

---

---

# 6B

## Information

### *Professional Services Committee*

#### Options for Proposed Changes to the Accreditation Framework

---

**Executive Summary:** In May 2004, the Commission approved the formation of an Accreditation Study Work Group comprised of members of the Committee on Accreditation and representatives of stakeholders to review and suggest any changes, if needed, to the Commission's accreditation system for educator preparation in California. This report presents an update on the topics the work group and the Committee on Accreditation have reviewed, the options considered to date, and the options preferred by the work group and Committee.

**Recommended Action:** This is an information item that requires no action.

**Presenters:** Lawrence Birch, Administrator, Teri Clark, Consultant and Cheryl Hickey, Consultant, Committee on Accreditation and Accreditation Study Work Group members.



## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
Background.....	1
Adopting Modifications to the Current Accreditation System .....	2
<b>Accreditation Topics</b> .....	3
1: Purpose of the Accreditation System.....	3
2: Roles and Responsibilities of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation .....	4
3: Accreditation as an On-Going Activity .....	5
4: Accreditation Cycle and Activities.....	6
5: Unit Accreditation and Program Approval .....	9
6: Accreditation Decisions-Program Finding .....	10
7: Accreditation Decisions-Unit Finding.....	10
8: National Unit Accreditation.....	11
9: National Program Accreditation.....	11
10: Program Standard Options.....	12
11: Consistency in including all Credential and Certificate Programs in the Accreditation Process .....	12
12: Designated Subjects Programs .....	13
13: Subject Matter Programs.....	13
14: Selection of COA Members.....	14
15: Evaluation of the Accreditation System .....	15
<b>Issues Requiring Further Discussion by the COA</b> .....	23
<b>Projected Cost of the Preferred Options</b> .....	26
<b>Additional Issues Beyond the Scope of the Current Charge to the Work Group</b> .....	28
Additional Issues Requiring Further Discussion by the COA .....	29
<b>Attachment A: Matrix of Issues and Options</b> .....	33

## List of Tables

<b>Table 1: Accreditation Cycle and Activities</b> .....	8
<b>Table 2: COA Members Transition Plan</b> .....	15
<b>Table 3: Summary of Preferred Options</b> .....	16
<b>Table 4: Cost of the Current Accreditation System</b> .....	26
<b>Table 5: Budget for Transition to Revised System</b> .....	27
<b>Table 6: Budget for Revised Accreditation System</b> .....	28



---

---

## Options for the Proposed Changes to the Accreditation Framework

---

---

### **Introduction**

This agenda item presents options for revising the accreditation system and *Framework* that govern educator preparation in California. This item is for Commission discussion and comment. Members of the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the Accreditation Study Work Group (work group) will discuss the options considered for changing the accreditation system and explain the rationale behind the preferred option identified by the two bodies. The COA and the Accreditation Study Work Group will meet again later this month. At that meeting both groups will discuss the comments made by the Commission on these issues.

### **Background**

In January 2004, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) directed the Committee on Accreditation (COA) to meet with stakeholders to identify options for establishing a process for the review of the Commission's *Accreditation Framework* that would be open, inclusive of key stakeholders, and consultative. At its meeting in May 2004, the Commission authorized the formation of an Accreditation Study Work Group. This work group, comprised of four members of the Committee on Accreditation and various representatives from the education stakeholder community, is charged with reviewing the Commission's current accreditation system and suggesting any changes, if needed, to the Committee on Accreditation for its consideration. In turn, the Committee on Accreditation is to submit its preferred options for changes to the system to the Commission for its consideration. This report provides an update on the topics the work group and the Committee on Accreditation have reviewed, the options considered to date, and the options preferred by the work group and Committee. Several important accreditation issues remain in need of significant further discussion. The Commission's comments on what is being presented thus far will help shape the direction of the future work.

At the June 2005 Commission meeting, a study session on accreditation was presented by staff, accreditation review team members, work group members and Committee on Accreditation members. Included in the study session was the description of the Commission's role in the policy decisions relating to accreditation and the Committee on Accreditation's role in implementing the Commission's policies. The June 2005 agenda item also summarized the structure of the proposed accreditation system and some of the following features being considered by the COA and the work group:

- Strengthen individual program accountability by blending "unit" accreditation with program evaluation

- Infuse the system with more data on candidate performance and program effectiveness
- Implement a biennial reporting system with data on candidate performance for all programs
  - Biennial reports that do not include adequate measures of candidate competence will lead to investigation and intervention
  - Other identified indicators in biennial reports will also lead to investigation and intervention
- Retain the site visit and institutional self-study document submission requirements to complement biennial data collection and confirm findings on quality and effectiveness
- Improve the selection and training of the Board of Institutional Reviewers
- Establish criteria for the selection of schools to visit during site visits

The study session also stressed that a central outcome of the revised accreditation system includes the concept that no institution or program sponsor be accredited unless it does all of the following:

- Meets Commission standards
- Produces qualified credential candidates
- Listens and attends carefully to feedback from stakeholders
- Aligns programs with the State-adopted Academic Content and Performance Standards for Students

The Accreditation Study Work Group has met regularly since June 2004 and communicated with the Committee on Accreditation throughout the process. This agenda item is an informational reporting of the consensus items from both the work group and Committee on Accreditation. The October 2005 agenda will bring the preferred options to the Commission officially from the Committee on Accreditation.

### **Adopting Modifications to the Current Accreditation System**

Education Code Section 44372 provides the Commission with the authority to modify the *Accreditation Framework* “in accordance with Section 8 of the *Framework* that was in effect on June 30, 1993.”

Section 8 (A) of the *Framework* addresses the evaluation of the *Framework* and Section 8 (B) addresses the conditions under which the *Accreditation Framework* may be modified. The *Framework* provides for modifications of three types: 1) General Provisions Regarding Modifications; 2) Refinements and Clarifications; and 3) Significant Modifications of the *Framework*. Because of its relevance to the current review process, the text of this section of the *Framework* is reproduced verbatim below.

## Section 8 (B). Modification of the *Accreditation Framework*

1. **General Provisions Regarding Modifications.** The Commission will consult with the Committee on Accreditation and educational institutions and organizations regarding any proposed modifications of the *Framework*. Modifications will occur in public meetings of the Commission, after the Commission has considered relevant information provided by the Committee on Accreditation, postsecondary institutions, accreditation team members, the Commission's professional staff, and other concerned individuals. The Commission will determine the date when a policy modification is effective.
2. **Refinements and Clarifications of the *Framework*.** The Commission may modify the *Accreditation Framework* to refine or clarify its contents, as needed. The Commission retains its authority to reconsider and modify the Program Standards for Options 1, 4, and 5 as the need arises.
3. **Significant Modifications of the *Framework*.** The Commission will maintain without significant modifications the *Framework's* major features and options, including the Common Standards, and Option 3 (General Program Standards), until the summative evaluation is completed or until there is compelling evidence that a significant modification is warranted. The determination of compelling evidence and the warranted significant modification will be made by the Commission with the concurrence of the Committee on Accreditation and the Chancellor of the California State University, the President of the University of California, and the President of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities.

## **Accreditation Topics Identified by the Committee on Accreditation and the Accreditation Study Work Group**

Below are some of the major topics addressed by the COA and the work group, a listing of the preferred options for each issue and the rationale for identifying this particular option as the preferred option. Attachment A includes the matrix used as a working document by the work group and by the COA to help keep track of the plausible options identified, and as the meetings and discussions progressed, to eliminate options. To review the options that were not selected as the preferred options, please see Attachment A, beginning on page 33 of this agenda item. At times, options were eliminated for practical reasons such as cost, but more often they were eliminated because the work group members believed the option did not adequately align with the four identified major purposes of accreditation, nor would it necessarily improve the accreditation system significantly. Table 3, beginning on page 16 of this agenda item, summarizes the preferred options.

### **Topic 1: Purpose of the Accreditation System**

***Preferred Option: 1a: Revise the Accreditation Framework to reflect four broad purposes of accreditation:***

- 1) **To ensure accountability;**

- 2) To ensure high quality and effective preparation programs;
- 3) To ensure adherence to credential standards; and
- 4) To encourage and support on-going program improvement.

***Preferred Option: 1b:*** The essential attributes of accreditation defined in the *Framework* should be revised to include:

- 1) The professional nature of accreditation;
- 2) Knowledgeable participants;
- 3) Breadth and flexibility;
- 4) Intensity;
- 5) Efficiency; and
- 6) Cost effectiveness.

***Background:*** The *Framework* adopted in 1995 outlines the purposes of accreditation as they were defined at that point in time. The Committee on Accreditation and the Accreditation Study work group reviewed these purposes to determine whether they were appropriately reflective of current needs and addressed the current educational policy environment. This discussion was a critically important first step as a common understanding and agreement about the purposes of accreditation was a necessary foundation to building a system that achieves these objectives.

***Rationale:*** After examining the purposes of accreditation as defined by other states, other accrediting bodies, and other professions, the Committee on Accreditation and the Accreditation Study Work Group suggests that the language within the *Framework* be revised. The proposed language would align better with generally accepted purposes of accreditation, simplify the language to facilitate public understanding, and recognize the importance of accreditation in program improvement – a purpose not explicitly defined in the 1995 *Framework* language. The language related to essential attributes would be revised to eliminate outdated language, consolidate ideas, and better reflect the proposed system.

## **Topic 2: Roles and Responsibilities of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation**

***Preferred Option:*** Maintain the current roles and responsibilities of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation as defined in California Education Code Section 44372 and 44373 (c) but improve the communication between the COA and the Commission.

**Improve communication by providing on-going reports from COA representatives at Commission meetings as appropriate, but more frequently than annual reporting. The COA will investigate and implement processes that will allow the Commission to better determine how its accreditation policies are being implemented.**

***Background:*** California Education Code Section 44372 delineates the powers and duties of the Commission as it relates to accreditation and section 44373 (c) delineates the powers and duties of the Committee on Accreditation. In sum, the Commission establishes accreditation policies, appoints members of the COA, and hears appeals of accreditation decisions. The COA implements the accreditation system and renders accreditation decisions.



California Education Code Section 44373 (c) (5) requires the Committee on Accreditation to present an annual report to the Commission. Over the past decade, the Committee on Accreditation has produced and adopted such a report and presented it to the Commission. Beyond this annual report, there has been little other interaction between the Committee on Accreditation and the Commission.

**Rationale:** The COA and the work group have agreed that the composition, roles, and responsibilities of the COA as currently defined by the Education Code have been beneficial for several reasons. First, the COA is composed of professional educators from both K-12 and higher education who are distinct from the Commission but who are appointed by the Commission because of their distinguished careers in education. Maintaining the current composition of the COA would keep accreditation decisions within the purview of professional educators and maintain a balance of K-12 and higher education. Second, having a body distinct from the Commission has allowed sufficient time for deliberation and depth of discussion required for making accreditation decisions. It was the general opinion of the members of both COA and the work group that the Commission currently has a full workload without adding accreditation decision-making.

However, the Committee on Accreditation and the Accreditation Study Work Group agreed that there ought to be improved communication between the Commission and the Committee. It was agreed that annual reporting alone is a minimal level of communication that has not been sufficient given the critical nature of accreditation. Increasing the Commission's interaction with the COA will foster greater understanding of accreditation issues, will allow the Commission more opportunity to determine whether its policies are being appropriately implemented, and will allow for discussion of trends and issues related to accreditation matters. Further, more opportunity for Commission discussion about accreditation will raise the visibility of accreditation and provide greater recognition of the importance of this function.

### **Topic 3: Accreditation as an On-Going Activity**

**Preferred Option:** Modify the system to reflect the fact that accreditation is an on-going activity. Accreditation should be viewed as an on-going cycle of activities focused on accountability, meeting Commission standards, and data-driven decision making. The prior accreditation report and continuing data reports should be considered in the accreditation system.

**Background:** Currently, the accreditation system examines an institution every six years with a "snapshot" – that is, the review team is limited to the information about the institution available at that time. Previous documentation and accreditation decisions are not considered by the review team or the COA. The COA decides on an accreditation finding and if that finding is "Accreditation" the institution is permitted to continue to operate its programs and is not required to provide further information to the COA until the next review. If an institution receives the status of accreditation with stipulations, it must take action to satisfactorily address the stipulations within one year, and no follow up occurs beyond that next year until the next review.

**Rationale:** The Committee on Accreditation and the Accreditation Study Work Group agreed that the snapshot approach does not sufficiently promote on-going program improvement at institutions and districts. Instead many faculty and administrators involved in credential

programs often view the current system as a cyclical event they “go through” and then do not have to think about again until the next site visit. While the accreditation process can, and does, encourage the kind of dialogue that prompts positive change, many suggest that, once the site visit is complete, the same level of focus on issues is not always maintained consistently over the intervening years.

Further, the COA and the work group also agreed that the snapshot approach does not assure a sufficient level of accountability. As an example, a review team may have significant concerns about an institution or a program that leads to a stipulation. Under the existing system, it is difficult for the review team to know whether a concern has been raised by previous review teams and thus is indicative of an ongoing issue at the institution, or whether the concern is of a more recent or isolated nature.

If the change in focus of accreditation is that it is no longer viewed as a “snapshot” or point in time process, but rather a look at an institution over time, the use of historical data – including continuing reports – can and should be considered for use in the accreditation system. Under such a system, full “accreditation” would no longer mean that an institution had no responsibilities related to accreditation between reviews. On the contrary, accreditation activities and reporting of performance data would be required of all institutions and programs throughout the cycle. Likewise, follow up and corrective action on issues of concern would not be limited to one year. The COA would have the ability to follow-up on an area of concern over the next few years to ensure that the programs being offered continue to meet the Commission’s adopted standards.

#### **Topic 4: Accreditation Cycle and Activities**

***Preferred Option: 4a: Revise the accreditation cycle from a single site visit once every 6 years, to a series of accreditation activities over the course of 7 years;***

***Preferred Option: 4b: Revise the cycle from a 3-4 day comprehensive site visit conducted every six years to a system that includes annual data collection by the institution or program sponsor;***

***Preferred Option: 4c: Require program sponsors to submit biennial reports to the COA;***

***Preferred Option: 4d: Retain and revise the review of documents submitted by all credential programs in the 4<sup>th</sup> year of the 7 year cycle;***

***Preferred Option: 4e: Retain and revise a site visit in the 6<sup>th</sup> year of the 7 year cycle focusing on Common Standards and where needed, program standards; and***

***Preferred Option: 4f: Use the 7<sup>th</sup> year in the cycle for required follow up.***

***Background:*** The current accreditation system utilizes a site visit at the institution once every five or six years to evaluate institution and program quality. The site visit team reviews all individual programs, program documentation, supporting evidence, and the institution as a whole during the one visit. No activities are required of institutions/program sponsors in the intervening years unless there has been a stipulation placed on the institution by the COA. All stipulations must be addressed within one year, after which time no ongoing accreditation activities are required

***Rationale:*** The COA and the work group believe the structure and cycle of the accreditation system can be improved upon to encourage program improvement and public accountability on a more consistent basis. The proposed structure would require that the same type of activities – review of program documentation and information from candidates, graduates, and employers, and faculty – take place across time, rather than at a single point in time. By collecting specific information from programs at multiple times during the accreditation cycle, the COA and work group believe that reviewers will have a more accurate understanding of the institution and its programs.

Under the proposed system, a variety of accreditation activities would take place throughout a seven year cycle and build upon one another. Table 1, on page 8, provides a concise summary of the types of activities and the frequency of each activity. It is believed that this on-going cycle of activities is more likely to accomplish the four primary objectives of accreditation than the current system.

***Annual Data Gathering and Analysis:*** Each program would be expected to collect data (contextual, demographic, and candidate competence data). The program would aggregate and analyze these data, use data to evaluate program effectiveness, and make adjustments as appropriate.

***Report to the Commission/COA (Years 2, 4, and 6):*** The institution would report summary data for each program for the current and prior year to the Commission. Each program would submit information describing how candidate competence is assessed in the program and how the candidates perform on those assessments. In addition, each report would include a brief statement of analysis and an action plan based on the analysis. Each institution or program sponsor would also submit an institutional summary identifying trends across the programs or critical issues. The COA and Commission staff would review the biennial reports. If the report is not submitted, or is incomplete or inadequate, Commission staff would contact the institution/program. Institutions that submit reports with data that do not demonstrate measures of candidate competence or that have other deficiencies would be reviewed by COA and could result in a request for additional information from the institution/program or possibly a site review.

***Program Review (Years 4 and 5):*** Each program that is offered by an institution/program sponsor would submit an updated version of its approved program document including current course syllabi. The update would detail all modifications in the program since its prior approval. In addition, the candidate assessments, rubrics, and scoring procedures that generated the data gathered over the current year and previous three years would be submitted. Program reviewers (trained members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers) would review each program through a review of updates to approved program documents, data reports, and the reports to the Commission/COA. The program review team could raise questions or request additional information. The program would submit additional information and evidence to address the questions that the reviewers have raised. Specific time limits would need to be observed by both the program and the reviewers so that the preliminary findings would be submitted to the COA at least one year prior to the scheduled site visit. The program review team would consider all information and agree upon “preliminary findings” for all program standards. The program review team submits any additional questions or areas of concern to the COA and makes a

**Table 1: Accreditation Cycle and Activities**

	Institution or Program Sponsors		Commission on Teacher Credentialing Committee on Accreditation and/or CTC Staff will Review	
	At the Institution	Submit to CTC/COA		
<b>Year 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data Gathering &amp; Analysis</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although no formal report is required, institution may be completing follow-up from the site visit in Year 6. All institutions will continue data gathering and analysis.</li> </ul>
<b>Year 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data Gathering &amp; Analysis</li> </ul>	Data Report Years 1 & 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biennial Data Report: Staff review of the report could result in a request for additional information and/or a focused site visit.</li> </ul>
<b>Year 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data Gathering &amp; Analysis</li> <li>Prepare program document updates</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No report unless there was follow-up from questions generated from the Year 2 Biennial Report.</li> <li>Data gathering and analysis is on-going at the institution</li> </ul>
<b>Year 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit Program Document(s)</li> <li>Data Gathering &amp; Analysis</li> </ul>	Data Report* Years 3 & 4	Program Review Document (s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biennial Data Report: Staff review of the report could result in a request for additional information and/or a focused site visit.</li> <li>Program reviewers are assigned to review each program’s documentation and pose questions for institution.</li> <li>Program review teams agree on preliminary findings for program standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Year 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data Gathering &amp; Analysis</li> <li>Prepare Common Standards self-study for site visit</li> </ul>		Response to questions on program review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program reviewers submit preliminary findings and remaining questions or concerns to the COA, with recommendations for any needed follow-up at the site visit.</li> <li>COA determines which, if any program(s) need to be included in the site visit and notifies institution at least one year prior to the site visit date.</li> </ul>
<b>Year 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data Gathering &amp; Analysis</li> <li>Complete preparations for site visit</li> <li>Host site visit</li> </ul>	Data Report Years 5 & 6	Common Standards Self-Study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site team is provided with preliminary findings from program review teams and all previous documentation from this cycle. Team is also provided with prior accreditation team report.</li> <li>Site team visits the institution reviewing all Common Standards and program(s) identified by the Program Reviews.</li> <li>Site team submits an accreditation report to COA, with recommendations.</li> <li>COA makes an accreditation decision and specifies required follow-up if necessary.</li> </ul>
<b>Year 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data Gathering &amp; Analysis</li> <li>Follow-up to site visit if necessary</li> </ul>		Follow-up to site visit, if necessary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>COA reviews follow-up, if warranted, asks further questions. Follow up may exceed one year at the discretion of the COA.</li> <li>After completing the seven year cycle, the institution begins the cycle again</li> </ul>

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

recommendation to COA whether the issue needs to be further reviewed at the site visit. The COA would consider the recommendation and in so doing, would determine the nature of the program review (size and composition of the team) that would take place during the site visit.

*Site Visit (Year 6):* Each institution or program sponsor would have an accreditation team visit the site in the sixth year of the accreditation cycle. Prior to the visit, the institution would submit a self-study that responds to the Common Standards. The institution would prepare for a site visit that focuses mainly on the Common Standards, but includes students, graduates, and faculty as well as other stakeholders from all programs that are sponsored by the institution. The site review team would be composed of 3 to 6 members that would focus on the Common Standards plus any program areas directed to be reviewed by the COA as a result of the program review. Within the site visit, each program in operation would participate fully in the interview schedule. The COA may add additional members to the team with expertise in the program area(s) to be reviewed at the site visit. The site review team would submit a report with program findings and an accreditation recommendation to the COA. It is possible that the site visit team may find a program concern or issue not previously identified by the program reviewers. In so doing, the team may recommend a follow up focused program review of the concerns or issues that have arisen. In this event, there would be no accreditation recommendation until after the focused review has been completed. The COA would review the team report and ask questions prior to making an accreditation decision. When follow-up is required, the COA would indicate what follow-up is required and when.

*Follow-up to site visit: (Year 7)* If necessary, the institution and all its programs would begin to respond to the follow-up required by the COA. COA will state the timeline for response from the institution. Institutions must address all stipulations within one year, however, the timeline for COA follow up may extend beyond the one year.

## **Topic 5: Unit Accreditation and Program Approval**

***Preferred Option:* Develop a revised system that addresses unit accreditation but enhances program review.**

***Background:*** Currently, California’s accreditation system involves a single accreditation decision for the institution – unit accreditation. The individual programs are approved within the process of coming to the institution’s accreditation decision. This system is often referred to as “unit plus” because it focuses on the program sponsor and all its credential programs.

***Rationale:*** In gathering feedback from the constituencies represented on the work group, it was clear that there is overwhelming support for continuing a “unit” based system. Deans and administrators of education preparation commented that the unit based system allows them some degree of leverage with the university or district to initiate or implement improvements in programs, particularly with those programs that are out of their direct control. However, concerns were raised that accreditation review team members have sometimes failed to sufficiently address program concerns in the report for fear of risking the accreditation status of the institution. This seemed to occur most often with larger institutions that might have one identified weak program among several strong programs. It was acknowledged that this is in part a structural issue and, in part, one of implementation and training.

One of the major ways in which the proposed system will enhance program review is that under the proposed system, findings for each standard of each credential program would be included in the accreditation report, rather than just findings on the common standards. In addition, the program review team would recommend whether review of a particular program needs to be part of a larger site visit at the institution or district office.

#### **Topic 6: Accreditation Decisions-Program Findings**

***Preferred Option:* Modify the accreditation system to more clearly show individual program findings.**

***Background:*** Under the current system, members of the review team examine each program credential area against the standards. These findings contribute to and are incorporated into the team's recommendation about the accreditation of the unit.

***Rationale:*** The COA and the work group indicated that one of the areas that needed strengthening in the accreditation system is to enhance program review and to better document the issues and concerns identified by reviewers about individual credential programs. Although the suggestion is to maintain the "unit plus" structure generally, the members of both bodies agreed that there was a need for greater focus on ensuring that program issues are not ignored or minimized. To that end, the COA and the work group recommend that findings of program standards be more clearly and explicitly included in the accreditation report. Reviewers develop their findings for each and every credential program and for each standard within each program. These program standard findings may include: Standard Met, Met with Concerns, Met Minimally, and Not Met. The program reviewers will develop preliminary findings after the review of the program document and biennial reports in the fourth year of the cycle. The site visit team will work to confirm these preliminary findings during the site visit. The COA may choose to follow up on concerns raised with programs regardless of the accreditation status of the institution. In other words, an institution may receive full accreditation, but the COA may require follow up on issues raised for particular programs.

#### **Topic 7: Accreditation Decisions-Unit Findings**

***Preferred Option:* Revise the Unit Accreditation Findings to allow for the finding of full accreditation with required follow up.**

***Background:*** Under the existing system, an institution or program sponsor that receives full accreditation is not required to provide additional information once they have been awarded the status of full accreditation. In the past, review teams have noted concerns about a program or institution that did not rise to the level of a stipulation. In the current system, without a stipulation, there is no way for the COA to require follow up on these concerns. As a result, the current structure limits the COA's ability to determine whether these concerns are addressed by an institution over time, or whether they become more serious and impact the quality of services provided to students.

***Rationale:*** The COA and the work group agreed that revising the menu of decision options to include "Accreditation with Follow Up Required" would allow the COA the flexibility to keep abreast of how an institution might be addressing a concern noted by the review team, despite

receiving full accreditation status. In addition, under the proposed system, all institutions, not just those with stipulations, would now be required to provide information between the site visits through the biennial reports.

### **Topic 8: National Unit Accreditation**

***Preferred Option:*** Continue national unit accreditation options as defined in the California Education Code and the *Accreditation Framework*.

***Background:*** The current system allows merged visits for national unit accreditations. The Commission currently has a long standing partnership agreement with the National Council of the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Presently NCATE is the only federally approved national unit accrediting body. Institutions seeking both state accreditation and voluntary national accreditation may do so through a “merged site visit” thus allowing program sponsors to prepare for one accreditation event and earn two distinct accreditations. In a merged visit, the NCATE team must have both out of state and California members. The institution must meet both national standards to earn national accreditation and state standards to earn state accreditation.

***Rationale:*** In general, the COA and the work group believe that the current system has served California institutions well. In addition, the logistical issues related to merged visits identified by the American Institutes for Research in its review of the accreditation system have improved significantly over time. As a result, the work group does not propose any significant changes to the National Unit Accreditation option.

***Please note:*** The current agreements and protocols with NCATE exempt California institutions from the program portfolio review process for NCATE because of California’s existing review of credential programs. Should the Commission decided to adopt the structure proposed by the COA and the work group, agreements and protocols with NCATE will need to be adjusted to accommodate the changes.

### **Topic 9: National Program Accreditation**

***Preferred Option:*** Clarify that all California programs must participate in the California accreditation process. California supports national program accreditation when the national program review can be coordinated with the California process.

***Background:*** Current law states that national accreditation of a specific program may be substituted for state accreditation, if specific conditions are met, and delegates the nature of the conditions to the *Framework*. As the current system is implemented, national accreditation of programs separate from state accreditation has not taken place in California. Instead, the current accreditation system supports programs that want to combine state and national accreditation. For example, a school counseling program could coordinate its accreditation from a national professional organization, Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP), and the California state visit.

***Rationale:*** The COA and the work group support the integration of national program accreditation with state accreditation when possible, but believe that all programs that prepare educators for California licensure must fully participate in the California accreditation system.

The members of the two bodies agree that the California accreditation system should be designed to assure that educators are prepared to work in California schools, with California students, and are prepared to teach to the California K-12 adopted student content standards. To the extent possible, the system could foster better coordination with national program accrediting bodies. In addition, the members agreed that national organizations could do the preliminary work involved in determining the alignment of standards, but that ultimately the COA would need to review all standards for comparability, consistent with its responsibility under Ed Code Section 44373 (c) (3).

#### **Topic 10: Program Standard Options**

***Preferred Option:*** Provide three program standard options: 1) California Program Standards; 2) National or Professional Program Standards; or 3) Alternate Program Standards. These alternate program standards would include experimental or research based and alternative standards. If national standards are used, comparability must be established and programs must address the California specific standards in addition to the national standards.

***Background:*** Under the existing accreditation system, institutions or program sponsors have the option of choosing among five standard options for programs: 1) California standards; 2) National or Professional Standards; 3) General Standards; 4) Experimental Standards, and 5) Alternative Standards.

***Rationale:*** The COA and the work group acknowledges the importance of all credential programs addressing California program standards (see Recommendation #9 above). Therefore, they recommend continuation of Option 1, California Standards. With respect to Option 2, however, if deemed comparable, national or professional standards could also be used in order to provide flexibility to the institution or program sponsor. As for Option 3, it was determined that under the current policy environment and given the development of California standards in each program area, that use of General Standards (found in Appendix 3 of the *Framework*) is no longer appropriate. In addition, very few institutions have chosen to exercise this option in the past. Therefore the two bodies are suggesting that this option be eliminated. The existence of the current Option 4, experimental standards not only is a specific requirement in the Education Code, but there is strong sentiment that experimental programs are needed to serve the larger purpose of contributing to the body of knowledge about educator preparation. These programs can be used to support new pathways to the profession. COA and work group members suggest maintaining both the experimental and alternative standard options but making some minor modifications. Minor modifications to the *Framework* would include consolidating the current Options 4 and 5 and clarifying the purpose and expectations regarding experimental programs.

#### **Topic 11: Establish consistency in the system by including all Credential and Certificate Programs in the Accreditation Process**

***Preferred Option:*** Adopt the general principle that all programs that lead to a credential or certificate in California should be reviewed on a periodic basis and that the review process should be implemented in a manner that recognizes program differences but maintains comparable rigor across program types.



**Background:** Currently, not all programs that a program sponsor may elect to offer are reviewed through the continuing accreditation system.

**Rationale:** The COA and the work group suggests that the Commission adopt a broad policy statement saying that all credential programs are subject to review on a periodic basis and are a part of the accreditation system. The COA and the work group recognize that this recommendation may have significant cost implications. The types of credential programs that are not currently part of the accreditation system include:

- Subject Matter Programs
- Certificate Programs (i.e. CLAD, BCLAD, Early Childhood)
- Designated Subject Programs-sponsored by a LEA
- Professional Clear Credential Programs (Induction and Fifth Year)

The work group and COA are continuing to discuss the ways in which these programs could be appropriately included in the system. Each credential program not currently included in the continuing accreditation process brings with it unique issues that would need to be addressed if they were brought into the system. For instance, induction programs were only recently added as a credential route as a result of SB 2042, although they have been operating in California for a number of years. They have not traditionally been part of the accreditation process; however, they have a long history of a rigorous program review process.

Further discussion is needed to determine how the addition of some of these programs into the accreditation system could be achieved in a cost efficient manner. The following two items fall under this category.

### **Topic 12: Designated Subjects Programs**

**Preferred Option:** Continue the initial program approval process for designated subject programs. Both Institution of Higher Education (IHE) and Local Educational Agency (LEA) sponsored programs should be reviewed through the accreditation system.

**Background:** Currently, only IHE sponsored programs are reviewed through the accreditation system. LEA sponsored programs are reviewed initially, but are not reviewed on a periodic basis.

**Rationale:** Consistent with the proposed general principle that all programs leading to a credential should fall within the on-going accreditation system, the COA and the work group believe that all designated subjects credential programs should likewise, be subject equally to the accreditation review process regardless of the entity that delivers the services. The seven IHE sponsored programs have historically been included in the accreditation system. Reviewing the 16 LEA sponsored designated subjects programs will add an increased minor cost to the accreditation system in that 12 of the LEAs are not currently included in the accreditation system.

### **Topic 13: Subject Matter Programs**

***Preferred Option:*** Continue initial program approval for subject matter programs. In addition, collect data periodically from subject matter programs to ensure alignment with the K-12 content standards and support program improvement.

***Background:*** Currently subject matter programs are initially approved by a team of readers and then approved by the Commission. There has been no ongoing review of the programs after the initial approval.

***Rationale:*** The initial approval of subject matter programs would assure that the program meets the Commission's adopted standards. The collection of periodic data (CSET scores and course matrices showing alignment with K-12 academic content standards) will assure that programs continue to meet the adopted standards. But because subject matter programs are not housed within the education unit or offered by education faculty, it may not be appropriate to include the subject matter programs in the institution's accreditation decision. Because this issue is highly complex, the work group is recommending that further study be done. (For additional information related to the initial approval process for subject matter preparation programs, see *Subject Matter Programs Work Group Consensus* on page 30.)

#### **Topic 14: Selection of COA Members**

***Preferred Option:*** Modify the selection process to reduce costs, prevent large turnover of COA members in the same year, and streamline the nominating panel process.

***Background:*** Education Code Section 44373 (a) sets forth the process by which the Commission goes about selecting members of the COA. It requires that 12 members be selected for their distinguished records of accomplishments in education. Six must be from postsecondary education and six shall be certificated professionals in public schools, school districts, or county offices of education in California. Appointment of members shall be from nominees submitted by a distinguished panel named by consensus of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation. For each Committee position to be filled, the nominating panel would submit two qualified nominees from which the Commission chooses one.

***Rationale:*** The process, as it has been implemented in the past is cumbersome, time consuming, and costly. The statute requires a two-phase process: 1) agreement by the Commission and the COA on the composition of a Nominating Panel; and 2) selection of COA members. The COA and the work group believe that the process can be adjusted and streamlined without affecting the quality of individuals who are selected to serve on the Committee.

The COA and the work group offer the following suggestions to improve the process:

1. Streamline the process to determine who shall serve as the nominating panel by establishing in the *Framework* that the Commission and the COA shall each nominate two individuals each to serve on the nominating committee. Each body shall nominate one college or university member, and one elementary or secondary school member.
2. Establish in the *Framework* that the terms of the Nominating Panel will be four years long and that members of the panel may serve more than one term. This will prevent the need for reestablishing the nominating panel each time there is a need for new COA members.

3. Change the length of the terms for COA members from 3-year terms to 4-year terms. This, together with staggering the terms, will ensure that the COA membership will be sufficiently balanced between new members and experienced members and necessitates selection of three members annually.
4. Stagger the COA members in the transition from the *Accreditation Framework* (1995) to the revised *Framework* (2005) such that there will be three new members appointed for four year terms in the first year. Nine members of the current members will continue to serve, with three members serving for one additional year, three for two additional years, and three for three additional years. This transition will ensure that, notwithstanding vacancies, each subsequent year, three new members will be appointed to the Committee by the Commission, yet maintain an understanding of accreditation.

**Table 2: COA Membership Transition Plan**

05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
12 current members	9 continuing members	6 continuing members	3 continuing members	
		3 members with one year of experience	6 members with one to two years of experience	9 members with 1, 2 or 3 years of experience
	3 newly appointed members	3 newly appointed members	3 newly appointed members	3 newly appointed members

**Topic 15: Evaluation of the Accreditation System**

***Preferred Option:*** **Revise Section 8 of the Accreditation Framework to define an ongoing data collection process regarding the efficacy of the accreditation system. Define how modifications will be made in the future and when stakeholder input is required.**

***Background:*** Modification of Section 8 of the Framework is significantly limited without changing California Education Code language. However, because the language related to evaluation (Section 8A) refers to a particular point in time and tasks which the Commission has already completed, the COA and the work group believe this language may be modified. The same is not true for the language related to modification (Section 8 B).

***Rationale:*** The COA and the work group believe that evaluation of the accreditation process itself should reflect the same general principle adopted for the institutions and districts it accredits – that is, that there should be a system of on-going data collection, evaluation, reflection, and modification – to determine whether the system is working effectively.

**Summary Table of the Preferred Options**

Table 3 follows on the next seven pages. It contains a summary of the preferred options described in this item. Within the table the preferred option is listed with a brief description of the how the topic is addressed in both the current accreditation system and the proposed system.

**Table 3: Summary of Preferred Options: Current and Proposed System**

<b>Preferred Options</b>	<b>Current System</b> (adopted 1995)	<b>Proposed System</b>
<p><b>1: Purposes of accreditation system</b></p> <p>1a: Revise the Accreditation Framework to reflect four broad purposes of accreditation:</p> <p>1b: Essential attributes of the accreditation system should be revised to include:</p>	<p><b>Purposes of accreditation and certification system:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• assure the public, the students and the profession that future educators have access to excellence in content education, specialized preparation and professional practica in education</li> <li>• ensure that future educators have actually acquired abilities and perspectives that are essential for fulfilling specified professional responsibilities</li> <li>• verify that each educator’s specialized preparation and attainments are appropriate for the assignment of particular responsibilities in schools</li> <li>• contribute to broader efforts to enhance the personal stature and professional standing of teachers and other educators as members of a profession</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Attributes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orientation to Educational Quality</li> <li>• The Professional Character of Accreditation.</li> <li>• Breadth and Flexibility</li> <li>• Intensity in Accreditation</li> <li>• Integration with the Certification System.</li> <li>• Contributions of Accreditation to Improved Preparation</li> <li>• Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness</li> </ul>	<p><b>Purposes of system:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure accountability</li> <li>• Ensure high quality and effective programs</li> <li>• Adherence to standards</li> <li>• Support program improvement</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Attributes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• professional character of accreditation</li> <li>• knowledgeable participants</li> <li>• breadth and flexibility</li> <li>• intensity in accreditation</li> <li>• efficiency and cost effectiveness</li> </ul>
<p><b>2: Roles and Responsibilities of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation:</b> Maintain the current roles and responsibilities of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation but improve the communication between COA and the Commission.</p>	<p>The Commission establishes accreditation policies, appoints members of the COA, and hears appeals of accreditation decisions. The COA implements the accreditation system and renders accreditation decisions.</p>	<p>Maintain Commission as the policy board and the Committee on Accreditation implementing the Commission’s policies but increase communication between the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation to support Commission in determining whether its policies are being appropriately implemented and to identify trends and issues related to accreditation.</p>

<b>Preferred Options</b>	<b>Current System</b> (adopted 1995)	<b>Proposed System</b>
<p><b>3: Accreditation as an On-Going Activity:</b> Modify the system to reflect the fact that accreditation is an on-going activity. Accreditation should be viewed as an on-going cycle of activities focused on accountability, meeting the standards, and data-driven decision making. The prior accreditation report and continuing data reports should be considered in the accreditation system</p>	<p>Snap shot look at an institution and all its programs</p> <p>No interim reporting is required of an institution</p> <p>Program reviews are completed during the site visit by a cluster of K-12 and IHE educators</p> <p>Previous documentation and accreditation decisions are not considered.</p> <p>If an institution receives the status of accreditation with stipulations, it must take action to satisfactorily address the stipulations within one year, and no follow up occurs beyond that next year until the next review.</p>	<p>Examine an institution and all its programs over time based on an on-going cycle of activities.</p> <p>Biennial reports are submitted by all educator preparation programs and used by both program reviewers and site visit team.</p> <p>Program Reviews are completed in the 4<sup>th</sup> year of the cycle and are used to inform the site visit. Program reviewers make preliminary findings on all program standards and recommendations regarding the site visit.</p> <p>Site visit team will have a copy of the previous team report and accreditation decision. COA members will be aware of previous accreditation decision.</p>
<p><b>4a: Accreditation Cycle and Activities:</b> Revise the accreditation cycle from a single site visit once every 6 years, to a series of accreditation activities over the course of a 7 years</p>	<p>Site visit once every 6 years.</p>	<p>A 7 year cycle of three different activities that take place at regular intervals over the 7 years: Biennial Reports, Program Review, and Site Visit.</p>
<p><b>4b: Accreditation Cycle and Activities:</b> Revise the cycle from a 3-4 day comprehensive site visit conducted every six years to a system that includes annual data collection by the institution or program sponsor;</p>	<p>No data collection is required between site visits.</p>	<p>Each program would be expected to collect data (contextual, demographic, and candidate competence data). The program would aggregate and analyze these data, use data to evaluate program effectiveness and make adjustments to the program as appropriate.</p>

<b>Preferred Options</b>	<b>Current System</b> (adopted 1995)	<b>Proposed System</b>
<b>4c:Accreditation Cycle and Activities:</b> Require program sponsors to submit biennial reports to the COA;	No reports are submitted between site visits.	The institution would report summary data for each program for the current and prior year to the CTC. Each program would submit information describing how candidate competence is assessed in the program and how the candidates perform on those assessments. In addition, each report would include a brief statement of analysis and an action plan based on the analysis.
<b>4d:Accreditation Cycle and Activities:</b> Retain and revise the review of documents submitted by all credential programs in the 4 <sup>th</sup> year of the 7 year cycle;	Program review is completed during the 3-4 day comprehensive site visit every 5-7 years.	Each program that is offered by an institution/program sponsor would submit an updated version of its approved program document including current syllabi. The update would detail all modifications in the program since its approval. The program is reviewed by trained reviewers. If questions or concerns, the COA may direct site visit to review one or more programs.
<b>4e:Accreditation Cycle and Activities:</b> Retain and revise a site visit in the 6 <sup>th</sup> year of the 7 year cycle focusing on Common Standards and where needed, program standards;	The 3-4 day comprehensive site visit reviews all Common Standards.	Each institution or program sponsor would have an accreditation team visit the site in the sixth year of the accreditation cycle. Prior to the visit, the institution would submit a self-study that responds to the Common Standards. The institution would prepare for a site visit that focuses mainly on the Common Standards, but includes students, graduates, and faculty as well as other stakeholders from all programs that are sponsored by the institution. The site review team would be composed of 3 to 6 members that would focus on the Common Standards plus any program areas directed to be reviewed by COA as a result of the program review.

<b>Preferred Options</b>	<b>Current System</b> (adopted 1995)	<b>Proposed System</b>
<b>4f: Accreditation Cycle and Activities:</b> Use the 7 <sup>th</sup> year in the cycle for required follow up.	All stipulations must be addressed within one year, after which time no activities are required.	If necessary, the institution and all its programs would begin to respond to the follow-up required by the COA. COA will state the timeline for response from the institution. Institutions must address all stipulations within one year, however, the timeline for COA follow up may extend beyond the one year.
<b>5: Unit Accreditation and Program Approval:</b> Develop a revised system that addresses unit accreditation but enhances program review.	Site team makes decisions regarding all program standards Site team makes decisions regarding unit standards Site team makes a recommendation about the accreditation of the institution as a whole, COA makes the accreditation finding	Program reviewers submit preliminary findings about all program standards, any remaining questions and a recommendation about reviewing the program during the site visit to COA. Site team either confirms the preliminary findings and makes decisions for all standards or may request a focused site visit to investigate any unexpected findings. Site team makes decisions regarding unit standards Site team makes a recommendation on the accreditation decision for the institution as a whole.
<b>6: Accreditation Decisions-Program Findings:</b> Modify the accreditation system to more clearly show individual program findings.	Under the current system, members of the review team examine each program credential area against the standards. These findings contribute to and are incorporated into the team's recommendation about the accreditation of the unit.	Program standard findings would be more clearly and explicitly included in the accreditation report. Reviewers will indicate their findings for each and every credential program and each standard within each program. These program standard findings may include: Standard Met, Met with Concerns, Met Minimally, and Not Met. The COA may choose to follow up on concerns raised with programs regardless of the accreditation status of the institution.
<b>7: Accreditation Decisions-Unit Findings:</b> Revise the Unit Accreditation Findings to allow for the finding of full accreditation with required follow up.	Accreditation decisions: -Accreditation -Accreditation with Stipulations -Denial of Accreditation	Accreditation decisions: -Accreditation (Follow up may be required even if full accreditation) -Accreditation with Stipulations -Denial of Accreditation

<b>Preferred Options</b>	<b>Current System</b> (adopted 1995)	<b>Proposed System</b>
<p><b>8: National Unit Accreditation:</b> Continue national unit accreditation options as defined in the California Education Code and the <i>Accreditation Framework</i></p>	<p>Institutions seeking both state accreditation and voluntary national accreditation may do so through a “merged site visit” thus allowing program sponsors to prepare for one accreditation event and earn two distinct accreditations. In a merged visit, the NCATE team must have both out of state and California members.</p>	<p>The work group and the COA do not propose any significant changes to the National Unit Accreditation option.</p>
<p><b>9: National Program Accreditation:</b> Clarify that all California programs must participate in the California accreditation process. California supports national program accreditation when the national program review can be coordinated with the California process.</p>	<p>Current law states that national accreditation of a specific program may be substituted for state accreditation, if specific conditions are met, and delegates the nature of the conditions to the Framework. The current accreditation system supports programs that want to combine state and national accreditation. For example, a school counseling program could coordinate its accreditation from a national professional organization, Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP), and the California state visit.</p>	<p>The COA and the work group support the integration of national program accreditation with state accreditation when possible, but believe that all programs that prepare educators for California licensure must participate in the California accreditation system.</p>
<p><b>10: Program Standard Options:</b> Provide three program standard options: 1) California Program Standards; 2) National or Professional Program Standards; or 3) Alternate Program Standards. If national standards are used, comparability must be established and programs must address the California specific standards in addition to the national standards.</p>	<p>Institutions have the option of choosing among five standard options for programs: 1) California standards; 2) National or Professional Standards; 3) General Standards; 4) Experimental Standards, and 5) Alternative Standards.</p>	<p>Institutions would have three standard options: 1) California Program Standards; 2) National or Professional Program Standards; or 3) Alternate Program Standards. These alternate program standards would include experimental or research based and alternative standards. If national standards are used, comparability must be established and programs must address the California specific standards in addition to the national standards.</p>



<b>Preferred Options</b>	<b>Current System</b> (adopted 1995)	<b>Proposed System</b>
<p><b>11: Establish consistency in the system by including all Credential and Certificate Programs in the Accreditation Process:</b> Adopt the general principle that all programs that lead to a credential or certificate in California should be reviewed on a periodic basis and that the review process should be implemented in a manner that recognizes program differences but maintains comparable rigor across program types.</p>	<p>Currently, not all programs that a program sponsor may elect to offer are reviewed through the continuing accreditation system.</p>	<p>The COA and the work group suggest that the Commission adopt a broad policy statement saying that all credential programs are subject to review on a periodic basis under the accreditation system. The COA and the work group recognize that this recommendation has significant cost implications.</p>
<p><b>12: Designated Subjects Programs:</b> Continue the initial program approval process for designated subject programs. Both Institution of Higher Education (IHE) and Local Educational Agency (LEA) sponsored programs should be reviewed through the accreditation system.</p>	<p>Currently, only IHE sponsored programs are reviewed through the accreditation system. About two thirds of the approved designated subjects programs are sponsored by a local education agency and are not included in the accreditation system.</p>	<p>All designated subjects credential programs should be included in the accreditation review process regardless of the entity that delivers the services.</p>
<p><b>13: Subject Matter Programs:</b> Continue initial program approval for subject matter programs. In addition, collect data periodically from subject matter programs to ensure alignment with the K-12 content standards and support program improvement.</p>	<p>Currently subject matter programs are initially reviewed by a team of readers and then approved by the Commission. There has been no periodic review of the programs after the initial approval.</p>	<p>The collection of periodic data (CSET scores and course matrix showing alignment with K-12 academic content standards) will assure that programs continue to meet the adopted standards. But because subject matter programs are not housed within the education unit or offered by education faculty, it may not be appropriate to include the subject matter programs in the institution's accreditation decision.</p>

Preferred Options	Current System (adopted 1995)	Proposed System
<p><b>14: Selection of COA Members:</b> Modify the selection process to reduce costs, prevent large turnover of COA members in the same year, and streamline the nominating panel process.</p>	<p>Currently the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> requires that 12 members be selected for their distinguished records of accomplishments in education. Six must be from postsecondary education and six shall be certificated professionals in public schools, school districts, or county offices of education in California.</p> <p>Appointment of members shall be from nominees submitted by a distinguished panel named by consensus of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation. For each Committee position to be filled, the nominating panel would submit two qualified nominees from which the Commission chooses one.</p> <p>Historically, consensus on the members of the nominating panel, bringing the panel together to review the applications, and interviewing the selected nominees have all been problematic and/or expensive.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Commission and the COA nominate two individuals each to serve on the nominating committee. Each body shall nominate one college or university member, and one elementary or secondary school member.</li> <li>2. The terms of the Nominating Panel will be four years long and that members of the panel may serve more than one term.</li> <li>3. Change the length of the terms for COA members from 3-year terms to 4-year terms.</li> <li>4. Stagger the COA members in the transition from the Accreditation Framework (1995) to the revised Framework (2005) such that there will be three new members appointed for four year terms in the first year. Nine members of the current members will continue to serve, with three members serving for one additional year, three for two additional years, and three for three additional years.</li> </ol>
<p><b>15: Evaluation of the Accreditation System:</b> Revise Section 8 of the Accreditation Framework to define an ongoing data collection process regarding the efficacy of the accreditation system. Define how modifications will be made in the future and when stakeholder input is required.</p>	<p>Modification of Section 8 of the Framework is significantly limited without changing California Education Code language. However, because the language related to evaluation (Section 8 A) refers to a particular point in time and tasks which the Commission has already completed, the COA and the work group believe this language may be modified. The same is not true for the language related to modification (Section 8 B).</p>	<p>The COA and the work group believe that evaluation of the accreditation process itself should reflect the same general principle adopted for the institutions and districts it accredits – that is, that there should be a system of on-going data collection, evaluation, reflection, and modification – to determine whether the system is working effectively.</p>

## **Issues Requiring Further Discussion by the COA**

At its July meeting, the Accreditation Work Group reached consensus about preferred options on a number of topics. The Committee on Accreditation has not yet discussed the work group's consensus on these items, which are scheduled for discussion at the August 18<sup>th</sup> COA and work group meeting. However, including these topics in this agenda item provides the Commission with an understanding of the direction the work has taken on these issues and provides an opportunity for the Commission to comment. The result of the COA discussion on these items and the preferred options will be included in the October agenda item for the Commission's consideration.

**Training -- Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) Work Group Consensus:** The COA should review and revise the content and process for BIR training to reflect the revised *Framework*. In implementation, the COA should gather feedback from the field and modify the training as necessary. The Commission will have the opportunity to comment on the training revisions prior to adoption.

***Background:*** In the past, the training for BIR members (the professional educators who conduct accreditation reviews and make up the pool of reviewers) has been conducted over 4 days and has been designed around the existing accreditation system.

***Rationale:*** If the system is revised, the training will likewise have to be revised to address all of the components of the new system. The training must ensure quality in the reviews and consistency in the process.

**Selection of the Review Teams Work Group Consensus:** The COA should review and revise the guidelines for review team composition to reflect the revised *Framework*. In implementation, the COA will gather feedback from the field and modify as necessary. The Commission will have the opportunity to comment on the proposed guidelines prior to adoption.

***Background:*** Currently the guidelines for determining the composition of review teams are contained in the *Accreditation Handbook* and are implemented by the Administrator with the involvement of the Consultant assigned to facilitate the review.

***Rationale:*** If the revised system of accreditation being proposed is ultimately adopted by the Commission, and the accreditation activities are distributed more broadly over the accreditation cycle, there will be a need to review the manner in which the composition of the review teams is determined. The current guidelines will need updating and revision to more appropriately address the changes in the new system. The revised guidelines will be included in the *Accreditation Handbook*.

**Selection of Interviews and Site Visits Work Group Consensus:** The COA should review and revise the guidelines for selection of site visits and interviews to reflect the revised *Framework*. COA should gather feedback from the field and modify as necessary. The Commission will have the opportunity to comment on the proposed guidelines prior to adoption.

**Background:** The current guidelines with respect to how sites and interviews are selected are contained in the *Accreditation Handbook*. It is the responsibility of the COA to make sure that Consultants and the Administrator of Accreditation are implementing the guidelines appropriately.

**Rationale:** Under the current system, there has been a concerted effort to ensure a fair and unbiased representation of interviewees so that the review team obtains an accurate understanding of the quality of an institution or district's credentialing programs. Random generation of lists of individuals to interview has been a common practice in the existing system. Nevertheless, there is always room for improvement. In particular, last minute changes and substitutions have always been an inherent difficulty in the site visit model. As such, a current review of the guidelines and modification to align with the revised system will be appropriate.

**Programs Leading to the Professional Clear Credential** Both the COA and the Work Group have had extensive discussion about the two pathways to earn the Professional Clear Credential – Induction and the Fifth Year Advanced Coursework – and to what extent they should be included in the accreditation system. In recent months, the Commission has had meetings with stakeholders to determine whether it is possible, or advisable, to review the standards for both Fifth year programs and induction programs and to revise them into one set of standards that would serve both types of programs leading to a Professional Clear credential. Stakeholders continue to meet and an update of these discussions is scheduled to come before the Commission in the future. The result of this work may impact how these programs are accredited. However, regardless of the outcome of these discussions, the work group was able to reach an agreement about a current preferred option with respect to these credential programs.

**Fifth Year Programs Work Group Consensus:** Include Fifth year programs in the accreditation system as other programs.

**Background:** SB 2042 changed the nature of the Fifth year coursework. In prior years, the three fifth year courses (health, special education, and technology) were initially approved and had no further review process. Under SB 2042, a single institution must recommend the candidate for the SB 2042 Professional Clear credential as an alternative route to completion of induction, if induction is not available to the candidate.

**Rationale:** It is the strong belief of the work group that the two routes to the Professional Clear Credential be reviewed on a level playing field. While the members recognize that the two routes themselves have distinct differences, they believe that the review process ought to be of equal or comparable rigor, although not necessarily exactly the same.

**Induction Programs Work Group Consensus:** Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system. For funded programs, the BTSA Task Force, under the direction of the COA could coordinate the process, and the COA would accredit the program based on the site visit and other reports. The process should be of at least equal rigor to the adopted accreditation process.

**Background:** SB 2042 provided for induction as the preferred route to a Professional Clear Credential. Currently, 149 induction programs have been approved by the Commission. In the past, the BTSA Task Force has implemented a Formal Program Review process whereby each BTSA program was reviewed on a four year cycle.

**Rationale:** The current accreditation system does not include a review of BTSA programs or any other type of induction program, because SB 2042 was passed subsequent to adoption of the current *Framework*. Now that completion of an induction program leads to a credential, the work group believes that induction programs should be folded into the accreditation process. Currently, only BTSA type induction programs exist, although the law allows for university based induction programs or alternative induction programs. Significant discussion has occurred about the current BTSA formal program approval process – which is generally believed to have encouraged on-going program improvement and accountability – and whether it can serve as the accreditation process with adjustments being made so that the results of these reviews would go to the COA for action. At this point, the work group has not determined the specific process that would be involved, but has agreed to the elements of the preferred option above. Under this option, the work group envisions the BTSA Task Force working with the COA to determine a process that serves accreditation purposes. A transition to a fully integrated and articulated accreditation process would be the goal.

**Data Collection: Work Group Consensus:** Each institution submits a biennial web-based report particularly focused on a selected, specific standard area. For the initial cycles, this area will be candidate competence and related assessments. Periodically, the Commission can designate a different standard area to be the focus for the next designated time period, with appropriate advance notice to programs. These reports are used by next site review team.

**Background:** Collection and reporting of data is a key component of the proposed accreditation system. Where the current accreditation system has relied exclusively on site visits every 5-7 years to ascertain the quality and effectiveness of educator preparation, the revised system being proposed complements seven-year site visits with reports on credential program outcomes every other year. The proposed system would allow the COA to intervene between site visits if information in the biennial reports suggests that such intervention is necessary.

**Rationale:** Because accreditation is an evidentiary process in which institutions are reviewed for their adherence to and implementation of standards, the data collection aspect of the new system is tied directly to the standards. Standards for all credential areas require sponsors of programs to assess their candidates prior to recommending them for a credential. The knowledge, skills and abilities to be assessed are also included in the standards. In keeping with the standards-based nature of accreditation, the biennial reports would focus on the candidate competence and performance standards and the evaluation standard. Program sponsors would be required to report on the nature and outcomes of their assessments.

The nexus between educator preparation and student learning is of interest in the policy and research communities, both within California and nationally. California's credentialing system, as envisioned by SB 2042, was intended to inform this complex question. The Commission has developed and validated the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) that represent the best thinking of the education community about the knowledge, skills and abilities teachers need in order to be effective in the classroom. Teaching Performance Assessments (TPAs) have been built to carefully assess these TPEs prior to candidates being recommended for preliminary teaching credentials. If the statutory requirements for TPAs are eventually funded and implemented, and if the Commission further validates the importance of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) in achieving student learning gains, then each candidate's

performance on a TPA could serve as a predictor of future success in teaching K-12 students. The revised accreditation system anticipates this future by proposing that data candidate competence be reported biennially, enabling the biennial reports to serve as one important indicator of the overall quality of a teacher preparation program. The work group recognizes the complexity of what it is recommending: current measures of student achievement in use in California are so laden with complex variables that they would have limited usefulness in the accreditation system. Measures of student learning gains that could control for variables effectively are difficult to mount and would require resources. To adequately predict future teaching success, existing TPA models may need to be upgraded and would certainly need to be funded. But the 2042 system was intended to push the State in these directions, and the Accreditation Work Group believes it is important to fully examine these questions and issues.

### Projected Costs of the Preferred Options

Following is an estimate of the cost of the revised accreditation system as contrasted with the cost of the current system at full implementation. These costs reflect only the cost to the Commission, not the institutional costs related to a revised system. Because of the current fiscal condition of the Commission, it is possible that the Commission will have to pursue a Budget Change Proposal to support future accreditation activities. The estimated costs below reflect a “ramping up” to the full system. Estimated costs are provided through 2008-09 at which time the system should be at full implementation.

**Table 4: Cost of Current Accreditation System, to the Commission, including Staffing\***

Activity	Annual Cost	% of Cost	Staff	\$ estimate
COA	\$81,851	21 %	Administrator, 1 FTE	\$110,000
BIR Training	\$44,333	11 %	Consultants, 2 FTEs	\$200,000
Previsits	\$15,241	4 %	SSA, 1 FTE	\$80,000
Revisits	\$8,793	2 %	Secretary	\$50,000
Site Visits	\$244,592	62 %		
	<b>\$394,810</b>			<b>\$440,000</b>

\* Based on 1998-2002 expenditures which included 13-14 site visits annually

The system proposed by the COA and the work group involves a cycle of different accreditation activities. In previous discussions among Commissioners there was a clear understanding that it is necessary to have two years of lead time prior to resumption of site visits. If the Commission adopts a revised accreditation system in Fall 2005, then a full schedule of site visits would be scheduled beginning in Fall 2007. But, data collection would begin in 05-06 for all institutions. Biennial reporting would begin in 05-06 for half the institutions and in 06-07 for the other half. Each institution will be placed in one of the years of the seven year cycle. Institutions on the 4<sup>th</sup> year of the cycle in 06-07 will be the first to participate in the revised program review process. Therefore, implementing a revised accreditation system will require a transition period to bring all institutions and program sponsors fully into the revised cycle of accreditation activities.

Below are the assumptions that would guide the transition phase and a proposed transition budget.

**Assumptions for the Transition:**

- Technical Assistance may include regional meetings to introduce the system, individual meetings with institutions, meetings focused on the Biennial Report, meetings focused on the Program Review Process, and meetings focused on preparing for the newly configured site visit.
- BIR training will be extensive during the transition period. All current members will receive retraining and recruitment for new members will be carried out. A cadre of approximately 400 BIR members will be assembled.
- Biennial Reports will be submitted beginning with 05-06 for half the institutions. Expectations are clearly communicated and it is understood that this is the first report and may not be as complete as later reports. In 06-07, the other half the institutions submit their first Biennial Reports.
- Program Review will begin in 06-07 with all institutions that are on the “4<sup>th</sup> year” of the cycle.
- Focused, Further Information Needed, and Revisits would follow the review of Biennial Reports or Site Visits.
- Six 2-day COA meetings would begin in 06-07. The COA will have six NCATE visits, continued technical assistance, Biennial Reports, and the first 14 Program Reviews to work with. In 07-08 and thereafter, COA will have the full set of Biennial Reports, Program Reviews and Site Visits.

**Table 5: Budget for Transition to Revised System<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>05-06</b>	<b>06-07</b>	<b>07-08</b>
Technical Assistance	\$10,000	\$52,000	0
BIR Training	0	\$60,000	\$50,000
Program Review (4 <sup>th</sup> year)	0	\$65,000	\$65,000
Previsits, institutions with site visit in next fiscal year	\$10,000	\$16,000	\$16,000
Focused, Further Information Needed, and Revisits	0	\$10,000	\$17,000
Site Visits <sup>2</sup> (6 <sup>th</sup> year) + scheduled NCATE visits <sup>3</sup>	\$15,000	\$52,000	\$120,000
Technical Assistance Visits—volunteers/new sponsors <sup>4</sup>	\$9,000	\$15,000	\$2,000
COA <sup>5</sup>	\$12,000	\$80,000	\$80,000
	<b>\$56,000</b>	<b>\$350,000</b>	<b>\$350,000</b>

1. Does not include Induction programs. Subject Matter programs would be reviewed in the 4<sup>th</sup> year process in a manner yet to be determined.
2. Site Visits will begin in 06-07 with institutions that volunteer to be reviewed and a full slate of 15-16 site visits will take place in 07-08.

3. *During the transition, NCATE visits—05-06 (1), 06-07 (6) and 07-08 (4)—program review will take place during the site visit per the NCATE partnership agreement. By fiscal year 08-09, the revised system will be in place for all NCATE visits and program review will take place two years prior to the site visit.*
4. *Ask 4-6 early volunteers or new institutions to take part in a technical assistance visit in Spring 06, and another 10 institutions to participate in a technical assistance visit in 06-07. The visits will provide feedback to the CTC and assist in preparing the institution for its accreditation visit. Institutions will then be placed on the regular accreditation schedule.*
5. *Reduced COA schedule in 05-06 since system is not fully implemented yet.*

**Revised System at Full Implementation (08-09 and after)\***

**Assumptions--Annually:**

- 108 individual program sponsors
- 15-16 institutions on each year of the cycle—therefore every year there will be
  - 54 Biennial reports
  - 15-16 Program Reviews (4<sup>th</sup> year) with an average of about 8 programs each (126 programs)
  - 15-16 Site Visits (6<sup>th</sup> year)
- Staff reviews the Biennial Reports and reports to the COA.
- Eight Regional meetings for Program Review—(Sac, LA, SD, Bay Area, Central Valley—rotating locations) 252 reviewers @ \$200 on average for 1 day meetings. All reviewers must attend meetings, at least initially.
- Fifteen to sixteen site visits @ \$7,500 on average per site visit—staff plus team of 3-7 reviewers, on average.
- Six 2-day COA meetings—allows COA to review the Biennial Reports, the Program Reviews and make decision regarding a focused program visit. In addition, the COA will review Team Reports from the site visits and make accreditation decisions.

**Table 6: Annual Budget for Revised Accreditation System at Full Implementation**

Activity	Annual Cost	% of Cost	Staff	\$ estimate
BIR Training	\$50,000	14 %	Administrator, 1 FTE	\$110,000
Program Review (4 <sup>th</sup> year)	\$65,000	18 %	Consultants, 3 FTEs	\$300,000
Previsits site visit in next fiscal year	\$16,000	5 %	SSA, 1 FTE	\$80,000
Focused, Further Information Needed, and Revisits	\$27,000	8 %	Secretary	\$50,000
Site Visits (6 <sup>th</sup> year)	\$117,000	32 %		
COA	\$80,000	23 %		
	<b>\$355,000</b>			<b>\$540,000</b>

*\* Although, a full slate of accreditation visits will take place in 07-08, the NCATE merged visits will still include the program review process at the site visit—due to the fact that the document review for the 07-*



08 site visits will not take place during 05-06. This fact impacts the budget for the 07-08 fiscal year site visits.

**Important Consideration:**

Please note these figures represent only the educator credential programs currently in the accreditation system and the inclusion of the LEA sponsored Designated Subjects Programs. Other programs are proposed for addition to make the review process consistent for all credential areas. The proposed programs, such as Induction and subject matter programs could have significant cost implications.

**Additional Issues Beyond the Scope of the Current Charge to the Work Group**

The work group and the COA have identified numerous areas that are related in some manner to accreditation but are beyond the charge of this particular work group. These issues range from fairly simple to significant in scope. Some may need discussion and possibly further work by an advisory body. The work group and COA wanted to bring these items to the attention of the Commission.

**Preferred Option: SB 2042 Required Elements**

**The Commission should identify a small expert writing group to carefully examine the SB 2042 standards and evaluate and consider where changes are needed relative to the concept of ‘required elements’ versus ‘factors to consider.’ The product should be distributed for stakeholder review and feedback prior to Commission adoption.**

**Background:** Prior to SB 2042, the standards had “Factors to Consider” and the review teams were guided by the factors. The existing *Accreditation Framework* discusses the need to recognize that institutions and program sponsors can meet the standards in different ways. The SB 2042 standards include “required elements” and the reviewers are asked to hold the institution accountable for every element. Further, there is a concern that there may be some inconsistencies between content of the standards and some of the elements.

**Rationale:** Institutions and program sponsors have expressed concern that the move to ‘required elements’ as a result of the SB 2042 standards adoption may be too prescriptive and contrary to the efforts to move towards an outcomes-based accreditation mode. However, because this would be a huge policy change with potential long term repercussions, the work group and COA suggest that further work be focused in this area.

**Preferred Option: Experimental Program Standards**

**The Commission should convene a group to review and suggest revisions to the Experimental Program Standards.**

**Background:** The current Experimental Program standards were approved in 1988.

**Rationale:** The COA and the work group are suggesting that the Experimental program option remain in a revised accreditation system as there continues to be a need for programs that allow for experimentation and research and that are designed to add to the body of knowledge about teaching and learning. However, the groups believe that the current set of experimental program standards may not sufficiently address current needs and should be reviewed and revised where appropriate.

### **Additional Issues Requiring Further Discussion by the COA**

With respect to the following issues, the Accreditation Work Group reached consensus at its last meeting, but the Committee on Accreditation has not yet fully discussed these items. The result of the COA discussion on these topics will be included in the October agenda item for the Commission's consideration.

#### **Professional Administrative Services Credential Guidelines Based Programs Work Group**

**Consensus:** The Commission should consider that both the Guidelines based Administrative Services Credential programs and the Standards based Administrative Services Credential programs be reviewed by the COA for ongoing accreditation. The process should be of equal rigor, although not necessarily the same.

**Background:** The new guidelines-based administrative services credentials were adopted by the Commission several years ago after a strong desire by public officials to create a route to the Professional Administrative Services Credential that was designed around a strong mentoring component at the site level. The guidelines based Administrative Services Credentials programs are currently subject to an initial staff review and approval by the Commission, while the standards-based administrative services credentials have been a part of the current on-going accreditation process reviewed by members of the BIR and subject to COA accreditation.

**Rationale:** The work group recognizes that the new guidelines-based programs are viewed favorably at the site level and have provided for a viable new pathway to the Professional administrative services credential. However, the inconsistency in the review process needs to be addressed. The work group believes that, ultimately, while the process for reviewing these programs may be different, the process should be of equal rigor.

**Subject Matter Programs Work Group Consensus:** The Commission should convene a group to review and suggest revisions to the subject matter program approval process.

**Background:** The issue of subject matter competence has taken on new importance in recent years. Yet, the current accreditation system does not include on-going review of subject matter preparation programs. These programs are reviewed initially when seeking initial approval or when new standards are adopted. One of the major reasons for this is that, historically, these were considered within the purview of undergraduate preparation programs, most of which are not within the schools of education. The initial approval of these programs which includes the institution submitting a program document and completing the review process is considered an arduous task.

***Rationale:*** While there exists a universally accepted public policy that requires all teachers be competent in the subjects that they teach and to know and be able to teach to the K-12 academic content standards, there is very little incentive for subject matter preparation programs to go through the formal approval process that would offer some level of assurance of alignment of program offerings to these goals. The Accreditation Work Group recognizes the complexity of this topic. It has been suggested previously in this agenda item, in Preferred Option # 13, that subject matter programs should participate in some type of periodic review in addition to the initial review of the program. The initial program review process has been difficult, and extremely time consuming. There are close to subject matter programs approved or in the pipeline, and adding these programs into the accreditation system will be costly.

In addition, the work group recognizes the far reaching implications of the current situation. The work group suggests that further discussion take place that addresses the current need for subject matter programs, particularly in mathematics and science, and a review process that would not discourage institutions from seeking official recognition for their alignment with the K-12 content standards.

**Preconditions Work Group Consensus:** The Commission should direct staff to review all preconditions and develop recommendations for the Commission to ensure that they are appropriate and equitable for all types of programs.

***Background:*** Preconditions are laws or policies that must be met by institutions offering educator preparation programs. They are different from standards because they are typically present or not present, and do not require interpretation or professional judgment in order to evaluate. Regional accreditation is an example of a precondition. Due to the development of different credential programs at different points in time and through different pieces of legislation, some credential programs have preconditions while others do not. While preconditions exist for many, they are generally not coordinated, consistent, or organized across all programs.

***Rationale:*** A review would be needed of all preconditions to ensure consistency across programs.

**Common (Unit) Standards Work Group Consensus:** The Commission should convene a group or ask the COA to review and suggest revisions to the Common Standards.

***Background:*** The Common Standards were adopted in 1995. These standards address the broader overarching issues related to the institution or district as a whole.

***Rationale:*** It has been a decade since the Common Standards were reviewed and it would be timely for such a review to take place. New language might be appropriate to better ensure that the overall objectives and four identified goals of the proposed revised accreditation process are achieved. It is possible that there is content in national standards for educator preparation that the Commission could incorporate into the Common Standards. Given the importance of the Common Standards as the central basis for accreditation decisions, the work group believes that they should be reviewed and updated.

**Blended Program Standards Work Group Consensus:** Recommend that the Commission infuse the requirements of the six Blended Program Standards into the specific program standards (MS, SS, and Education Specialist) so that if a program wants to offer a blended system of delivery (in a similar manner as the Intern Program is a delivery system), then that program would address the blended standards within the basic program document. Institutions/Program Sponsors would submit biennial data reports with data disaggregated by delivery mode (blended, intern, or traditional).

***Background:*** There are currently six program standards that all approved blended programs are required to meet. An institution that wants to offer an approved Blended Program must have both an approved subject matter program and an approved teacher preparation program. Then the institution would submit an additional document that addresses the Blended Standards.

***Rationale:*** The work group believes that because the institution must have an approved subject matter program and an approved teacher preparation program, the Blended Program concept is a method of delivery of the educational services, much like an intern program. As such, the work group suggests that review of an institution's Blended Program can be integrated into the on-going accreditation review of the institution as a whole, rather than distinct with its own additional approval process.

**Attachment A**

**Accreditation Study Work Group**  
**Matrix of Issues**

## Accreditation Study Work Group Topic, Issues and Options Matrix

### I. Topics where the Accreditation Study Work Group has reached consensus on a recommendation to the COA

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Purpose of Accreditation “Framework - Introduction to the Framework”	Refine the purpose of accreditation for California’s educator preparation programs, taking into consideration the policy and budget environment in California and nationally.  <i>Does the current purpose of the Accreditation system as contained in the introduction of the Accreditation Framework reflect the generally agreed upon purpose(s) of accreditation today?</i>	<del>Continue purposes as defined in <i>Accreditation Framework</i></del>
		Modify definition of purpose of accreditation *** <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose of accreditation: Ensure accountability; Adhere to standards; Ensure high quality and effective preparation programs; Support program improvement.</li> <li>• Essential Attributes: Description of the attributes of the accreditation system: <i>Professional Nature; Knowledgeable participants; Breadth and flexibility; Intensity, Efficiency and cost-effectiveness.</i></li> </ul>
Role of CTC and COA  Framework: Sections 1 & 2  Handbook	The Commission’s vision statement is “To ensure that those who educate the children of this state are academically and professionally prepared.” One of the Commission’s goals is to: “Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators. “ The COA has responsibility for implementing the accreditation system, while the Commission establishes policies. The COA reports to the Commission on an annual basis.  <i>Do the roles and responsibilities of the Commission and COA under the current accreditation system provide appropriate oversight of teacher education and maximum efficiency?</i>	Continue the roles of the Commission and COA as defined in the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> but improve communication between COA and Commission by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) On-going COA representative reports at Commission meetings as appropriate, but more frequently than annual reporting. COA will investigate and implement processes that will allow the Commission to better determine how its accreditation policies are being implemented.***</li> <li><del>b) COA information or consent item on the agenda at each Commission meeting, or as appropriate</del></li> </ul>
		<del>Modify the role of the Commission in accreditation</del> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>e) Commission ratification of accreditation decisions made by COA</del></li> <li><del>d) Eliminate COA, Commission makes all accreditation decisions</del></li> <li><del>e) COA initially accredits institutions instead of the Commission</del></li> </ul>

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Unit Accreditation and Program Approval Framework: Section 5	<p>Currently California’s accreditation system involves a single accreditation decision for the institution—unit accreditation. The individual programs are approved within the process of coming to the institution’s accreditation decision.</p> <p><i>Does the current system need to be modified to ensure appropriate attention to both program and unit issues?</i></p>	<p><del>Continue to accredit the institution with program approval embedded in the single accreditation process.</del></p> <p><del>Move back to a program approval system without any institution wide accreditation decision</del></p> <p>Develop a new system that addresses both unit accreditation AND enhanced program review in a different manner. (For more information on this proposed system, see topics 11-15 of this matrix.) ***</p>
Accreditation as a single event or an on-going activity Framework: Section 5	<p>Currently the accreditation system examines an institution every six years with a ‘snapshot.’ The COA decides on an accreditation finding and if that finding is Accreditation, the institution does not interact with the COA until the next review in six years.</p> <p><i>Would an approach that allows historical data to be considered better support the purposes of an accreditation system?</i></p>	<p><del>Maintain the current system with the snapshot approach</del></p> <p>Modify the system to reflect the fact that accreditation is an on-going activity. Accreditation should be viewed as an on-going cycle of activities focused on accountability, meeting the standards, and data driven decision making. The prior accreditation report and continuing data reports are considered in the accreditation system. ***</p>
Accreditation Decisions Framework: Section 5	<p>Current Framework includes three options—Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations, and Denial of Accreditation. Current Framework also requires all Stipulations to be cleared within one year.</p> <p><i>Does this menu of options or the time frame for follow-up need to be modified in any way?</i></p>	<p><del>Continue with the current accreditation options as described in the <i>Accreditation Framework</i></del></p> <p>Modify the accreditation system to more clearly show individual program findings. Program Standard findings on standards will include Standard Met, Met with Concerns, Met Minimally, and Not Met. Revise the Unit Accreditation findings to include the finding of full accreditation for the educational unit with required follow-up. ***</p>
National Unit	<p>Current law states that national accreditation of an educational unit may be substituted for state accreditation, if specific conditions are met. Conditions are set forth in the <i>Framework</i>. As the current accreditation system is implemented, national</p>	<p>Continue national unit accreditation options as defined in Ed Code and <i>Accreditation Framework</i>: Agreements and protocols with national accrediting bodies may need to be adjusted to accommodate the revised state accreditation system.***</p>

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Accreditation  Framework: Section 7	accreditation separate from state accreditation has not taken place in California.  <i>How or should national accreditation of the education unit integrate with state accreditation?</i>	<del>Replace California's accreditation process with national accreditation</del> <del>Eliminate national accreditation options</del> <del>Modify existing practice...</del>
National Program Accreditation  Framework: Section 7	Current law states that national accreditation of a specific program may be substituted for state accreditation, if specific conditions are met. Conditions are set forth in the <i>Framework</i> . As the current accreditation system is implemented, national accreditation separate from state accreditation has not taken place in California.  <i>How or should national accreditation of individual preparation programs integrate with state accreditation?</i>	<del>Continue national program accreditation options as defined in Ed Code and Accreditation Framework, no change required</del> <del>Replace California's program approval process with national program accreditation or approval</del> <del>Eliminate national program options</del> All California programs must participate in the California accreditation process. California supports national program accreditation when the national program review can be coordinated with the California process*** (National organizations may do the preliminary work of determining alignment of national standards to California standards, but COA will review all standards for comparability.)
Program Standard Options  Framework: Section 3	Currently, there are five program standard options that institutions may choose among: California Standards, National or Professional Standards, General Standards, Experimental Standards, or Alternative Standards.  <i>Do each of the five current options provide equivalent or adequate standards for accreditation activities? Should the options be modified or changed?</i>	<del>Continue with the current five program standard options</del> Provide three program standards options: 1) California Program Standards, 2) National or Professional Program Standards, or 3) Alternate Program Standards. These alternate standards include experimental or research based and alternative standards. If national standards are used, comparability must be established and programs must address the California specific standards in addition to the national standards. *** <del>Require all institutions to use 1) California or 2) National or Professional Program Standards</del> <del>Require all institutions to use California Program Standards only</del>



I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Evaluation of the Accreditation System Framework: Section 8	Currently Section 8 of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> defines how the accreditation system is evaluated and modified. Because the law required a one time, external evaluation of the system and that evaluation has taken place, much of the current Section 8 would not apply to a revised accreditation system.	Modify Section 8 of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> to define an ongoing data collection process regarding the efficacy of the accreditation system. Define how modifications will be made in the future and when stakeholder input is required.***
		<del>Leave Section 8 of the Accreditation Framework as it is currently</del>
Selection of COA members Framework: Section 2	The current selection process for COA members is cumbersome and costly. <i>Can the selection process be simplified, still meet the requirements of the Education Code, and support the selection of quality COA members?</i>	<del>Keep current process with no modifications</del> Modify the selection process to reduce costs, prevent large turnover of COA members in the same year, streamline the nominating panel process. ***
Site Level Activity— Scope and Structure Framework: Section 5	The current site visit reviews all standards—unit and program—through document review, interviews and a self-study at the institution. <i>What should take place during the site level activity? Could the site level activity benefit from increased use of technology?</i>	<del>Continue with the current site visit as defined in the Accreditation Framework where both unit and program standards are examined.</del>
		Move to a “focused site visit” that reviews only some standards or some programs. Review the unit through a site visit. Review all programs through biennial data collection and once per cycle document review prior to site activity. Program issues identified during the biennial report and document review can also be addressed during the site review.***
	Currently, institutions have a site visit every six years. (NCATE has moved to a seven year cycle with additional	<del>Continue with the six year cycle as defined in the Accreditation Framework</del>

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Site Level Activity-Frequency Framework: Section 5	interim reporting mechanisms required during the interval.)  <i>What is the appropriate cycle for the future site level activity?</i>	Move to a seven year cycle but with biennial data collection and an interim activity in the fourth year of the cycle. Develop a plan for immediate intervention, if warranted, based on Biennial Report, Program Document Review. ***
Interim Review Activities Framework: Section 5	The BTSA program review process incorporates an informal peer review which occurs between formal site visits. The value of these activities for program improvement is widely understood in the BTSA community.  <i>What type of interim activities—unit or program focused—would support program improvement?</i>	<del>Standards based review process that takes place in the interval between the site visits. The process could be focused on the unit or the programs, there are options for institutions, and the activity is required.**</del> Biennial report. Standards related data is collected annually. Programs report biennially. Reports are used by program review process and by the site team. *** No interim review activity
Use of Technology	Currently, the use of technology is not integrated into the accreditation system in any sort of systematic manner. <i>Would it be helpful to systematize and/or increase the use of technology in accreditation activities: annual reports, program documents, site visits, reports</i>	<del>Leave the use of technology (type and level of) to the individual institution.</del> Use technology to support the 1) biennial reports, 2) program documents, 3) site visits ***
Data Collection	Annual, bi-annual, or periodic data collection on programs and/or the unit. Information gathered could be used to inform, and possibly structure, the site visit.	<del>Goal for institution to aggregate data, systematically review the data and use the data for program improvement*</del> Focus on candidate competence through pre- and post- test, TPA scores, employer survey, candidate self-assessment*

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Framework: Section 5	<p><i>What type of data should be collected and analyzed 1) during the site visit, and 2) in an interim activity, or annually? How should the data impact 1) the accreditation decision and 2) the focus of the site visit?</i></p> <p><i>What data will provide information on candidate competence?</i></p>	<p>Each institution submits a biennial web based report particularly focused on a selected, specific standard area. For the initial cycles, this area will be candidate competence and related assessments. Periodically CTC can designate a different standard area to be the focus of the next designated time period, with appropriate notice to programs of the change. These reports are used by next site review team. *** #</p> <p><del>Use of surveys—program completers, employers, IHE faculty to gather appropriate information*</del></p>
BIR Training	<p>The current Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) training was developed for the current accreditation system. If a new accreditation system is adopted, a new training must be developed that is appropriate for the new system. The training must ensure quality in the reviews and consistency in the process.</p>	<p><del>COA, with interested stakeholders, will develop a training process during 05-06.*</del></p> <p>COA will review and revise the content and process for BIR training. COA will gather feedback from the field and modify as necessary. COA will present the training to the Commission for comment prior to adoption. *** #</p>
Selection of Review Teams	<p>Currently, site review team size varies greatly due to the size of the institution and the number of programs in operation at the institution. <i>What should guide the composition of the review team in a revised accreditation system?</i></p>	<p>COA will review and revise the guidelines for review team composition. COA will gather feedback from the field and modify as necessary. COA will present the guidelines to the Commission for comment prior to adoption. *** #</p> <p><del>Use the current composition and selection guidelines. No review or change would be needed.</del></p>
Selection of interviews and site visits	<p><i>How should sites and interviewees be selected to ensure a fair and unbiased representation of interviewees and to allow the review team to obtain an accurate understanding of the quality of an institution or district's credential programs?</i></p>	<p>COA will review and revise the guidelines for selection of site visits and interviews. COA will gather feedback from the field and modify as necessary. COA will present the guidelines to the Commission for comment prior to adoption. *** #</p> <p><del>Use the current selection guidelines. No review or change would be needed.</del></p>

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
<p>Specialized Credential Programs Framework: Section 5</p>	<p>In addition to Multiple and Single Subject Credentials, the Commission awards credentials in many specialized areas— Special Education, Pupil Personnel Services, Administrative Services, Designated Subjects, and Intern credentials. <i>Should there be any modifications to the accreditation system to support the review of these programs?</i></p>	<p>Include specialized credential programs in the revised system. Review specialized programs through the biennial report and 4<sup>th</sup> year program review process. If concerns are raised in the 4<sup>th</sup> year program review process, include the specialized program in the site visit. ***</p>
<p>Certificate Programs Framework: Section 5</p>	<p>Certificate programs (CLAD/BCLAD, Early Childhood for example) have not previously been a part of the accreditation system, although Reading certificate is now a part of accreditation. <i>Should all the certificate programs be reviewed through the accreditation system process?</i></p>	<p><del>Continue to approve certificate programs with no on-going program approval</del> Review CTC approved certificate programs through the accreditation system in addition to the original program approval process. ***</p>
<p>Multiple Subject-Subject Matter Programs</p>	<p>Subject matter programs are initially approved by a team of readers and there has been no ongoing review of the programs after the initial approval. Multiple Subject Programs can be offered by an IHE to help candidates develop subject matter competence. Prior to NCLB, completion of a subject matter program waived the examination requirement. Currently completion of a program does not waive the examination requirement. <i>Should the Multiple Subject subject matter programs be reviewed (on-going review) through the accreditation or some other process?</i> <i>Should a transition begin so that eventually the subject matter programs are reviewed through the accreditation system?</i></p>	<p><del>Continue current initial program approval process and no further program review</del> Continue current initial program approval and in addition collect data every seven years from programs, but not include in the institution’s accreditation decision. Periodic data (CSET scores-contingent on the availability of meaningful score reports, course matrix showing alignment with K-12 academic content standards) will support the program in focusing on the K-12 content standards and program improvement and could result in further review. *** <del>Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system.</del></p>

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Single Subject-Matter Programs	<p>Subject matter programs are initially approved by a team of readers and there has been no ongoing review of the programs after the initial approval. Single Subject Programs can be offered by an IHE to satisfy the subject matter requirement.</p> <p><i>Should the Single Subject subject matter programs be reviewed (on-going review) through the accreditation or some other process?</i></p> <p><i>Should a transition begin so that eventually the subject matter programs are reviewed through the accreditation system?</i></p>	<p><del>Continue current initial program approval process and no further program review</del></p> <p>Continue current initial program approval and in addition collect data every seven years from programs but do not include in the institution’s accreditation decision. Periodic data (course matrix showing alignment with the K-12 academic content standards, program evaluation data and an update on program changes) will support the program in focusing on the K-12 content standards and program improvement and could result in further review.***</p> <p><del>Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner.*</del></p> <p><del>Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system</del></p>
Designated Subjects Programs Framework: Section 5	<p>Institutions of higher education and local education agencies may both offer designated subjects credential programs. Both types of programs are initially reviewed by a panel for initial program approval. Currently, only the IHE programs are reviewed through the accreditation system. <i>Should LEA sponsored designated subjects programs be reviewed through the accreditation system?</i></p>	<p><del>Continue the initial program approval process for designated subject programs. Only the IHE sponsored programs are reviewed through the accreditation system.</del></p> <p>Continue the initial program approval process for designated subject programs. Both IHE and LEA sponsored programs are reviewed through the accreditation system. ***</p>
5 <sup>th</sup> Year Programs	<p>Prior to SB 2042, the three Fifth Year courses were initially approved with no further review. The SB 2042 Fifth Year Programs are teacher preparation programs offered by institutions that have a Multiple Subject or Single Subject Preliminary Preparation Programs. One institution must recommend the candidate for the SB 2042 Professional Clear Credential as an alternative route to completion of induction. <i>Should 5<sup>th</sup> year programs be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i></p>	<p><del>Continue current initial program approval process with no further review</del></p> <p><del>Include 5<sup>th</sup> year programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner. Review should be equitable to the review process of Induction programs.**</del></p> <p>Include 5<sup>th</sup> year programs in the accreditation system as other programs. *** #</p>

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Induction Programs	<p>There are currently 149 Commission approved BTSA Induction Programs—these programs are funded through the Department of Education. In the past, the BTSA Task Force has implemented a Formal Program Review process to review the BTSA programs on a four year cycle. Now Induction Programs are the preferred path to earn the Professional Clear Credential and there could in the future be induction programs that are not BTSA programs—offered by IHEs or other local agencies. <i>Should Induction Programs be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i></p> <p><i>Should the goal be to begin a transition designed to fully integrate Induction Programs into the accreditation system?</i></p>	<p><del>Continue current initial program approval process and ongoing review with Formal Program Review with oversight by the BTSA Task Force for BTSA Induction programs.</del></p> <p><del>Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner. Review should be equitable to the review process of Fifth Year programs.**</del></p> <p>Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system. For funded programs, BTSA Task Force (under the direction of the COA) coordinates the process, and the COA accredits the programs based on site visit and other reports. Process should be of at least equal rigor to the adopted accreditation process. *** #</p>
Evaluation of the revised system #	<p>The proposed revised accreditation system is drastically different than the current accreditation system. <i>How can we be sure that the new system is increasing accountability? Fostering program improvement? Ensuring high quality preparation programs?</i></p>	<p>All elements of the revised accreditation system must be evaluated in a short but reasonable period of time to ensure implementation is move forward appropriately and that the new system is holding all program sponsors accountable. #</p>
2042 Required Elements	<p>Prior to SB 2042, the standards had “Factors to Consider” and the review teams were guided by the factors. The 2042 Standards (subject matter, teacher prep, induction and 5<sup>th</sup> year) have “Required Elements” and the reviewers are asked to hold the institution accountable for every element. <i>A concern has been expressed that the ‘required elements’ may be too prescriptive and contrary to efforts to move towards an outcomes-based accreditation mode. Should the required elements aspect of the SB 2042 standards be reviewed and revised?</i></p>	<p>Recommend that the Commission identify a small expert writing group to carefully examine the 2042 standards and evaluate and consider where changes are needed relative to the concept of ‘required elements’ versus ‘factors to consider.’ Product distributed for stakeholder review and feedback prior to adoption. ***</p> <p><del>Recommend that the “Required Elements” in the SB 2042 Standards be revised to “Factors to Consider” in keeping with the attribute of flexibility in the accreditation system</del></p> <p><del>No change to the current system, maintain Required Elements</del></p>

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Administrative Services Guideline based Programs	The current pathways to earn an Administrative Services Professional Credential include both standards based programs and guideline based programs (in addition, AB 75 programs are approved by the CDE). The approval and review process for the two types of programs differ. <i>Should both types of programs be approved and reviewed under the same process?</i>	<p><del>Continue to use the current two pathways to the Tier II credential with the two program approval and review processes.</del></p> <p>Recommend the Commission consider that both the Guidelines based programs and Standards based programs be reviewed and approved by the COA for ongoing accreditation. The processes should be of equal rigor although not necessarily the same. *** #</p>
Experimental Program Standards	An institution may submit a program designed to meet the Experimental Program standards. These standards were approved in 1988. <i>Should the Experimental Program Standards be reviewed and revised?</i>	<p><del>Continue to use the currently approved Experimental Program Standards</del></p> <p>Recommend the Commission convene a group to review and suggest revisions to the Experimental Program Standards ***</p>
30) Standards for Induction and 5 <sup>th</sup> year programs	Currently Induction programs (LEA or IHE based programs) have to meet the Commission adopted Induction Standards which are 20 standards. Fifth Year programs (IHE based) must meet the Commission adopted Fifth Year of Study Standards which are four standards. The field perceives this as an inequity for the two routes to the MS and SS Professional Clear Credential. <i>Should the standards for Induction and 5<sup>th</sup> year of study programs be reviewed and possibly revised?</i>	<p>Standards for the Professional Clear MS and SS credential should be aligned to hold candidates to equally rigorous courses of study, although possibly different courses of study*** #</p> <p><del>Continue with the current Induction standards (20 standards) and Fifth Year standards (4 standards) for candidates to earn the Professional Clear MS or SS Credential.</del></p>

I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Subject Matter Programs	<p>Currently, the process of submitting a program document and completing the review process is viewed as an arduous task. <i>Should subject matter programs be reviewed in a different manner that streamlines the process but still ensures program quality? Is there a way to facilitate candidate's satisfaction of subject matter requirements in fields such as math and science where there is a critical need for teachers?</i></p>	<p>Recommend the Commission convene a group to review and suggest revisions to the subject matter approval process. *** #</p> <p>See Items 21 and 22 for consensus option for review of subject matter programs.</p>
Pre-conditions	<p>Preconditions exist but are not coordinated, consistent or organized across all programs. <i>Should the Preconditions be reviewed and possibly made more consistent across all programs?</i></p>	<p>Recommend the Commission direct staff to review all Preconditions and develop recommendations for the Commission to ensure that Preconditions are appropriate and equitable for all types of programs. *** #</p> <p><del>Preconditions do not need review or revision.</del></p>
Common Standards	<p><i>The Common Standards were adopted in 19 . Should the Common Standards be reviewed and possibly revised? Are there portions of the national standards that should or could be incorporated into the Common Standards?</i></p>	<p>Recommend the Commission convene a group to review and suggest revisions to the Common Standards. *** #</p> <p><del>Maintain current Common Standards without review.</del></p>
Blended	<p>There are currently six program standards that all approved blended programs are required to meet. An institution that wants to offer an approved blended program must have both an</p>	<p><del>Continue to use the six Blended Program Standards as a separate set of standards that approved blended programs must submit to in addition to the subject matter and the teacher preparation standards.</del></p>



I: Consensus Issues

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Program Standards	<p>approved subject matter program and an approved teacher preparation program. Then the institution would submit an additional document that addresses the Blended Standards. The blended document is reviewed by readers, possibly readers that have not reviewed both the subject matter and the teacher preparation documents.</p> <p><i>Should the elements of the six Blended Program Standards be integrated within the preparation program standards and the blended program is viewed as a delivery mode or should the Blended Program Standards remain distinct with an additional approval process?</i></p>	<p>Recommend that the Commission infuse the requirements of the six Blended Program Standards into the specific program standards (MS, SS, and Ed Sp) so that if a program wants to offer a blended system of delivery (in a similar manner as the Intern program is a specific type of delivery system), then that program would address the blended standards within the basic program document. Institutions/Program Sponsors would submit biennial data reports with data disaggregated by delivery mode (blended, intern or traditional). *** #</p>

II: Topics where the Work Group has not yet reached consensus

**II. Topics where the Work Group has not yet reached consensus and would like to continue to work**

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Specialized Credential Programs	<p>In addition to Multiple and Single Subject Credentials, the Commission awards credentials in many specialized areas— Special Education, Pupil Personnel Services, Administrative Services, Designated Subjects, and Intern credentials.</p> <p><i>Should there be any modifications to the accreditation system to support the review of these programs?</i></p>	<p>There are additional issues to consider related to specialized credential programs that are beyond the topic of the reviewing and revising the accreditation system. *** #</p> <p>The work group needs to discuss these issues more to offer specific options.</p>
Indicators of immediate intervention needed & types (steps in) of intervention #	<p><i>When should an institution or program be asked to provide additional information to the COA? When should the COA schedule a focused site visit?</i></p>	<p>Work group agenda for August 2005</p>