution/program sponsor additional time to address issues. Stipulations may (if adopted) require the discontinuation of severely deficient programs at the institution/program sponsor.

c. **Accreditation Decisions.** After reviewing the recommendation of an accreditation site visit team the Committee on Accreditation makes a decision about the accreditation of educator preparation at the institution/program sponsor. The Committee makes one of three decisions pertaining to each institution: *Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations,* or *Denial of Accreditation*. The Committee's Annual Accreditation Reports summarize these decisions.

d. **Required Follow-up.** The Committee on Accreditation may grant full accreditation to an institution/program sponsor, but require follow-up by one or more programs or the institution/program sponsor as a unit. The required follow-up will be documented in reports submitted to the Committee on Accreditation.

e. **Accreditation with Stipulations.** The Committee on Accreditation allows an institution/program sponsor one year to remove all stipulations or to discontinue deficient program(s). COA may require additional progress reports beyond one year even if stipulations have been removed. The Committee on Accreditation has discretion to allow an institution/program sponsor additional time to address issues. An additional period to remedy severe deficiencies may be granted by the Committee on Accreditation if the Committee determines that (a) substantial progress has been made and/or (b) special circumstances described by the institution justify a delay. The Committee also determines how the institution's/program sponsor's response to adopted stipulations is to be reviewed. The Committee may require a second site visit for this purpose. Failure to remove all stipulations may result in the denial of accreditation to the entire institution/program sponsor.

Appeals

a. **Appeals to Committee on Accreditation.** Within thirty days after an accreditation site visit, the institution/program sponsor may submit evidence to the Committee on Accreditation that the site visit team demonstrated bias or acted arbitrarily or capriciously or contrary to the policies of this *Framework* or the procedural guidelines of the Committee on Accreditation. (Information related to the quality of a program or the education unit that was not previously provided to the accreditation site visit team may not be considered by the Committee on Accreditation.) The Committee on Accreditation may use this evidence to make a different decision than was recommended by the site visit team. If the Committee on Accreditation makes such a decision, the leader of the team may file a dissent with the Commission. If the Committee on Accreditation decides that an incorrect judgment was made by a team and that the result leaves some doubt about the most appropriate decision to be made, the Committee on Accreditation may assign a new site visit team to visit the institution/program sponsor and provide a recommendation on its accreditation.

b. **Appeals to the Commission.** Pursuant to *Education Code* Section 44374-e, an institution/program sponsor has the right to appeal to the Commission a decision by the Committee on Accreditation to deny accreditation or accredit with stipulations. Such an appeal must be based on evidence that accreditation procedures by the site visit team or decisions by the Committee on Accreditation were arbitrary, capricious, unfair, or contrary to the policies in this *Framework* or the procedural guidelines of the Committee on Accreditation. Information related to the quality of a program or the education unit or LEA that was not previously provided to the accreditation site visit team may not be considered by the Commission. The Commission resolves each appeal pursuant to *Education Code* Section 44372-f.

Complaints about Credential Program Quality

When one or more complaints about a credential program indicate that the program may not be meeting Commission adopted standards, the Executive Director of the Commission may investigate the basis for the concerns, provide technical assistance to the institution/program sponsor, or refer the concerns to the Committee on Accreditation for consideration of possible action.

Section 6
Board of Institutional Reviewers

This section governs both initial and continuing accreditation reviewers.

A. Board of Institutional Reviewers

To conduct reviews for the initial and continuing accreditation of institutions/program sponsors, the Executive Director of the Commission maintains a pool of trained reviewers consisting of California college and university faculty members, staff and administrators; elementary and secondary school teachers and other certificated professionals, pursuant to *Education Code* Section 44374(b). These reviewers may participate as reviewers in Program Assessment documents and/or Site Visits. Individuals may serve in one of those capacities or both. The pool consists of individuals who are geographically and culturally diverse, and who represent gender equity and who have expertise across the spectrum of credential areas. The Committee on Accreditation establishes criteria for membership in the pool. The Executive Director adds new members to the pool when necessary.

Conflict of Interest Care is exercised to avoid conflicts of interest involving accreditation team members and the institution/sponsor being reviewed, such as current, or past enrollment; programmatic collaboration; past, prospective or present employment; or spousal connections.

B. Team Structure, Size and Expertise

1. **Initial Program Approval:** New programs may be reviewed by Commission staff members who have expertise in the credential area. If the Commission staff does not possess the necessary expertise, the program proposals may be reviewed by external experts selected by the Executive Director. New programs are reviewed by one to two reviewers.

2. **Continuing Program Review (Program Assessment Reviewers):** For each program being considered for continuing accreditation, the Executive Director appoints Program Assessment reviewers. Reviewers are responsible for reviewing a credential program from the program sponsor. The document reviewers will prepare a report to the Committee on Accreditation containing preliminary findings on all standards and a recommendation regarding the site visit. Reviewers with appropriate experience and qualifications are responsible for professional judgments about credential programs. Reviewers should have sufficient expertise to make sound judgments about the program under review. Each program document should have at least two reviewers and a team leader should be designated to serve as a contact for the Commission to ensure appropriate communication to the site visit review team.

3. **Continuing Institutional Accreditation (Site Visit Reviewers):** For an institution/sponsor being considered for continuing accreditation, the Executive Director appoints a site visit team and designates a team leader. The accreditation

team members have responsibility for reviewing the Common Standards and either confirming or altering the findings from the Program Assessment. The size of the site visit team will be determined based upon factors such as: enrollment, complexity of programs, and satellite locations. One to three members will have primary responsibility for the program findings. Where issues have been identified for further review by the Program Assessment about particular credential programs, and agreed to by the Committee on Accreditation, additional members with expertise in the specific areas will be added to the site visit team.

4. **Team Expertise.** The range of credential programs at an institution/sponsor must be reflected in the expertise of the reviewers, but there need not be a one-to-one correspondence between credential programs and reviewer specializations. Student enrollments in programs, the complexity of programs, and/or the numbers of specialized programs offered by an institution/program sponsor will all be considered when both Program Assessment reviewers and Site Visit teams are created. The nature of the preliminary findings will also be considered in establishing the site visit team.

C. Organization of Continuing Accreditation Activities

1. **Coordination and Communication between the Program Assessment Reviewers and the Site Visit Teams.** Clear and timely communication from the Program Assessment Reviewers to the Committee on Accreditation and from the Committee on Accreditation to the sponsor and site visit team is essential. To support a comprehensive and complete review of the program sponsor and all its programs, members of the site visit team may have previously served as Program Assessment Reviewers for the institution/program sponsor.

2. **Team Leader.** The Executive Director appoints an experienced reviewer as the leader of a sponsor's Site Visit team for continuing accreditation. The leader's roles are to assist the Commission's staff consultant in planning the review, participate in team size and composition decisions, and provide leadership in team training, orientation and support during the site visit. The team leader and the Commission's staff consultant are jointly responsible for management of the program assessment and site visit.

D. Training, Orientation and Evaluation

Prior to participation in accreditation review activities, all Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) members participate in two kinds of in-depth training and orientation. All training and orientation is evaluated by participants to guide later training and orientation.

1. **Training.** To ensure that accreditation review activities examine issues of quality in educator preparation, prospective BIR members participate in an intensive training program, which focuses on document review, data analysis, team skills, interview techniques, accreditation procedures, and the consistent application of standards. In adopting an *Accreditation Handbook*, the Committee on Accreditation will attend to

appropriate differentiation in the training of new and returning team members and team leaders and training and calibration for the different types of review activities: Initial Program Approval, Continuing Program Assessment, and Site Visits. The Board of Institutional Reviewers will have members who are involved in all types of review activities but not all BIR members must be trained in all types of reviews. All reviewers must be trained in the specific activity or activities in which he or she will be participating.

2. **Orientation**.

Initial Program Approval: As new programs are submitted by eligible institutions or new program standards are adopted, documents are submitted by eligible institutions/program sponsors. A Commission staff member will be assigned to the program area. The staff member will work to ensure calibration of reader responses to the standards and work with all reviewers to ensure that all program documents submitted for initial program approval are reviewed in an equitable manner.

Program Assessment: Program Assessment Document reviewers may meet regionally to review program documents. At such a meeting, a Commission staff consultant will be present. Program Assessment Document reviewers will receive training on all standard updates and changes.

Site Visit Reviewers: On the day prior to the beginning of an accreditation site visit, team members meet to discuss their observations about the institutional self-study report, the preliminary program standard findings, and review their prior training as site visit reviewers. They thoroughly plan the team activities for the site visit under the team leader.

3. **Evaluation of Training and Accreditation Activities.** To ensure that future team training and orientations are as effective as possible, all team members will be asked to evaluate training and orientation activities. The Committee on Accreditation will analyze the responses and modify the training appropriately.

4. **Evaluation of BIR Members**. To ensure that accreditation activities are as effective as possible, free of bias and in accordance with high standards of professionalism, BIR members will be evaluated by accreditation team members and institutional representatives. This feedback will be considered in determining assignment to future accreditation activities.

E. Role of Staff

Professional expertise of staff will be used in accreditation activities and staff members will be assigned to facilitate accreditation activities. Prior to participation in accreditation review activities, staff will participate in the appropriate training and orientation.

Initial Accreditation Activities:

1. **Initial Institution/Program Sponsor Approval -** Staff reviews the response to the Preconditions and verifies that all the legal requirements and the requirements set by the Commission have been met by the prospective program sponsor.

2. **Initial Approval of Programs** - Staff facilitates the review of initial program documents using members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) or if staff has the expertise required, completes the review of the initial program document.

Continuing Accreditation Activities:

3. **Biennial Reports -** Staff will review all Biennial Reports and prepare a summary report for the Committee.
4. **Program Assessment -** Staff facilitates the review of program documents in the fourth year of the accreditation cycle using members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR).
5. **Site Visit -** Staff is assigned to facilitate the site visit. The assignment takes place a minimum of one year prior to the site visit and begins with the 'Year-Out Pre-visit'. In the year of the site visit, staff makes an additional pre-visit to assist in planning the site visit. The team members are members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) and staff is responsible to ensure that the accreditation procedures as developed by the Committee are followed.

Section 7
Articulation Between National and State Accreditation

Upon the request of an institution, the accreditation of an education unit (school, college or department of education) or program by a national accrediting body shall substitute for state accreditation provided that the Committee on Accreditation certifies to the Commission that the national accrediting entity fulfills the following conditions (*Education Code* 44374 (f)):

A. National Accreditation of an Education Unit

1. The national accrediting entity agrees to use the Common Standards that have been adopted by the Commission.
2. The accreditation process of the national entity includes on-site reviews.
3. The team has two co-leaders, one appointed according to state accreditation procedures and one appointed by the national accrediting body.
4. The team members reviewing the Common Standards include members appointed by the national body and at least one California member selected according to state accreditation procedures.
5. The review of all program documentation must be completed prior to the site visit, the preliminary findings on all programs will be available to the accreditation team, and the state team members will substantiate the preliminary findings at the visit.
6. Accreditation teams represent ethnic and gender diversity, and include elementary and secondary school practitioners and postsecondary education members.
7. The period of accreditation is consistent with a seven-year cycle and is compatible with the accreditation activities established by the state.

B. National Accreditation of a Credential Program

1. The accrediting entity agrees to use the adopted California Program Standards for the specific credential under Option 1, or the standards used by the national entity are determined by the Committee to be equivalent to those adopted by the Commission under Option 1.
2. The accreditation team represents ethnic and gender diversity.
3. The accreditation team includes both postsecondary members and elementary and secondary school practitioners; a minimum of one voting member is from California.
4. The period of accreditation is consistent with a seven-year cycle and is compatible with the accreditation activities established by the state.
5. Nationally accredited credential programs participate in the unit accreditation process. The national accreditation of the program serves in lieu of the state's Program Assessment process.

Section 8
Evaluation and Modification of the *Framework*

This section governs the evaluation and modification of the *Accreditation Framework*.

A. Evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework*

1. **Evaluation of Accreditation System.** The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation are jointly responsible, in consultation with educational institutions/program sponsors and organizations, for establishing, maintaining, and continually refining a system of on-going evaluation of the accreditation system for educator preparation.

2. **Evaluation Report and Recommendations.** The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation shall implement a process of continual evaluation and improvement to its accreditation system.

B. Modification of the *Accreditation Framework*

1. **General Provisions Regarding Modifications.** The Commission will consult with the Committee on Accreditation and educational institutions, program sponsors, and organizations regarding any proposed modifications of the *Framework*. Modifications will occur in public meetings of the Commission, after the Commission has considered relevant information provided by the Committee on Accreditation, postsecondary institutions, accreditation team members, the Commission's professional staff, and other concerned individuals. The Commission will determine the date when a policy modification is effective.

2. **Refinements and Clarifications of the *Framework*.** The Commission may modify the *Accreditation Framework* to refine or clarify its contents, as needed. The Commission retains the authority to reconsider and modify the Program Standards for Options 1, 2 or 3 as the need arises.

3. **Significant Modifications of the *Framework*.** The Commission will maintain without significant modifications the *Framework*'s major features and options, unless there is compelling evidence that a significant modification is warranted. The determination of compelling evidence and the warranted significant modification will be made by the Commission with the concurrence of the Committee on Accreditation and the Chancellor of the California State University, the President of the University of California, and the President of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities.

Appendix A

Accreditation Activities Summary Charts and Cohort List by Institution

Appendix A was current when the Framework was adopted.

For current information, consult the Commission web page as the schedules are updated as additional sponsors are approved:

http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred.html

Accreditation Cycle and Activities

	Institution or Program Sponsors		CTC and COA	Accreditation Activities
	At the Institution	Submit		
Year 1	• Data Gathering & Analysis	Biennial Report Year 6,7 & 1	Review report	• Biennial Data Report: Staff review of the report could result in a request for additional information and/or a focused site visit. In addition, institution may be completing follow-up from the site visit in Year 6. All institutions will continue data gathering and analysis annually.
Year 2	• Data Gathering & Analysis			• Data gathering and analysis is on-going at the institution • No report unless there was follow-up from questions generated from the Year 6, 7 and 1 Biennial Report.
Year 3	• Data Gathering & Analysis • Prepare program document updates	Biennial Report Years 2 & 3	Review report	• Biennial Data Report: Staff review of the report could result in a request for additional information and/or a focused site visit.
Year 4	• Submit Program Document(s) • Data Gathering & Analysis	Program Assessment*	Review Assessment Document (s)	• Program reviewers are assigned to review each program's documentation and pose questions for institution. • Program review teams agree on preliminary findings for program standards.
Year 5	• Data Gathering & Analysis • Prepare Common Standards self-study for site visit	Biennial Reports Years 4 & 5	Preliminary Program Review questions for sponsor	• Biennial Data Report: Staff review of the report could result in a request for additional information and/or a focused site visit. • Program reviewers submit preliminary findings and remaining questions or concerns to the COA, with recommendations for any needed follow-up at the site visit. • COA determines which, if any program(s) need to be included in the site visit and notifies institution at least one year prior to the site visit date.
Year 6	• Data Gathering & Analysis • Complete preparations for site visit • Host site visit	Common Standards Self-Study	Conduct Site Visit	• Site team is provided with preliminary findings from program review teams and all previous documentation from this cycle. Team is also provided with prior accreditation team report. • Site team visits the institution reviewing all Common Standards and program(s) identified by the Program Reviews. • Site team submits an accreditation report to COA, with recommendations. • COA makes an accreditation decision and specifies required follow-up if necessary.
Year 7	• Data Gathering & Analysis • Follow-up to site visit if necessary	Site visit response	Follow-up to site visit, if necessary	• COA reviews follow-up, if warranted, asks further questions. Follow up may exceed one year at the discretion of the COA. • After completing the seven year cycle, the institution begins the cycle again

* Data related to approved subject matter programs is submitted in Year 4

Accreditation Activities by Cohort
2007-2014

Each institution of higher education and/or program sponsor is assigned to a cohort. There are seven cohorts. The chart below indicates the accreditation activities for each cohort over the next 8 years. After the seventh year, the cycle begins again with the same activities as the 2006-07 year.

Note: Information below the chart indicates the phased-in implementation of the system

Cohort	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue	Indigo	Violet
2007-2008		Biennial Report	Program Assess	Biennial Report	Site Visit[3]	Site Visit Report [4,5]	Biennial Report
2008-2009	Biennial Report	Program Assess	Biennial Report	Site Visit[3]	Site Visit Report [4]	Biennial Report	
2009-2010	Program Assess	Biennial Report	Site Visit	Site Visit Report [4]	Biennial Report		Biennial Report
2010-2011	Biennial Report	Site Visit	Site Visit Report [4]	Biennial Report		Biennial Report	Program Assess
2011-2012	Site Visit	Site Visit Report [4]	Biennial Report		Biennial Report	Program Assess	Biennial Report
2012-2013	Site Visit Report [4]	Biennial Report		Biennial Report	Program Assess	Biennial Report	Site Visit
2013-2014	Biennial Report		Biennial Report	Program Assess	Biennial Report	Site Visit	Site Visit Report [4]

[1] Begin collecting Biennial Reports on a voluntary basis.

[2] This accreditation activity will not take place in the 2006-07 year, except the NCATE site visits will take place as scheduled.

[3] Site Visit will include the program review since the revised Program Review will not have occurred two years prior to the site visit.

[4] The report due the year after the site visit will address issues raised during the site visit.

[5] Since the 2006-07 site visits will not take place (except for NCATE merged visits), the report due the year after the site visit will also not be required.

All institutions and program sponsors will be notified by the Commission of the upcoming accreditation activities.

Accreditation Cohorts by Institution

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

University of California			
Institution	**Cohort**	**Institution**	**Cohort**
UC Berkeley	Red	UC Riverside	Blue
UC Davis	Violet	UC Santa Barbara	Orange
UC Irvine	Violet	UC Santa Cruz	Red
UC Los Angeles	Red	UC San Diego	Violet

Independent Institutions			
Institution	**Cohort**	**Institution**	**Cohort**
Alliant	Blue	Occidental	Orange
Antioch Los Angeles	Violet	Pacific Oaks	Violet
Antioch Santa Barbara	Orange	Pacific Union	Red
Argosy	Blue	Patten	Green
Azusa Pacific: F*	Indigo	Pepperdine	Red
Bethany	Indigo	Phillips Graduate	Blue
Biola	Yellow	Point Loma	Red
Cal Baptist	Orange	Saint Mary's	Orange
California Lutheran: S*	Green	San Diego Christian	Yellow
Chapman	Red	Santa Clara	Yellow
Claremont Graduate	Violet	Simpson	Green
Concordia	Red	Stanford: S	Blue
Dominican	Blue	The Master's College	Orange
Fresno Pacific	Yellow	Touro	Yellow
Holy Names	Blue	*University of La Verne: S**	Orange
Hope International	Violet	University of the Pacific: S*	Orange
Interamerican	Blue	University of Phoenix	Orange
JFK	Yellow	University of Redlands	Indigo
La Sierra	Violet	University of San Diego: F*	Orange
Loma Linda	Blue	University of San Francisco	Indigo
Loyola Marymount: S*	Yellow	University of Southern California	Indigo
Mills College	Green	Vanguard	Blue
Mt. St Mary's	Indigo	Western Governors	Green
National Hispanic	Yellow	Westmont	Green
*National: S**	Violet	Whittier	Yellow
New College	Violet	William Jessup	Yellow
Notre Dame de Namur	Green		

Other Program Sponsors (Districts/County Offices/Other)			
Institution	**Cohort**	**Institution**	**Cohort**
ACSA/SCNTC	Orange	Orange COE	Blue
Alameda COE	Red	Project Pipeline	Blue
Butte COE	Orange	REACH	Red
Compton USD	Violet	Sacramento COE	Indigo
Contra Costa COE	Red	SAIL	Orange
Fresno COE	Green	Salinas Adult	Violet
High Tech High Learning Communities	Green	San Diego COE	Green
Imperial COE	Violet	San Diego USD	Green
Kern COE	Violet	San Joaquin COE	Indigo
Los Angeles COE	Green	Santa Barbara COE	Orange
Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)	Red	Santa Clara USD	Yellow
Mendocino COE	Yellow	Santa Clara COE	Red
Metropolitan	Red	Stanislaus COE	Yellow
Ontario-Montclair SD	Red	Ventura COE	Yellow

*NCATE Accredited F: Fall Visit; S: Spring Visit
Italics = candidate for NCATE

Consult the Commission web page as the schedules are updated as additional sponsors are approved: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred.html

CTC's Accreditation Cycle – Schedule of Activities by Institution							
Cohort	**Red**	**Orange**	**Yellow**	**Green**	**Blue**	**Indigo**	**Violet**
	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 1
07-08		Biennial Report	Program Assessment	Biennial Report	Site Visit		Biennial Report
Site Visits	**11-12**	**10-11**	**09-10**	**08-09**	**07-08**	**[06-07]**	**12-13**
1	Alameda COE	ACSA/SCNTC	Biola	CSU CI	Alliant	[Bethany]	Antioch Los Angeles
2	Chapman	Antioch Santa Barbara	Fresno Pacific	Fresno COE	Argosy	[CalPoly Pomona]	Claremont Grad
3	Concordia	*Butte COE*	JFK University	High Tech High Learning Communities	Dominican	[Humboldt St]	Compton USD
4	Contra Costa COE	Cal Baptist	Mendocino COE	Los Angeles COE	Holy Names	[Mt. St Mary's]	Hope International
5	LAUSD	Cal State TEACH	National Hispanic	Mills College	Interamerican	[San Joaquin COE]	Imperial COE
6	Metropolitan Santa Clara COE	CSU Sac	San Diego Christian	Notre Dame de Namur	Loma Linda	[University of Redlands]	Kern COE
7	Ontario-Montclair SD	The Master's College	Santa Clara	Patten University	Orange COE	[USF]	La Sierra
8	Pacific Union	Occidental	Stanislaus COE	San Diego COE	Phillips Graduate	[USC]	New College
9	Pepperdine	SAIL	Touro	San Diego USD	Project Pipeline Sacramento COE	Sacramento COE	Pacific Oaks College
10	Point Loma	Saint Mary's College	Ventura COE	Simpson	UC Riverside		Salinas Adult
11	REACH	Santa Barbara COE	Whittier	Western Governors	Vanguard		UCD
12	UCB	UCSB	William Jessup	Westmont College			UCI
13	UCLA	University of Phoenix					UCSD
14	UCSC						
Technical assistance site visit			REACH	Santa Barbara COE		CSU CI	
				SAIL	William Jessup	High Tech HS	
				ACSA/SCNTC	Touro	Western Govs	
	NCATE Visits						
Site Visits	**11-12**	**10-11**	**09-10**	**08-09**	**07-08**	**06-07**	**12-13**
1	CSUDH: F	USD: F	CSUN: F	Cal Lutheran: F	CSUFul: F	APU: F	CSU Fr: S
2	CSULA: F	*University of La Verne: S**	San Diego St: F	*CSUSB:S*	Stanford: S	CSUMB: F*	*National: S**
3	*CSU Chico: S*	Sonoma St: S	*Cal Poly SLO: S**	CSUEB: S	CSUBak: S	SF State: S	
4	*CSUMB: S*	UOP: S	LMU: S			CSUSM:S	
5			San Jose St: S			CSU Chico: S*	
6			CSU Stan: S			CSULB: S	
Calif	**14**	**13**	**12**	**12**	**11**	**[9]**	**13**
NCATE	**4**	**4**	**6**	**3**	**3**	**6**	**2**
Total	**18**	**17**	**18**	**15**	**14**	**15**	**15**
Site Visits	***11-12*** *18-19*	***10-11*** *17-18*	***09-10*** *16-17*	***08-09*** *15-16*	***07-08*** *14-15*	***06-07*** *13-14*	***12-13*** *19-20*

Program Sponsors not yet in the accreditation cycle:

BTSA Induction (~135)

Single Subject Matter Program

Appendix B

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Common Standards

Adopted June 2007
Effective July 1, 2008

Institutions/program sponsors with a site visit in 2007-08 may elect to use the newly adopted Common Standards (2007).

All initial program documents submitted on or after January 1, 2008 must address the newly adopted Common Standards (2007).

Common Standards reflect aspects of program quality that are the same for all credential programs, regardless of type of program. The institution/program sponsor must respond to each Common Standard by providing information and/or supporting documentation about the individual programs to be offered by the institution/program sponsor.

Standard 1: Educational Leadership
The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability. The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution. The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation
The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

Standard 3: Resources
The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management. Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel
Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution provides support for faculty development. The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

Standard 5: Admission
In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance
Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist each candidate's professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice
The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.

Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors
District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence
Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.

Common Standards Glossary

Adopted by the COA October 2008

Term	Common Standard	Definition
Admission Criteria	**5**	• Candidate eligibility criteria as defined in the Preconditions for each type of educator preparation program. For example, a key admission criterion for Second Tier credential programs is that the candidate be employed in an appropriate education position.
Assessment	**2, 3, 9**	• Process to evaluate, appraise, or measure an individual's knowledge, skills and ability in relation in meeting the adopted program standards. Information gained through assessment processes performed for the accreditation process is not used for employment purposes.
Assessment and Evaluation System	**2**	• A comprehensive and integrated set of procedures that measure candidate performance, completer preparedness, and program effectiveness, thereby, allowing an institution to monitor candidate knowledge and skill development, manage academic programs and practica, and identify strengths and weakness of the educator preparation programs and unit.
Authority	**1**	• An individual who the institution has granted the power to manage the human and fiscal resources needed to meet all educator preparation program goals. The program authority is usually the dean at an IHE, or an associate superintendent/director for a local education agency.
Candidate	**1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7**	• An individual participating in a credential program, whether for an initial or advanced level credential or authorization. This includes both teaching credentials and services credentials.
Certified, Certificated	**8**	• To hold a California educator credential appropriate to his/her role and/or responsibility.
Clinical Experiences	**3, 4, 7**	• Student teaching, internships, or clinical practices that provide candidates with an intensive and extensive culminating activity. Within the field-based experiences, candidates are immersed in the learning community and are provided opportunities to develop and demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing. Field-based experiences are provided to the candidate under the supervision or guidance of an experienced individual who has the knowledge and skills the candidate is working to attain. • See also Field-Based Experiences
Clinical Personnel	**3, 4, 7**	• P–12 school personnel or professional education faculty responsible for instruction, supervision, support, and/or assessment of candidates during field experiences and clinical practice.

Term	Common Standard	Definition
Competency Requirements	**9**	• The set of knowledge, skills, and abilities that candidates are required to demonstrate, as defined in the applicable program standards.
Course Instructors	**4**	• Individuals who teach courses and/or provide instruction to candidates.
Courses	**1**	• CTC-approved professional preparation provided to candidates under the auspices of an IHE, a local education agency, or other approved services provider. Courses may be offered through organized studies that carry units, and/or through modules, professional development settings, online, or independent study.
District-Employed Supervisors	**8**	• Applies only to Level I Credential Programs. The master teacher, cooperating teacher, resident teacher, coach, directing teacher, or other designated supervisory personnel who assesses student teachers. • In internship programs for Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist credentials, the site support provider, mentor, or coach is considered a district-employed supervisor.
Evaluate, Evaluation	**2, 4, 7, 8**	• Assess candidate knowledge, skills, and performance for the purposes of helping the candidate satisfy the relevant program competency requirements. Does not include evaluation for employment purposes. • Analyze data from multiple candidate assessments, program completer surveys, and other stakeholder surveys to identify program strengths and to identify areas needing improvement.
Faculty	**1, 4**	• Those individuals employed by a college, university, school district, county office of education, or other CTC-approved entity, including graduate teaching assistants, who teach one or more courses in education, provide services to candidates (e.g., advising, support), provide professional development, supervise clinical experiences, and/or administer some portion of the educator preparation unit.
Field and Clinical Supervisors	**4, 7**	• Those individuals from the CTC-approved program or employing district assigned to provide supervision and/or to assess candidates during field experiences and clinical practice. This does not apply to Second Tier Credential Programs. • For intern programs, this individual may be called a Site Support Person.
Field-Based Work or Experience	**3, 4, 7**	• Student teaching, internships, or clinical practices that provide candidates with an intensive and extensive culminating activity. Within the field-based experiences, candidates are immersed in the learning community and are provided opportunities to develop and demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing. Field-based experiences are provided to the candidate under the supervision or guidance of an experienced individual who

Term	Common Standard	Definition
		has the knowledge and skills the candidate is working to attain.
Governance	**1**	• The institutional system and structure for defining policy, providing leadership, and managing and coordinating the procedures and resources that ensure the quality of all education professionals prepared at the institution.
Information Resources	**3**	• Library and/or digital media resources, as well as information and communication technology resources available to candidates.
Institution	**1, 6**	• The university, college, school district, county office of education or other entity approved by the CTC to offer educator preparation programs. An institution may be a regionally accredited (IHE) or a local educational agency (LEA) approved to sponsor educator preparation program(s).
Instructional Personnel	**4**	• Individuals employed by a college or university, a school district, county office of education or other approved entity who may teach one or more courses to candidates, provide services to candidates such as advising, provide professional development, supervise clinical experiences, and/or administer some portion of the unit.
Intern Program		• A partnership between an approved educator preparation program and an employing school district for the purpose of preparing, supervising, and supporting candidates employed at the school district as educators. Intern programs can be offered for the Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist teaching credentials or the Pupil Personnel or Administrative Services credentials.
P-12 Student	**7**	• Refers to students enrolled in pre-school through 12th grade.
Multiple Measures	**5**	• Multiple sources of information used to determine whether an applicant possesses the requisite personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, communication skills, academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for effectiveness as a professional educator.
P-12	**4**	• Refers to the entire range of grades in which students are enrolled; preschool through 12th grade.
Partners	**7**	• Agencies, institutions and others who enter into a voluntary collaborative arrangement to provide services to educator candidates. Examples of partners include departments, schools, county offices of education, and school districts.
Professional Development	**3**	• Learning opportunities for individuals to develop new knowledge and skills such as in-service education, conference attendance, intra- and inter-institutional visits, fellowships, collegial work, and work in P–12 schools.
Professional Placement	**6**	• A classroom, clinical or field experience that a candidate participates in during the preparation program. A school site is often a candidate's

Term	Common Standard	Definition
		assigned location for field experiences.
Program	**all**	• A planned sequence of courses and/or experiences for the purpose of preparing teachers and other school professionals to work in pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade settings, and which leads to a credential.
Program Completer	**2**	• An individual who has completed a credential program,
Personnel	**3,7, 9**	• Individuals employed by a college or university, a school district, county office of education or other approved entity who may teach one or more courses to candidates, provide services to candidates such as advising, provide professional development, supervise clinical experiences, and/or administer some portion of the unit. • See also Instructional Personnel, Site-Based Supervising Personnel, Clinical Personnel
Qualified Persons, Qualified Members	**4, 6**	• Individuals whose background and experience are appropriate for the role to which they are assigned and who receive initial and ongoing professional development consistent with their assigned responsibilities.
Recognize	**4, 8**	• To acknowledge and to appreciate the contributions and achievements of another member of the institution or partner organization.
Scholarship	**1, 4**	• Systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school professionals, including but not limited to traditional research and publication, the systematic study of pedagogy, action research, and the application of current research findings in new settings.
Second Tier Credential Programs		• Professional preparation programs including Induction, Education Specialist Level II, and Administrative Services Tier II programs which prepare the holder of a first level/tier/preliminary credential to earn a second level credential.
Service	**1, 4**	• Faculty contributions to college or university activities, P-12 settings, communities and professional associations in ways consistent with the individual's specialized knowledge and the institution and unit's mission as preparers of educators.
Site-Based Supervising Personnel	**7**	• Those individuals from the CTC-approved program or employing district assigned to provide supervision and/or to assess candidates during field experiences and clinical practice. This does not apply to Second Tier Credential Programs. • See Also Field and Clinical Supervisors.
Stakeholder	**1**	• Any individual or institution such as a college, university, or school district that is impacted by and/or that has a professional interest in an

Term	Common Standard	Definition
		educator preparation program or institution.
Student	**7**	• In the context of educator preparation programs, a student is considered to be an individual enrolled in a district or county office of education preschool, kindergarten through 12th grade, or adult education program.
Sufficient	**3**	• Adequate or ample to meet the need.
Supervise	**4**	• The act of guiding, directing, and evaluating candidates in a credential program. This activity does not apply to evaluation for employment purposes.
Supervisor	**4, 8**	• For intern programs, those individuals from the CTC-approved program or employing district assigned to provide supervision and/or to assess candidates during field experiences and clinical practice. This does not apply to Second Tier Credential Programs. • See Also Field and Clinical Supervisors.
Supervision	**3, 8**	• Activities undertaken to evaluate a candidate's competence by a qualified person designed to assist a candidate in mastering the required knowledge, skills and abilities expected of the candidate.
Support	**1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9**	• Aid provided by a qualified individual to a candidate in his/her early teaching or service that includes collecting evidence relating to the candidate's competence for the purpose of helping the candidate satisfy knowledge and skill requirements, but who does not supervise or evaluate the candidate.
Unit	**1, 6, 7**	• The college, school, department, or other administrative body in colleges, universities, school districts, county offices of education, or other organizations with the responsibility for managing and coordinating all aspects of CTC-approved educator preparation programs offered for the initial or advanced preparation of educators, regardless of where these programs are administratively housed in an institution.
Unit Leadership	**1**	• Individuals designated by the institution to be responsible for administering all aspects of the CTC-approved educator preparation programs offered by the institution, and who have been granted, by the institution, the authority to manage the human and fiscal resources needed to meet all educator preparation program goals. The program authority is usually the dean at an IHE, or a director of teacher education, district superintendent or county office program director.

Italics indicate that the term does not appear in the Common Standards.

Appendix C

California Education Code

California Education Code Sections
As Related to Accreditation of Educator Preparation Programs

Education Code Section 44370. Legislative Purpose. The Legislature finds and declares that the competence and performance of professional educators depends in part on the quality of their academic and professional preparation. The Legislature recognizes that standards of quality in collegiate preparation complement standards of candidate competence and performance, and that general standards and criteria regarding candidate's competence and performance.

Section 44371. Accreditation System and Framework.

(a) The system for accreditation of educator preparation shall do all of the following:

(1) Concentrate on the overall quality of educator preparation in credential programs.

(2) Hold professional elementary, secondary, and postsecondary educators responsible for quality in the preparation of professional practitioners.

(3) Contribute to improvements in educator preparation and recognize excellence in preparation programs and institutions.

(4) Replace the prior system of program approval, as established by the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Act of 1970.

(5) Be governed by an Accreditation Framework that sets forth the policies of the

Commission on Teacher Credentialing regarding the accreditation of educator preparation.

(b) The Accreditation Framework shall do all of the following:

(1) Establish broad, flexible policies and standards for accreditation of educator preparation.

(2) Define the accreditation responsibilities, authority, and roles of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the Committee on Accreditation.

(3) Establish an accreditation system that is efficient and cost-effective.

(4) Require that accreditation decisions be based on sufficient reliable evidence about the quality of educator preparation.

Section 44372. Accreditation Responsibilities of the Commission.

The powers and duties of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing regarding the accreditation system shall include the following:

(a) Adopt and implement an Accreditation Framework, which sets forth the policies of the Commission regarding the accreditation of educator preparation in California.

(b) Establish and modify credential-specific standards, experimental program standards, and alternative program standards, as defined in the adopted Accreditation Framework.

(c) Rule on the eligibility of an applicant for accreditation when the applying institution has not previously prepared educators for state certification in California, pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 44227.

(d) Appoint and reappoint the members of the Committee on Accreditation, in accordance with Section 44373, by selecting among nominees submitted by a panel of distinguished educators.

(e) Review periodic accreditation reports by the Committee on Accreditation, and refer accreditation issues and concerns to the Committee for its examination and response.

(f) Hear and resolve appeals of accreditation decisions, pursuant to subdivision (e) of Section 44374.

(g) Allocate resources annually for implementation of the accreditation system.

(h) With the Committee on Accreditation, jointly design an evaluation of accreditation policies and their implementation, and jointly select an external evaluator t o conduct the evaluation, in accordance with Section 8 of the Accreditation Framework that was in effect on June 30, 1993.

(i) Modify the Accreditation Framework in accordance with Section 8 of the Framework that was in effect on June 30, 1993.

(j) Inform and advise the Legislature regarding statutory issues related to accreditation, and submit legislative recommendations, after considering the advice of the Committee on Accreditation, education institutions and professional organizations.

Education Code Section 44373. Committee on Accreditation.

(a) There is hereby established the Committee on Accreditation consisting of 12 members selected for their distinguished records of accomplishment in education. Six members shall be from postsecondary education institutions, and six shall be certificated professionals in public schools, school districts, or county offices of education in California. No member shall serve on the Committee as are representative of any organization or institution. Membership shall be, to the maximum extent possible, balanced in terms of ethnicity, gender, and geographic regions. The Committee shall include members from elementary and secondary schools, and members from public and private institutions of postsecondary education.

(b) The terms of Committee members shall be in accordance with the Accreditation Framework. Appointment of the initial Committee members shall be from nominees submitted by a panel of distinguished educators, who are named by a consensus of the Commission and the Accreditation Advisory Council, pursuant to Section 44371, as that section read on December 31, 1993. Appointment of subsequent Committee members shall be from nominees submitted by a distinguished panel named by a consensus of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation. For each Committee position to be filled by the Commission, the panel shall submit two highly qualified nominees.

(c) The Committee shall do, but shall not be limited to doing, all of the following:

(1) Make decisions about the accreditation of educators' preparation. The Committee's decision making process shall be in accordance with the Accreditation Framework.

(2) Make decisions about the initial accreditation of new programs of educator preparation in accordance with procedures established by the Committee.

(3) Determine the comparability of standards submitted by applicants with those adopted by the Commission, in accordance with the Accreditation Framework.

(4) Adopt guidelines for accreditation reviews, and monitor the performance of accreditation teams and other aspects of the accreditation system.

(5) Present an annual accreditation report to the Commission and respond to accreditation issues and concerns referred to the Committee by the Commission.

Section 44374. Accreditation Standards and Procedures.

(a) The Accreditation Framework shall include common standards that relate to aspects of program quality that are the same for all credential programs. The Framework shall also include multiple options for program standards.

(b) The Accreditation Framework shall include provisions regarding well-trained accreditation teams whose members shall be drawn from a pool of California college and university faculty members and administrators, elementary and secondary school teachers and other certificated professionals, and local school board members. For each accreditation visit there shall be one team, whose size, composition, and expertise shall be constituted according to the Accreditation Framework.

(c) An accreditation team shall present its report and recommendations to the Committee on Accreditation in accordance with the Accreditation Framework. The Committee shall consider the accreditation team report and recommendations, and shall also consider evidence, which may be submitted by the institution, that the team demonstrated bias or acted arbitrarily or capriciously or contrary to the policies of the Accreditation Framework or the procedural guidelines of the Committee.

(d) The Committee on Accreditation shall make a single decision to accredit, to accredit with stipulations, or to deny accreditation to an institution's credential programs, pursuant to Section 44373 and the Accreditation Framework.

(e) An institution has the right to appeal to the Commission if the procedures or decisions of an accreditation team or the Committee on Accreditation are arbitrary, capricious, unfair, or contrary to the policies of the Commission or the procedural guidelines of the Committee. An institution also has the right to recommend changes in the accreditation policies of the Commission, which shall be considered by the Commission in consultation with the Executive Director and the Committee on Accreditation.

(f) At the request of an institution, the accreditation of an education unit or a specific program by a national accrediting body shall substitute for state accreditation provided that the national accrediting body has satisfied the applicable conditions set forth in the Accreditation Framework.

Appendix D

Glossary of Terms

Appendix D

Glossary of Terms

Accreditation Framework	The document that sets forth the policies of the Commission regarding the accreditation of educator preparation in California.
Accreditation Handbook	The document that details the procedures that implement accreditation according to the *Accreditation Framework.*
Annual Accreditation Report	A document presented to the CTC by the COA that summarizes information regarding each year's accreditation activities.
Biennial Reports	An institutional report that summarizes data on candidate competence for each program within an institution/program sponsor. The Biennial Report also provides information about how those data informs program improvement.
Board of Institutional Reviewers	To conduct reviews for the initial and continuing accreditation of institutions/program sponsors, the Executive Director of the Commission maintains a pool of trained reviewers consisting of California college and university faculty members, staff and administrators; elementary and secondary school teachers and other certificated professionals, pursuant to *Education Code* Section 44374(b). These reviewers may participate as reviewers in Program Assessment documents and/or Site Visits. Individuals may serve in one of those capacities or both. The pool consists of individuals who are geographically and culturally diverse, and who represent gender equity and who have expertise across the spectrum of credential areas. The Committee on Accreditation establishes criteria for membership in the pool. The Executive Director adds new members to the pool when necessary.
Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC)	The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing is an agency in the Executive Branch of California State government. It was created in 1970 by the Ryan Act and is the oldest of the autonomous state standards boards in the nation. The major purpose of the agency is to serve as a state standards board for educator preparation for the public schools of California, the licensing and credentialing of professional educators in the State, the enforcement of professional practices of educators, and the discipline of credential holders in the State of California.
Committee on Accreditation (COA)	A Committee of twelve members (six from institutions of higher education and six from K-12 public schools) established by *Education Code* and appointed by the Commission to oversee the implementation and effectiveness of accreditation activities.
Common	The Common Standards deal with aspects of program quality that are the same

Standards	for all credential programs. The institution responds to each Common Standard by providing pertinent information, including information about individual programs. Common standards can be found within each program's standard document.
Ed Code	Statutes, laws and regulations dealing with education.
Educator Preparation Program Standards	Program standards address aspects of program quality and effectiveness that apply to each type of educator preparation program offered by a program sponsor. Program standards contain overall summary statements describing the nature and purpose of each standard, plus required elements that further clarify required aspects subsumed within the domain of the standard. Program sponsors must meet all applicable program standards and required elements before the program application may be approved by the Commission.
Experimental Standards	Standards submitted by institutions/program sponsors used for program development, submission and approval with a focus on a research question.
Initial Institution /Program Sponsor Approval	An institution/program sponsor that would like to offer educator preparation programs must first be granted this approval by the CTC.
Initial Program Approval	The approval to begin a program that has not already been operational at an institution/program sponsor.
Institutional Report (IR)	The term that NCATE uses for the document prepared by the institution prior to the site visit. The IR serves the same purpose as the Common Standards Self Study.
National or Professional Program Standards	California institutions may propose program standards that have been developed by national or state professional organizations. Such a proposal may be submitted to the Committee on Accreditation with a statement of the institution's reasons for requesting this option and the requested National or Professional Program Standards. If the Committee determines that the requested standards, taken as a whole, provide a level of professional quality comparable to the standards adopted by the Commission under Option 1 (California Program Standards), the Committee approves the proposed standards for use as Program Standards in the initial or continuing accreditation of credential program. If the Committee determines that the requested standards do not adequately address one or more aspects of California Standards (Common and/or Program), the Committee may approve the requested standards but also require the institution/program sponsor address the missing portions of the California Standards.
Ongoing Data Collection by Institutions/Progr	A variety of data collection activities, determined by the institution/program sponsor and the subsequent analysis and sharing of the data for program improvement.

am Sponsors

Preconditions	Preconditions are requirements that must be met in order for an accrediting association or licensing agency to consider accrediting a program sponsor or approving its programs or schools. Some preconditions are based on state laws, while other preconditions are established by Commission policy. Preconditions can be found within each program's standard document.
Preliminary Report	An activity of the Site Visit (Year 6) due no less than 12 months before the site visit. This brief report describes the institutional mission and includes information about institutional demographics, special emphasis programs, and other unique features of the institution/program sponsor—including its response to accreditation preconditions established by state laws and the Commission.
Program Assessment	Program Assessment is the feature of the accreditation system that asks institutions/program sponsors to report on their ongoing improvement efforts at the program level. It is designed so that institutions/program sponsors mirror the reflective practices that are taught to candidates. Program Assessment asks institutions/program sponsors to consider how they measure candidate competence and how those measures inform instruction, assessment and program design/implementation. Program Assessment examines each program individually and informs the Site Visit that will take place in two years—year 6 of the accreditation cycle.
Self Study	An activity of the Site Visit (Year 6) due no fewer than 60-90 days before the Site Visit. The report focuses on the Common Standards for the team leader and the Commission staff consultant,
Site Visit	An accreditation team visits each institution/program sponsor in the sixth year of the accreditation cycle. The institution/program sponsor prepares for a site visit that focuses mainly on the Common Standards, but may include any program areas identified in advance by the Committee on Accreditation (COA) as a result of the program review process. The Biennial Reports, Program Assessment Document and Preliminary Report of Findings will be made available to the site review team in order to confirm the Preliminary Report of Findings from the Program Assessment. The site visit will result in an accreditation recommendation for consideration and action by the COA.