

Draft of Annual Report of the COA November 2016

Overview of this Report

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

Staff Recommendation

This is an action item. The Commission staff seeks approval of the report. Any suggested edits and comments can be incorporated into the report before it is presented to the Commission in December 2016.

Background

California Education Code and the *Accreditation Framework* require the COA to provide the Commission with a report on accreditation activities on an annual basis. Typically, the two Co-Chairs present the *Annual Report* at a fall meeting of the Commission. The current schedule is for the previous COA chairs to present the report at the December 8-9, 2015 Commission meeting.

Next Steps

Upon adoption of the report, the Commission staff will ensure that comments and suggestions made during this discussion are incorporated into the version that will be presented to the Commission. In addition, appropriate appendices will be added to the document. The COA chairs can review the final version before it goes to the Commission to ensure that the comments were incorporated appropriately. The report will then be presented by COA chairs at the December 2016 Commission meeting and then placed on the Commission's website in the reports section.



**The Committee on Accreditation's
Annual Accreditation Report to the
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
2015-2016**

Dear Commissioners:

It is with personal and professional pleasure that, on behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation (COA), we submit to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) the *2015-16 Annual Accreditation Report* by the Committee on Accreditation in accordance with the provisions of the *Accreditation Framework*. This report presents an overview of the activities and accomplishments of the Committee over the past year and its proposed work plan for 2016-17 as it implements the Commission's accreditation system.

The *Annual Accreditation Report* is organized to address the purposes of the accreditation system: ensure accountability, ensure high quality programs, ensure adherence to standards, and foster on-going improvement. Each purpose is addressed as the report notes what was accomplished in 2015-16 and in the proposed work plan for 2016-17. We believe that aligning the *Annual Accreditation Report* to these purposes provides evidence of the integrity of the accreditation system.

The COA shares with the Commission the goal of having a strong accountability system that encourages excellence and holds educator preparation programs to high standards. The membership of COA is encouraged by the recent progress made by the Commission to strengthen and streamline the accreditation process and welcome the opportunity to assist in the transition to the revised accreditation system. We continue to offer our collective expertise and assistance to the Commission in this important effort to ensure a rigorous and robust system of accreditation that places a greater emphasis on outcomes. The Committee stands ready to assist the Commission in achieving the goal of a high quality teacher in every classroom.

Sincerely,

Anna Moore
Committee Co-Chair

Pia Wong
Committee Co-Chair

**The Committee on Accreditation
2015-16**

Jomeline Balatayo

ELD Teacher
Palisades Charter High School

Suzanne Borgese

Education Specialist
Placenta-Yorba Linda USD

Deborah Erickson

Professor and Dean
School Of Education
Point Loma Nazarene University

Robert Frelly

Director of Music Education
Chapman University

Gary Kinsey

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

Anna W. Moore

Regional Director II
Sonoma County Office of Education

Reyes Quezada

Professor of Education
University of San Diego

Margo Pensavalle

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

Jose Rivas

Teacher
Lennox Mathematics, Science and
Technology Academy

Kelly Skon

District Coordinator of Secondary STEM
Saddleback Valley Unified School District

Yvonne White

Science Teacher
Oakland Unified School District

Pia Wong

Chair, Department of Teaching Credentials
California State University, Sacramento

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee’s Work Plan in 2015-16	3
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession.....	3
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality	5
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards.....	6
Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement.....	7
General Operations	8
Section II: Summary of Accreditation Activities 2015-16	9
COA Accreditation Decisions	9
Institutions Meeting All Standards.....	10
Institutions in 7 th Year Follow Up	11
Analysis of Standards Decisions	12
Initial Approval of New Credential Programs.....	16
Programs Entering Inactive Status	17
Withdrawal of Programs	18
Reactivation of Programs	19
Initial Institutional Approval.....	20
Institutions No Longer Approved Program Sponsors.....	20
Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee in 2016-17.....	21
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and the Profession	21
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality.....	22
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards.....	22
Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement.....	23
Continued Development and Implementation of Accreditation System	24
General Operations	25
Appendix A: CTC Accreditation Cohorts	26
Appendix B: Technical Assistance Activities	27

Introduction: Summary of Activities of the Accreditation System

The 2015-16 year represents a year of significant undertaking by the Commission, the Committee on Accreditation, and the Commission staff with respect to accreditation. The accreditation system is the primary means by which the Commission ensures quality in educator preparation in California. Not only did the Commission and its staff implement the routine accreditation activities required under the *Accreditation Framework* of 2006, but were simultaneously engaged in the Commission's Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation Project which consisted of reviewing and significantly revising numerous aspects of accreditation, including the adoption of a new *Accreditation Framework* (2015) to guide all future accreditation efforts.

In 2015-16, all institutions and programs were operating for the last time under the 2006 *Accreditation Framework*. This system was designed as a 7 year cycle comprised of three major components or activities: 1) biennial reports, 2) program assessment, and 3) site visits. Each of the over 260 Commission-approved institutions has been assigned a color cohort which identifies which component or activity is expected of those institutions in any given year. Biennial reports are submitted in Year 1, 3, and 5 of the accreditation cycle; program assessment has been conducted in year 4; site visits in year 6; and finally, follow up is required in Year 7. Below is a summary description of each of the three components.

BIENNIAL REPORTS: Educator preparation programs collect and analyze data on candidate competence and program effectiveness annually for the purpose of informing program improvements. In addition, programs report the results every other year of the cycle. Reports are reviewed by Commission staff and used by accreditation teams to inform accreditation decisions.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT: Programs provide a narrative describing how the program is aligned to each of the Commission adopted program standards for the particular credential area. The program sponsor reports on indicators of candidate competence such as performance on assessments and feedback from employers. The report also includes program updates and provides a data-based rationale for any program changes. Reports are reviewed by trained educators with expertise in the credential area, are summarized by staff, and then reported to the Committee on Accreditation.

SITE VISITS: All data are provided to a trained team of evaluators. Team members are experts in the credential areas being reviewed. Site visits also include in-depth interviews of graduates, candidates, employers, and program faculty and administrators. The team makes accreditation recommendations for final action by the Committee on Accreditation.

The Commission is assisted in the implementation of the accreditation system by the Committee on Accreditation. This body is comprised of twelve members of the education community – 6 from postsecondary education and 6 K-12 practitioners. While the Commission sets policy for accreditation, the COA implements the accreditation system and makes accreditation decisions for institutions offering educator preparation in California.

This report presents information about the accreditation system, the COA decisions, and the three major components for the academic year 2015-16. The items that follow represent the key components of the 2015-16 accreditation activities for the COA and a summary of each task and its current status.

As the Commission completes its year of technical assistance and transition in 2016-17, all future reports will be focused on the activities that fall under the umbrella of the recently adopted *Accreditation Framework (2016)* and will reflect the revised accreditation cycle of activities, the new data warehouse and dashboards, inclusion of statewide survey data, revised processes and procedures and, perhaps most importantly, strengthened and streamlined standards and competencies adopted by the Commission.

Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2015-16

The items that follow represent the key components of the 2015-16 accreditation activities for the COA and a summary of each task and its current status. In addition to its normal activities, during the 2015-16 year the Professional Services Division has continued to work diligently on the *Strengthening and Streamlining the Commission's Accreditation System* project.

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

Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation. The COA held meetings on the following dates:

August 14, 2015

October 1, 2015

January 28, 2016

March 10-11, 2016

April 28-29, 2016

June 13-14, 2016

All Committee meetings were held in public and all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. In addition, except where technical difficulties occurred, meetings were transmitted via audio broadcast to allow any individual with access to the internet the ability to hear live or recorded broadcasts of all Committee meetings. The Commission's website was utilized fully to provide agenda items and notification of meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation.

As a continuing cost saving measure and to ensure access for all participants, phone conferencing and Zoom, a videoconferencing program, were used frequently, where possible and appropriate, in order that those located in various regions of California who are involved in accreditation activities could participate without the time and cost commitments required of traveling to the Commission offices.

PSD News. The PSD E-news, developed in 2008, continued to be distributed weekly. This electronic notification reaches over 1,800 individuals including all approved institutions, to inform them of accreditation-related activities such as information regarding standards development and revision, technical assistance opportunities, and notification of requests for stakeholder input.

Program Sponsor Alerts. Program Sponsor Alerts (PSA) continued to be used to provide important and timely information on specific topics of interest to program sponsors. The Commission staff used this resource frequently in the 2015-2016 year, issuing 12 PSAs. The 12 PSAs issued from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016 are as follows:

PSA Number	Issue Date	Title
15-04	August 20, 2015	Program Sponsor Responsibilities – Updating Contact Information Electronically
15-05	September 23, 2015	Update on the Implementation of the Strengthened and Streamlined Accreditation System – Transition of Institutions to the New Accreditation System
15-06	October 26, 2015	Commission Adoption of Revised Common Standards (2015)
15-07	December 18, 2015	Commission Adoption of Preliminary Multiple/Single Subject Program Standards and the Transition Plan (2015)
15-08	December 18, 2015	Commission Adoption of General Education Induction Program Preconditions and Standards (2015)
16-01	February 2, 2016	Temporary Waiver of the 120 Day Enrollment Requirement in Clear Induction
16-02	February 3, 2016	New Accreditation Schedule and Activity Webpage and Updated Cohort Maps
16-03	February 11, 2016	Education Specialist Out-of-State Credentials and Clearing Level I Education Specialist Credentials
16-04	February 12, 2016	Common Standards-CAEP Alignment Matrix
16-05	March 29, 2016	Commission Adoption of Accreditation Framework and Revised Language for Common Standard 3
16-06	March 29, 2016	Preparing for Annual Accreditation Fees – Inactive Status and Withdrawal Deadlines
16-07	May 5, 2016	Implementation of Administrative Services Credential Programs

The PSA is used to address a specific issue such as requirements for transition to new standards and has served the Commission and the field well. Program Sponsor Alerts will continue to be used to provide information to the field.

Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission. COA Co-Chair Reyes Quezada presented the COA annual report to the Commission at the December 2015 Commission Meeting. This can be accessed at the following link:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-12/2015-12-agenda.html>.

Commission Liaison. The Commission’s liaison provides an important perspective to COA discussions and serves as an effective means of communication between the COA and the Commission. For the 2015-16 year, the liaison to the COA was Commissioner Haydee Rodriguez.

Implementation of a Fee Recovery System for Certain Accreditation Activities and Annual Accreditation Fee. The Commission adopted a cost recovery plan and associated regulations (effective October 2013), for the review of new programs and for accreditation activities outside

the typical accreditation cycle. In the 2015-16 year, the system for tracking reviewer assignments and credit institutions for in-kind services was strengthened and improved.

In addition, in 2014 the Commission adopted an Annual Accreditation Fee structure and associated regulations. Emergency regulations became effective in August 2014, followed by permanent regulations that became effective as of April 1, 2015. In 2015-16, Commission staff provided the necessary staffing to calculate the appropriate annual accreditation fees, invoice institutions, collect the fees, and communicate with institutions when questions or issues were raised. These funds continue to be critical to supporting the infrastructure of the Commission's accreditation system.

Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality

Professional Accreditation of Institutions and their Credential Preparation Programs. This is one of the principal ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of institutions and their credential programs. Thirty-seven¹ institutions were reviewed in 2015-16 resulting in the following decisions:

- 27 institutions Accredited (2 with a 7th year report)
- 5 institutions Accredited with Stipulations
- 4 institutions Accredited with Major Stipulations
- 1 institution Accredited with Probationary Stipulations

Eight institutions that were accredited with Stipulations in 2014-15 addressed all stipulations, and the COA changed their status to Accreditation in 2015-16. One institution accredited with probationary stipulations had three of seven stipulations removed by the COA and status changed to Accreditation with Major Stipulations in 2015-16. A list of the institutions that had a site visit, revisit or addressed stipulations via reports in 2015-16 is included in Section II of this report.

Accreditation Handbook revisions. The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. Over the course of 2015-16 staff proposed, and the COA adopted, revisions to the *Accreditation Handbook* (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook.html>). Considering and adopting revisions to processes and procedures as a result of the strengthening and streamlining accreditation project were a considerable part of the COA work in 2016. For example, the changes in required documentation that must be submitted and reviewed as a result of moving from Program Assessment to a more streamlined Program Review process required a wholesale rewriting of the section on program review in the Accreditation Handbook. Consideration of numerous new procedures for handling various aspects of program review required careful thought and policy and procedures adoption by COA. These many changes are now reflected in

¹ This includes one review that was begun in spring 2016, but additional review of Common Standards were necessary to be continued in fall 2016.

the revised 2016 *Accreditation Handbook*. While some chapters required minor revisions others required major revisions to reflect the new system and revised processes.

Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission. During 2015-16 staff continued to prepare agenda items for the COA on issues related to the Commission's work as directed by the Commission or as appropriate. The COA continued to discuss issues referred to it by the Commission and provide guidance as appropriate. With the efforts to streamline and strengthen accreditation this function continued to be critically important in 2015-16.

Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards

Review and take action to grant initial approval of new program sponsors. In October 2015, the Commission approved a new initial institutional approval policy for when institutions seek to become a Commission approved program sponsor of educator preparation programs in California. The requirements for an institution to become a Commission approved educator preparation program sponsor in California was an area in which significant strengthening and revision was necessary as it had not been reviewed in many years. The Commission lifted the temporary moratorium on Initial Institutional Approval in February 2016. This moratorium had been enacted to provide the Commission with time to develop new policies for approving new program sponsors and for staff to put into place all the details involved in implementation. As the Commission updated the *Accreditation Frameworks* and the *Accreditation Handbook*, implementation began in early spring 2016 with the first Accreditation 101 session being held on May 10, 2016. This session was attended by teams representing 7 institutions. Additional sessions were held in August and September 2016 and were attended by 10 additional institutions that are considering whether to apply to offer an educator preparation program in California.

Review and take action to grant initial program approval for new credential programs. This is also one of the major ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Programs are only granted initial approval when reviewers have determined that all Commission's standards are met and after COA acts to approve. This review process continued in 2015-16. A one day dedicated review session was held at the Commission, though a vast majority of the reviews were conducted remotely – with reviewers being sent the documents and devoting time on their own schedule, at their homes or offices, working via technology with their initial program review partner. A total of 31 new programs were approved by the COA in 2015-16. The list of these new programs are included in Section II of this report.

Conduct and review program assessment activities. The Green cohort submitted program assessment documents in fall of 2014 and reviewers have largely completed these reviews. (A cohort list is provided in the Appendix.). Since 2016-17 is dedicated to the development and transition of the policies and procedures surrounding the new Accreditation system, program review submissions by the Yellow cohort will occur fall 2017. The Yellow cohort will be the first

cohort to complete program review under the new process. Technical assistance specific to the Yellow Cohort is currently scheduled so that the new procedures related to program review are understood clearly by all.

Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement

Collect, analyze, and report on Biennial Reports submitted in fall 2015. Biennial Reports were submitted for all programs in the Blue and Orange cohorts during fall 2015. These two cohorts represent 32 institutions offering a total of 191 programs. Staff reviewed all Biennial Reports that were submitted and provided written feedback at the program and unit level. Technical assistance was also provided to individual institutions that were in need. This occurred via phone and video conference and was led by the consultant assigned to the institution's accreditation cohort.

Biennial Report templates were revised to be more streamlined and provide clearer direction to institutions and direct them toward providing more specific information focusing on candidate competency, fieldwork, and program effectiveness. The new template was revised based on feedback from institutions and consultants and was a required format for Biennial Reports due from the Blue and Orange cohorts in 2015.

Prior to the redesigned template and technical assistance provided to institutions it sometimes took staff well beyond 90 days to review and return feedback. In the fall of 2015 the average time to provide feedback was successfully reduced to an average of 45 days. This was accomplished by revising the process for reviewing the reports, revising expectations about dedicated time for review, and the manner in which the second reviewer and administrator provide input and revisions to the feedback.

Noting Late Document Submission. Providing a report on institutions that have not complied with the required timelines and due dates has become a standard agenda item for the COA. Staff continued the reports with the Blue Biennial Report submission which was due September 15, 2015 and continued reporting for each meeting since. This information has improved the COA's understanding of the scope and size of institutions that have not complied and has served as additional leverage with institutions to ensure compliance with specified timelines for accreditation reports.

Continue implementation of the evaluation system for the accreditation system. Site visit surveys were provided to site visit team leads, team members, institutions, and consultants. Analysis of 2015-16 site visit evaluation data is currently underway. Staff uses this information to determine what additional trainings are needed in the future, how consultants and team leads can be assisted in their responsibilities, and to identify both leadership potential in members of the BIR and or biases and issues that may have arisen with BIR members.

Continue partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) (formerly the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)) and efforts to collaborate with other national

accrediting bodies, where appropriate. With the unification of TEAC and NCATE into CAEP, and the adoption of new national educator preparation standards, the COA worked with staff and stakeholders to develop a new Partnership Agreement with CAEP that was signed by both parties in May 2015. During the 2015-16 year, the Commission staff continued to work with the CAEP staff to better understand some of the nuances of the new CAEP process, the specific requirements for meeting its standards, and in particular continued to discuss the challenge with some of its standards language for post baccalaureate programs.

Board of Institutional Reviewer's (BIR) Training. Training was placed on hold during 2015-16 in order to refocus limited staff resources and attention on redesigning the BIR training to align with the revised accreditation system. Given that numerous aspects of the new accreditation needed to be in place before training could be fully developed, planning the new training opportunities for reviewers continues in 2016. BIR training is expected to resume in January 2017 with training for new reviewers, a training for veteran reviewers on the new system, and team lead training.

General Operations

In addition to the above mentioned items, the COA engaged in routine matters necessary for general operations of the Committee. This includes the election of Co-Chairs, the adoption of a meeting schedule, and orientation of new members.

Section II: Summary of 2014-15 Accreditation Activities

This section of the report provides more detailed information about results of the 2014-15 Work Plan with a focus on accreditation activities.

Professional Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Credential Preparation Programs

2015-16 accreditation decisions were made based upon the written reports of the evidence gathered at the site visit, recommendations made by the site visit team, and the COA interview of program leadership and the team lead. Teams reviewed documentation, interviewed a variety of constituencies (candidates, program completers, faculty, employers, administration, supervisors, etc.), deliberated, and came to consensus on findings for all Common standards, program standards, and an accreditation recommendation. CTC consultants, team leads, and institutional representatives attended Committee on Accreditation meetings to present the results of the site visit report and respond to questions. Copies of the site visit team reports are available on the Commission’s website at: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accreditation-reports.html>. The COA made the following accreditation determinations in 2015-16:

COA Accreditation Decisions 2015-16 Visits	
Program Sponsor	Accreditation Decision
Alliant International University	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations
Bellflower Unified School District	Accreditation
California School for the Deaf	Accreditation with Stipulations
Chaffey Joint Union High School District	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
Corona-Norco Unified School District	Accreditation
California State University, Fullerton	Accreditation
Dominican University	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Elk Grove Unified School District	Accreditation
Encinitas Union School District	Accreditation
Escondido Union School District	Accreditation
Fresno Unified School District	Accreditation
Fullerton School District	Accreditation
Grossmont Union High School District	Accreditation
Holy Names University	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Kern High School District	Accreditation
Loma Linda University	Accreditation
Long Beach Unified School District	Accreditation
Monterey County Office of Education	Accreditation
Oak Grove School District	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Ocean View School District	Accreditation
Orange County Department of Education	Accreditation
Palmdale School District	Accreditation
Phillips Graduate University	Accreditation

COA Accreditation Decisions 2015-16 Visits	
Program Sponsor	Accreditation Decision
PUC Schools	Accreditation
San Jose Unified School District	Accreditation
San Luis Obispo County Office of Education	Accreditation
San Mateo County Office of Education	Accreditation
Santa Clara County Office of Education	Accreditation
Stanford University	Accreditation
Tehama Department of Education	Accreditation with Stipulations
Torrance Unified School District	Accreditation
Tustin Unified School District	Accreditation
United States University	Accreditation with Stipulations
University of California, Riverside	Accreditation with Stipulations
Vallejo Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations
Vanguard University	Accreditation with 7 th Year Report
Wiseburn Unified School District	Accreditation with Major Stipulations

Institutions Meeting All Standards

The institutions listed in the table below hosted an accreditation site visit in 2014-15 which resulted in the team determining that the institution had met all Common and program standards for all programs offered by the institution.

Institutions Receiving Accreditation with All Common and Program Standards Met 2015-16 Visits	
Program Sponsor	Number of Programs
Bellflower Unified School District	1
Corona-Norco Unified School District	2
California State University, Fullerton	17
Elk Grove Unified School District	2
Escondido Union School District	1
Fresno Unified School District	1
Fullerton School District	1
Grossmont Union High School District	1
Kern High School District	2
Loma Linda University	2
Long Beach Unified School District	2
Monterey County Office of Education	3
Ocean View School District	1
Palmdale School District	2
Phillips Graduate University	3

Institutions Receiving Accreditation with All Common and Program Standards Met 2015-16 Visits	
Program Sponsor	Number of Programs
San Jose Unified School District	2
San Mateo County Office of Education	4
Santa Clara County Office of Education	5
Stanford University	3
Torrance Unified School District	1
Tustin Unified School District	2

Institutions in 7th Year Follow Up

In addition, in 2014-15, revisits were conducted for institutions assigned stipulations as a result of site visits conducted in 2013-2014 and documentation of changes were received from those institutions with stipulations that did not require a revisit. After these revisits and reviews of submitted reports, the COA made the following decisions:

2015-16 Accreditation Follow-Up		
Revisits		
Program Sponsor	2014-2015 Decision	2015-2016 Revisit Decision
Pasadena Unified School District	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation
Tracy Unified School District	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations	Accreditation
University of Redlands	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Submission of Documentation Addressing Stipulations		
Program Sponsor	2014-15 Decision	2014-15 Decision
Argosy University ²	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Azusa Pacific University	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Baldwin Park Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations	TBD November 2016
Fielding Graduate University	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Hebrew Union College	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
High Tech High	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Madera Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation

² No revisit was required by CTC for Argosy University, but CAEP revisit is scheduled for December 2016

2015-16 Accreditation Follow-Up		
Mount St. Mary's	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Pacific Oaks College	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation
7th Year Reports		
California Polytechnic University, Pomona	Accreditation w/7 th year Report	Accreditation
San Francisco State University	Accreditation w/7 th Year Report	Accreditation
University of San Francisco	Accreditation w/7 th Year Report	Accreditation

Analysis of Standards Decisions

In the following credential programs, all program standards were found to be met in the identified program. The number in the right column indicates the number of institutions that hosted site visits in 2015-16 where the identified program had all standards met.

2015-16 Site Visits - All Program Standards Found to be Met	
Program	Number of Institutions
Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder	2
Added Authorization: Early Childhood	3
Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance	1
Added Authorization: Resource Specialist	1
Added Authorization: Traumatic Brain Injury	1
Administrative Services: Clear Induction	5
Administrative Services: Preliminary	4
Bilingual Authorization	3
CTEL	1
Clear Education Special Induction	12
Designated Subjects: CTE	1
Early Childhood Education Specialist	2
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate	3
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate w/intern	1
Education Specialist Moderate/Severe	3
General Education (Multiple Subject, Single Subject) Induction	19
General Education Clear	2
Preliminary Multiple Subject	3
Multiple Subject w/intern	3
PPS Child Welfare and Attendance	1
PPS School Counseling	3
PPS School Psychology	3
Reading Certificate	1
Reading Language Arts Credential	1
School Nurse Services	1
Single Subject	3
Single Subject w/intern	2
Speech Language Pathology	2

Findings for Common and Program Standards

The Commission's 2008 Common Standards and all appropriate credential program standards were utilized in the accreditation site visits in 2015-16.

Common Standards

A review of the year's site visit results serves as information for the COA and staff in determining needs of institutions for technical assistance meetings and as a guide for institutions as they prepared for site visits. The information regarding findings on the Common Standards from 2014-2015 is presented in the following table.

Findings on the Common Standards 2015-2016 Accreditation Site Visits (36 institutions, including NCATE institutions)	Standard Findings		
	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 1: Education Leadership	32	3	2
Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	26	5	6
Standard 3: Resources	34	3	0
Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel	33	3	1
Standard 5: Admission	37	0	0
Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	36	1	0
Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice	33	3	0
Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors*	9	3	1
Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence	35	1	0

*Institutions with only second tier programs were not reviewed for Standard 8 as it does not apply.

Program Standards

A summary of the information gathered on all educator preparation programs with determinations of *Met with Concerns* or *Not Met* are presented in the tables below. If a standard is not listed, all institutions met that standard. As with the information about the Common Standards, this information about standards that were *Not Met* or were *Met with Concerns* guides the COA and staff in determining what additional technical assistance might be helpful to the field.

Preliminary Multiple Subject Standards (8 site visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Design	1	1
2: Communication and Collaboration	-	1
8: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction	1	-
14: Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork	1	-
15: Qualifications of Individuals who Provide School Site Support	-	1
17: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment	1	-

Preliminary Single Subject Standards (8 site visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Design	1	1
2: Communication and Collaboration	-	1
8: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction	3	-
14: Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork	2	-
15: Qualifications of Individuals who Provide School Site Support	-	1

Preliminary Single Subject Standards (8 site visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
17: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Program Administration Processes	1	-
18: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Candidate Preparation and Support	1	-
19: Implementation of the Teaching Performance: Assessor Qualifications, Training, and Scoring Reliability	1	-

General Education (MS/SS) Induction Standards (25 site visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Rationale and Design	-	1
2: Communication and Collaboration	1	-
3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers	5	-
4: Formative Assessment System	1	1

Preliminary Education Specialist Program Standards 1-16 (8 site visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination	1	

Clear Education Specialist Induction Standards (16 site visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
2: Communication and Collaboration	2	-
3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers	2	-
5: Pedagogy	1	-
7: Education Program Specialist Induction Program Menu	1	-

Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education (3 site visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Design and Rationale	1	-
3: Early Orientation	1	-
5: Beginning Teacher Support and Advisement	2	-

California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) (2 site visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Philosophy, Design, and Coordination	1	-

Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders (2 site visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Characteristics of ASD	-	1
2: Teaching, Learning, and Behavior Strategies for Students with ASD	-	1

Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders (2 site visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
3: Collaborating with Other Service Providers and Families	-	1

Bilingual Authorization (5 site visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
2: Assessment of Candidate Competence	2	-

Initial Approval of New Credential Programs (IPR)

Institutions seeking Initial Program Approval for new credential programs submit a document that indicates how the program will meet each of the Commission-adopted program standards along with supporting documents that serve as evidence to verify the claims made, and a Common Standards document (or a Common Standards addendum if the institution has recently submitted Common Standards). In addition, the institution submits a response to all relevant program specific preconditions that are reviewed by Commission staff. A team of educators who have expertise in the program area and are trained for the review process read the standards documents and consult with one another to determine whether standards are met. If the reviewers jointly agree that standards are met, it is so noted. If the review team agrees that standards are not met, reviewers request specifically what additional information is needed. This feedback is shared with the institution by the CTC staff. When all standards are found to be met and all relevant preconditions are determined to be addressed, Commission staff includes the item, along with a paragraph about the program written by the institution, in the COA agenda at the next scheduled meeting. Initial Program Approval actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation in 2015-16 are listed in the tables below.

New Credential Programs Approved (31)	
Credential Program	Institutional Sponsor
Administrative Services Clear Induction (11)	California State University, Dominguez Hills
	California State University, East Bay
	California State University, Fullerton
	Pepperdine University
	Selma Unified School District
	University of La Verne
	University of California, Berkeley
	William S. Hart Union High School District
	California State University, Los Angeles
	Fresno Pacific University
	San Francisco Unified School District
Clear Education Specialist Induction (8)	Fremont Union High School
	Irvine Unified School District
	Modesto City Schools

New Credential Programs Approved (31)	
Credential Program	Institutional Sponsor
	San Jose State University
	Sequoia Union High School District
	Summit Public Schools
	New Haven Unified School District
	Sacramento City Unified School District
Early Childhood Special Education (1)	Brandman University
Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization (3)	Dominican University of California
	San Diego County Office of Education
	University of California, Los Angeles
General Education (MS/SS) Induction (2)	Fremont Union High School
	Summit Public Schools
General Education Multiple Subject Intern (1)	California State University, Sacramento
Orthopedically Impaired: Added Authorization (1)	Point Loma Nazarene University
Preliminary Administrative Services (2)	Animo Leadership Charter High School (Green Dot Public Schools)
	San Mateo County Office of Education
Teacher Librarian Services Credential and Special Class Authorization in Information and Digital Literacy (1)	Azusa Pacific University
Traumatic Brain Injury Added Authorization (1)	Madera County Office of Education

Inactive Status

Institutions may temporarily cease offering an approved program for a variety of reasons such as decreased need in the service area or changes in faculty with expertise in the area. In the past, once a program was approved, it was listed as approved on the Commission website even if the program was not being offered at the institution. At the May 2008 meeting, the COA took action to allow institutions to declare a program to be **Inactive**. A program may be declared inactive for a maximum of five years. Inactive status does not excuse an institution from accreditation activities. All inactive programs must participate in accreditation activities in a modified manner as determined by the COA and Administrator of Accreditation. The following programs noted below were declared to be in an Inactive status in 2015-16.

Programs Entering Inactive Status (14)	
Institution	Program
California Baptist University	Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization

Programs Entering Inactive Status (14)	
Institution	Program
California Lutheran University	Reading and Literacy Added Authorization
California State University, Sacramento	Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program
	Reading Certificate Program
Notre Dame de Namur	Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization
Orange County Department of Education	Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization
Patten University	Multiple Subject Credential Program, with Intern
	Single Subject Credential Program, with Intern
Saint Mary's College of California	Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program
	Reading Certificate Program
Stanislaus County Office of Education	Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization
	Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization
	Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate District Intern
	Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe District Intern

Withdrawal of an Approved Program

For a variety of reasons, institutions may choose to no longer offer an approved program. Institutions are encouraged to formally seek a withdrawal of these programs thus removing the program from the Commission's accreditation system. The program is then no longer considered a Commission-approved program. If an institution decides to offer a program in the future, it is a minimum of one year before a new program proposal will be accepted.

Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (34)	
Institution	Program
Azusa Pacific University	Resource Specialist Program
	California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) Program
Butte County Office of Education	Designated Subjects: Supervision and Coordination
	Designated Subjects: Special Subjects
California Baptist University	Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization
California State University, Dominguez Hills	Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Program
California State University, Los Angeles	Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential - Audiology
	General Education (MS/SS) Clear Credential

Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (34)	
Institution	Program
Dominican University of California	Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization
Fresno Pacific University	Preliminary Education Specialist: Physical and Health Impairments
	Level II Education Specialist: Physical and Health Impairments
	Level II Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education
	Resource Specialist Added Authorization
	Early Childhood Special Education Added
	Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization
National Hispanic University	Multiple Subject Credential Program, with Intern
	Single Subject Credential Program with Intern
	General Education (MS/SS) Clear Credential
	Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Credential Program Preliminary
	Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Intern
	Clear Education Specialist Induction
	Education Specialist - Added Authorization ASD
	California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)
	Bilingual Teacher Authorization: Spanish
Notre Dame de Namur	Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Level II Credential Program
	Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Level II Credential Program
Patten University	Single Subject Credential Program: Mathematics
	Single Subject Credential Program: Science
	Single Subject Credential Program: Music
	Single Subject Credential Program: Health
San Jose State University	Speech-Language Pathology: Special Class Authorization
	Clinical Rehab: Audiology
University of California, Riverside	Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance
	Designated Subjects Credential: Adult Education

Reactivation of Inactive Program

An inactive program may be reactivated only when the institution submits a request to the COA and the COA has taken action to reactivate the program. If the program standards under which the program was approved have been modified, the institution or program sponsor must address

the updated standards before the program may be reactivated. During 2014-15, ten programs previously deemed inactive requested and received reactivation and are once again fully approved programs operating in California.

Reactivation Requests in 2014-15 (6)	
Institution	Program
California State University, Sacramento	Single Subject Intern Program
Keppel Union School District	General Education (MS/SS) Induction
Pepperdine University	Multiple Subject Credential Program, with Intern
	Single Subject Credential Program, with Intern
Sweetwater Union High School District	General Education (MS/SS) Induction

Initial Institutional Approval

The Committee on Accreditation does not have authority to approve the eligibility of institutions to offer educator preparation programs in California. Rather, Initial Institutional Approval is within the purview of the Commission. Once the Commission determines that an institution is eligible to offer educator preparation in California, the program proposals by those institutions are brought forward to the COA for its consideration and action. Additionally, due to the temporary moratorium placed in Initial Institutional Approval there were no institutions granted approval.

Institutions that are No Longer Approved Program Sponsors

During 2014-2015, five institutions ceased to be Commission-approved program sponsors. Institutions lose Initial Institutional Approval when they withdraw all of their Commission approved programs or are denied accreditation.

Institutions No Longer Eligible to Offer Educator Preparation	
Drexel University	No program proposal submitted
Metropolitan Education District	Denied Accreditation in June 2015 and closed in September 2015
National Hispanic University	Closed Educator Preparation in August 2015

Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2016-17

The work plan for the Commission and COA for 2016-17 is divided between two accreditation activities. In addition to completing the work of the current accreditation system, the Commission, staff and the Committee on Accreditation will also continue will begin the process of transitioning to the revised accreditation system.

At the time that the Commission adopted the implementation plan for the accreditation system, the Commission discussed the need for a “transition and implementation year” in order to ensure that institutions had sufficient time to adjust their curriculum and fieldwork to align with new standards and for the staff to have time to work with the COA to adopt a new Accreditation Handbook and clarify new processes and procedures. 2016-17 is the transition and implementation year and so the list of activities is somewhat outside of the normal accreditation activities. For 2016-17, the COA identifies the following priorities.

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

Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation. All Committee meetings will continue to be held in public and all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. In addition, meetings will be broadcast to allow any individual with access to the Internet the ability to hear live or recorded broadcasts of all Committee meetings. The Commission’s website will continue to be utilized fully to provide agenda items, notification of meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation. Meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

August 8, 2016
November 9, 2016
February 2-3, 2017
March 24, 2017
June 29, 30, 2017

Because the Committee’s schedule in 2016-17 does not include a full schedule of site visits this summer, it is anticipated that the bulk of the work related to the Committee will be following up on institutions with stipulations and assisting staff in preparing for the implementation of the new system. The schedule will be adjusted as needed as the work progresses.

Continuing in 2016-17, the *PSD ENews*, Program Sponsor Alerts, and press releases will be routinely used to ensure a transparent accreditation process.

Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission. The Committee on Accreditation will present its annual report to the Commission in December 2016. Additional updates and reports to the Commission will be provided as necessary and appropriate throughout the year.

Commission liaison. Maintaining a liaison from the Commission to the COA continues to be a critical aspect of the current process. The Commission’s liaison will continue to provide an

important perspective to COA discussions and serve as an effective means of communication between the COA and the Commission.

Continued Implementation of a fee recovery system for certain accreditation activities and an annual accreditation fee system. The Commission adopted a cost recovery plan, and regulations, for the review of new programs and for accreditation activities outside the typical accreditation cycle in October 2013. In addition, in 2014, the Commission implemented an annual accreditation fee. The annual accreditation fee structure will be reviewed in 2016 by the Commission in light of new standards and new requirements. Should there be changes in the fee structure, the COA and Commission staff stand ready to ensure its effective implementation. Particular attention will continue to be paid to effective implementation of a fiscal process to invoice institutions, refining processes to ensure timeliness of reviews, and to maintaining procedures to keep track of reviewer assignments to credit institutions for in-kind assistance in order to waive fees for initial program review, where appropriate.

Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality

Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs. This is one of the principal ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing accreditation of education institutions and their credential programs. Accreditation site visits have been deferred until the 2017-18 year and will begin again with the Green Cohort. Because the Green Cohort was the last cohort to submit program assessment documents, this site visit will be a hybrid of the old and the new system. The program assessment document review will be concluded and the new streamlined program review process will begin for those in the Yellow Cohort.

Review and revise the Accreditation Handbook. The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. The COA completed a comprehensive review and update of all but one chapter of the *Accreditation Handbook* in 2016 to reflect the new revised accreditation system. However, because the work around data, the data warehouse and data dashboard is continuing, the *Accreditation Handbook* chapter on Annual Data Submission will need to be developed. It is anticipated that during 2016-17, much of the details related to annual data submission will be completed and can be incorporated into the *Accreditation Handbook*.

Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards

Review and take action to grant initial approval of new program sponsors. At the end of 2015 and beginning of 2016, the Commission approved a new, more rigorous Initial Institutional Approval process for institutions seeking to become a Commission-approved program sponsor. As the Commission staff and the Commission begin to implement the new system, minor adjustments to the process may need to take place. The Commission staff will bring forward those institutions that have completed the various stages of the new system for the Commission approval. In addition, at least 3 Accreditation 101 sessions will be held at various times during the year for institutions interested in becoming a Commission-approved program to better

understand the expectations and responsibilities of being a program sponsor and to begin the approval process.

Review and take action to grant initial program approval for new credential programs. This is also one of the major ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Programs are only being given initial approval when the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met. This review process will continue in 2016-17. Additional resources available as the result of cost recovery and annual accreditation fees should continue to assist in ensuring greater timeliness of reviews by allowing the Commission to bring reviewers together for some dedicated review time, as well as encouraging the participation of additional reviewers from the in-kind contribution option.

Conduct and review program assessment activities. The Green cohort submitted program assessment documents in fall of 2014 and reviewers have largely completed these reviews. (

Begin the Program Review Process. The Administrative Services programs as well as institutions in the Yellow cohort are the first to submit program evidence to demonstrate alignment with the standards through the new Program Review process. Staff has worked on the process and procedures and will evaluate the process as it is conducted for the first time. Staff will report on the success or challenges of this new process at a regularly scheduled COA meeting.

Review and Approve Elementary Subject Matter Programs. Although subject matter programs are not fully part of the accreditation system, there is a need to review and approve Elementary Subject matter programs in 2016-17 to once again allow completion of a subject matter program to waive the subject matter examination. Given the significant interest in this effort, it is anticipated that the Commission will need numerous trained reviewers and dedicated review time to ensure that this activity is conducted efficiently and in a timely manner in preparation for the approval of regulations by the Office of Administrative Law.

Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement

Data – Annual Data Submission and Survey Data. The Commission will continue to develop and refine the annual survey data collection process and hold discussions with the COA about the appropriate use of that data in accreditation decisions. In addition, there remains significant work to be done around the annual data submission. These discussions will take place this year and it is anticipated that specific data elements, definitions for data sources, and means of collecting, reporting, and analyzing within the newly developed data warehouse and data dashboards will take place.

Continued implementation of the evaluation system for the accreditation system. The COA will continue to refine the evaluation tool that is used by site visit reviewers, team leads, and institutions to evaluate the accreditation system. This data will be collected over the course of the year, with a review of the data taking place in fall 2016. Improvements will be discussed and incorporated into the revised accreditation system.

Continue partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (formerly the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate. The partnership agreement with CAEP was signed by both the Commission and CAEP leadership in 2015. The Commission staff continues to keep abreast with changes to the CAEP accreditation system, determine the alignment or misalignment with California's process and standards, and to clarify areas of uncertainty with respect to some of the CAEP standards for applicability to California's institutions, particularly post baccalaureate granting programs.

Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes. The Commission staff hopes to be able to incorporate into its work plan the beginning of the review of the Pupil Personnel Services program standards. In doing so, it will be important to review the work of the national professional bodies in recent years and to determine where new concepts or ideas need to be incorporated into the Commission's standards.

Continue Development and Implementation of the Revised Accreditation System

In 2016-17, the Committee on Accreditation will serve to assist in the continued development of the various aspects of the new accreditation system. A brief summary of the continued efforts to develop the system include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. *Provide Technical Assistance on the Wide Variety of Revisions to Standards, Policy and Procedures.* The Commission staff is engaged in a year of transition and implementation to the new accreditation system. The primary focus of the year is to ensure that the field has extensive opportunities to technical assistance provided by Commission staff.
2. *Revising the Board of Institutional Review Training.* Given how significantly the standards and competencies have changed, as well as the shift in reviewing programs and standards without such a reliance on long narrative, an important focus of 2016-17 will be to revamp the Board of Institutional Review training. The success of the new accreditation system will depend on reviewers not only understanding the intricacies of what is being asked, but also a big picture understanding of the objectives of the Strengthening and Streamlining project. Commission staff anticipates a training for new individuals, one for team leads, as well as an updated "refresher" training for veteran reviewers. All of these trainings will need to be developed and implementation begun during 2016-17.
3. *Continue Discussing the Role, Purpose, and Specificities of Annual Data.* A focus for 2016-17 will be to continue the discussion about the types of required data that institutions should submit annually, the expectations around that data, and its uses in accreditation. Staff will work to establish the specific protocols necessary to ensure smooth submission of the data into the data warehouse and identify which data elements are part of the data dashboard. In addition, BIR members will need to be trained in how to analyze and use the data appropriately in accreditation..
4. *Continued refinement and implementation of surveys for the following constituencies:*
 - a. Preliminary Multiple Subject Completer Survey

- b. Preliminary Single Subject Completer Survey
- c. Preliminary Education Specialist Completer Survey
- d. Preliminary Administrative Services Completer Survey
- e. Clear/Induction Multiple and Single Subject Completer Survey
- f. Clear Education Specialist Induction Completer Survey
- g. Master Teacher Survey
- h. Employer Survey

In addition, significant work will need to be done in 2016-17 to ensure that consistent policies and procedures are established regarding the manner in which the survey results are used in accreditation.

5. *Next generation of performance assessments* – As the development of the next generation of teaching performance assessments and the development of administrator performance assessments continues, the COA and Commission staff will begin to review the various implications of that work. Determining how the data from performance assessment will be used, providing some guidance for reviewers, and ensuring that both institutions and reviewers understand the new models as well as the implementation standards that support the new models will be critical and a long term effort as the field testing does not conclude until 2017-18.
6. *Establishing and implementing processes and procedures for identifying exceptional programs.* Building on the discussions that have taken place thus far, the Commission will continue to explore a variety of options to ensure that those institutions with particularly strong or innovative programs are able to be recognized and share their experiences and accomplishments with the broader education community. The Committee on Accreditation will provide feedback on the system as it develops and in its early implementation.

General Operations

In addition to the above-mentioned items, the COA will engage in routine matters necessary for general operations of the Committee. This includes the election of Co-Chairs, the adoption of a meeting schedule, and orientation of new members.

Appendix A
(Alphabetical List of Institutions by Cohort)
To be added

Appendix B
List of Technical Assistance Meetings
(To be added)