

Review and Approval of Accreditation Handbook Revisions

Chapter 6: Program Review Process

April 2016

Overview

This agenda item presents information and incorporates proposed COA edits regarding revised Program Review process and related proposed revisions to Chapter 6 of the *Accreditation Handbook* for COA consideration and discussion. The proposed revisions would ensure that Chapter Six better reflects current practices and procedures related to the Program Review Process.

Staff Recommendation

Staff requests that the Committee on Accreditation discuss and adopt the updated *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Six.

Background

As part of the effort to strengthen and streamline the accreditation process, the Commission took action at its [August 2015 meeting](#) to approve Program Review as a new approach to the submission and review of documentation to ensure alignment with credential program standards that would occur in Year Five of the accreditation cycle. As a result, the *Accreditation Handbook* was revised to reflect the changes.

At its [January](#) and [March](#) 2016 meetings, the COA discussed proposed changes to the *Accreditation Handbook*. The revised Chapter Six of the *Accreditation Handbook* reflects those discussions and incorporates the requested edits in the following handbook pages. Please note that the links provided within the *Handbook* and including links to Program Review instructions will be updated once the *Handbook* revisions are adopted.

Program Review instructions and a sample course matrix are included in the Appendix.

Next Steps

If adopted, staff will update the *Accreditation Handbook* on the Commission website, communicate to program sponsors and provide technical assistance throughout 2016-17 in preparation for the transition to the new strengthened and streamlined accreditation system.

Chapter Six Program Review

Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the Program Review process, which occurs during year five of the accreditation cycle. Program Review provides the Commission and the Institutional Review Team with evidence that an institution is consistently meeting program standards. Once programs have submitted full narrative responses to standards with supporting documentation during Initial Program Review (IPR) and are approved (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/new-program-submission.html>), programs will not be required to submit full narrative responses to standards again, unless it is determined that there is inadequate evidence to demonstrate implementation and it is determined that a full review of the standards is needed. The program documents enumerated below provide the required information for the initial review in Year Five. If the review team determines that additional narrative or documentation is needed, the institution will be able to provide it at the site visit. Programs transitioning to new standards should refer to section IV of this chapter.

I. Purposes of Program Review

Trained reviewers from the Commission's Board of Institutional Review (BIR) will review the program submission during Year Five of the seven-year accreditation cycle along with annual program data and analysis, and provide a Preliminary Report of Findings on the alignment of program activities with program standards. The BIR will review the submission only one time and provide feedback to the institution, which may choose to provide a Program Review # addendum for additional review- 60 days prior to the site visit by the site visit team. BIR members will review the Common Standards concurrently with program standards and in some cases will refer to the evidence presented for Program Review will suffice during the review of the for Common Standards Submission <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-standards.html>. The Preliminary Report of Findings along with the Program Review addendum forms the basis of the BIR team's review of the program's implementation in Year Six during the accreditation site visit to determine the degree to which program S standards are met. Program Review is not a single source of information. Data available in the data warehouse, such as survey data and assessment data, and data submitted by the institution annually, such as enrollment and completion data will be critical components used by the BIR members in understanding the program.

II. Program Review Submission

A Program Review submission is required for each Commission-approved educator preparation program offered by the institution. Program Review submission dates will be determined by the Administrator of Accreditation. Each section of Program Review is outlined below. The submission guidelines are subject to change as deemed appropriate by the Committee on Accreditation.

Differentiated instructions for both preliminary and second tier induction programs can be found at the Commission's [Accreditation webpage](#).

Program Description

The program description is a clear and brief description providing context for the evidence being submitted during Program Review. This section might provide information as to whether courses are taken as a cohort, can be taken out of order, or other pertinent information that provides a clear picture of how the program is designed. The guiding philosophies for the program or specific mission should be included. The Program Description is not to exceed 500 words.

The program description should also include a table showing delivery models and other options/pathways available at each location (if more than one).

Organizational Structure

This section requires a graphic to demonstrate how the program leadership and faculty/staff are organized within the program and how the program fits into the education unit, including faculty serving in non-teaching roles, including the roles and responsibilities of those involved in mentoring and/or supervision of candidates in field placement aspects of the program. The graphic should depict the chain of authority and include individuals up to the dean or superintendent level.

Faculty/Mentor and Professional Development Personnel Qualifications

This section requires institutions to provide information on the qualifications of faculty and instructional personnel. Requirements include a table that provides an overview of faculty and/or mentors, coaches and professional development personnel. The table should include the number of full time, part time, adjunct, and retired annuitants. Vacancies should also be noted.

Preliminary Programs are required to submit a current annotated faculty and/or instructional personnel list. The list will denote faculty name, degree, status (full time, part-time, retiree), and list of courses he/she teaches. Links to all courses and most recent syllabus should be provided for each faculty member listed. Induction programs submit similar information for mentors and professional development providers. *Complete instructions [and required templates](#) for both preliminary and induction programs can be found at the Commission's [Program Review webpage](#).*

Course/Program Sequence

This section requires institutions to provide a link to clear information about the sequence in which candidates take courses or complete the program. Program sequence should be provided for each pathway or model.

Course Matrix (applies to preliminary programs only)

Each preliminary program must provide a course matrix denoting the introduction, opportunities to practice, and candidate assessment for each of the competencies for that credential. Required course matrix templates can be found on the Commission's [Program Review webpage](#). These templates provide the candidate competencies for each program and must be used.

Fieldwork and Clinical Practice

This section requires institutions to provide specific evidence of meeting the requirements of fieldwork and clinical practice as described in the Commission standards for that program. Complete information [and required templates](#) regarding specific submission requirements for both preliminary and induction programs can be found on the Commission's [Program Review webpage](#).

Credential Recommendation

This section requires a brief description of the program's process to ensure that only qualified candidates are recommended for the credential. This section should include a link to the program's candidate progress monitoring document or other tracking tool used to verify that candidate has met all requirements for the program prior to recommendation.

For required exhibits and guidance, differentiated instructions for Program Review submission can be found on the Commission's [Program Review webpage](#).

III. Review of Program Review Submission

The Program Review submission will be reviewed by trained members of the Board of Institutional Review (BIR) who have expertise in each program area. The reviewers will also have access to the institution's portion of the data warehouse, such as survey and assessment data, and data submitted by the institution annually, such as enrollment and completion data. Reviewers will be looking for the following:

- Does the narrative provide a brief description that provides the context for the review team?
- Does the implementation, as provided through evidence, meet the standard? That is does the evidence demonstrate **how** the institution meets the standard?
- Does the evidence provided demonstrate that the institution is consistently meeting [Program Standards](#)? That is, does the submission include links to the organizational structure, faculty qualifications, course sequence, course syllabi, and other exhibits as required? Furthermore, does the evidence link to the assessments used to ensure that candidates develop the required knowledge and skill?
- What is the evidence that a program gathers from each candidate to demonstrate competency or completion of the program and by what means is that evidence judged?

Program Review submissions are reviewed to determine if the standard is preliminarily aligned or if more information is needed. If more information is needed, reviewers clearly specify what additional information is needed and how it relates to one of the points above. The program provides an addendum to Program Review for the team during the site visit.

The Program Review submission is reviewed only one time by the BIR team. BIR team feedback will be sent by Commission staff to the institution in a Preliminary Report of Findings that will be required as part of the preparation for the site visit in Year Six. Once the institution has received the Preliminary Report of Findings, it has the option to provide a Program Review addendum 60 days prior to the site visit for additional review by the site visit team that addresses any areas needing further information. However, depending on the findings of the program review team, the Commission may require an institution to submit an addendum 60 days prior to the site visit. The Preliminary Report of Findings along with the Program Review addendum, provides a basis for the BIR team's review of the program's implementation in Year Six during the accreditation site visit.

If the reviewers determine that there is inadequate evidence ~~for the reviewers~~ to understand program implementation and ~~it is determined that~~ conclude that a full program review is needed, the Administrator of Accreditation may ~~include~~ assign an additional member ~~on to~~ the site visit team who can focus exclusively on that program. This constitutes an extraordinary activity and cost recovery fees of \$1000 per additional member will be charged to the institution.

The site visit team ~~members~~ makes all decisions to determine the degree to which ~~P~~ program ~~S~~ standards are met and makes an accreditation recommendation to the COA, who then determines accreditation status.

The format of the feedback will provide information regarding each program standard, using a form similar to the one below:

**Program Review
Preliminary Report of Findings**

Status	Standard
<p>More Information Needed</p> <p>OR</p>	<p>Standard 1: Program Design Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: Identify the areas that did not have sufficient evidence, the parts of the standard where it was not clear “HOW” the program aligns with the standards, or what additional documentation needs to be made available at the site visit.</p>
<p>Preliminarily Aligned</p>	<p>Program Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed Identify any evidence to be reviewed at the site visit</p>
	<p>Row inserted for each program standard</p>

Additional Information

Please see the [Program Review webpage](#) on the Commission website for additional information. Those who are preparing Program Review submissions may also contact their [Cohort Consultant](#) for technical assistance.

IV. Programs that are Transitioning to New Program Standards

Programs that are transitioning to newly adopted standards in the year that Program Review is due may, instead, submit a transition plan outlining how and when the program will transition to the new Program Standards. This transition plan template will be provided by the Commission.

Programs that plan to transition to the new standards the year after the Program Review submission is completed must submit updated evidence and links of their program documents.

Program Review Submission Instructions For Approved Preliminary Educator Preparation Programs

Program Review occurs in Year Five of the Accreditation Cycle. Program Review provides the Commission and the Institutional Review Team with evidence that an institution is consistently meeting program standards. Once programs have submitted full narrative responses with supporting documentation to standards during [Initial Program Review \(IPR\)](#) and are approved programs will not be required to submit full narrative responses to standards again, unless it is determined that there is inadequate evidence to demonstrate implementation and it is determined that a full review of the standards is needed. The program documents enumerated below provide the required information unless the review team determines that additional narrative or documentation needs to be available at the site visit.

Trained reviewers from the Commission's Board of Institutional Review (BIR) will review the program documentation during Year Five of the seven-year accreditation cycle along with annual program data and analysis, *Common Standards* responses and program-specific *Precondition* responses when needed, and provide a *Preliminary Report of Findings* on the alignment of program activities with [P](#)rogram [S](#)tandards. The BIR will review the submission one time and provide feedback to the institution, which may choose to provide an addendum at the site visit. The *Preliminary Report of Findings* forms the basis of the BIR team's review of the program's implementation in Year 6 during the accreditation site visit to determine the degree to which [P](#)rogram [S](#)tandards are met.

The following items must be included in the Year Five Program Review submission:

1. Program Description (less than 500 words).

This **brief description** provides the context for the review team. A clear description allows the reviewer to understand the remaining evidence submitted during Program Review but is not repetitive for exhibits that can stand on their own. For example, it is not necessary to describe the order in which courses occur because the submission of a Course Sequence is required. It might, however, be important to provide the reviewer with information as to whether courses are taken as a cohort, can be taken out of order, or other pertinent information that provides a clear picture of how the program is designed. The guiding philosophies for the program or specific mission should be included to help reviewers better understand the program.

The program description should also include a **table** showing delivery models (online, in-person, hybrid) and other options/pathways (intern, traditional, etc.) available for each location (if more than one).

✓ *Required Exhibit:*

1.1 Narrative Description no longer than 500 words.

1.1.1 Table depicting location, delivery models, and pathways

2. Organizational Structure

Provide a **graphic** to show how the program leadership and faculty/staff are organized within the program and how the program fits into the education unit, including faculty serving in non-teaching roles, including the roles and responsibilities of those involved in field placement aspects of the program. The graphic should depict the chain of authority and include individuals up to the dean or superintendent level.

✓ *Required Exhibit:*

2.1 Organizational Chart/Graphic

3. Faculty Qualifications

Three items are required.

1) Submit a **table that provides an overview of faculty**. The table should include numbers of full time, part time, and adjunct faculty. Vacancies should also be noted.

2) Programs must also submit a current **annotated faculty list** denoting which courses are taught by which faculty, including part time faculty members. It is not necessary to include intermittent adjunct faculty unless they are the only instructor for a particular course. The annotated list should include the faculty member's name, degree, status (fulltime, part time, adjunct), and list of the courses he/she teaches. The faculty member's name should link to his/her vita. The courses should link to his/her most recent syllabus for the courses noted. See example below:

[John Smith, Ph.D.](#)

Fulltime Tenure Track

[CURR131 Educational Foundations](#)

[CURR140 Classroom Management](#)

[EDADM220 Schooling in a Democratic Society](#)

3) Provide links to **published documentation** regarding the experience and qualifications used to select adjunct faculty.

✓ *Required Exhibits and links:*

3.1 Faculty Distribution Table

3.2 Annotated Faculty List with links to Faculty Vitae and Syllabi

3.3 Published Adjunct Experience and Qualifications Requirements

✓ *Other Exhibits, if applicable:*

3.4 Faculty Recruitment Documents

4. Course Sequence

Clear information about the sequence in which candidates take courses should be submitted. If the program is offered via more than one pathway or model, a **course sequence** should be provided for each pathway or model.

✓ *Required Exhibits/Link:*

4.1 Published course sequence from Course Catalog

5. Course Matrix

Each program must provide a **matrix** denoting the candidates' opportunity to learn and master the competencies for that credential. Required course matrix templates for each program can be found at the Commission's [Program Review webpage](#). These templates provide the candidate competencies for each program and **must** be used.

The required courses for the program (course names not just course numbers) should go across the top of the matrix; the candidate competencies are listed in the first column. Programs may add additional competencies specific to the institution's program if needed. For each competency it should be noted when the candidate is introduced (I), practices (P), and is assessed for (A) the competency. These notations may occur under more than one course heading. Each notation should link to a specific place in the syllabus within that course that demonstrates that this is occurring. A partial sample is provided below.

	EDU 230 Classroom Management	EDU 234 Early Literacy	EDU 235 Teaching English Learners								EDU 452 Student Teaching
TPE 1	I, P										
TPE 2		P	P, A								A

✓ *Required Exhibit:*

5.1 Course matrix with links to specific activities within the syllabi that provide documentation of Introduction (I), Practice (P), and Assessment (A) of candidate competencies. Assessment (A) should link to the assessments used to determine competence.

6. Fieldwork and Clinical Practice

Programs must provide specific evidence of meeting the requirements of clinical practice as described in the Commission standards for that program. The required documentation is:

- 1) **A Table** that denotes the number of **hours** that each candidate is required to participate in early fieldwork and supervised clinical practice and how those hours are broken out across fieldwork/clinical experiences.
- 2) **Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), Partnership Agreement**, or link to **published supporting document** that clearly delineates the requirements of each candidate placement in alignment with the requirements of the Commission **P**rogram **S**tandards for that program; expectations and criteria for veteran practitioner selection, training and evaluation; and support and assessment roles and responsibilities for the program and the district.
- 3) **Training Materials** used to train Veteran Practitioners (for example, master teachers) serving in support and/or supervisory roles.
- 4) Documentation such as a **spreadsheet or table** verifying appropriate placements for all candidates that aligns with the particular **P**rogram **S**tandards. For example, in a multiple subjects program the spreadsheet would show that each candidate was placed in two different grade ranges.
- 5) **Published Manuals or Handbooks or Advising Materials** (links) that provide information to the district and candidates about expectations within the clinical experience including appropriate placements, veteran practitioner support, and information about clinical practice assessment.
- 6) 5) **Syllabi** for supervised clinical experiences. The syllabi should include information regarding how the candidate is assessed during clinical practice. Copies of **blank assessment instruments** should be included.

✓ *Required Exhibits and links:*

- 6.1 *Table denoting number of hours of fieldwork, clinical practice*
- 6.2 *Signed MOU or Agreement for each placement*
- 6.3 *Veteran Practitioner Training Material*
- 6.4 *Documentation of Candidate Placements*
- 6.5 *Clinical Practice Handbook/Manual*
- 6.6 *Fieldwork/Clinical Practice Syllabi*
- 6.6.1 *Clinical Practice Assessment Instruments*

7. Credential Recommendation

Provide a **brief description** (200 words or less) of the program's process to ensure that only qualified candidates are recommended for the credential. The description should include a **link** to the program's **candidate progress monitoring document or other tracking tool** used to verify that candidate has met all requirements for the program prior to recommendation.

- ✓ *Required Exhibits and links:*
 - 7.1 Description of process ensuring appropriate recommendation*
 - 7.1.1 Candidate Progress Monitoring Document*

**Appendix B
Sample Course Matrix**

Preliminary Administrative Services Program Standards Course Matrix

In the matrix below denote the candidates’ opportunity to learn and master the competencies listed. The required course names and numbers should go across the top of the matrix, replacing the “Course Title and Number” text below. For each competency note when the candidate is introduced (I), practices (P), and masters (M) the competency. Mastery must link to the assessments used to determine mastery. These notations may occur under more than one course heading. Each notation should link to a specific place in the syllabus within that course that demonstrates that this is occurring.

California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE)	Course Title and Number													
1. Developing and Articulating a Vision of Teaching and Learning for the School Consistent with the Local Education Agency’s Overall Vision and Goals														
2. Developing a Shared Commitment to the Vision Among All Members of the School Community														
3. Leading by Example to Promote Implementation of the Vision														

California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE)	Course Title and Number											
4. Sharing Leadership with Others in the School Community												
5. Promoting Implementation of K-12 Standards, Pedagogical Skills, Effective Instructional Practices and Student Assessments for Content Instruction The principal is knowledgeable about all of the K-12 student												
6. Evaluating, Analyzing, and Providing Feedback on the Effectiveness of Classroom Instruction to Promote Student Learning and Teacher Professional Growth												
7. Demonstrating Understanding of the School and Community Context, Including the Instructional Implications of Cultural/Linguistic, Socioeconomic, and Political Factors												
8. Communicating With the School Community about Schoolwide Outcomes Data and Improvement Goals												
9. Working with Others to Identify Student and School Needs and Developing a Data-Based School Growth Plan												
10. Implementing Change Strategies Based on Current, Relevant Theories and Best Practices in School Improvement												
11. Identifying and Using Available Human, Fiscal, and Material Resources to Implement the School Growth Plan												
12. Instituting a Collaborative, Ongoing Process of Monitoring and Revising the Growth Plan Based on Student Outcomes												
13. Modeling Life-Long Learning and Job-Related Professional Growth												

California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE)	Course Title and Number											
14. Helping Teachers Improve Their Individual Professional Practice Through Professional Growth Activities												
15. Identifying and Facilitating a Variety of Professional and Personal Growth Opportunities for Faculty, Staff, Parents, and Other Members of the School Community in Support of the Educational Program												
16. Understanding and Managing the Complex Interaction of All of the School's Systems to Promote Teaching and Learning												
17. Developing, Implementing, and Monitoring the School's Budget												
18. Implementing California School Laws, Guidelines, and Other Relevant Federal, State, and Local Requirements and Regulations												
19. Representing and Promoting the School's Accomplishments and Needs to the LEA and the Public												
20. Involving the Community in Helping Achieve the School's Vision and Goals												

Program Review Submission Instructions For Approved Induction Programs

Program Review occurs in Year Five of the Accreditation Cycle. Program Review provides the Commission and the Institutional Review Team with evidence that an institution is consistently meeting [P](#)program [S](#)standards. Once programs have submitted full narrative responses to standards during [Initial Program Review \(IPR\)](#) and are approved programs will not be required to submit full narrative responses to standards again, unless it is determined that there is inadequate evidence to demonstrate implementation and it is determined that a full review of the standards is needed. The program documents enumerated below provide the required information unless the review team determines additional narrative or documentation needs to be available at the site visit.

Trained reviewers from the Commission's Board of Institutional Review (BIR) will review the program documentation during Year Five of the seven-year accreditation cycle along with annual program data and analysis, *Common Standards* responses and program-specific *Precondition* responses when needed, and provide a *Preliminary Report of Findings* on the alignment of program activities with program standards. The BIR will review the submission one time and provide feedback to the institution, which may choose to provide and addendum at the site visit. The *Preliminary Report of Findings* forms the basis of the BIR team's review of the program's implementation in Year Six during the accreditation site visit to determine the degree to which [P](#)program [S](#)standards are met.

The following items must be included in the Year Five Program Review submission:

1. Program Description (less than 500 words).

This **brief description** provides the context for the review team. A clear description allows the reviewer to understand the remaining evidence submitted during Program Review but is not repetitive for exhibits that can stand on their own. For example, it is not necessary to describe the order in which Induction activities occur because the submission of a Program Sequence is required. It might, however, be important to provide the reviewer with information as to whether activities occur as part of a cohort, can be done out of order, or other pertinent information that provides a clear picture of how the program is designed. The guiding philosophies for the program or specific mission should be included to help reviewers better understand the program.

The program description should also include a **table** showing delivery models (online, in-person, hybrid) and other options/pathways (ECO, traditional, etc.) available for each location (if more than one).

✓ *Required Exhibit:*

1.1 *Narrative Description no longer than 500 words.*

1.1.1 *Table depicting location, delivery models, and pathways*

2. Organizational Structure

Provide a **graphic** to show how the program leadership and instructional personnel/staff are organized within the program and how the program fits into the education unit, including personnel serving in non-teaching roles, including the roles and responsibilities of those involved in assigning and placing mentors/coaches. The graphic should depict the chain of authority and include individuals up to the dean or superintendent level. If the program operates as a consortium with shared leadership, the graphic should also include individuals serving in induction administrative roles in entities within the consortium.

✓ *Required Exhibit:*

2.1 *Organizational Chart/Graphic*

3. Qualifications of Mentors and Professional Development Personnel (Instructional Personnel)

Three items are required.

1) Submit a **table** that provides a summary of coaches/mentors and professional development personnel. The table should include numbers of full time, part time, and retired annuitants. Vacancies should also be noted.

2) Programs must also submit a current **annotated list of instructional personnel** denoting which are mentors, which are professional development providers, and which are both. This should include full time and part time instructional personnel, including retired annuitants. The annotated list should include the mentor and/or professional development provider's name, degree, status (fulltime, part time, retiree), and list of either the professional development he/she provides or mentoring assignment. The instructional person's name should link to his/her resume. The professional development activity should link to the professional development provider's most recent materials for those events. It should also note if the professional development provider is an outside contractor. Mentors should note the type of educator they mentor (single subject content, multiple subject, mild/moderate, administrator, etc).

See examples below:

[Mary Garcia, M.Ed.](#)

Professional Development Provider (outside contractor)

[Educational Equity](#)

[John Smith](#)

Fulltime Mentor

Single Subject Math

Single Subject Science

3) Link to **published documentation** regarding the experience and qualifications used to select instructional personnel.

✓ *Required Exhibits:*

3.1 Instructional Personnel Table

3.2 Annotated Personnel List with links to Mentor/Coach and Professional Development Providers' Resumes

3.3 Published Experience and Qualifications Requirements

✓ *Other Exhibits, if applicable:*

3.4 Instructional Personnel Recruitment Documents (if vacancies exist)

4. Program Sequence

Clear information about the sequence in which candidates complete the induction program should be submitted. If the program is offered via more than one pathway or model, a **program sequence** should be provided for each pathway or model.

✓ *Required Exhibits:*

4.1 Link to Published sequence of induction activities required for program completion (Candidate Handbook, Website, or other widely distributed documents)

5. Job-embedded Fieldwork and Clinical Practice

Programs must provide specific evidence of meeting the requirements of job-embedded induction as described in the Commission standards for that program. The required documentation is:

7) **A Timeline or Table** that denotes at what point after being hired in a position requiring a teaching or administrative services credential that each candidate is assigned a mentor/coach and how those support hours are broken out across

the preliminary teaching or administrative experiences. For teacher induction programs, this table must also include ECO candidates.

- 8) **Signed Employer Agreement or MOU** that clearly delineates the number of coaching hours provided to each candidate; expectations and criteria for veteran practitioner selection (coach/mentor), training and evaluation; and support and assessment roles and responsibilities for the program and the employer.
- 9) **Training Materials** used to train mentors/coaches serving in support and/or supervisory roles.
- 10) Documentation such as a **spreadsheet or table** verifying appropriate coach/mentor matches for all candidates that align with the [P](#)rogram [S](#)tandards and design. For example, in a general education induction program the spreadsheet would show that each candidate is assigned a mentor that appropriately matches the candidate's credential and setting.
- 11) Links to **Published Manuals or Handbooks or Advising Materials** that provide information to the district and candidates about expectations of the Induction program including appropriate placements, veteran practitioner support (coach/mentor), and information about completion requirements
- 12) **Individual Learning Plan (ILP) Template and related program documents.** These should include information regarding how the candidate is assessed during induction. Copies of [blank assessment instruments](#) should be included.

✓ *Required Exhibits:*

- 5.1 Timeline or Table denoting timing of mentor assignment for candidates*
- 5.2 Signed Employer Agreement or MOU for each Employer*
- 5.3 Coach/Mentor Training Material*
- 5.4 Documentation (spreadsheet or table) of Candidate Placements*
- 5.5 Induction Program Handbook/Manual/Advising Material*
- 5.6 ILP Template and Related Documents*
 - 5.6.1 Assessment Instruments*

6. Credential Recommendation

Provide a **brief description** (200 words or less) of the program's process to ensure that only qualified candidates are recommended for the credential. The description should include a **link** to the program's **candidate progress monitoring document or other tracking tool** used to verify that candidate has met all requirements for the program prior to recommendation.

✓ *Required Exhibits:*

6.1 Description of process ensuring appropriate recommendation

6.1.1 Candidate Progress Monitoring Document