6C

Action

Professional Services Committee

Extension of Terms for Members of the Committee on Accreditation

Executive Summary: The terms of six members of the Committee on Accreditation expired on June 30, 2005. This agenda item provides background information relating to the terms of committee members and provides information about the advisability of extending those terms.

Recommended Action: That the Commission take action on the possible extension of terms for members of the Committee on Accreditation whose terms have expired.

Presenter: Lawrence Birch, Administrator, Professional Services Division.

Strategic Plan Goal: 1

Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

♦ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators.
♦ Assess and monitor the efficacy of the Accreditation System, Examination System, and State and Federal Funded Programs.

Extension of Terms for Members of the Committee on Accreditation

Background

Education Code Section 44373 established the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and delegates to the Committee the authority to make decisions about the accreditation of educator preparation in accordance with policies adopted by the Commission set forth in the *Accreditation Framework*. By statute, the COA consists of 12 members selected for their distinguished records of accomplishment in education. Education Code 44373 specifies, "six members shall be from postsecondary education institutions, and six shall be certificated professionals in public schools, school districts, or county offices of education in California. No member shall serve on the Committee as a representative of any organization or institution." The law requires membership to be (to the maximum extent possible) balanced in terms of ethnicity, gender, and geographic regions and requires the Commission to include members from elementary and secondary schools, and members from public and private institutions of postsecondary education. The *Accreditation Framework* also defines the process and procedures for selecting new members of the COA. The terms of six members of the COA expired on June 30, 2005. This agenda item provides options and considerations concerning the extension of those terms to allow the COA to complete its review of the *Accreditation Framework*.

In December 2002, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) took action to focus its accreditation activities for the remainder of 2002-2003 and all of 2003-2004 on initial program accreditation activities to fully implement the SB 2042 standards. Accreditation site visits scheduled in those time periods were postponed with the exception that all scheduled NCATE/Commission merged visits would be held according to schedule. In light of this action, the Commission determined that it was not prudent to conduct a selection process for new COA members during that time. The Commission took action on May 8, 2003 to extend the terms of all COA members for an additional two years. Faced with significant budget constraints, the Commission took action on March 25, 2004, to suspend all non-NCATE accreditation visits for an additional state fiscal year (2004-2005).

The two-year extension of terms enabled the Commission to maintain the full membership of the Committee on Accreditation during the review of its accreditation system. By having experienced members, the COA was better able to participate in discussions about the future of accreditation and work with the Accreditation Study Work Group in advising the Commission on accreditation issues as required under the *Framework* and requested by the Commission at its May 2004 meeting. The postponement of the selection process to seek and screen nominations and to schedule subsequent interviews with the Commission resulted in cost savings during the two-year period.

Appointments to the Committee on Accreditation

As a result of the Commission's action to extend the terms of COA members taken two years ago, there are now six members of the Committee whose terms ended on June 30, 2005. The terms of the other six members of the Committee will end on June 30, 2006. Because the Commission had not yet taken action on a revised accreditation system and because sufficient resources were not available, the COA selection process was not conducted last year that would have appointed new COA members.

COA Terms ending June 30, 2005	COA Terms ending June 30, 2006
Diane Doe – K-12 San Francisco Unified School District	Karen O'Connor – K-12 Poway Unified School District
Dana Griggs – K-12 Ontario Montclair School District	Donna Uyemoto – K-12 Dublin Unified School District
David Madrigal – K-12 Antioch Unified School District	Michael Watenpaugh – K-12 Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District
Fred Baker – Postsecondary Education Calif. Polytechnic State Univ., Pomona	Lynne Cook – Postsecondary Education California State University, Northridge
Ed Kujawa – Postsecondary Education Dominican University	Ruth Sandlin – Postsecondary Education Calif. State University, San Bernardino
Irma Guzman Wagner – Postsecondary Educ. California State University, Stanislaus	Sue Teele – Postsecondary Education University of California, Riverside

At the May-June 2005 Commission meeting, the Commission discussed the possibility of further extending terms for Committee on Accreditation members to enable the completion of the accreditation review and the transition to a revised *Accreditation Framework*.

The review of the *Framework* has included discussions between the COA and the Accreditation Study Work Group about the current selection process and potential modifications that would make it less cumbersome and less costly. The current procedures are outlined in Section 2 of the 1995 *Accreditation Framework* (see Appendix A). The Committee on Accreditation in conjunction with the Accreditation Study Work Group has identified a preferred option concerning a modified selection process (see agenda item 6B – Accreditation Topic 14 for a more complete description). Suggested modifications to the 2005 *Accreditation Framework* would include a less cumbersome process for selecting the nominating committee, a more complete process for soliciting nominations, a change in the length of terms so that only 1/4 of the COA members will need to be replaced each year, and a transition schedule for COA appointments that will ensure consistency as the Commission moves to the revised *Framework*. When the Commission takes action on the revised *Accreditation Framework*, it will make final decisions on how it wishes to select COA members in the future and how the transition will be made to the new Committee under the *2005 Accreditation Framework*.

Options, Costs, and Considerations

As the Commission transitions from the 1995 *Framework* to the 2005 *Framework*, the Committee on Accreditation will be responsible for implementing the policies of the revised *Framework*, including a revision of the Commission's *Accreditation Handbook*, which provides guidelines for accreditation reviews. The development of implementation procedures will be a major focus of the COA during the entire 2005-06 fiscal year. In reviewing the following options, the Commission may wish to consider the need for continuity and committee member experience as the COA begins to implement the modifications to the *Accreditation Framework* that the Commission adopts.

Option A: Extend the appointments of six COA members to June 30, 2006

If the Commission were to extend the terms of members of the Committee on Accreditation that expired on June 30, 2005 for an additional year to June 30, 2006, all COA terms would then end on the same date. Subject to the adoption of a revised selection process by the Commission, during the 2005-2006 year, a new selection process for new COA members could be implemented and the Commission could be ready to select new members by June 2006. The revised selection process will also include a transition plan that will indicate the number of new COA members to be selected each year and the number and terms of current COA members (if any) to be continued beyond June 30, 2006 throughout the transition.

Each of the six termed-out COA members has indicated a willingness to continue as members of the COA, should the Commission wish to extend their appointments for an additional year. The extension of terms for those members of the COA through June 30, 2006, would ensure that their significant knowledge of accreditation could assist in the completion of the accreditation review process. The Commission would also have the benefit of having experienced COA members to begin the process of implementing the Commission's revised *Framework*.

This option would have minimal costs in the current (2005-2006) year. Assuming the Commission adopts a selection and transition schedule similar to what is included as the preferred option by the Committee on Accreditation and the Accreditation Study Work Group (as presented in Item 6B of this agenda), it would be necessary to initiate the new selection process and appoint three new members of the COA who would begin their service on July 1, 2006. The estimated costs for selecting and appointing three new COA members would be approximately $3,500 in the 2005-06 fiscal year.

Option B: Extend the appointments of six COA members to December 31, 2005

If the Commission were to extend the terms of members of the Committee on Accreditation that expired on June 30, 2005 through December 31, 2005, there would then be six vacancies on the COA effective January 1, 2006. This option would require the nomination and appointment of six new COA members by the end of this calendar year in order to assure a quorum at the January 2006 COA meeting. Because the Commission has not yet adopted new procedures for selecting COA members, the older, more cumbersome and costly current selection process would need to be used. Historically, it has taken 9-10 months to complete all of the steps required in

the current selection process, from the appointment of the nominating panel, to the soliciting of nominees, to the selection of those to be interviewed by the Commission, to the interviews of the nominees by the Commission, and to their selection and appointment by the Commission. Further, the loss of expertise from the six experienced outgoing COA members could create challenges for beginning the implementation of new accreditation policies adopted by the Commission, as new COA members "learn the ropes" and become acquainted with the Commission's new accreditation policies.

Selection of this option, in essence, would limit the ability of the Commission to consider certain options for a revised COA selection and transition process and could hinder a smooth transition to a revised *Accreditation Framework*. This option would result in the need to select six members of the COA for terms of three years beginning January 1, 2006. The appointment of six new individuals under the current appointment procedures could make it difficult to phase in any new selection procedures that might be adopted in a revised *Accreditation Framework*. If this option were chosen, it would result in current year costs of approximately $6,150.

Option C: Extend the appointments of all COA members by one year:

Under this option, the terms of six COA members would expire on June 30, 2006 and the terms of the other six COA members would expire on June 30, 2007. Selection of this option, before the Commission has made a decision on the revised *Accreditation Framework*, would also limit the ability of the Commission to consider certain options for a revised COA selection and transition process. This option would put into place a selection process whereby six members of the COA would be new in the first year of implementation and six the next year. This option would lose many of the benefits of continuity and experience of the current COA during the transition to the revised *Framework*.

Subject to the adoption of a revised selection process by the Commission, during the 2005-2006 year, the new selection process for COA members could be implemented and the Commission could be ready to fill the six vacancies by June 2006. This option would have higher costs in the current (2005-2006) year than Option A because the Commission would be selecting six new members of the COA, instead of three. The Commission would need to interview twelve candidates for the six positions. Under this option, the current year costs for implementing the selection and appointment process for six new COA members who would begin their service July 1, 2006, would be approximately $5,300.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission choose one of the three options. Option A is consistent with the preferred option of the COA and the Accreditation Study Work Group, described in agenda item 6B, which would extend by one year, the terms of members of the Committee on Accreditation whose terms have expired. This action would result in the terms of all current COA members expiring on June 30, 2006. Further Commission decisions about the length of terms and on the process for selecting and appointing COA members would then be made within the context of its decisions about the entire *Accreditation Framework*.

Appendix A

Steps in the Current Process for the Selection of New COA Members

1995 *Accreditation Framework*, Section 2C

C.   Appointment of the Committee on Accreditation

1. **Nominating Panel.**   A Nominating Panel of six distinguished members of the education profession in California identifies and nominates individuals to serve on the Committee on Accreditation. The Nominating Panel is comprised of three college and university members and three elementary and secondary school members.   The Commission and the Accreditation Advisory Council must reach consensus on the members of the initial Nominating Panel. Subsequently, the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation will reach consensus on new members of the Nominating Panel. The terms of Nominating Panel members are four years long. Members of the Panel may not serve more than one term.

2. **Nomination of Committee Members.**   To select members for the Committee on Accreditation, the Nominating Panel solicits nominations from professional organizations, agencies, institutions, and individuals in education. Each nomination must be submitted with the consent of the individual and the nominee's professional resume. Self-nominations are not accepted.

3. **Selection of Initial Committee Members.**   Based on the membership criteria and the principles of balanced composition set forth in this section, the Nominating Panel recommends for initial appointment twenty-four highly qualified nominees who are drawn equally from colleges and universities (twelve nominees) and elementary and secondary schools (twelve nominees). The Commission appoints the twelve members and six alternate members of the Committee by selecting from the nominations submitted by the Panel.

4. **Terms of Appointment.** The Commission appoints members of the Committee on Accreditation to three-year terms. However, the initial appointees include six members with two-year appointments and six with three-year appointments. A member may be renominated and reappointed to a second term of three years. A member may serve a maximum of two terms on the Committee.

5. **Selection of Subsequent Committee Members.**   Prior to the conclusion of the Committee members' terms, the Nominating Panel again submits nominations to the Commission, which must be drawn from individuals who have been nominated and reviewed.   The Panel submits twice as many nominees as the number of pending vacancies on the Committee. The Commission fills each Committee seat and alternate position by selecting from the nominations.

6. **Committee Vacancies.** When a seat on the Committee becomes vacant prior to the conclusion of the member's term, the Executive Director fills the seat for the remainder of the term by appointing a replacement from the list of alternate members.