



NOTICE OF PROPOSED EMERGENCY RULEMAKING

October 7, 2013

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) proposes to adopt emergency regulations pertaining to cost recovery fees for specified accreditation activities after considering all comments, objections, and recommendations regarding the proposed action. A copy of the proposed regulation additions is attached with the text underlined.

Government Code section 11346.1(a)(2) requires that, at least five working days prior to submission of the proposed emergency regulation action to the Office of Administrative Law, the adopting agency must provide a notice of the proposed emergency action to every person who has filed a request for notice of regulatory action with the Commission. After submission of the file to the Office of Administrative Law, the Office of Administrative Law shall allow interested persons five calendar days to submit comments on the proposed emergency regulations. If approved, the Office of Administrative Law will file the regulations with the Secretary of State and the emergency regulations will be effective for one hundred and eighty (180) days. The Commission will proceed with the regular rulemaking action, including a 45-day public comment period followed by a public hearing, within the 180-day emergency regulation effective period. The emergency regulations will remain in effect during the regular rulemaking action.

The proposed emergency regulations were presented to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing at a public meeting held on September 26, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. at the Commission's office located at 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95811. This Notice of Proposed Emergency Rulemaking is being provided five days prior to the date that the Commission will submit the regulations to the Office of Administrative Law.

Authority and Reference

Education Code (EC) section 44225 authorizes the Commission to adopt these proposed emergency regulations. The proposed emergency regulations implement, interpret, and make specific EC section 44374.5 that authorizes the Commission to implement a cost recovery plan for specified accreditation activities.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Summary of Existing Laws and Regulations

Assembly Bill (AB) 86 (Chap. 48, Stats. 2013) added EC section 44374.5 and authorizes the Commission to develop and implement a cost recovery plan for specified accreditation activities. The purpose of the proposed cost recovery fees are to implement a cost sharing plan for the specified accreditation activities.

AB 110 (Chap. 20, Stats. 2013) assumes up to \$200,000 in funds [reference 6360-001-0407(8)] from the implementation of a cost recovery plan for the accreditation activities specified below. "Institution" as used in this section refers to an agency that is authorized to seek initial

institutional approval in order to submit a professional preparation program for approval and accreditation pursuant to EC section 44373.

Reviewing Initial or New Educator Preparation Programs [EC §44374.5(a)]

Initial Institutional Approval

Initial Institutional Approval is the process that must be completed by an institution that has not previously been authorized by the Commission to offer educator programs in California. This is a lengthy process that requires review of Commission-adopted preconditions, program standards, and common standards. Additionally, because the institution is new to the process, multiple reviews and resubmissions are often required. These approvals are less frequent in occurrence than other document reviews; however, they require considerable time for reviewers.

Initial Program Review

Initial Program Reviews (IPR) are initiated in two ways: 1) an approved institution intends to offer a new program and submits a program proposal for review; and 2) the Commission revises program standards to such a significant degree that institutions are required to rewrite a program proposal and submit it for IPR. Staff will include a discussion of costs when presenting proposed program standards revisions to the Commission for approval at a regularly scheduled public meeting. The Commission will determine, after considering all comments, objections, and recommendations, whether programs will be required to submit the new program for IPR and bear the associated costs or if submission of a no-fee transition plan will suffice.

Accreditation Activities in Excess of the Regularly Scheduled Data Reports, Program Assessments, and Accreditation Site Visits [EC §44374.5(b)]

Focused Site Visit

The Commission's accreditation system allows the Committee on Accreditation (COA), as defined in EC section 44373, to call for a focused site visit when the institution is not complying with the accreditation system activities or if there are concerns expressed about a program or institution.

Late Document Reviews

Institutions are required to submit Biennial Report documents to the Commission that include two years of assessment data being used to ensure that candidates are developing, and completers have acquired, the appropriate skills and knowledge to prepare them to be professional educators. Institutions are required to submit Program Assessment documents to the Commission in Year Four of the accreditation cycle to assist the institution in preparing for the site visit in Year Six as well as providing information to the site visit team. The Commission incurs additional costs when reviewing documents that are submitted past an established due date, including costs associated with rescheduling reviews, recruiting additional reviewers, and holding additional review events.

Program Assessments Requiring More Than Three Reviews

Program assessment occurs in Year Four of the accreditation cycle. This is a review of all programs offered by an institution. Program assessment is used to assist the institution in preparing for the site visit in Year Six as well as providing information to the site visit team. Two Board of Institutional Review (BIR) members review the program assessment documents in a protected environment facilitated by Commission staff to determine if the programs are preliminarily aligned with the program standards. If the reviewers cannot determine that the response is aligned to the standards, the institution resubmits documents with additional information. More than three reviews of a program assessment are considered extraordinary and

are beyond the normal accreditation activities. Program assessment documents that require numerous reviews require redirection of staff time as well as travel costs related to the reconvening of BIR members to perform the additional reviews.

Full Program Review During Site Visit

Program assessment documents are due to the Commission two years prior to the scheduled site visit. When an institution does not complete the program assessment process six months prior to the site visit, and when completion of that activity is due to the fact that the documents were significantly late, the document will not be read as a program assessment document, but will be reviewed as part of the site visit responsibilities. The costs for two additional BIR members to perform a full review of the document during the site visit will be the responsibility of the institution upon approval of the proposed regulations.

Site Revisit

The purpose of a site revisit is to allow an institution that received stipulations from the COA following an accreditation site visit the opportunity to demonstrate to a review team that it has modified its practices or corrected its deficiencies. Site revisits generally require a two-day visit of a smaller team within one year of the original site visit. The site revisit team always includes a team lead, which in most cases is the same team lead as the original visit, and a Commission consultant. The number of reviewers depends upon the number and complexity of issues identified, but generally includes at least one reviewer in addition to the team lead.

Reports Addressing Stipulations

An institution granted “Accreditation with Stipulations” by the COA must complete a seventh year report as part of the accreditation review process. The report should address the action taken by the institution to address any stipulations as well as the standards determined by the review team to be “not met” or “met with concerns.” At the time “Accreditation with Stipulations” is granted, the COA will indicate whether the process for removal of the stipulations requires a site revisit.

If no site revisit is required, the consultant, and in some cases the team lead, will review the responses provided in the seventh year report provided by the institution. The consultant and, if appropriate, the team lead will prepare a report with recommendations for COA consideration in determining whether the stipulations can be removed.

If a site revisit is required by the COA, the seventh year report will be provided to the review team to help with the assessment of the institution’s progress toward addressing the stipulations. Upon the conclusion of the site revisit, a report with recommendations will be prepared for COA consideration in determining whether the stipulations can be removed.

The review of reports addressing stipulations, with or without a site revisit, requires redirection of staff time.

Table A: Summary of Proposed Cost Recovery Fees

Beyond Standard Accreditation Cycle Activities Education Code §44374.5	Cost Recovery
Initial Institutional Approval	\$2,000
Initial Program Review 12 or more standards	\$2,000
Initial Program Review 6-11 standards	\$1,500
Initial Program Review fewer than 6 standards	\$1,000

Beyond Regularly Scheduled Accreditation Activities	Cost Recovery
Focused Site Visit	<i>\$1,000 per individual attending visit</i>
Late Document Reviews	<i>\$500 per program</i>
Program Assessment Requiring More than 3 Reviews	<i>\$1,000</i>
Full Program Review during Site Visit as a result of not completing program assessment process	<i>\$3,000 per program</i>
Site Revisit	<i>\$1000 per individual attending visit</i>
Reports Addressing Stipulations (no revisit required)	<i>\$500</i>
Reports Addressing Stipulations (revisit required)	<i>\$1000</i>

Objectives and Anticipated Benefits of the Proposed Regulations

The objectives of the proposed regulations amendments are to establish fees that will allow the Commission to recover costs incurred for initial institutional and new program review and accreditation activities in excess of the regularly scheduled data reports, program assessments, and accreditation site visits.

Determination of Inconsistency/Incompatibility with Existing State Regulations

The Commission has determined that the proposed regulation amendments are not inconsistent or incompatible with existing regulations. There are no other 5 CCR sections that specify cost recovery fees for accreditation activities associated with Commission-approve programs.

Findings of Emergency

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing finds that the adoption of the proposed regulations on an emergency basis is required for the immediate preservation of the public general welfare within the meaning of Government Code section 11346.1.

The purpose of the accreditation system is to ensure the quality of California educators. The Commission's accreditation system is the only quality control mechanism the state has over educator preparation programs and helps ensure the integrity of the credentials issued by the agency (reference EC sections 44370 and 44371). Delaying implementation of cost recovery fees for program approval and accreditation during the regular rulemaking process that will take at least six months to complete will cause the Commission to temporarily suspend accreditation activities. Failure by the Commission to perform its statutorily-mandated duties could result in the certification and placement of unqualified teachers in California's public schools.

Emergency regulations are necessary to ensure that the Commission has the monetary means to perform its statutorily-mandated accreditation duties, thereby ensuring high quality educator preparation for the instruction of California public school pupils. The 2013-14 budget, which allows the Commission to institute a cost recovery plan, assumes \$200,000 from the cost recovery fees. The emergency regulations are needed to implement the cost recovery plan as early as possible in the 2013-14 fiscal year.

Summary of Proposed Amendments to Regulations

Subarticle 3.

Proposed new subarticle to Chapter 5, Article 3 of Title 5 of the CCR in order to clarify, interpret, and make specific the professional preparation program approval and accreditation cost recovery fees per EC section 44374.5 added as a result of Assembly Bill 86 (Chap. 48, Stats. 2013).

§80691 and Introduction: Proposed new section to provide definitions for the terms associated with the cost recovery fees for program approval and accreditation.

(a): Proposed language provides the definition for a “Board of Institutional Review member” and incorporates by reference Chapter Eleven of the *Accreditation Handbook*.

(b): Proposed language provides the definition for a “focused site visit” and incorporates by reference Chapter Four of the *Accreditation Handbook*.

(c): Proposed language provides the definition for “initial institutional approval” and incorporates by reference Chapter Three of the *Accreditation Handbook*.

(d): Proposed language provides the definition for “initial program review” and includes a reference to Chapter Three of the *Accreditation Handbook*.

(e): Proposed language provides the definition for “institution” as related to the types of organizations that are authorized to seek professional preparation program approval and accreditation.

(e)(1) through (e)(5): Proposed new subsections list the type of institutions, as defined in subsection (e), that are authorized to seek initial institutional approval.

(f): Proposed language provides the definition for “late review” as related to the submission of biennial reports and/or program assessments, incorporates by reference Chapter Five and Chapter Six of the *Accreditation Handbook*, and includes a reference to Chapter Four of the *Accreditation Handbook*.

(g): Proposed language provides the definition for “program assessment” and includes a reference Chapter Six of the *Accreditation Handbook*.

(h): Proposed language provides the definition for “professional preparation program.”

(i): Proposed language provides the definition for “site revisit” and incorporates by reference Chapter Fifteen of the *Accreditation Handbook*.

(j): Proposed language provides the definition for “site visit” and includes a reference to Chapter Four of the *Accreditation Handbook*.

(k): Proposed language provides the definition for “standard accreditation cycle” and includes a reference to Chapter Four of the *Accreditation Handbook*.

(l): Proposed language provides the definition for “stipulations” and incorporates by reference Chapter Eight of the *Accreditation Handbook*.

Note: Cites the relevant Education Code authority and references for the proposed addition of 5 CCR section 80691.

§80692 and Introduction: Proposed new section to clarify the cost recovery fees as established by the Commission that must be submitted by a professional preparation program for the program approval and accreditation activities specified.

(a): Proposed new subsection to establish the cost recovery fees for document review beyond the Standard Accreditation Cycle, as defined in section 80691(k) and includes language specifying when the fees must be submitted to the Commission [reference EC section 44374.5(a)].

(a)(1): Proposed language establishes the cost recovery fee for initial institutional approval as defined in section 80691(c).

(a)(2): Commission-approved professional preparation programs include specific standards that must be addressed by the institution. The proposed language prefaces the subsections that will establish the cost recovery fees for initial program review (IPR) as defined in section 80691(d) depending on the number of required standards to be addressed.

(a)(2)(A): Proposed language establishes the flat fee for the IPR of a professional preparation program that addresses twelve or more standards. Preliminary credential programs typically include twelve or more standards [reference 5 CCR section 80054(a)(2) pertaining to Preliminary Administrative Services Credentials].

(a)(2)(B): Proposed language establishes the flat fee for the IPR of a professional preparation program that addresses six to eleven standards. Clear credential programs typically include between six and eleven standards [reference 5 CCR section 80054(d)(3) pertaining to Clear Administrative Services Credentials].

(a)(2)(C): Proposed language establishes the flat fee for the IPR of a professional preparation program that addresses fewer than six standards. Added authorization and certificate programs typically include fewer than six standards [reference 5 CCR section 80069.2(a)(3) pertaining to the Mathematics Instructional Added Authorization].

(a)(2)(D): Proposed language clarifies the circumstances under which a professional preparation program may be exempted from the fees associated with IPR. Exemption from the costs associated with IPR is a win-win situation, in that the program will not be required to pay the cost recovery fees and the number of available Board of Institutional members will be increased.

(b): Proposed new subsection to establish the cost recovery fees for accreditation activities in excess of the regularly scheduled data reports, program assessments, and accreditation site visits and includes language specifying when the fees must be submitted to the Commission [reference EC section 44374.5(b)].

(b)(1): Proposed language establishes the cost recovery fee for focused site visits as defined in section 80691(b).

(b)(2): Proposed language establishes the cost recovery fee for late reviews as defined in section 80691(f).

(b)(3): Proposed language prefaces the subsections that establish the cost recovery fees for extraordinary activities associated with program assessments as defined in section 80691(g).

(b)(3)(A): Proposed language establishes the cost recovery fee for program assessments that require more than three reviews.

(b)(3)(B): Proposed language establishes the cost recovery fee for two additional Board of Institutional Review members to attend a site visit in order to perform a program review when the professional preparation program does not complete the program assessment process six months prior to the scheduled site visit.

(b)(4): Accreditation activities required by a professional preparation program that has had stipulations placed upon it by the Committee on Accreditation include additional reports with or without a site revisit. The proposed language prefaces the subsections that establish the cost recovery fees for a professional preparation program operating with stipulations as defined in section 80691(1).

(b)(4)(A): Proposed language establishes the cost recovery fee for a site revisit as defined in section 80691(i).

(b)(4)(B): Proposed language establishes the cost recovery fee for review of a report due to stipulations that does not require a site revisit. Also incorporates by reference Chapter Nine of the *Accreditation Handbook* which details the activities associated with accreditation stipulations.

(b)(4)(C): Proposed language establishes the cost recovery fee for review of a report due to stipulations that does require a site revisit. Also incorporates by reference Chapter Nine of the *Accreditation Handbook* which details the activities associated with accreditation stipulations.

Note: Cites the relevant Education Code authority and references for the proposed addition of 5 CCR section 80692.

Documents Relied Upon in Preparing Regulations:

August 2013 Commission Agenda Item 3D:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-08/2013-08-3D.pdf>

September 2013 Commission Agenda Item 4A:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-09/2013-09-4A.pdf>

Documents Incorporated by Reference:

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three, Institutional and Program Approval (rev. 2012):

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/AH-Chapter-03.pdf>

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Four, The Accreditation Cycle (rev. 2012):

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/AH-Chapter-04.pdf>

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Five, Biennial Reports (rev. 2012):

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/AH-Chapter-05.pdf>

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Six, Program Assessment (rev. 2012):

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/AH-Chapter-06.pdf>

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Eight, Accreditation Decisions: Options and Implications (rev. 2012): <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/AH-Chapter-08.pdf>

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Nine, Activities during the Seventh Year of the Accreditation Cycle (rev. 2012): <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/AH-Chapter-09.pdf>

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Eleven, Board of Institutional Review Member Skills and Competencies (rev. 2012):

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/AH-Chapter-11.pdf>

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Fifteen, The Accreditation Revisit (rev. 2012):

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/AH-Chapter-15.pdf>

Matters Prescribed by Statute Applicable to the Agency or to Any Specific Regulation or Class of Regulations: None.**Mandate on Local Agencies or School Districts:**

The Commission has determined that this proposed regulatory action would not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts.

These proposed regulations will not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts that must be reimbursed in accordance with Part 7 (commencing with section 17500) of the Government Code.

Fiscal Impact Statement:

Cost or savings to any state agency: \$0 to approximately \$7,000 every seven-year accreditation cycle per institution with document review or extraordinary accreditation activities.

The Commission implements a seven-year accreditation cycle that includes three major components: 1) program assessment, 2) biennial reports, and 3) site visits. In addition, Initial Institutional Approval and Initial Program Approval are accreditation functions associated with new programs and new institutions. Costs are primarily incurred for components of the accreditation system that require the use of experts from the field to determine if the documentation provided by institutions regarding the quality of their program's operations, faculty, and services for candidates are aligned to the requirements of the Commission's adopted standards. Expenses include reimbursement for the travel of volunteers and staff who review documents and participate in approximately 40 educator preparation program and institution site visits per year. This results in a projected outlay of \$415,000 for site visits, including pre-visits and revisits, in 2013-14 and \$271,000 for document review activities. The 2013-14 Budget Act authorizes the Commission to recover up to \$200,000 of these overall costs for activities other than regularly scheduled reviews.

Costs associated with accreditation activities vary depending on the scope of review required and the number of reviewers needed to accomplish the activity. There are currently 23 California State Universities (CSU) offering approximately 12 programs per entity (276 CSU programs) and 8 Universities of California (UC) offering approximately 7 programs per entity (56 UC programs) for a total of approximately 332 programs. There are also currently 59 private institutions of higher education offering approximately 8 programs per entity (472 programs) and 169 school districts and county offices of education offering approximately two programs per entity for a total of approximately 338 programs.

Provided below are estimates of the total yearly cost recovery fees by each institution type:

CSUs: 276 programs/1142 total programs = 24% x \$200,000 = \$48,000

UCs: 56 programs/1142 total programs = 5% x \$200,000 = \$10,000

Private Institutions: 472 programs/1142 total programs = 41% x \$200,000 = \$82,000

School Districts and County Offices: 338 programs/1142 total programs = 30% x \$200,000 = \$60,000

CSUs, UCs, private institutions, school districts, and county offices of education are not required by statute or regulations to offer Commission-approved programs. Further, the cost recovery fees are not intended to be punitive in nature. The fees are proposed as a means for the Commission to recover incurred costs associated with initial institutional or new program review and extraordinary accreditation activities as provided in EC section 44374.5.

Program sponsors may offset the costs associated with initial program review by providing Board of Institutional Review members [reference 5 CCR section 80692(a)(2)(D)]. In addition, program sponsors may avoid the proposed cost recovery fees associated with the extraordinary accreditation activities by successfully completing all scheduled accreditation activities on time. The Commission will not need to recover costs if no costs are incurred.

Cost to any local agency required to be reimbursed under Part 7 (commencing with section 17500) of the Government Code: None.

Cost to any school district required to be reimbursed under Part 7 (commencing with section 17500) of the Government Code: None.

Other non-discretionary costs or savings imposed upon local agencies: None.

Cost or savings in federal funding to the state: None.

Availability of Text of Proposed Regulations and Findings of Emergency

The emergency regulation file is available for inspection and copying throughout the rulemaking process at the Commission office at 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95811. Copies may be obtained from the Commission's website at www.ctc.ca.gov or by contacting Tammy Duggan at the address provided above or by telephone at (916) 323-5354.

CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS
TITLE 5. EDUCATION
DIVISION 8. COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
CHAPTER 5. APPROVED PROGRAMS
ARTICLE 3. OTHER PROGRAM APPROVAL PROCEDURES

Subarticle 3. Cost Recovery Fees for Program Approval and Accreditation

§80691. Definitions.

As used in this subarticle, the following terms shall have the meanings as set forth below:

- (a) "Board of Institutional Review member" is an individual who has successfully completed the Commission-provided training detailed in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Eleven, Board of Institutional Review Member Skills and Competencies (rev. 2012), available on the Commission's website and hereby incorporated by reference.
- (b) "Focused site visit" is a site visit requested by the Committee on Accreditation when it is determined that the professional preparation program is not complying with the accreditation system activities specified in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Four, The Accreditation Cycle (rev. 2012), available on the Commission's website and hereby incorporated by reference.
- (c) "Initial institutional approval" is granted by the Committee on Accreditation when an institution that has not previously prepared educators for certification in California has been deemed to meet the accreditation requirements as explained in the *Accreditation Handbook*

Chapter Three, Institutional and Program Approval (rev. 2012), available on the Commission's website and hereby incorporated by reference.

- (d) "Initial program review" is the review of a professional preparation program's formal response to the program standards associated with a specific program type as explained in the Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three, Institutional and Program Approval (rev. 2012). Initial program review occurs when a professional preparation program intends to offer a new professional preparation program type or when the Commission revises program standards to such a significant degree that a professional preparation program must rewrite the program document.
- (e) "Institution" means any of the following categories of agencies which are authorized to seek initial institutional approval as defined in subsection (c) in order to submit a professional preparation program for approval and accreditation as defined in subsection (h):
- (1) A California county superintendent of schools office;
 - (2) A California school district;
 - (3) A charter school as established in Education Code Section 47605;
 - (4) A regionally-accredited college or university;
 - (5) A non-governmental or community-based organization.
- (f) "Late review" refers to the submission of a Biennial Report, as defined in the Accreditation Handbook Chapter Five, Biennial Reports (rev. 2012), available on the Commission's website and hereby incorporated by reference, and/or a Program Assessment, as defined in Chapter Six, Program Assessment (rev. 2012), available on the Commission's website and hereby incorporated by reference, after the deadline established pursuant to the Accreditation Handbook Chapter Four, The Accreditation Cycle (rev. 2012).
- (g) "Program Assessment" is a process that occurs in year four of the seven year accreditation cycle and requires professional preparation programs to submit to the Commission a clear description of how a program is operating as explained in the Accreditation Handbook Chapter Six, Program Assessment (rev. 2012).
- (h) "Professional preparation program" refers to an institution that has been approved by the Commission and accredited by the Committee on Accreditation to offer a program which leads to the issuance of teaching credentials, services credentials, specialist credentials, added authorizations, or certificates.
- (i) "Site revisit" is an accreditation visit that is conducted as a result of an action taken by the Committee on Accreditation to place stipulations on the accreditation of a professional preparation program as detailed in the Accreditation Handbook Chapter Fifteen, The Accreditation Revisit (rev. 2012), available on the Commission's website and hereby incorporated by reference.
- (j) "Site visit" is an accreditation visit conducted in the seventh year of the accreditation cycle as specified in the Accreditation Handbook Chapter Four, The Accreditation Cycle (rev. 2012).

(k) “Standard accreditation cycle” refers to the seven-year accreditation cycle specified in the Accreditation Handbook Chapter Four, The Accreditation Cycle (rev. 2012).

(l) “Stipulations” are placed on the accreditation of a professional preparation program by the Committee on Accreditation when it is determined that one or more applicable common and/or program standards have not been met or have been met with concerns as explained in the Accreditation Handbook Chapter Eight, Accreditation Decisions: Options and Implications (rev. 2012), available on the Commission’s website and hereby incorporated by reference.

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225, Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225(h), 44370, 44371, 44372, 44373(c) and 44374, Education Code.

§80692. Program Approval and Accreditation Fees

The following fees associated with the activities defined in §80691 shall be submitted to the Commission by the professional preparation program:

(a) Fees for document review beyond the Standard Accreditation Cycle shall be submitted with the professional preparation program’s formal response to the applicable standards as follows:

(1) Initial institutional approval: \$2,000 flat fee.

(2) Initial program review:

(A) Professional preparation program that addresses twelve or more standards: \$2,000 flat fee.

(B) Professional preparation program that addresses six to eleven standards: \$1,500 flat fee.

(C) Professional preparation program that addresses fewer than six standards: \$1,000 flat fee.

(D) A professional preparation program that provides a number of Board of Institutional Review members that is equal to or greater than two times the number of their program documents submitted for initial program review annually and that assume all travel costs related to the review of the program documents submitted for initial review shall be exempt from payment of the fees associated with this subsection.

(b) Fees for the following activities in excess of the regularly scheduled accreditation activities shall be submitted to the Commission in the year that the extraordinary activities are performed:

(1) Focused site visit: \$1,000 for each individual attending the focused site visit.

(2) Late reviews: \$500 per document.

(3) Program assessments:

(A) No fee shall be charged for the first three reviews of a program assessment submitted by a professional preparation program. The fee for review of a program assessment beyond the first three reviews: \$1,000 flat fee.

(B) A professional preparation program that does not complete the program assessment process at least six months prior to a scheduled site visit: \$3,000 flat fee for two additional Board of Institutional Review members to review the program during the site visit.

(4) Stipulations:

(A) Site revisit: \$1,000 per individual attending the site revisit;

(B) Review of a report due to stipulations that does not require a site revisit as detailed in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Nine, *Activities during the Seventh Year of the Accreditation Cycle* (rev. 2012), available on the Commission's website and hereby incorporated by reference: \$500 flat fee;

(C) Review of a report associated with a site revisit as detailed in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Nine, *Activities during the Seventh Year of the Accreditation Cycle* (rev. 2012): \$1,000 flat fee.

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225, Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225(h), 44371, 44372, 44373(c), 44374 and 44374.5, Education Code.