



**SIXTH ANNUAL  
ACCREDITATION REPORT**

To the  
**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON  
TEACHER CREDENTIALING**

By the  
**COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION**



**Sixth Annual Accreditation Report to  
the  
California Commission on  
Teacher Credentialing**

**By the Committee  
on Accreditation**

**Assisted by the  
Professional Services Division**

**Sacramento, California  
August 2001**



# Sixth Annual Accreditation Report to the Commission by the Committee on Accreditation

## Table of Contents

Letter of Transmittal to the Commission	v
The Committee on Accreditation (September, 2001)	vii
<b>Section I: Major Activities of the Committee on Accreditation</b>	<b>1</b>
(1) Election of Co-Chairs for 2000-2001	1
(2) Committee Meetings During 2000-2001	1
(3) Presentations by the Committee on Accreditation	1
(4) Schedule of Committee Meetings for 2001-2002	2
<b>Section II: Accomplishment of the Committee's Workplan in 2000-2001</b>	<b>3</b>
Task 1 Monitor the Evaluation of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i>	3
Task 2 Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National Organizations (including NCATE)	3
Task 3 Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs	4
Task 4 Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and their Credential Preparation Programs	5
Task 5 Revise the <i>Accreditation Handbook</i> and Team Training Curriculum	7
Task 6 Maintain Public Access to the Committee on Accreditation	7
Task 7 Receive Regular Updates on SB 2042 Advisory Panel and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation	7
Task 8 Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission	7
Task 9 Other Required Elements of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> - Election of Co-Chairs, Adopt Meeting Schedule, Orient New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.	8
<b>Section III: Proposed Workplan for the Committee in 2001-2002</b>	<b>8</b>
Task 1 Monitor the Evaluation of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i>	9
Task 2 Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National Organizations (including NCATE)	9
Task 3 Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs	10

Task 4	Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and their Credential Preparation Programs	10
Task 5	Revise the <i>Accreditation Handbook</i> and Team Training Curriculum	11
Task 6	Maintain Public Access to the Committee on Accreditation	11
Task 7	Receive Regular Updates on SB 2042 Advisory Panel and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation	11
Task 8	Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission	12
Task 9	Other Required Elements of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> - Election of Co-Chairs, Adopt Meeting Schedule, Orient New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.	12
<b>Section IV. Analysis of 2000-2001 Accomplishments</b>		<b>13</b>
<b>Appendix A:</b>	<b>Continuing Accreditation Decisions Made by the Committee on Accreditation Based Upon Institutional Site Visits Conducted - 2000-2001</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix B:</b>	<b>Initial Program Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation - 2000-2001</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>Appendix C:</b>	<b>Additional Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation – 2000-2001</b>	<b>76</b>

**COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**

1900 Capitol Avenue  
Sacramento, California 95814-4213  
(916) 323-4508 fax



COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION  
(916) 327-2967

June 30, 2001

Dear Commissioners:

It is with personal and professional pleasure that, on behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation, we submit to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing the *Sixth 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 in the past year and its proposed workplan for 2001-2002.

2000-2001 was the fourth year that the Committee fully exercised its responsibilities under the *Accreditation Framework*. Through the continued receiving of accreditation team reports and the accreditation decision-making activity, the Committee has gained a more comprehensive understanding of its work and has taken steps to enhance its procedures.

The Committee now looks forward to its fifth full year with operational responsibilities in 2001-2002. We have had a successful year and are confident that we have maintained the high standards set by the Commission. This report provides evidence of our preparation and our confidence.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Maspero  
Committee Co-Chair

Sue Teele  
Committee Co-Chair



# The Committee on Accreditation

## June 2001

### California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Sacramento, California

- **Anthony Avina**, Superintendent  
Whittier Union High School District
- **Edward Kujawa**, Dean  
School of Education  
Dominican University
- **Fred Baker**, Professor  
School of Educ. & Integrative Studies  
Calif. Polytechnic State Univ., Pomona
- **Kim Lindley**, Director  
Staff Development  
Capistrano Unified School District
- **Carol Barnes**, Systemwide Assoc.  
Director, CalStateTEACH &  
Professor of Teacher Education  
California State University, Fullerton
- **David Madrigal**, Principal  
John Muir Elementary School  
Antioch Unified School District
- **Diane Doe**, Teacher  
Peer Assistance and Review  
San Francisco Unified School District
- **Bonnie Maspero**, COA Co-Chair  
Assistant Superintendent  
Lake Elsinore Unified School District
- **Irma Guzman-Wagner**, Dean  
College of Education  
California State University, Stanislaus
- **Ruth Sandlin**, Chair, Ed. Psych & Couns  
College of Education  
Calif. State University, San Bernardino
- **Dennis Jory**, Teacher  
BTSA/PAR Consultant  
Desert Sands Unified School District
- **Sue Teele**, COA Co-Chair  
Director, Education Extension  
University of California, Riverside

#### Committee Support Staff (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing)

- **Mary Vixie Sandy**, Director, Professional Services Division
- **Lawrence Birch**, Administrator for Accreditation, Professional Services Division
- **Philip A. Fitch**, Consultant, Professional Services Division
- **Elizabeth Graybill**, Consultant, Professional Services Division
- **Teri Ackerman**, Analyst, Professional Services Division
- **Marla Miles**, Secretary, Professional Services Division



## **Section I. Major Activities of the Committee on Accreditation**

This section of the Annual Report provides specific information about the principal activities of the Committee on Accreditation. In addition, information is provided about the meetings of the COA and its presentations during the year. Finally, the meeting schedule and proposed workplan for 2001-2002 are provided.

### **(1) Election of Co-Chairs for 2000-2001**

In developing its procedures, the Committee agreed that Co-Chairs (one from postsecondary education and one from K-12 education) would be elected annually. In August of 2000, the Committee elected Bonnie Maspero and Sue Teele to serve as Co-Chairs during the 2000-2001 accreditation cycle.

### **(2) Committee Meetings During 2000-2001**

In accordance with the duties assigned to the Committee on Accreditation and its adopted workplan for 2000-2001, the Committee on Accreditation held the following meetings. The Committee held either one-day or two-day meetings, depending on the amount of business before the body.

August 23, 2000	Commission Offices, Sacramento
October 29-30 2000*	Shelter Pointe Hotel, San Diego
January 18-19, 2001*	Commission Offices, Sacramento
March 28-29, 2001*	Hyatt Hotel, San Jose
April 26-27, 2001	Commission Offices, Sacramento
May 24-25, 2001	Commission Offices, Sacramento
June 29, 2001	Commission Offices, Sacramento

\* These meetings were held in conjunction with the Fall and Spring Conferences of the California Council on the Education of Teachers.

### **(3) Presentations by the Committee on Accreditation**

The Committee continued to make presentations about its activities, in order to make accurate accreditation information available to the education community. The Committee sought opportunities to present its work at appropriate occasions. In 2000-2001, the Committee made presentations at the following events.

California Council on the Education of Teachers, October, 2000  
Credential Counselors and Analysts of California, October, 2000

In addition to these presentations, the Committee on Accreditation is included on the web-site operated by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. There is a separate "web page" devoted to accreditation information and activities.

**(4) Schedule of Committee Meetings for 2001-2002**

In order to fulfill its responsibilities and accomplish its workplan, the Committee on Accreditation has adopted a schedule for meetings for the 2001-2002 accreditation cycle.

August 22, 2001	Commission Offices, Sacramento
October 24-25, 2001*	Shelter Pointe Hotel, San Diego (in conjunction with CCTE)
January 24-25, 2002	Commission Offices, Sacramento
March 21-22, 2002	Commission Offices, Sacramento
April 25-26, 2002	Commission Offices, Sacramento
May 23-24, 2002	Commission Offices, Sacramento
June 27-28, 2002	Commission Offices, Sacramento

\* The meeting is scheduled in conjunction with the Fall Conference of the California Council on Teacher Education will begin at mid-day on Wednesday and conclude by noon on Thursday.

## **Section II. Accomplishment of the Committee's Workplan in 2000-2001**

On August 23, 2000, the Committee on Accreditation adopted its workplan for 2000-2001. The Committee's elected Co-Chairs presented this workplan to the Commission one month later. The nine items that follow represent the key elements of the 2000-2001 workplan for the Committee on Accreditation. They include a detailed explanation of each task and its current status.

### **(Task 1) Monitor the Evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework***

The *Accreditation Framework* calls for an outside evaluator to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the *Framework* over a four-year period beginning with the first official accreditation visits under the oversight of the Committee on Accreditation. The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation developed a plan for the evaluation and a Request for Proposals was approved by the Commission. The contractor was selected in December 1999 and the contract was subsequently approved by the Commission. The COA and Commission staff are assisting in the gathering of data and monitoring the progress of the evaluation. A progress report was presented to Commission staff in November 2000. During the 2000-2001 accreditation cycle, the contractor was fully involved in gathering data, attending Committee on Accreditation meetings and Commission meetings and observing accreditation visits, interviewing accreditation team members, institutional personnel and other participants in the accreditation process. An interim report will be made in Fall 2001. Another report is to be made in the Spring of 2002, with the final report due by December 2002.

### **(Task 2) Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National Organizations (including NCATE)**

A Partnership Agreement is in effect with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) that is monitored and periodically renewed. The partnership must be renewed in October 2001. The required initial steps for the review and modification of the partnership with NCATE were undertaken. The Committee on Accreditation approved the procedures developed by staff to develop the partnership application. California was invited to participate in a pilot study of revised procedures for the renewal of the partnership that required additional activities beyond those originally anticipated and the COA agreed to participate. For that process, the state has been required to prepare documents showing how the requirements of the California Program Standards match the standards for each of the NCATE Specialized Professional Associations and submit an application that shows how the California state program accreditation/approval process meets the NCATE guidelines.

As a part of the preparation for the partnership renewal, the COA was involved in a number of activities. The COA reviewed the Protocol for the Partnership Agreement and agreed to seek some modifications, primarily related to team configuration and options for accreditation team reporting. The NCATE 2000 unit standards were reviewed in order to determine their comparability with the California Common Standards adopted by the Commission. The COA determined that the two sets of standards are comparable with the addition of specific information not required by the NCATE 2000 unit standards. (The NCATE 2000 unit standards also require some specific information in addition to that required under the California Common Standards.) The COA approved the voluntary use of NCATE 2000 unit standards for institutions with NCATE visits, with the addition of the specific information not required under the NCATE 2000 standards. Institutions are still required to respond to approved program standards for each program area.

As part of the further implementation of the *Accreditation Framework*, the Committee negotiates formal memoranda of understanding with national professional education organizations. These memoranda govern the portion of the *Accreditation Framework* that permits national accreditation of credential programs to substitute for state accreditation. The Committee is required to monitor the ongoing implementation of these agreements and evaluate their effectiveness.

In August 2000, the COA approved a plan for comparability studies in four areas of selected national program standards with Commission approved program standards and/or accreditation procedures. These included studies in the following credential areas: reading/language arts, deaf and hard of hearing, pupil personnel services, and library media services. Because of the additional work required for the participation in the NCATE pilot partnership renewal process, work was only completed on the reading/language arts area. The COA determined that the International Reading Standards are not comparable to the Commission adopted standards for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential and Reading Certificate. Comparability studies of the three remaining areas will be carried forward to the next year.

### **(Task 3)      Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs**

This is one of the principal ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The Committee has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Some of the decisions are made on the basis of expert review panel recommendations and some are made on the basis of staff recommendations. In all cases, programs are not given initial accreditation until the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's program standards are met.

During the 2000-2001 year, the following number of programs were given initial accreditation:

Administrative Services Credential Programs	4
Library Media Teacher Credential Program	1
Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program	1
Education Specialist Credential and Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential Programs	31
Adapted Physical Education Credential Programs	1
Reading Certificate Programs	7
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Programs	6
Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation	18
Multiple and Single Subject CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Credential Programs and Internship Programs	7
Programs of Professional Preparation for the BCLAD Certificate by Coursework Credential (Experimental)	1
Approved Responses to Standard 20.5 – Use of Computer Based Technology in the Classroom for Multiple and Single Subject Credential	42

A detailed listing of the programs granted initial accreditation is included in Appendix B.

**(Task 4) Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and their Credential Preparation Programs**

This is the principal ongoing task of the Committee on Accreditation. Effective September 1, 1997, the Committee on Accreditation assumed full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of postsecondary education institutions and their credential programs. This task continues to make up the major portion of the March through June agendas of the Committee on Accreditation. During the 2000-2001 year, there were eleven accreditation visits to colleges and universities and one accreditation visit to a district internship program. A total of 122 accreditation team members

participated in the visits. Following is the list of institutions and the accreditation status given by the Committee on Accreditation.

### 2000-2001 Accreditation Visits

Institution	Accreditation Decision
Azusa Pacific University	Accreditation with Technical Stipulations
California State University, Bakersfield	Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations
California State University, Fullerton	Accreditation
California State University, Long Beach	Accreditation
Claremont Graduate University	Accreditation
Hope International University	Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations
La Sierra University	Accreditation
New College of California	Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations
Pacific Oaks College	Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations
University of California, Davis	Accreditation
University of California, Irvine	Accreditation
University of California, San Diego	Accreditation
District Internship Program	Accreditation Decision
Compton Unified School District	Accreditation with a Technical Stipulation

A more detailed report of each accreditation visit is included in Appendix A. For each visit, the accreditation team report information is provided, followed by the COA accreditation decision, the list of all credential programs authorized for the institution or district, any stipulations given by the Committee on Accreditation, and the date of the next accreditation visit.

In addition to the above accreditation visits, the Committee on Accreditation received follow-up information from the six institutions and two district internship programs that received stipulations in the 1999-2000 accreditation cycle. This included three focused accreditation re-visits. Actions were taken to remove stipulations, approve the withdrawal of programs and to change the accreditation status of institutions, based upon the removal of stipulations. A summary of these accreditation actions is included in Appendix C.

**(Task 5)      Revise the *Accreditation Handbook* and Team Training Curriculum**

The Committee on Accreditation is committed to continuous improvement in the accreditation process. Each year, the Committee reviews the *Accreditation Handbook* and its training curriculum to ensure that it provides accurate and useful information to its clients. Minor modifications of the accreditation procedures are incorporated into the accreditation process and the training curriculum as they occur. A complete revision of the *Accreditation Handbook* was completed in Fall 2000 and printed in January 2001.

**(Task 6)      Maintain Public Access to the Committee on Accreditation**

The Committee made a formal presentation at the annual conference of the California Credential Analysts and scheduled its October and March meetings in conjunction with the Fall and Spring conferences of the California Council on the Education of Teachers. The Committee has continued to seek opportunities to make presentations to professional organizations. Written materials/publications were developed when possible to carry this task forward. Individual committee members were available to assist in the process. Regular information about the Committee and its deliberations is posted on the COA webpage at the Commission's website.

**(Task 7)      Receive Regular Updates on SB 2042 Advisory Panel and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation**

The Committee believes that the work of the SB 2042 Advisory Panel will have significant implications for its work in accreditation. Thus, the Committee was regularly apprised of the progress of the panel throughout the year. The Committee also received reports on the new Pupil Personnel Services Credential standards, the work of the Administrative Services Credential Task Force, the pilot accreditation project (AB 2730 - Mazzoni), the state plan for preparing federally-mandated reports on teacher education programs (Title II), and the implementation of AB 877 related to out-of-state prepared educators.

**(Task 8)      Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission**

The Committee on Accreditation presented its Fifth Annual Accreditation Report to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing at its September 2000 meeting.

The presentation of the Sixth Annual Accreditation Report is scheduled for presentation at the November 2001 Commission meeting.

**(Task 9) Other Required Elements of the *Accreditation Framework* - Election of Co-Chairs, Adopt Meeting Schedule, Orient New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.**

Each year, the Committee elects Co-Chairs, adopts a meeting schedule, orients new members, and modifies its own procedures manual. In August 2000, the Co-Chairs were elected. The 2000-2001 schedule of meetings was adopted in April 2001. The orientation of members selected in July 2001 was conducted the day prior to the August 2001 COA meeting.

### **Section III. Proposed Workplan for the Committee in 2001-2002**

The items that follow represent the key elements of the 2001-2002 workplan for the Committee on Accreditation. As the Committee is fully involved in the implementation phase of the accreditation system, ongoing tasks make up a major part of the work and the oversight of the COA, rather than the development of policies and procedures. The nature of the workplan has gradually shifted in that direction over the past two years.

#### **((Task 1) Monitor the Evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework***

The *Accreditation Framework* calls for an outside evaluator to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the *Framework* over a four-year period beginning with the first official accreditation visits. The contractor was selected in December 1999 and the contract was subsequently approved by the Commission. The COA and Commission staff will be assisting in the gathering of data and monitoring the progress of the evaluation. During the 2001-2002 accreditation cycle, the contractor will continue gathering data, attending Committee on Accreditation meetings and Commission meetings and observing accreditation visits, interviewing accreditation team members, institutional personnel and other participants in the accreditation process. An interim report will be made in Fall 2001. Another report is to be made in the Spring of 2002, with the final report due by December 2002.

#### **(Task 2) Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National Organizations (including NCATE)**

A Partnership Agreement is in effect with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The partnership must be renewed in October, 2001. Current activities related to the application will be finished and a complete application will be prepared before the October renewal date. Follow up activities and rejoinders will be prepared, as necessary to support the application. The COA will implement the provisions of the partnership during the four COA/NCATE merged visits in the 2001-2002 accreditation cycle.

As part of the implementation of the *Accreditation Framework*, the Committee has negotiated formal memoranda of understanding with national professional education organizations over the past three years. These memoranda govern the portion of the *Accreditation Framework* that permits national accreditation of credential programs to substitute for state accreditation. The Committee is required to monitor the ongoing implementation of these agreements and evaluate their effectiveness.

According to the plan for comparability studies of selected national program standards adopted in August 1999 by the COA, studies will be completed in the following credential areas: deaf and hard of hearing, pupil personnel services, and library media services. The COA will review the timelines adopted previously for allowing the use of national accreditation according to the Accreditation Framework. A plan will be developed for reviewing the additional national program standards.

### **(Task 3) Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs**

This is one of the principal ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The Committee has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Some of the decisions are made on the basis of expert review panel recommendations and some are made on the basis of staff recommendations. In all cases, programs are not given initial accreditation until the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's program standards are met.

### **(Task 4) Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and Their Credential Preparation Programs**

This is the principal ongoing task of the Committee on Accreditation. Effective September 1, 1997, the Committee on Accreditation assumed full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of postsecondary education institutions and their credential programs. This task continues to make up the major portion of the March through June agendas of the Committee on Accreditation. During the 2001-2002 year, there will be thirteen accreditation visits to colleges and universities and no accreditation visits to district internship programs. In addition, five visits will be made to Accreditation Pilot Project institutions to provide formative evaluation and prepare a final report on the Project. The following is a list of institutions to be visited.

#### **Institutional Reviews**

Bethany Bible College  
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona  
California State University, Hayward\*  
California State University, San Bernardino\*  
California State University, Stanislaus\*  
Humboldt State University  
Mt. St. Mary's College  
National University  
Stanford University  
University of Redlands  
University of San Diego  
University of San Francisco

University of Southern California  
\* Merged COA/NCATE Visit

**Accreditation Pilot Project Institutions**

Antioch University  
CalState TEACH  
City University  
Nova Southeastern  
University of Phoenix

In addition to the above accreditation visits, the Committee on Accreditation will continue to receive follow-up information from the six institutions/districts that received stipulations in the 2000-2001 accreditation cycle, all of which require re-visits. Actions will be taken to remove stipulations, approve the withdrawal of programs and to change the accreditation status of institutions, based upon the removal of stipulations

**(Task 5) Revise the *Accreditation Handbook* and Team Training Curriculum**

The Committee on Accreditation is committed to continuous improvement in the accreditation process. Each year, the Committee reviews the *Accreditation Handbook* and its training curriculum to ensure that it provides accurate and useful information to its clients. Minor modifications of accreditation procedures are incorporated into the accreditation process and the training curriculum as they occur. The accreditation team training curriculum will be reviewed and revised in the light of the changes in accreditation procedures necessitated by the implementation of the SB 2042 reforms.

**(Task 6) Maintain Public Access to the Committee on Accreditation**

The Committee will continue to seek opportunities to make presentations to professional organizations. Written materials/publications will be developed when possible to carry this task forward. Individual committee members will be available to assist in the process. Regular information about the Committee and its deliberations is posted on the COA webpage at the Commission's website.

**(Task 7) Receive Regular Updates on the Implementation of SB 2042 and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation**

The Committee believes that the implementation of the SB 2042 reforms will have significant implications for its work in accreditation. Thus, regular reports on the topic will be presented. The Committee will also be receiving information about other Commission activities related to accreditation issues.

**Task 8) Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission**

Each year the Committee on Accreditation presents its annual report to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing at its September or October meeting. Interim reports to the Commission will be made as needed.

**(Task 9) Other Required Elements of the Accreditation Framework - Election of Co-Chairs, Adopt Meeting Schedule, Orient New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.**

Each year, the Committee elects Co-Chairs, adopts a meeting schedule, orients new members, and modifies its own procedures manual. In the process of the ongoing accreditation reports and discussions, the Committee conducts an on-going review of the accreditation process. As a result of those discussions, the Committee modifies and adopts accreditation procedures, as necessary.

## Section IV. Analysis of 2000-2001 Accomplishments

The 2000-2001 year was important in the life of the Committee on Accreditation, as seven new members began their service on the Committee. After its first three full years of receiving accreditation team reports and making accreditation decisions (1997-1998, 1998-1999, and 1999-2000), the Committee continued an on-going discussion at a number of its meetings about ways to improve the accreditation decision-making process. The Committee decided to continue, during the 2000-2001 accreditation cycle, a practice initiated during its first year, that of devoting part of each meeting to a de-briefing discussion of the accreditation decision-making process, after action had been taken on each institution or district. The discussions have continued to be very helpful to the Committee in "fine tuning" the accreditation procedures. As a result, the COA has incorporated a number of refinements in the accreditation decision-making process.

The Committee had a successful year in its fourth year of full accreditation decision-making responsibility. In addition to hearing and acting upon thirteen accreditation team reports, the COA made initial accreditation decisions for 77 professional preparation programs, mostly in special education and blended programs of undergraduate teacher preparation and 42 approved responses to the Commission's new technology standard for multiple and single subject programs. The Committee was responsible for conducting a training session for new members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers. A major accomplishment of the year was the preparation activities related to the renewal of the partnership with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). In summary, the Committee on Accreditation has completed its workplan, and looks forward to continuing to exercise its authority as defined in the *Accreditation Framework*. One of the important tasks of the upcoming year will be the orientation of the four new COA members selected by the Commission in July.



# **APPENDIX A**

**Continuing Accreditation Decisions Made by the  
Committee on Accreditation Based Upon  
Institutional Site Visits Conducted  
2000-2001**



# APPENDIX A

## Continuing Accreditation Decisions Made by the Committee on Accreditation Based Upon Institutional Site Visits Conducted 2000-2001

### Introduction

Following is a summary of the continuing accreditation decisions made by the Committee on Accreditation during the 2000-2001 academic year, based upon team site visits. Accreditation visits were conducted for twelve institutions and one district internship program. The accreditation information is presented in two parts as follows:

- Accreditation team report information, including the accreditation team recommendation and the rationale for the recommendation, the team membership, and a summary of the documents reviewed and the interviews conducted.
- Committee on Accreditation action, including the Committee's accreditation decision, a list of credentials for which an institution or district internship program is authorized to recommend its candidates, any stipulations given by the Committee on Accreditation, and the date of the next accreditation visit.

### Azusa Pacific University April 21-25, 2001 (COA/NCATE Merged Accreditation Visit)

#### A. Accreditation Team Report Information

##### Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Technical Stipulations

##### Rationale

The team recommendation for Accreditation with Technical Stipulations was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Report, including documents for each credential program, a review of extensive supporting documentation provided in the documents room, visits to twelve public school sites, six regional centers, and an extensive number of interviews of administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, public school administrators, teachers and field supervisors. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the unit was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards – The Common Standards were assigned specifically to the Common Standards Cluster composed of two COA/BIR members and five NCATE/BOE members, with input requested from each member of the program clusters. Information was compiled from the entire team about each Common Standard, the four NCATE categories (20 standards) and was

presented as a summary finding for review by the entire team. The team voted approval of the findings, and judged that six of the Common Standards were fully met and two were met minimally.

2. Program Standards - Results of the review of all program standards for all credential programs were presented to the entire team by cluster leaders with additional comments from cluster members. Following discussion of each program, the team considered that program standards were either met or met minimally. Then the team discussed in detail each program standard that was less than fully met. There was one program standard met minimally in the pupil personnel services credential area and one program standard not met and one met minimally in the special education credential area.
3. Overall Recommendation – The decision to recommend accreditation with technical stipulations was based on team consensus that all Common Standards were met, but two were met minimally. All program standards were met, with the exception of two standards that were met minimally and one was not met. On the basis of the team findings, the team determined that “Accreditation with Technical Stipulations” was the appropriate recommendation.

### **Team Membership**

**Team Leader:**

**Al Koppes** (Visit Co-Chair)  
Loyola Marymount University

**Common Standards Cluster:**

**Melba Spooner**, Cluster Leader  
(NCATE Chair – Visit Co-Chair)  
University of North Carolina, Charlotte

**Christine Neville** (NCATE)  
Colorado Education Association

**Marilyn Troupe** (NCATE)  
Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board

**David S. Martin** (NCATE)  
Gallaudet University

**Peter C. Murrell** (NCATE)  
Northeastern University

**J. L. Fortson**  
Pepperdine University

**Kimberlee Breen**

West Covina Unified School District

**Basic Credential Cluster:**

**Marilyn Vaughn**, Cluster Leader  
Bethany Bible College

**Phil Romig**  
Elk Grove Unified School District

**Juan Flores**  
California State University, Stanislaus

**Paula Bowers**  
Lake Elsinore Unified School District

**Specialist Credential Cluster:**

**Jane Duckett**, Cluster Leader  
National University

**Nancy Tatum**  
California Department of Education

**Services Credential I:**

**Gene Gallegos**, Cluster Leader  
California State University, Bakersfield

**Steve Van Zant**  
Carlsbad Unified School District

**Janet Minami**  
Los Angeles Unified School District

**Mel Lopez**  
Chapman University

**Services Credential Cluster II:**

**Albert Valencia**, Cluster Leader  
California State University, Fresno

**Mark Fulmer**  
Visalia Unified School District

### Data Sources

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
91	Program Faculty	X	Catalog
29	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
126	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
94	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
37	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook
33	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Survey Results
28	Advisors	X	Needs Analysis Results
38	School Administrators	X	Information Booklet
9	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
23	Advisory Committee	X	Schedule of Classes

**Total Interviews 508**

#### **B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for Azusa Pacific University is **ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS.**

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence of continued efforts to increase the diversity of the faculty in the School of Education and to fill all allocated tenure track positions for the School, particularly in the Departments of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services.
- That the institution continue to review and monitor existing admission practices to ensure that the established practices are being uniformly and consistently administered for all specialist and service credential programs.
- That the institution provide evidence that an emphasis on diversity be extended beyond the specific courses on multiculturalism and exceptionality in the School Counseling and School Psychology Programs.
- That the institution revise the Level 1–Special Education document to adequately describe the current program that is being implemented and to insure that appropriate academic rigor is in evidence in the program.

- That the institution provide evidence that all Level I Track II students (those on Emergency Permits) have a formal directed teaching experience that includes observation and mentoring from district field supervisors.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
    - Preliminary
    - Preliminary Internship
    - Professional
  - Education Specialist Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II
    - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
  - Library Media Teacher Credential
  - Multiple Subject Credential
    - Multiple Subject Internship
  - Single Subject Credential
  - Pupil Personnel Services Credential
    - School Counseling
    - School Psychology
  - Resource Specialist Certificate
2. Azusa Pacific University is required to provide evidence to the Committee on Accreditation regarding actions taken to respond to all technical stipulations noted above within one year of the date of this action through a written report and a re-visit by the Team Leader and Commission Consultant.
  3. In addition:
    - The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
    - Azusa Pacific University is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.

- Azusa Pacific University will be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2005-2006 academic year subject to receiving accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

**California State University, Bakersfield**  
**November 12-15, 2000**  
**(COA/NCATE Merged Accreditation Visit)**

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations**

**Rationale**

The team recommendation was based on a thorough review and analysis of all documents and materials presented to the team, with additional information provided in the form of interviews with campus and field-based personnel and administrators. The team finds a growing program with many strengths and graduates that are effectively prepared for their professional positions. The team also identified several areas of concern.

**Common Standards:**

Common Standards 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8 were judged to have been met. Common Standard 3 was judged to have been met with “Quantitative Concerns” and Standard 6 with “Qualitative Concerns.” The team provides further information in the Common Standards responses for the need for more faculty, an adjustment by current faculty to adjust to new curriculum demands such as preparing students for RICA and integrating technology, and the implementation of workshops which would give uniformity to faculty advice to students concerning all program and credential requirements.

**Program Standards:**

Based on a review of the self-study documents presented, additional information in the form of supporting documentation, interviews with candidates, employers, and graduates, and additional information requested from the School of Education during the visit, the team concluded that all standards have been met for the Multiple Subject Program – CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Internship program with the exception of 1,5, and 7. Concerns for program design, preparation for Multicultural Education, and field experience prior to student teaching were stated in the Common Standards responses

**Team Membership**

**Team Leader:** Lamar Mayer (Visit Co-Chair)  
California State University, Los Angeles

**Common Standards Cluster:** Jan McCarthy, Cluster Leader  
(NCATE Chair –Visit Co-Chair)  
University of South Florida

**Judith Entwife** (NCATE)  
Alaska Department of Education

**Gail Joyner-Fleming** (NCATE)  
South Carolina State University

**Barbara Dew** (NCATE)  
National Education Association

**Joe Schieffer**  
California State University Northridge (Retired)

**Honoruth Finn**  
Tehama County Office of Education (Retired)

**Basic Credential Cluster:**

**JL Fortson**, Cluster Leader  
Pepperdine University

**Doug Robinson**  
Simi Unified School District

**Gloria Guzman Johannessen**  
California Polytechnic State University, Pomona

**Katy Anderson**  
California State University, Chico

**Specialist Credential Cluster:**

**Colleen Stump**, Cluster Leader  
San Francisco State University

**Judy Purvis**  
Sweetwater Union High School District

**Pat Ghiglieri**  
Folsom-Cordova Unified School District

**Services Credential Cluster:**

**Gary Hoban**, Cluster Co-Leader  
National University

**Bill Watkins**, Cluster Co-Leader  
Davis Joint Unified School District (Retired)

### Data Sources

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
116	Program Faculty	X	Catalog
57	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
355	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
72	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
27	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook
54	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Results
42	Advisors	X	Needs Analysis Results
28	School Administrators	X	Information Booklet
2	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
24	Advisory Committee		Schedule of Classes
4	Clerical Staff	X	Advisement Document
		X	Faculty Vitae

**Total Interviews 791**

#### **B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for California State University, Bakersfield is **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS**

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution is required to provide evidence that all standards less than fully met be appropriately addressed within one year of the date of this action.
- That the institution is required to provide evidence of the full implementation of the standards for the Level II Special Education program and appropriate staffing for the moderate/severe credential programs.
- That the institution is required to provide evidence that all internship programs are fully developed and implemented according to the standards.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
  - Preliminary
  - Professional
- Education Specialist Credential
  - Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Internship
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities, Internship
- Health Services/School Nurse Credential
- Multiple Subject Credential
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish) Internship
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
  - School Counseling
- Single Subject Credential
  - CLAD Emphasis
  - CLAD Emphasis Internship

A. A small team will return within one year for a focused re-visit to review the standards that are less than fully met and the continued development and implementation of the programs listed above.

3. In addition:

- The institution's responses to the preconditions is accepted.
- California State University, Bakersfield is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, Bakersfield will be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2005-2006 academic year.

**California State University, Fullerton**  
**November 11-15, 2000**  
**(COA/NCATE Merged Accreditation Visit)**

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation**

**Rationale**

The team used a consensus model to reach all decisions and recommends Accreditation. The team reached this decision after reviewing the Institutional Self Study Report and additional supporting documents available during the visit; and conducting interviews with administrators, faculty, staff, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the unit. The process is described below:

1. Common Standards - The entire team reviewed the findings related to each standard one-by-one, and carefully discussed each standard and then determined that all of the Common Standards were fully met.
2. Program Standards - The Cluster Leaders assisted by the cluster members to provide additional clarification, presented their findings about the program standards. Following their presentation, the team discussed each program area and determined that all program standards were fully met in all program areas.

The team noted some concerns about some of the Common Standards and Program Standards, but concluded that these concerns did not affect the overall quality of the graduates. After the discussion about the standards, the team discussed and reached consensus on the accreditation recommendation, found that the Administrative Services Programs are generally well-regarded in the field. All standards were fully met for the Professional Level program. All standards were met in the Preliminary level program, however four were met minimally with qualitative concerns. The team concluded that these findings did not affect the overall accreditation recommendation.

3. Overall Recommendation - The Team's decision to recommend Accreditation was based on the fact that all Common Standards were fully met. Furthermore, even though some concerns were identified, the team determined that there were numerous compensating strengths both institution-wide and in all program areas and no stipulations should be placed on the institution. The team concluded that all credential programs were strong, effective and of high quality. The team unanimously decided that the overall evidence clearly supported the accreditation recommendation.

## **Team Membership**

### **Team Leader:**

**Vera Lane** (Visit Co-Chair)  
San Francisco State University

### **Common Standards Cluster:**

**Kenneth Moore**, Cluster Leader  
(NCATE Chair, Visit Co-Chair, )  
Eastern New Mexico University

**Barbara Farnandis** (NCATE)  
Chicago State University (Illinois)

**James Sullivan** (NCATE)  
University of Mississippi

**Linda Denmark** (NCATE)  
North Lakeland Elementary School District  
(Florida)

**Robert Monke**  
California State University, Fresno

**Jim Reidt**  
San Juan Unified School District

### **Elementary and Reading Cluster:**

**Charles Zartmen Jr.**, Cluster Leader  
California State University, Chico

**Joel Colbert**  
California State University, Dominguez Hills

**Penny Roberts**  
California State University, Long Beach

**Beth Bythrow**  
Los Angeles Unified School District

### **Secondary and Educational Leadership Cluster:**

**Daniel Elliott**, Cluster Leader  
Azusa Pacific University

**Patricia Sako-Briglio**  
Bassett Unified School District



**Judy Daughtry**  
California State University, Fresno

**Charles Weber**  
Acton-Agua Dulce Unified School District

**Specialist Credential Cluster**     **Linda Smetana**, Cluster Leader  
College of Notre Dame

**Melinda Medina-Levin**  
San Diego Unified School District

**JoAnne Abrassart**  
Murietta Valley Unified School District

**Data Sources**

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
224	Program Faculty	X	University Catalog
68	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
447	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
170	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
53	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbooks
89	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Survey Results
36	Advisors	X	Needs Analysis Results
52	School Administrators	X	Applications and Information
7	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
40	Advisory Committee	X	Schedule of Classes
		X	Advisement Document
		X	Faculty Vitae
		X	Student Portfolios
		X	Recruitment Materials

**Total Interviews 1186**

## **B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for California State University, Fullerton is **ACCREDITATION**.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
  - Preliminary
  - Professional
- Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential
  - Language Speech and Hearing
  - Special Class Authorization
- Early Childhood Specialist Credential
- Education Specialist Credentials - Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship
- Multiple Subject Credential
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish) Internship
- Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential
- Resource Specialist Certificate
- Single Subject Credential

2. In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- California State University, Fullerton is permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, Fullerton will be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2005-2006 academic year.

**California State University, Long Beach**  
**March 31-April 4, 2001**  
**(COA/NCATE Merged Accreditation Visit)**

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation**

**Rationale**

This accreditation visit was a merged visit between the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accreditation process. The merged process provided an opportunity for the team to view the College of Education and its programs using multiple sets of standards with individuals trained to examine programs from both the perspective of state as well as national standards. This allowed for cross-validation of perceptions related to program quality. Both the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and NCATE members of the team functioned as a single unit. The decision for the recommendation of "Accreditation" was a unanimous, single recommendation based upon the following:

1. Common Standards – Seven of the Common Standards were judged to have been fully met. The Common Standard related to advising and assistance to candidates was met minimally with qualitative concerns. Even though efforts have been made by having an advising center available to students and a considerable amount of printed information, some candidates feel they still lack information, are not sure where to locate needed information, or feel the information they receive is not consistent or accurate.
2. Program Standards – All program standards were judged to be fully met with the exception of the three standards described below. However, the team felt that these standards not being fully met did not negatively influence candidates being well prepared to meet their beginning teaching responsibilities.

In both the Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs, Standard 7 was judged to be met minimally with qualitative concerns. In the first semester of the Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs students take a series of pedagogy courses. Each of these courses has an associated fieldwork component. Students report that the field experiences are, in some course sections, not sufficiently defined, especially the observation experiences. There appears to be a need to develop consistent fieldwork experiences that are not redundant across the various pedagogy courses.

In the Preliminary Education Specialist programs, both the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe, Standard 18, Determination of Candidate Competence, are judged to be met minimally with quantitative concerns. This difficulty is that

candidate competence is not documented appropriately. The team found no reason to believe that candidates were not appropriately prepared, but they could not locate the specific documentation of competence assessment.

3. **Overall Recommendation** - The Team's decision to recommend Accreditation was made recognizing that there were deficiencies in four standards (noted above). Furthermore, even though some concerns were identified, the team determined that there were numerous compensating strengths both institution-wide and in all program areas and no stipulations should be placed on the institution. The team concluded that all credential programs were strong, effective and of high quality. The team unanimously decided that the overall evidence clearly supported the accreditation recommendation.

### **Team Membership**

**Team Leader:** **James Richmond** (Visit Co-Chair)  
California State University, Chico

#### **Common Standards Cluster:**

**Jack Maynard**, Cluster Leader  
(NCATE Chair, Visit Co-Chair)  
University of Michigan, Flint

**Christy Levings** (NCATE)  
Olathe District Schools (Kansas)

**Quiping Cao** (NCATE)  
Ohio University, Lancaster

**Thomas K. Fagan** (NCATE)  
University of Memphis (Tennessee)

**Janet Carlton** (NCATE)  
Guthrie Public Schools (Oklahoma)

**Andrea Guillaume**  
California State University, Fullerton

**Dave Baker**  
Azusa Unified School District

#### **Basic Credential Cluster:**

**Lu Chang**, Cluster Leader  
College of Notre Dame

**Alice Bullard**  
Newark Unified School District

**Eileen Oliver**  
California State University

**Chris Hopper**  
Humboldt State University

**William Oudegeest**  
Oakdale Unified School District

**Specialist Credential  
Cluster 1:**

**Sharon Jarret**, Cluster Leader  
Los Angeles Unified School District

**Victoria Graf**  
Loyola Marymount University

**Sharon Rogers**  
Claremont Graduate University

**Services Credential  
Cluster:**

**Marcia Weill**, Cluster Leader  
Folsom-Cordova Unified School District

**Marcel Soriano**  
California State University, Los Angeles

**Hal Bush**  
Vacaville Unified School District (Retired)

**Deanna Bowers**  
San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools

**Specialist Credential  
Cluster II:**

**Phillip Lucero**, Cluster Leader  
Anaheim Union High School District

**Barbara Price**  
Sillers College

**Carolyn Cogan**  
University of California, Santa Barbara

**Norman Lorenz**  
Montessori Learnings Commons

**Karen McVey**

Twentynine Palms High School District

Data Sources

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
248	Program Faculty	X	University Catalog
98	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
566	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
151	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
79	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbooks
106	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Survey Results
64	Advisors	X	Needs Analysis Results
70	School Administrators	X	Information Booklets
12	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
96	Advisory Committee	X	Schedule of Classes
		X	Advisement Documents
		X	Faculty Vitae
		X	Student Portfolios
		X	Action Research Projects
		X	Survey Forms

**Total Interviews 1490**

**B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for California State University, Long Beach is ACCREDITATION

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Adapted Physical Education Credential
- Administrative Services Credential  
Preliminary  
Professional
- Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential  
Adult Education  
Vocational Education  
Special Subjects (Except for Driver Education and Training)  
Supervision and Coordination

- Early Childhood Specialist Credential
- Education Specialist Credentials
  - Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship
- Health Services (School Nurse) Credential
- Library Media Teacher Credential
- Multiple Subject Credential
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Vietnamese, Chinese, Korean, Spanish)
  - Middle Level Emphasis
  - Multiple Subject Internship
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
  - School Counseling
  - School Psychology
  - School Social Work
  - Child Welfare and Attendance Specialization
- Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential
  - Reading Certificate
  - Reading and Language Arts Specialist
- Resource Specialist Certificate
- Single Subject Credential
  - Single Subject Credential
  - Single Subject Internship

2. In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted with the exception of Interim Precondition #2. The institution must provide evidence of compliance with the limitation on student teaching prerequisites within one year of the date of this action.
- California State University, Long Beach is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.

- California State University, Long Beach is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2005-2006 academic year subject to achieving accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

## **Claremont Graduate University** **March 4-7, 2001**

### **A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

#### **Team Recommendation: Accreditation**

##### **Rationale**

The overall quality of the program and of the candidates and graduates of the program at Claremont Graduate University is judged to be outstanding. This judgement is based on findings identified through examination of the institutional self study; interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, university administrators and staff, faculty associates (university supervisors), district cooperating teachers and mentors (district field supervisors), school administrators/employers, and advisory committee members; and examination of the university catalog, advisement materials, and other program documents provided by the institution.

The team decision to recommend accreditation was based on the following:

Common Standards – Two Common Standards were judged to be Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns: Common Standard 4 - Evaluation and Common Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors. Documentation revealed lack of systematic processes for the collection of data from all participants regarding all aspects of the program and lack of consistency in systematic reporting and use of data collected. Documentation also revealed lack of systematic attention to the selection, training, support, and evaluation of district field supervisors.

Program Standards - Findings about program standards were presented to the team by the Cluster Leaders, assisted by the Cluster members (for additional clarification). Following their presentation, the team discussed each program area and determined that all program standards were met.

Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that all Common Standards were met, with two having been met minimally. The team determined that the areas of concern are mitigated by the overall high quality of the institution and the candidates. Employers were

overwhelmingly enthusiastic regarding the preparation and success of Claremont Graduate University

graduates and the institution is held in extremely high regard within the educational community of this region and beyond. In addition, the institution was honest and forthcoming about these concerns during the visit and shared plans already being implemented in these two areas. The changes underway were confirmed in interviews with recently admitted and continuing candidates, and through evidence in the documents room. The responsiveness and integrity of program directors, in particular, and the preponderance of the evidence led the team to its conclusion.

### **Team Membership**

**Team Leader:**

**Judith Greig**  
College of Notre Dame

**Common Standards:**

**Judith Greig**  
College of Notre Dame

**Nancy S. Brownell**  
Institute for Education Reform  
California State University

**Basic Credential Cluster:**

**John Yoder**, Cluster Leader  
Fresno Pacific University

**Janet Bonney**  
Sweetwater Union High School District

**Barbara Black**  
San Juan Unified School District

**Administrative Services  
Standards:**

**Nancy S. Brownell**  
Institute for Education Reform  
California State University

**Data Sources**

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
34	Program Faculty	X	Catalog
21	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
64	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
33	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
16	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook
16	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Survey Results
15	Advisors	X	Institutional Web Page
36	School Administrators	X	Information Booklet
2	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
16	Advisory Committee	X	Schedule of Classes
2	Program Directors	X	Advisement Documents
		X	Faculty Vitae
		X	Candidate Portfolios

**Total Interviews 255**

**B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for Claremont Graduate University is **ACCREDITATION**

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential  
Professional
- Multiple Subject Credential  
CLAD Emphasis Internship
- Single Subject Credential  
CLAD Emphasis Internship

2. In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.

- Claremont Graduate University is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Claremont Graduate University will be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006-2007 academic year.

## Compton Unified School District April 9-11, 2001

### A. Accreditation Team Report Information

#### **Team Recommendation: Accreditation with a Technical Stipulation**

##### **Rationale**

The team recommendation for Accreditation with a Technical Stipulation was the result of a review of the Self Study Report, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the district.

Based on the review and analysis of all documents, materials, and interviews, the team found a growing program with many strengths and graduates that are effectively prepared for their professional positions. The team also identified several areas for improvement.

The recommendation pertaining to the accreditation status of the district was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards – All standards in the program were met. However, Standard 6 was minimally met with Quantitative Concerns. Standards 15, 25 and 26 were minimally met with Qualitative Concerns.
2. Program Standards – The team determined that all program standards were met in all program areas.
3. Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend Accreditation with a Technical Stipulation was, in part, based on team consensus that all Common Standards were met. Although some program standards were judged to have been met minimally with qualitative concerns, and Standard 6 was met minimally with quantitative concerns, there was consensus among the team members that all four standards that are less than fully met can be corrected based on documentation. .

**Team Membership**

**Team Leader:** Mary H. Lewis  
Los Angeles Unified School District

**Team Member:** Michele Britton Bass  
Antioch University

**Data Sources**

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
5	Program Faculty	X	Institutional Self Study
11	Institutional Administration	X	Course Syllabi
37	Candidates	X	Candidate Files
15	Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook
8	Employers of Graduates	X	Information Booklet
10	Supervising Practitioners	X	Field Experience Notebook
9	School Administrators	X	Schedule of Classes
2	Credential Analyst	X	Advisement Documents
1	Advisory Committee	X	Faculty Vitae

**Total Interviews 98**

**B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for Compton Unified School District is **ACCREDITATION WITH A TECHNICAL STIPULATION**

Following is the stipulation:

- That the district provide evidence that all standards not fully met have been satisfactorily addressed. The district has one year to provide documentation that modifications have been made in the four less than fully met standards.

On the basis of this decision, the district is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credential:

- Multiple Subject Internship Credential
2. The Compton Unified School District is required to provide evidence of the actions taken to respond to all of the stipulations within one year of the date of this action, to be verified by a team re-visit (including both members of the team).
  3. In addition:
    - The agency's response to the preconditions is accepted.
    - The Compton Unified School District is permitted to propose new district internship credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
    - The Compton Unified School District will be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006-2007 academic year.

**Hope International University**  
**April 1-4, 2000**

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations**

**Rationale**

The team unanimously recommends Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations based on findings which reveal deficiencies as listed in this report. The findings were identified by reviewing the self-study report, program documents, advisement materials, the university catalog, and interviewing candidates, graduates, full and part-time faculty, university staff coordinators, institutional administrators, K-12 site supervisors, teachers and administrators.

**Team Membership**

**Team Leader:**     **Jean Conroy**  
California Sate University, Long Beach

**Team Members:**   **Barbara Morton**  
Concordia University

**Rodger Cryer**  
Franklin McKinley School District (Retired)

**Data Sources**

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
8	Program Faculty	X	Catalog and Addendum
11	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
41	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
26	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
9	Employers of Graduates	X	Budgetary Information
21	Supervising Practitioners	X	Information Booklet
1	Advisor	X	Field Experience Notebook
5	School Administrators	X	Schedule of Classes
1	Credential Analyst	X	Advisement Documents
5	Field Supervisors	X	Faculty Vitae
		X	Textbooks
		X	Candidate Credential Files
		X	Student Teacher Portfolios
		X	WASC Self Study Report

**Total Interviews 128**

**B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for Hope International University is **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS**

Following are the stipulations:

- That the Institution provide evidence of the development and maintenance of complete, accurate and up-to-date databases of program completers, current students including student teachers, and master teachers.
- That the Institution provide evidence that a comprehensive evaluation of the program by program participants, practitioners, graduates and community members has been established and implemented and that the evaluation results are utilized in on-going programmatic modifications.

- That the institution provide evidence of implementation of a substantive process to meet all standards that are less than fully met.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Multiple Subject Credential  
CLAD Emphasis
  - Single Subject Credential  
CLAD Emphasis
2. Hope International University is required to provide evidence to the Committee on Accreditation that appropriate actions have been taken to address each of these stipulations within one year from that date of this action. A focused revisit by the Team Leader and staff Consultant will verify the appropriateness of the institution's actions. Additionally, the university is to work closely with the Team Leader and Consultant in meeting all timelines and COA regulations in preparation for the focused revisit.
3. In addition:
- The institution's responses to the preconditions are accepted with the exception of General Precondition 9 related to CBEST verification. The institution must provide written evidence of full implementation of General Precondition 9 to the staff Consultant by July 1, 2001.
  - Hope International University is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
  - Hope International University is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006-2007 academic year.

**La Sierra University**  
**April 22-25, 2001**

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation**

## **Rationale**

The team recommendation for Accreditation was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Report, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with La Sierra University. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards - The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by-one and then voted upon by the entire team. Seven standards were judged to have been fully met, and Common Standard Two was judged to have been Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns.
2. Program Standards – Findings about program standards were presented to the team by the Cluster Leaders, assisted by the Cluster members (for additional clarification). Following their presentation, the team discussed each program area and determined that all program standards were met in all program areas.
3. Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend Accreditation was based, in part, on team consensus that all Common Standards were Met although one was Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns. Compensating strengths include leadership and attention to programs that prepare educators who are competent, caring, and effective. The team further determined that there were numerous compensating strengths in the School of Education and that a stipulation should not be placed on the institution. Strengths include consistent reports of the knowledge and dedication of faculty, their commitment to students, outreach to schools in their service area, and programs that effectively blend theory and practice. The team concluded that all credential programs are effective and generally of high quality. Although the team identified some areas of concern in this report, the overall quality of the programs is good. Therefore, the team decided that the overall evidence supports the above accreditation recommendation.

## **Team Membership**

**Team Leader:** **Marilyn Draheim**  
University of the Pacific

**Common Standards Cluster:** **Jo Birdsell, Cluster Leader**  
Point Loma Nazarene University

**Basic Credential Cluster:** **Sally Botzler, Cluster Leader**  
Humboldt State University

**Lanna Andrews**  
University of San Francisco

**Don Grimes**  
Grant Union High School District

**Services Cluster:** **Ken Engstrom**, Cluster Leader  
Fresno Pacific University

**Christy Reinold**  
Lodi Unified School District

**Data Sources**

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
46	Program Faculty	X	University Catalog
10	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
96	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
36	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
39	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbooks
22	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Survey Results
25	Advisors	X	Needs Analysis Results
41	School Administrators	X	Budgetary Information
7	Credential Analyst	X	Information Booklets
21	Advisory Committee	X	Field Experience Notebooks
		X	Schedule of Classes
		X	Advisement Documents
		X	Faculty Vitae

**Total Interviews 343**

**B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The accreditation decision for La Sierra University is **ACCREDITATION**

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Multiple Subject Credential
- Single Subject Credential
- Administrative Services Credential
  - Preliminary
  - Professional
- Pupil Personnel Services
  - School Counseling
  - School Psychology

2. In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- La Sierra University is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- La Sierra University will be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006-2007 academic year.

## **New College of California May 7-9, 2001**

### **A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

#### **Team Recommendation: Accreditation With Substantive Stipulations**

##### **Rationale**

The team recommendation for Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations was based on the review of the New College Self Study Report, additional supporting documents, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the institution.

1. Common Standards – Six of the eight Common Standards were met. Standard 2 (Resources) was met minimally with some quantitative concerns having to do with inadequate library services and technology. Standard 8 (District Field Supervisors) was not met.

2. Program Standards - Findings about program standards were discussed and it was determined that all of the Program Standards were met except Program Standard 8 – Advancement to Daily Student Teaching Responsibilities.
  
3. Overall Recommendation - The team consensus was that six of the eight Common Standards were met and twenty of the twenty-one Program Standards were met. The team further determined that there were numerous strengths in the program of New College of California. There were consistent reports from employers that graduates were well prepared, competent, and effective in their classroom and schools. Although the team identified some areas of concern in this report, it concluded that overall the credential program was of high quality. Therefore, the team reached the decision that the evidence gathered clearly supported the above accreditation recommendation.

**Team Membership**

**Team Leader:** **Victoria (Tory) Courtney**  
Saint Mary’s College of California

**Team Member:** **Magdalena Ruz Gonzalez**  
San Bernardino County Office  
Superintendent of Schools

**Data Sources**

<b>INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED</b>		<b>DOCUMENTS REVIEWED</b>	
<b>10</b>	Program Faculty	<b>X</b>	Catalog
<b>9</b>	Institution Administration	<b>X</b>	Institutional Self Study
<b>14</b>	Candidates	<b>X</b>	Course Syllabi
<b>22</b>	Graduates	<b>X</b>	Candidate Files
<b>4</b>	Employers of Graduates	<b>X</b>	Fieldwork Handbooks
<b>7</b>	Supervising Practitioners	<b>X</b>	Follow-up Survey Results
<b>6</b>	Advisors	<b>X</b>	Needs Analysis Results
<b>2</b>	School Administrators	<b>X</b>	Information Booklet
<b>1</b>	Credential Analyst	<b>X</b>	Field Experience Notebook
<b>4</b>	Advisory Committee	<b>X</b>	Schedule of Classes
		<b>X</b>	Advisement Documents

		X	Faculty Vitae
--	--	---	---------------

Total Interviews 79

**B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for New College of California is **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS** .

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of selection procedures for district field supervisors assuring proper qualifications and experience, implementation of an appropriate training program to prepare district field supervisors for their role, and development of new procedures to assure that all candidates enrolled in student teaching have an assigned district field supervisor.
- That the institution provide evidence that all candidates who are advanced to daily student teaching have demonstrated proficiency in subject matter competence per the Commission’s standards.
- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a plan to provide access to sufficient educational resources, including professional books, journals, and a computer lab with capacity for instructional purposes.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credential:

- Multiple Subject Credential  
CLAD BCLAD (Spanish/Cantonese) Emphasis
2. New College of California is required to provide evidence about the actions taken to respond to all of the stipulations noted above within one year of the date of this action, to be verified with a revisit by Commission staff and the Accreditation Team Leader.
  3. In addition:
    - The institution’s response to the preconditions is accepted.
    - The New College of California is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.

- The New College of California will be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006–2007 academic year.

**Pacific Oaks College**  
**May 6 – May 9, 2001**

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations**

**Rationale**

The unanimous recommendation of the accreditation team was based on a thorough review of the self-study documentation presented to the team, additional information in the form of exhibits, extensive interviews with campus and field based personnel, and additional information requested from administrators during the visit. The team felt it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgements about the institution. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards: Three of the Common Standards were Met Minimally (Standards 2, 3 and 6) while two of the Common Standards were not met at all (Standard 1 and Standard 4).
2. Program Standards: The team concluded that all credential program standards were met, however some were only met minimally and thus the programs were only partially effective. The Multiple Subjects program had three minimally met standards and the Education Specialist programs had substantial weaknesses in program design and curriculum.
3. Overall Recommendation: As reflected in the report, there are numerous examples of excellence in program design and delivery, however, Pacific Oaks needs to assure excellence across all programs areas. The team decided that the overall evidence clearly supported the Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations recommendation.

**Team Membership**

**Team Leader:**

**Jesus Cortez**  
California State University, Chico

**Basic Credential  
Cluster:**

**Pamela Bailis**  
University of California, Los Angeles

**Cynthia Fernandes**

Acton Aqua Dulce Unified School District

**Specialist Credential  
Cluster:**

**Satoko Davidson**  
Vallejo Unified School District

**Theresa Davis**  
California State University, Chico

Data Sources

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
21	Program Faculty	X	University Catalog
11	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
73	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
20	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
5	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbooks
15	Supervising Practitioners	X	Graduate Survey Results
11	Advisors	X	Information Booklets
6	School Administrators	X	Schedule of Classes
1	Credential Analyst	X	Faculty Vitae
		X	Supervision/Candidate Observation Forms
		X	University Publications
		X	Program Flyers
		X	Textbooks
		X	Advisory Committee Minutes
		X	Student Work Samples
		X	Grant Applications and Information
		X	Field Experience Notebooks
		X	Advisement Documents
		X	Demographic Profiles of Schools
		X	District Agreements/Contract with College

**Total Interviews 163**

## **B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

### **1. The decision for Pacific Oaks College is ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS**

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence of leadership which acts as an advocate for credential programs within the college, education profession, and the community.
- That the institution provide evidence that each credential program within the college receives an equitable allocation of resources in relation to the student population it is required to serve. The resources must enable each program to effectively operate in terms of coordination, recruitment, advisement, program development and instruction.
- That the institution provide evidence of substantive process (including an action plan and timeline) toward implementation of the necessary infrastructure and the purchase of hardware and software to provide appropriate faculty and student access to electronic sources of data.
- That the institution provide evidence of a comprehensive system of selection, training, and evaluation of the field supervisors/cooperating teachers who supervise in all credential areas. The training should include information about the credential program for which supervision is given, such as program philosophy and design, and how the courses in the program relate to field work.
- The institution provide evidence that all the CLAD/BCLAD content specifications be included in the curriculum of the program. These content areas are:
  - Language Structure and First – and Second – Language Development
  - Methodology of Bilingual, English Language Development, and Content Instruction
  - Culture and Cultural Diversity
  - Methodology for Primary Language Instruction
  - The Culture of Emphasis

Special attention should be given to Methodology for Primary Language Instruction and the Culture of Emphasis (Spanish Culture) or the BCLAD portion of the program should be withdrawn from the program.

- The institution either redesign the Education Specialist Credential Programs to include a core of special education classes that adequately addresses the standards found in the Commission on Teacher Credentialing *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Education Specialist Credential Programs (including Internship Options) and Clinical Rehabilitation Services Programs*, or withdraw the programs.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Multiple Subject Credential  
Multiple Subject Internship  
CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis
  - Education Specialist Credential Level I  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities  
Early Childhood Special Education
2. Pacific Oaks College is required to provide written to the Commission staff and the accreditation team regarding actions taken to respond to all of the stipulations noted above within one year of the date of this action, to be verified by a team re-visit.
  3. In addition:
    - The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
    - Pacific Oaks College is not permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation until the stipulations are removed.
    - Pacific Oaks College is required to notify the students in the Education Specialist Programs and the BCLAD emphasis program of the accreditation status of the institution.
    - The institution is required to provide a written progress report to the Committee on Accreditation by December 31, 2001, describing steps taken to remove stipulations.

- Pacific Oaks College will not be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits until after the Committee on Accreditation acts upon the results of the re-visit.

**University of California, Davis**  
**May 6-9, 2001**

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation**

**Rationale**

The overall quality of programs at University of California, Davis (UCD) is high in the judgement of the team based on it's findings. The findings were identified through interviews with candidates, graduates, ladder and clinical faculty, university administrators and staff, university supervisors, university field supervisors, coordinators, cooperating teachers, school administrators and employers; program documents; advisement materials; university catalog, and other documents

The recommendation pertaining to the accreditation status of University of California, Davis was based on the following:

1. Common Standards – The team judged that seven Common Standards were fully met and one Common Standard was Minimally Met with Qualitative Concerns.
2. Program Standards – Findings about program standards were discussed regarding each program area and determined that all program standards were met in all program areas; however some were not fully met in relation to the UCD/CSUS Collaborative Program. The team discussed in detail each program standard that was less than fully met. In the UCD/CSUS Collaborative Program, Standards 4a and 10 were Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns.

After discussion about the standards for each credential program, the team discussed and then voted on the accreditation recommendation.

3. Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend accreditation was based on team consensus that all while there are some areas of concern in regard to Common and Program Standards, on balance, these are mitigated by the overall high quality of the institution, and compensating strengths within these credential programs when all sources of evidence are considered.

**Team Membership**

**Team Leader:**

**Jon Snyder**  
University of California, Santa Barbara

**Common Standards :**                      **Jon Snyder**  
University of California, Santa Barbara

**Beverly Young**  
The California State University Chancellor’s Office

**Basic Credentials:**                      **Clara Chapala**  
California Department of Education

**Cheryl Getz**  
University of San Diego

**Robert O’Connor**  
ABC Unified School District, Retired

**Specialist Credential:**                      **Carol Adams**  
Lompoc Unified School District

**Data Sources**

<b>_INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED</b>		<b>DOCUMENTS REVIEWED</b>	
<b>39</b>	Program Faculty	<b>X</b>	Catalog
<b>10</b>	Institution Administration	<b>X</b>	Program Documents
<b>62</b>	Candidates	<b>X</b>	Course Syllabi
<b>30</b>	Graduates	<b>X</b>	Candidate Files
<b>7</b>	Employers of Graduates	<b>X</b>	Fieldwork Handbooks
<b>19</b>	Supervising Practitioners	<b>X</b>	Follow-up Survey Results
<b>5</b>	Advisors	<b>X</b>	Budgets
<b>9</b>	School Administrators	<b>X</b>	Information Booklet
<b>3</b>	Credential Analysts	<b>X</b>	Field Experience Notebook
<b>9</b>	Advisory Committee	<b>X</b>	Candidate Portfolios
<b>2</b>	Other Staff	<b>X</b>	Faculty Publications
		<b>X</b>	Web Site
		<b>X</b>	Faculty Vitae

**Total Interviews 195**

## **B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for the University of California, Davis and all of its credential programs is **ACCREDITATION**

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Multiple Subject Credential  
Multiple Subject Internship  
CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
  - Reading Certificate
  - Single Subject Credential  
Single Subject Internship  
Single Subject CLAD Emphasis
2. In addition:
    - The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
    - University of California, Davis is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
    - University of California, Davis is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006-2007 academic year.

## **University of California, Irvine May 6-9, 2001**

### **A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

#### **Team Recommendation: Accreditation**

##### **Rationale**

The unanimous recommendation of the accreditation team for Accreditation was based on a thorough review of the self study documents prepared by the university, and additional documentation provided to the team on request. The team conducted an extensive number of interviews with campus and field based personnel and conducted field visits to eight schools sites to conduct interviews with candidates, site administrators, adjunct faculty, graduates, field supervisors and

University Associates. The team obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to the high degree of

confidence in making overall and programmatic judgement about the UCI Department of Education Credential Programs.

1. Common Standards - The team found that all Common Standards were met fully. The educational leadership for the Credential Programs was strong. Resources for the program were sufficient to support quality programs and the qualifications, scholarship and instruction by the faculty is exceptional. The admissions of, advice and assistance for candidates is more than adequate for the professional programs.
2. Program Standards – Candidates who complete the professional credential programs, preliminary and professional administrative, multiple and single subject, CLAD/BCLAD, and Internship Programs, are judged to be well prepared. The team found that, in all program areas, the course offerings are strong, the teaching is effective, course material is current and that the programs address the real world needs of the public schools in the communities served by the university. Research findings are presented in the courses that are “cutting edge”. Technology is infused in the course work of all professional credential programs and resources are available to ensure adequate support for the programs. The fieldwork, internship and student teaching experiences are extensive. Graduates of the various credential programs are desired and in many cases preferred for employment in the many districts in the service area of the university. The team found that the vast majority of the standards are fully met but also found elements of the following standards to be less than fully met. Two standards are met minimally in the Preliminary Administrative Services program and one standard is met minimally in the Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Program, Standard 6, Program Evaluation and Development. The two Preliminary Standards are Standard 18, Collaboration with Educational Agencies, and Standard 31, Determination of Candidate Competence.

### **Team Membership**

<b>Team Leader:</b>	<b>Irving G. Hendrick</b> University of California, Riverside
<b>Common Standards:</b>	<b>Grace E. Grant</b> , Cluster Leader Dominican University of California
<b>Basic Credential Cluster:</b>	<b>Reyes L. Quesada</b> , Cluster Leader University of San Diego
	<b>Mary A. Humphreys</b> Buena Park School District

**Services Cluster:**  
(Preliminary  
Professional  
Administration)

**Cameron M. McCune**  
Walnut Valley Unified School District

**Mary K. McCullough**, Cluster Leader  
Loyola Marymount University

**Douglas D. Smith**  
Grossmont Union High School District

Data Sources

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
68	Program Faculty	X	University Catalog
32	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
45	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
45	Graduates	X	Textbooks
20	Employers of Graduates	X	Candidate Files
36	Supervising Practitioners	X	Student Handbooks: Fieldwork, Intern
23	Advisors	X	Follow up Survey Results
27	School Administrators	X	UCI Intern Council Minutes
6	Credential Analysts	X	Profiles - Professional Development Schools
8	Advisory Committee	X	Student Portfolios
5	Employers of Interns	X	Needs Analysis Results
		X	Field Experience Notebooks
		X	Schedule of Classes
		X	Advisement Documents
		X	Faculty Vitae
		X	Intern, PDS, UA Dialogue Meeting Minutes
		X	Mentoring Agreements
		X	District Agreements or Contracts with University

**Total Interviews 315**

**B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for University of California, Irvine is **ACCREDITATION**

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Administrative Service Credential
  - Preliminary
  - Professional
- Multiple Subject Credential
  - Multiple Subject Internship
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
- Single Subject Credential
  - Single Subject Internship
  - Single Subject CLAD Emphasis

2. In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- The University of California, Irvine is permitted to propose new credential programs for initial accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- The University of California, Irvine will be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006-2007 academic year.

**University of California, San Diego**  
**April 29-May 2, 2001**

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation**

**Rationale**

The team used a consensus model to reach all decisions and recommends Accreditation. The team reached this decision after reviewing the Institutional Self-Study Report and additional supporting documents available during the visit; and conducting interviews with administrators, faculty, staff, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the unit. This decision was based on the following:

- Common Standards - The entire team reviewed each standard one-by-one and determined that all of the Common Standards were fully met.

- Program Standards - The Team Leader was assisted by team members to provide additional clarification as they presented their findings about the program standards. Following their presentation, the team discussed each program and determined that all program standards were met in all areas.
- Overall Recommendation - The team's decision to recommend Accreditation, was in part, based on the fact that all Common Standards were fully met. The team concluded that all credential programs were strong, effective and generally of high quality. Therefore, the team decided that the overall evidence clearly supported the accreditation recommendation.

### Team Membership

**Team Leader:**

**Athena Waite**  
University of California, Riverside

**Basic Credential Cluster:**

**Greg Kaiser**  
Azusa Pacific University

**Blanca Gibbons**  
Placentia Yorba Linda Unified School District

**Rajendra Prasad,**  
San Mateo Foster City Unified School District

**Willa Ramsay**  
San Diego Unified School District

**Specialist Credential:  
(Experimental DHH)**

**Kathryn Burns-Jepson**  
Fremont Unified School District

Data Sources

<u>INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED</u>		<u>DOCUMENTS REVIEWED</u>	
37	Program Faculty	X	University Catalog
21	Institution Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
188	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
42	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
22	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook
41	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Survey Results
9	Advisors	X	Needs Analysis Results
10	School Administrators	X	University Publications
6	Credential Analysts	X	Field Experience Notebook
22	Advisory Committee	X	Program Flyers
		X	Textbooks
		X	Advisory Committee Minutes
		X	Student Work Samples

**Total Interviews 398**

**B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for University of California, San Diego is **ACCREDITATION**

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Multiple Subject Credential
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Internship
- Single Subject Credential
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
  - CLAD/BCLAD Internship
- Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing
  - BCLAD Emphasis (American Sign Language-English)

2. In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- The University of California, San Diego is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- The University of California, San Diego will be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006-2007 academic year.

## **APPENDIX B**

**Initial Program Accreditation Actions Taken by  
the Committee on Accreditation  
2000-2001**



# APPENDIX B

## Initial Program Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation – 1999-2000

### Introduction

Following is a summary of the initial program accreditation actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation during the 2000-2001 academic year. For each program area, the institutions are listed in alphabetical order. For each of the institutions, the specific programs accredited are named in each listing.

### Initial Accreditation Based Upon Panel Review

The Committee on Accreditation granted initial accreditation to the following preparation programs, based upon the recommendations of the appropriate review panels. Each of the institutions listed responded fully and appropriately to the adopted standards and preconditions by preparing a program proposal that described how each standard and precondition was met and that included appropriate supporting evidence. The program proposals were read by the appropriate review panels following the procedures adopted by the Committee on Accreditation. The programs were judged to meet all standards and preconditions.

#### A. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Education Specialist Credential and Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential

Azusa Pacific University  
Professional Level II  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities

California State University, Bakersfield  
Preliminary Level I  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship

California State University, Monterey Bay  
Preliminary Level I  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities

College of Notre Dame  
Preliminary Level I  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship

Fresno Pacific University  
Professional Level II  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities

Humboldt State University  
Professional Level II  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Loyola Marymount and Mount St. Mary's College (Joint Program)  
Professional Level II  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Mills College  
Professional Level II  
Early Childhood Special Education

National University  
Professional Level II  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities

San Diego State University  
Professional Level II  
Deaf and Hard of Hearing

San Francisco State University  
Professional Level I  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship

San Jose State University  
Preliminary Level I  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship  
Professional Level II  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Sonoma State University  
Professional Level I  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship

University of La Verne  
Professional Level I  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities

University of San Diego

Preliminary Level I

Early Childhood Special Education

Early Childhood Special Education Internship

Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship

Moderate/Severe Disabilities

Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship

Professional Level II

Early Childhood Special Education

Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Moderate/Severe Disabilities

Early Childhood Special Education Certificate

**B. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Adapted Physical Education Credential**

Sonoma State University

**C. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential**

Reading Certificate

California State University, Bakersfield

California State University, Los Angeles

California State University, San Marcos

California State University, Stanislaus

Loyola Marymount University

St. Mary's College of California

San Diego State University

Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

California State University, Bakersfield

California State University, Los Angeles

California State University, San Marcos

California State University, Stanislaus

St. Mary's College of California

San Diego State University

**D. Approved Responses to Standard 20.5 – Use of Computer Based Technology in the Classroom for the Multiple and Single Subject Credential**

California State University

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona  
California State University, Bakersfield  
California State University, Chico  
California State University, Dominguez Hills  
California State University, Fresno  
California State University, Fullerton  
California State University, Hayward  
California State University, Long Beach  
California State University, Northridge  
California State University, San Bernardino  
California State University, San Marcos  
California State University, Stanislaus  
Humboldt State University (Multiple Subject only)  
San Diego State University  
San Francisco State University

University of California

University of California, Irvine  
University of California, Riverside (on campus program)  
University of California, San Diego  
University of California, Santa Barbara

Independent Colleges and Universities

Azusa Pacific University  
Bethany College of the Assemblies of God  
California Baptist College  
California Lutheran University  
Chapman University  
College of Notre Dame  
Concordia University  
John F. Kennedy University  
La Sierra University  
Loyola Marymount University  
Mills College  
Mount St. Mary's College  
National University  
Occidental College  
Pacific Oaks College  
Patten College  
Pepperdine University

St. Mary's College of California  
United States International University  
University of the Pacific  
University of Redlands  
Westmont College  
Whittier College

**E. Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation**

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo  
Multiple Subject

California State University, Chico  
Multiple Subject

California State University, Fresno  
Multiple Subject

California State University, Hayward  
Multiple Subject  
Liberal Studies

California State University, Los Angeles  
Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate

California State University, Northridge  
Multiple Subject, CLAD Emphasis  
Single Subject, English  
Single Subject, Math  
Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate

California State University, Sacramento  
Single Subject, Math  
Multiple Subject

California State University, San Bernardino  
Multiple Subject /CLAD Emphasis

Humboldt State University  
Multiple Subject

San Diego State University  
Multiple Subject

San Francisco State University

## Multiple Subject CLAD Emphasis

Stanford University  
Single Subject English

University of California, Berkeley  
Single Subject, Math

### **Initial Accreditation Based Upon Staff Review**

The Committee on Accreditation granted initial accreditation to the following preparation programs, based upon the recommendations of the Commission consultants. Each of the institutions listed responded fully and appropriately to the adopted standards and preconditions by preparing a program proposal that described how each standard and precondition was met and that included appropriate supporting evidence. The program proposals were read by the appropriate consultant following the procedures adopted by the Committee on Accreditation. The programs were judged to meet all standards and preconditions.

**A. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Multiple and Single Subject Credentials**

Alliant University  
Multiple Subject: CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish/Hmong )Emphasis

California State University, Bakersfield  
Single Subject Internship

Humboldt State University  
Single Subject CLAD Emphasis

InterAmerican College  
Multiple Subject CLAD /BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis  
Single Subject CLAD /BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis

La Sierra University  
Multiple Subject CLAD Emphasis  
Single Subject CLAD Emphasis

**B. Programs of Preparation for the Administrative Services Credential**

University of California, Berkeley  
Preliminary

University of California, Los Angeles  
Preliminary

California State University, San Marcos  
Professional

Whittier College  
Preliminary Internship

**C. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Library Media Teacher**

Azusa Pacific University

**D. Programs of Preparation for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential**

California Lutheran University  
School Counselor with Specialization in Child Welfare and Attendance,  
Internship

**E. Experimental Program of Professional Preparation for the Multiple Subject  
BCLAD Certificate by Coursework**

San Diego State University

# **APPENDIX C**

## **Additional Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation 2000-2001**



## **APPENDIX C**

### **Additional Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation – 1999-2000**

#### **Introduction**

Following is a summary of other accreditation actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation during the 2000-2001 academic year. Actions include the withdrawal of programs, removal of accreditation stipulations and changing of accreditation status.

#### **A. Withdrawal of Professional Preparation Programs**

In October 2000, the Committee approved the voluntary withdrawal of the Professional Preparation Programs for the Agricultural Specialist and Physical Education Specialist Credentials at the **University of California, Davis**.

In January 2001, the Committee approved the voluntary withdrawal of the Program of Professional Preparation for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counselor Credential at **California State University, Hayward**.

In January 2001, the Committee approved the voluntary withdrawal of the Program of Professional Preparation for the Multiple Subject BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis Credential at the **Ontario-Montclair School District**.

All three of these programs no longer accept candidates and the programs are not included in any continuing accreditation visits. A withdrawn program may be re-accredited only when the institution submits a new proposal for initial accreditation according to the policies of the Committee on Accreditation. From the date in which candidates were no longer admitted to the program the institution must wait at least two years before requesting re-accreditation of the program.

#### **B. Removal of Accreditation Stipulations and Change of Institutional Accreditation Status**

In August 2000, The Committee voted to remove the technical stipulation placed on **San Francisco State University** on the basis of information submitted by the institution and to change the accreditation status from "Accreditation with a Technical Stipulation" to "Accreditation".

In October 2000, the Committee voted to remove the technical stipulation placed on the **University of California, Berkeley** on the basis of information submitted by the institution and to change the accreditation status of the University of California, Berkeley from "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations" to "Accreditation."

In January 2001, the Committee voted to remove the three stipulations placed upon the **Ontario-Montclair School District** based on information submitted by the district and to change the accreditation status of the Ontario-Montclair District Internship Program from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Accreditation".

March 2001, the committee voted to remove the stipulations placed on **California Lutheran University**, based upon the Accreditation Re-Visit Team Report, team recommendations and staff recommendations. The Committee also voted to change the accreditation status of California Lutheran University from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Accreditation".

In March 2001, the Committee voted to remove the technical stipulations placed upon **Concordia University** on the basis of the evaluation of the institutional response to the stipulations. The Committee also voted to change the accreditation status of Concordia University from "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations" to "Accreditation".

In April 2001, the Committee voted to remove the two stipulations placed on the **Los Angeles Unified School District** based upon the Accreditation Re-Visit Team Report, team recommendations and staff recommendations. The Committee also voted to change the accreditation status of the Los Angeles Unified School District Internship Program from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Accreditation".

In May 2001, the Committee voted to remove the substantive stipulation placed on **Point Loma Nazarene University** based upon the Accreditation Re-Visit Team Report, team recommendations and staff recommendations. The Committee also voted to change the accreditation status of Point Loma Nazarene University from "Accreditation with a Substantive Stipulation" to "Accreditation".

In June 2001, the Committee voted to remove the technical stipulations placed upon **The Master's College**, based upon information submitted by the institution, team recommendations and staff recommendations. The Committee also voted to change the accreditation status of The Master's College from "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations" to "Accreditation".