

---

# 6D

## Information

### *Professional Services Committee*

#### **Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation**

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents the *2009-10 Annual Accreditation Report* from the Committee on Accreditation to the Commission.

**Recommended Action:** For information only

**Presenters:** Cheryl Hickey, Acting Administrator, Professional Services Division, Gary Kinsey and Nancy Watkins, Co-Chairs, Committee on Accreditation, 2009-2010

**Strategic Plan Goal: 1**

**Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators**

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation and performance of professional educators and for the accreditation of credential programs

December 2010



---

---

# Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation

---

---

## Introduction

This agenda item presents the *2009-10 Annual Accreditation Report* from the Committee on Accreditation (COA). This *Annual Accreditation Report* describes in Section I the major accomplishments of the Committee's Work Plan in 2009-10, which is organized around the four identified purposes of accreditation. Section II of the *2009-10 Annual Accreditation Report* presents a summary of the accreditation activities around these purposes. Section III reflects the work plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2010-11.

## Background

The COA consists of 12 professional educators selected by the Commission for their distinguished records of accomplishment in education. The following responsibilities are delegated to the COA in Education Code §44373 and outlined in the Commission's *Accreditation Framework*:

The Committee shall . . . make decisions about the accreditation of educator preparation. The Committee's decision making process shall be in accordance with the *Accreditation Framework* adopted by the Commission.

The Committee shall . . . make decisions about the initial accreditation of new programs of educator preparation in accordance with procedures established by the Committee.

The Committee shall . . . determine the comparability of standards submitted by applicants with those adopted by the Commission, in accordance with the *Accreditation Framework*.

The Committee shall . . . adopt guidelines for accreditation reviews, and (shall) monitor the performance of accreditation teams and other aspects of the accreditation system.

The Committee shall . . . present an annual accreditation report to the Commission and respond to accreditation issues and concerns referred to the Committee by the Commission.

In establishing the COA, the Commission did not cede any of its policymaking authority over the preparation of educators or the accreditation of institutions. Under SB 655 (Chap. 426, Stats. 1993) and the *Accreditation Framework*, the Commission retains the exclusive authority and responsibility to adopt standards for educator preparation, and to make all other policy decisions that govern the system of professional accreditation in education. The COA is responsible for implementing the Commission's policies, enforcing the Commission's preparation standards and annually reporting its activities to the Commission.

The *2009-10 Annual Accreditation Report*, attached, reviews the accreditation decisions made by the COA during 2009-2010, including specific information about the Committee's decisions

during 2009-2010 to grant initial accreditation to new programs of professional preparation. The *Accreditation Report* also presents for information the 2009-2010 work plan. The *2009-10 Annual Accreditation Report*, attached, was adopted by the COA on August 4, 2010.



COMMISSION ON  
**TEACHER CREDENTIALING**

*Ensuring Educator Excellence*

**The Committee on Accreditation's  
Annual Accreditation Report to the  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
2009-2010**



Dear Commissioners:

It is with personal and professional pleasure that, on behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation, we submit to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing the *2009-2010 Annual Accreditation Report* by the Committee on Accreditation in accordance with the provisions of the *Accreditation Framework*. This report presents an overview of the activities and accomplishments of the Committee in the past year and its proposed work plan for 2010-2011 as it continues to implement and refine the Commission's accreditation system.


The *Annual Accreditation Report* is organized to address the purposes of the accreditation system: ensure accountability, ensure high quality programs, ensure adherence to standards, and foster on-going improvement. Each purpose is addressed as the report notes what was accomplished in 2009-2010 and what is proposed in the work plan for 2010-2011. We believe that aligning the *Annual Accreditation Report* to these purposes provides more useful information and demonstrates integrity with the accreditation system.

The Committee looks forward to continuing to maintain the high standards set by the Commission for its accreditation responsibilities. The Committee also stands ready to assist the Commission as it considers its accreditation policies for the future.

Sincerely,



Nancy Watkins  
Committee Co-Chair



Gary W. Kinsey  
Committee Co-Chair

# The Committee on Accreditation 2009-2010

<b>K-12 Professionals</b>	
<b>Joyce Abrams</b> Teacher Chula Vista Elementary School Chula Vista Elementary School District	<b>Carol Leighty</b> Superintendent Temecula Valley Unified School District
<b>Dana Griggs</b> Coach/Consultant District Accountability Support San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools	<b>Sally Plicka</b> Yolo-Solano BTSA Program Director Davis Joint Unified School District
<b>Joseph Jimenez</b> BTSA Induction Cluster Region Director Tulare County Office of Education	<b>Nancy Watkins</b> Teacher Valencia High School Placentia-Yorba Linda School District
<b>Postsecondary Professionals</b>	
<b>Lynn Cook</b> Dean and Faculty, College of Education California State University, Dominguez Hills	<b>Ellen Curtis Pierce</b> Associate Vice Chancellor of Professional Accreditation and Faculty Development Interim Dean, School of Education Brandman University
<b>Anne Jones</b> Assistant Dean, Academic Programs and Student Affairs Director, Teacher Education Programs Graduate School of Education University of California, Riverside	<b>Reyes Quezada</b> Professor of Education University of San Diego
<b>Gary Kinsey</b> Associate Dean, College of Education Cal Poly Pomona University	<b>Pia Wong</b> Associate Dean CSU Sacramento
<b>Committee Support Staff (CTC)</b>	
Lawrence Birch, Director, Professional Services Division Teri Clark, Administrator of Accreditation, Professional Services Division Cheryl Hickey, Consultant, Professional Services Division Rebecca Parker, Consultant, Professional Services Division Teri Ackerman, Analyst, Professional Services Division	





# Table of Contents

<b>Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2009-2010</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession.....	1
a) <i>Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation</i> .....	1
b) <i>Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission</i> .....	2
c) <i>COA Procedures Manual</i> .....	2
d) <i>Commission Liaison</i> .....	2
e) <i>Press Releases</i> .....	2
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality.....	2
a) <i>Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs</i> .....	2
b) <i>Revise and finalize the Accreditation Handbook</i> .....	3
c) <i>Update members of the Board of Institutional Reviewer (BIR) so that each individual is prepared to participate in the revised accreditation system</i> .....	3
d) <i>Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested of it by the Commission</i> .....	3
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards.....	3
a) <i>Conduct and review program assessment activities</i> .....	3
b) <i>Review and initial approval of new credential programs</i> .....	3
c) <i>Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation.</i> .....	3
d) <i>Disseminate information related to the Commission's Common Standards</i> .....	3
e) <i>Integrate Induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system</i> .....	4
f) <i>Review a document that provides Guidance on Granting Equivalency</i> .....	4
g) <i>Begin the discussion of how the Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system</i> .....	4
h) <i>Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment</i> .....	4
Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement.....	4
a) <i>Collect, analyze, report on the second year of biennial reports submitted in fall 2009</i> .....	4
b) <i>Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system</i> .....	4
c) <i>Continue Partnership with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate</i> .....	5
d) <i>Develop an agreement detailing how the Commission's accreditation system can function in alignment with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)</i> .....	5
e) <i>Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state process</i> .....	5
General Operations.....	5
 <b>Section II: Summary of Accreditation Activities 2009-2010</b> .....	 <b>6</b>
Professional Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Credential Preparation Programs.....	6
Technical Assistance Site Visits.....	10
Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs.....	10
Transitioned Programs.....	12
Inactive Status.....	12
Withdrawal of an Approved Program.....	13

<b>Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee in 2010-2011 .....</b>	<b>14</b>
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and the Profession .....	14
a) <i>Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation</i> .....	14
b) <i>Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission</i> .....	14
c) <i>Commission Liaison</i> .....	14
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality.....	14
a) <i>Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs</i> .....	14
b) <i>Revise and finalize the Accreditation Handbook</i> .....	15
c) <i>Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission</i> .....	15
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards .....	15
a) <i>Review and take action to grant initial approval of new credential programs</i> .....	15
b) <i>Conduct and review program assessment activities</i> .....	15
c) <i>Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation</i> .....	15
d) <i>Disseminate information related to the Commission’s Common Standards</i> .....	15
e) <i>Integrate induction programs into the Commission’s accreditation system</i> .....	15
f) <i>Continue the discussion of how Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system</i> .....	15
g) <i>Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment</i> .....	16
Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement .....	16
a) <i>Collect, analyze and report on the biennial reports submitted in fall 2010</i> .....	16
b) <i>Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system</i> .....	16
c) <i>Continue Partnership with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate</i> .....	16
d) <i>Monitor the agreement detailing how the Commission’s accreditation system can function in alignment with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)</i> .....	16
e) <i>Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes</i> .....	17
General Operations .....	17
<b>Appendix A: Accreditation Activities 2009-2010 .....</b>	<b>18</b>

## **Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2009-2010**

On August 4, 2009 the Committee on Accreditation (COA) adopted its work plan for 2009-2010. Co-Chairs Nancy Watkins and Ruth Sandlin presented this work plan to the Commission at the December 9, 2009 Commission meeting. The items that follow represent the key components of the 2009-2010 work plan for the COA and a summary of each task and its current status.

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

- a) *Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation.* All Committee meetings were held in public with all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. In addition, meetings were transmitted via audio broadcast and some via video webcast to allow any individual with access to the internet the ability to hear live or recorded broadcasts of all Committee meetings. The Commission's website was utilized fully to provide agenda items, notification of meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation. The COA held meetings as follows:

August 4-5, 2009

October 23, 2009

January 20-21, 2010

February 22, 2010 \* *Subcommittee work meeting focusing on SB5X 1*

April 14-15, 2010

May 19-20, 2010

June 24-25, 2010

COA meetings were broadcast live over the internet. Agenda items and the audio archive of the meetings are housed on the Commission website. In addition, videoconferencing has been used in order that those involved in accreditation activities from the southern part of the state can participate from a videoconferencing center and not have to travel to Sacramento for an agenda item or report to the COA that might last between 20-60 minutes.

#### *PSD-News*

The PSD E-news was developed in 2008 and was maintained on a weekly basis throughout 2009-10. This electronic correspondence notifies over 300 individuals, including all approved institutions, of on-going activities related to the Professional Services Division. Information on accreditation related activities such as standards development and revision work and technical assistance workshops are routinely distributed via this communication tool.

#### *Program Sponsor Alerts*

A new type of communication was established in 2008 that supplements the PSD E-News. The Commission staff continued to use this resource frequently during the 2009-2010 year. The Program Sponsor Alert format addresses a specific issue, such as institutional responsibilities, implementation of inactive status for programs, or modification to preconditions for multiple and single subject programs. These Program

Sponsor Alerts are announced in the PSD E-news and are sent via e-mail to the program contact and archived at: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PS-alerts.html>

*Accreditation Process and Procedures*

In 2009-2010 a variety of activities took place designed to share information about the revised accreditation system and its implementation. All technical assistance meetings were broadcast through the web and the audio archived for access by stakeholders: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/webcasts.html>. Highlights of the activities are noted in the following table:

Date	Technical Assistance Activity By Topic
July 22, 2009	2009-10 Accreditation Site Visits: Preparing for the Site Visit
Oct. 26, 2009	Clear Education Specialist Credential Programs
Nov. 4, 2009	Preliminary Education Specialist and Added Authorization Programs
Dec. 2, 2009	Program Assessment
Dec. 8, 2009	Biennial Reports
May 5, 2010	Transitioning your Preliminary Education Specialist Program

- b) *Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission.* The Committee on Accreditation presented its annual report to the Commission at the December 2009 Commission meeting.
- c) *COA Procedures Manual.* The COA reviewed its *Procedures Manual* and updated it so that it accurately reflects the manner in which COA operates. Action was taken by the COA at the April 2010 to adopt the revised *Procedures Manual*.
- d) *Commission Liaison.* The liaison from the Commission is invited to attend each COA meeting. The liaison participates in discussions and brings the perspective of the Commission to the COA. In addition, the liaison then reports back to the Commission on the activities of the Committee. Commission Chair Ting Sun continues to serve in this role for the Commission.
- e) *Press Releases.* The Commission released nine notices to the media related to the Committee’s accreditation decisions <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/briefing-room/default.html>

**Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality**

- a) *Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs.* This is the principal, ongoing task of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of institutions and their credential programs. In the 2009-2010 academic year, accreditation site visits were held at 13 institutions. Visits were held at institutions of higher education, county offices of education and school districts. Four institutions were revisited in 2010 to ensure sufficient progress in addressing issues identified in previous accreditation visits. A list of the institutions that had a site visit or revisit in 2009-2010 is included in Section II of this report.

- b) *Revise and finalize the Accreditation Handbook.* One of the major goals of 2009-10 was to finalize the *Accreditation Handbook*. This document explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the Commission's accreditation system. Stakeholder review of the various chapters of the *Handbook* was completed and the document was placed on the Commission's website prior to the 2008-2009 accreditation site visits. During the 2009-10 year, chapters were brought to each COA meeting for final review and adoption.
- c) *Update members of the Board of Institutional Reviewer (BIR) so that each individual is prepared to participate in the revised accreditation system.* Staff worked with each member of the BIR who participated in initial program review, program assessment or accreditation site visits to understand the Commission's accreditation system, the revised Common Standards and Glossary, the use of the Common Standard Descriptors, the Program Assessment process, and the revised site visit format.
- d) *Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission.* The COA received updates on Commission activities at each meeting. The Commission requested that the COA focus efforts on the work required by SBX5 1. A work group was convened, met to address this topic, reported to the COA and recommendations were forwarded to the Commission in June 2010.

**Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards**

- a) *Conduct and review program assessment activities.* The COA heard updates on the program assessment process for the Orange Cohort, the second group of institutions to participate in program assessment. Staff has worked to utilize findings from program assessment to determine the composition of the Site Visit team. In addition to the 16 institutions that have been in program assessment, the approved BTSA Induction programs began to participate in Program Assessment during the 2009-10 year. Due to the transition of induction into the accreditation system, four of the Induction cohorts (Red, Orange, Yellow and Green) began program assessment during the 2009-10 year rather than one cohort. A list of institutions engaged in program assessment in the 2010-11 year is included in Appendix A.
- b) *Review and initial approval of new credential programs.* This is also one of the major ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Some of the decisions are made on the basis of expert review panel recommendations and some are made on the basis of staff recommendations. Programs were not given initial approval until the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met. A list of all credential programs approved in the 2009-10 year is included in Section II of this report.
- c) *Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation.* Review teams conducted technical assistance visits to five institutions in preparation for a full accreditation site visit in the future. A list of institutions that hosted a technical assistance site visit in the 2009-10 year is included in Section II.
- d) *Disseminate information related to the Commission's Common Standards.* The plan for the 2009-10 year included the dissemination of the Common Standard descriptors which

were intended to facilitate a more consistent understanding of, and agreement about, the Common Standards. This work was put on hold once it became clear that the descriptors include information above and beyond the requirements of the Common Standards. Therefore this work has not been completed.

- e) *Integrate Induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system.* The COA took action in January 2009 to transition Induction Programs into the Commission's accreditation system beginning July 1, 2009. During the 2009-10 year, staff worked with all Cluster Region Directors (CRDs) through the BTSA State Leadership Team to provide technical assistance to all BTSA Induction programs as the transition to the accreditation system moves forward. Four of the seven cohorts participated in Program Assessment and three cohorts will submit their first Biennial Reports in fall 2010.
- f) *Review a document that provides Guidance on Granting Equivalency.* The COA was charged by the Commission to review the report, *Comparability of Coursework for Sponsors of Special Education Teacher Preparation Programs*, prepared pursuant to AB 2226 (Chap. 233, Stats. 2008). The COA developed subsequently developed an additional document to provide similar guidance to all types of educator preparation programs.
- g) *Begin the discussion of how the Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system.* The Commission took action in fall 2006 that all programs that lead to an authorization to teach or provide services in California's public schools need to be reviewed through the Commission's accreditation system, the subject matter programs are the only programs that have not been integrated into the accreditation system. During 2009-10, the COA began to discuss and consider the appropriate way to work with the approved subject matter programs. This work will continue into the 2010-11 year.
- h) *Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment.* During 2009-10, the Commission staff, the Committee on Accreditation, and the Teaching Performance Assessment Users Advisory Committee (UAC) began discussing more effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the Teaching Performance Assessment to ensure appropriate implementation. This work will continue in 2010-11 as the proposed strategies are put into place.

#### **Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement**

- a) *Collect, analyze, and report on the second year of biennial reports submitted in fall 2009.* The 2009-2010 academic year was the second full year of implementation of the biennial report component of the revised accreditation system. All institutions in three of the seven cohorts (Red, Yellow, and Indigo) were required to submit candidate competence and performance data in their biennial reports. A list of all institutions required to submit biennial reports in 2010-2011 is provided in Appendix A. A major focus of the effort in this second year of implementation was to provide institutions with constructive feedback on their submission which would assist the institution in developing and refining the institutional assessment system.
- b) *Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.* As the various components of the system were implemented, staff and the COA continued to

work to ensure that additional evaluation components are embedded into the system. An on-line evaluation form that team members, team leaders, and institutions complete at the conclusion of a site visit was implemented. Implementing evaluation mechanisms for program assessment, biennial reporting, as well as other aspects of the system, was a major focus in 2009-2010.

- c) *Continue Partnership with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate.* The Partnership Agreement with NCATE was renewed in 2007 and is effective through 2014. The COA will continue monitoring the agreement to make certain that the implementation of the partnership results in assuring that state issues are appropriately addressed in each joint NCATE-CTC visit and that the process reduces duplication. In addition with the redesign of NCATE's accreditation process it is critical that the COA revisit the protocol to see if any additional modifications need to be made to ensure that the institutions working with NCATE are completing the appropriate activities of the Commission's accreditation system. A major part of the work with NCATE in 2009-2010 was to begin to understand how changes in the NCATE process, with the introduction of the continuous improvement and transformation initiative options, impacts California institutions and the accreditation process. Staff will continue to work closely with NCATE and the California pilot institutions on the implementation of these options in 2010-2011.
- d) *Develop an agreement detailing how the Commission's accreditation system can function in alignment with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).* The COA took action in January 2010 to adopt the initial agreement with TEAC. The agreement is for two years and one institution, Chapman University, has a joint site visit scheduled for February 2011.
- e) *Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes.* Staff has begun working with stakeholders on an alignment with the American Speech-Language- Hearing Association (ASHA) standards to the Commission's adopted Speech-Language Pathology program standards. Once the COA adopts an alignment matrix, programs sponsored by California institutions may submit a program proposal using the ASHA standards and address the concepts from the California standards that have been identified as not present in the ASHA standards.

### **General Operations**

In addition to the above mentioned items, the COA engaged in routine matters necessary for general operations of the Committee. This included the election of Co-Chairs, the adoption of a meeting schedule, orientation of new members, and modification of its own procedures manual which has become necessary in order to address issues related to the revised accreditation system. In addition, the COA completed its review of its *Procedures Manual* and took action to adopt the 2010 version of the Manual.



## Section II: Summary of 2009-2010 Accreditation Activities

This section of the report provides more detailed information about elements of the 2009-2010 Work Plan with a focus on accreditation activities.

### *Professional Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Credential Preparation Programs*

2009-2010 accreditation decisions were made based upon the written reports of the evidence gathered at the site visit, recommendations made by the team, and the COA interview of program leadership and the team lead. Teams reviewed documentation, interviewed a variety of constituencies (candidates, program completers, faculty, employers, administration, supervisors, etc.), deliberated and came to consensus on findings for all common standards, program standards, and an accreditation recommendation. Commission consultants, team leads and institutional representatives attended Committee on Accreditation meetings to present the results of the site visit report and respond to questions. Copies of the site visit team reports are available on the Commission's website at: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accreditation-reports.html>. The COA made the following accreditation determinations:

<b>COA Accreditation Decisions 2009-2010 Visits</b>	
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
San Diego State University	Accreditation
CSU Northridge	Accreditation
National Hispanic University	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Santa Clara University	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Loyola Marymount University	Accreditation
Whittier College	Accreditation with Stipulations
Fresno Pacific University	Accreditation with Stipulations
Biola University	Accreditation
San Diego Christian College	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
CSU Stanislaus	Accreditation with Stipulations
Touro University	Accreditation
William Jessup University	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Stanislaus County Office of Education	Accreditation

In addition, the COA heard reports from re-visits of 2008-2009 visits and made the following decisions:

<b>2008-2009 Accreditation Re-visits</b>		
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>2008-09 Decision</b>	<b>2009-10 Re-Visit Decision</b>
San Francisco State University	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations	Accreditation
Alliant University	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations
Phillips Graduate Institute	Accreditation with Technical Stipulations	Accreditation

2008-2009 Accreditation Re-visits		
Program Sponsor	2008-09 Decision	2009-10 Re-Visit Decision
Notre Dame de Namur University	Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations	Accreditation

The Commission's revised Common Standards (2008) were utilized in all accreditation site visits in 2009-2010. For institutions which are also NCATE accredited, the NCATE Unit Standards and the four components of the Commission's Common Standards are used for the site visit. A review of the year's site visits results serves as information for the COA and staff in determining needs of institutions for technical assistance meetings and as a guide for institutions as they prepared for site visits. The information regarding findings on the Common Standards from 2009-2010 is presented in the following table.

2009-2010 Findings on the Common Standard			
Summary of 13 site visits	Standard Findings		
	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 1: Education Leadership	10	2	1
Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	5	4	4
Standard 3: Resources	8	3	2
Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel	11	2	0
Standard 5: Admission	13	0	0
Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	13	0	0
Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice	10	3	0
Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors	11	2	0
Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence	11	2	0

As was the case in 2008-09, the Common Standard that the fewest institutions met fully was Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation. Although the staff held a technical assistance webcast in October 2008 focusing on Common Standard 2, it is possible that additional technical assistance should be provided to institutions.

A summary of the information gathered on each type of educator preparation program at the 13 site visits is presented in a series of tables below. Each type of credential program is noted separately. As with the information about the Common Standards, this information about standards that were *Not Met* or were *Met with Concerns* guides the COA and staff in determining what additional technical assistance might be helpful to the field.

Multiple Subject Standards (12 site visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Design	2	0
2: Collaboration in Governing the Program	2	0
3: Relationship between Theory and Practice	0	0
4: Pedagogical Thought and Reflective Practice	1	0
5: Equity, Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum	0	0
6: Opportunities to Learn, Practice and Reflect on Teaching in All Subject Areas	0	0

<b>Multiple Subject Standards (12 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
7A: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction in English	2	0
7B: Single Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction in English	0	0
8A: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Multiple Subject (MS) candidates.	0	1
8B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction for Single Subject Candidates	0	0
9: Using Computer-Based Technology in the Classroom	0	0
10: Preparation for Learning to Create a Supportive, Healthy Environment for Student Learning	1	0
11: Preparation to Use Educational Ideas and Research	0	0
12: Professional Perspectives Toward Student Learning and the Teaching Profession	0	0
13: Preparation to Teach English Language Learners	1	0
14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom	1	0
15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork	2	0
16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors	1	0
17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence	0	0
18: Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments During the Program	1	0
19: Assessment of Candidate Performance	0	0
20: Assessor Qualifications and Training	0	0
21: Assessment Administration, Resources and Reporting	0	0

<b>Single Subject Standards (11 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Design	1	0
2: Collaboration in Governing the Program	1	0
3: Relationship between Theory and Practice	0	0
4: Pedagogical Thought and Reflective Practice	1	
5: Equity, Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum	0	0
6: Opportunities to Learn, Practice and Reflect on Teaching in All Subject Areas	0	0
7A: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction in English	0	0
7B: Single Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction in English	1	0
8A: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Multiple Subject (MS) candidates.	0	0
8B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction for Single Subject Candidates	2	1

<b>Single Subject Standards (11 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
9: Using Computer-Based Technology in the Classroom	0	0
10: Preparation for Learning to Create a Supportive, Healthy Environment for Student Learning	1	0
11: Preparation to Use Educational Ideas and Research	0	0
12: Professional Perspectives Toward Student Learning and the Teaching Profession	0	0
13: Preparation to Teach English Language Learners	1	0
14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom	1	0
15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork	1	0
16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors	1	0
17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence	0	0
18: Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments During the Program	1	0
19: Assessment of Candidate Performance	0	0
20: Assessor Qualifications and Training	0	0
21: Assessment Administration, Resources and Reporting	0	0

<b>Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Level I (9 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
11: Educational Policy and Perspectives	1	0
13: Special Education Field Experiences with Special Population	2	0
14: Qualifications and Responsibilities of Supervisors and Selection of Field Sites	1	0
17: Assessment, Curriculum, and Instruction	1	0
18: Determination of Candidate competence	1	0
21: General Education Field Experience	1	0
22: Assessment and Evaluation of Students	1	0
25: Characters of Individuals with Mild to Moderate Disabilities	1	0

<b>Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Level I (6 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
13: Special Education Field Experiences with Special Population	1	0
18: Determination of Candidate competence	1	0
21: General Education Field Experience	1	0

<b>Preliminary Administrative Services (7 Site Visit)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
7: Nature of Field Experiences	1	0
8: Guidance, Assistance and Feedback	1	0

In the following credential programs, all program standards were found to be met. The number in bold indicates the number of institutions that hosted site visits in 2009-10 where the identified program is offered.

Adapted Physical Education (**1 site visit**)  
California Teachers of English learners (CTEL) (**3 site visits**)  
Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Level I (**1 site visit**)  
Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Level II (**1 site visit**)  
Education Specialist: Early Childhood Level I (**4 Sites**)  
Education Specialist: Early Childhood Level II (**4 Sites**)  
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Level II (**7 Site Visits**)  
Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Level II (**6 site visits**)  
Education Specialist: PHI (**1 site visit**)  
Health Services: School Nurse (**2 site visits**)  
Multiple and Single Subject Clear (**3 Site Visits**)  
Professional Clear Administrative Services (**6 site visits**)  
Pupil Personnel Counseling: School Counseling (**5 site visits**)  
Pupil Personnel: Child Welfare and Attendance (**1 site visit**)  
Pupil Personnel: School Psychology with Internship (**4 site visits**)  
Pupil Personnel: School Social work (**1 site visit**)  
Reading Certificate (**5 Site Visits**)  
Reading Language Arts Specialist (**4 site visits**)  
Speech-Language Pathology (**2 site visits**)  
Teacher Librarian (**1 Site visit**)

During the 2009-10 accreditation site visits, 108 approved educator preparation programs were reviewed. Across all one hundred plus programs, 40 program standards were *Met with Concerns* and 2 program standards were *Not Met*. The remainder of the program standards in the 13 institutions were all found to be *Met*.

### ***Technical Assistance Site Visits***

Institutions new to the Commission's accreditation system host a technical assistance site visit approximately two years before the scheduled site visit. During the 2009-10 year technical assistance visits were held at the following institutions:

Santa Barbara County Education Office  
REACH  
Oakland Unified School District  
ACSA/SCNTP  
Standards Aligned Instructional Leadership (SAIL)

After the technical assistance site visit an information item is presented to the Commission on the progress of the entity in preparing for its future site visit and generally on its implementation of the standards in its first years of operation.

### ***Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs***

Institutions that would like a program to be considered for Initial Program Approval submit a document that indicates how the program will meet each of the standards along with supporting

documents that serve as evidence to verify the claims made. A team of educators who have expertise in the program area and are trained for the review process read the document and consult with one another to determine whether standards are met. If the reviewers jointly agree that standards are met, it is so noted. If the review team agrees that standards are not met, reviewers write specific information as to what is needed. This information is shared with the institution by the consultant. The review process continues until all standards are found to be met. When standards are found to be met, the Commission consultant forwards the item to the COA agenda at the next scheduled meeting. Initial program approvals include programs that are new to the credential area. 2009-2010 Initial Program Approval actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation are listed in the tables below.

<b>Preliminary Single Subject Credential (2)</b>	
Hope International University	
UC Berkeley: Mathematics and Science: Experimental Program	

<b>Agriculture Specialist Credential (1)</b>	
Cal Poly Pomona	

<b>Clear Multiple and Single Subject BTSA Induction (2)</b>	
Cupertino Union School District	
Oak Grove School District	

<b>Clear Multiple and Single Subject Credential (2)</b>	
San Francisco State University	
Hebrew Union College Jewish Institute of Religion – DeLeT Program	

<b>Bilingual Teacher Authorization (5)</b>	
Loyola Marymount University: Spanish, Mandarin	
CSU Fullerton: Spanish	
CSU Stanislaus: Spanish, Lao, Hmong, Khmer, Portuguese, Vietnamese, Punjabi and Arabic	
University of California, Riverside: Spanish	
San Diego State University: Spanish, Arabic, Mandarin, Japanese Tagalog	

<b>California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) (1)</b>	
UC Berkeley	

<b>Education Specialist Credential (9)</b>	
Sacramento County Office of Education : Clear Credential Program	
Ventura County	Clear Credential Program
Office of Education	Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders
North Coast BTSA (Sonoma COE) : Clear Credential Program	
Oakland USD: Moderate/Severe Preliminary Credential Program	
Madera COE: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders	
Santa Rosa City Schools BTSA: Clear Credential Program	
Orange County Office of Education: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders	
UCLA Extension: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders	

<b>Career Technical Education (CTE) Credential (5)</b>	
Fresno Pacific University	
San Joaquin COE	
CSU San Bernardino	
University of California, Riverside	
North Coast BTSA with Sonoma County serving as LEA	

<b>Administrative Services Credential Program (3)</b>	
University of Phoenix: Preliminary Administrative Services	
Fielding Graduate Institute: Preliminary Administrative Services	
Cal Poly Pomona: Preliminary Administrative Services: Experimental Program	

***Transitioned Programs***

When the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) adopted its updated Unit Standards, NCATE did not require all accredited institutions to submit a new proposal addressing the revised standards. Beginning with the Education Specialist standards revision, the Commission is implementing a standard transition process that parallels the NCATE process, requiring that all accredited institutions meet the revised standards as of a specific date. During the next regularly scheduled accreditation activity, the institution is to be evaluated against the updated standards. These programs are ‘transitioning’ to the updated standards. Provided below is the list of programs that transitioned in 2009-10.

<b>Education Specialist Credential (10)</b>	
CSU Dominguez Hills: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders	
UC Riverside: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders	
Azusa Pacific University	Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance
Brandman University: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders	
National University: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders	
San Joaquin COE Project Impact: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders	
CSU San Bernardino: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders	
Touro University: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders	
CSU San Marcos: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders	

<b>Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential (1)</b>	
Biola University	Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential

***Inactive Status***

Institutions may temporarily cease offering an approved program for a variety of reasons such as decreased need in the service area or changes in faculty with expertise in the area. In the past, once a program was approved, it was listed as approved on the Commission website even if the program was not being offered at the institution. At the May 2008 meeting, the COA took action to allow institutions to declare a program to be ***Inactive***. A program may be declared inactive for a maximum of five years. The following institutions put the programs noted below on Inactive status in 2009-10.

<b>Inactive Status of Professional Preparation Programs in 2009-2010 (19)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo	Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Level II Program Pupil Personnel Services-School Counseling
Chapman University	Preliminary Administrative Services Program Preliminary Administrative Services Internship Multiple Subject Internship Program Single Subject Internship Program Reading Certificate Program
CSU Chico	Early Childhood Special Education Certificate Program Library Media Services
CSU East Bay	Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential
CSU San Bernardino	Multiple Subject Credential
Lodi USD	BTSA Induction Program
Los Angeles USD	Tier II Guidance Based Administrative Services Credential
Salinas Adult School (LEA)	Adult Designated Subjects Credential Program
Santa Clara USD	Designated Subjects LEA Program
UC Riverside	Education Specialist Multiple Subject Dual Credential – Preliminary Mild/Moderate/Multiple Subject/Moderate/Severe/Multiple Subject Credential Program Administrative Services Credential Program
University of LaVerne	Clear Administrative Services Credential Program
Los Angeles Unified School District	Multiple Subject District Intern Program

### ***Withdrawal of an Approved Program***

For a variety of reasons, institutions may choose to no longer offer an approved program. Institutions are encouraged to formally seek a withdrawal of these programs thus removing the program from the Commission's accreditation system. The program is then no longer considered a Commission approved program. If an institution decides to offer a program in the future, it is a minimum of two years before a new program proposal will be accepted. The following institutions and programs selected this option in the 2009-2010 year.

<b>Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (7)</b>	
Alliant International University	Bilingual Education Credential Program (Hmong, Spanish)
CSU Northridge	Clinical Rehabilitative Services: Audiology
Downey Unified School District	BTSA Induction Program
Fresno Pacific University	Bilingual Specialist Credential Preparation Program Reading Specialist Credential Program
San Diego State University	Education Specialist Credential: Deaf and Hard of Hearing Levels I and II
University of California, Irvine	Bilingual Education Credential Program



### **Section III:**

## **Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2010-2011**

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

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

August 3-4, 2010  
October 22, 2010  
January 20, 2011  
March 17-18, 2011  
April 21-22, 2011  
May 25-26, 2011  
June 23-24, 2011

Additionally, in 2010-2011, the PSD E-News, Program Sponsor Alerts, and press releases will be routinely used to ensure a transparent accreditation process. Additionally, frequent technical assistance workshops on the various aspects of the accreditation process and procedures will also be provided to ensure broad understanding of accreditation requirements and expectations.

- b) *Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission.* The Committee on Accreditation will present its annual report to the Commission in the fall. Additional updates and reports to the Commission will be provided as necessary and appropriate throughout the year.
- c) *Commission Liaison.* Maintaining a liaison from the Commission to the COA continues to be a critical aspect of the current process. The Commission's liaison will continue to provide an important perspective to COA discussions and serve as an effective means of communication between the COA and the Commission.

### **Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality**

- a) *Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs.* This is the principal, ongoing task of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of institutions and their credential programs. In the 2010-2011 academic year, accreditation site visits are scheduled for 36 institutions in the Orange cohort. This number is notably greater than past years because the BTSA Induction programs have joined the Commission's accreditation system. In addition, six institutions will be revisited in 2010-11 to ensure sufficient progress in addressing issues identified in previous accreditation visits. A list of the institutions scheduled for a site visit in 2010-2011 is included in Appendix A.

- b) *Revise and finalize the Accreditation Handbook.* The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. Stakeholder review of the various chapters of the *Handbook* was completed. The majority of the chapters have been adopted by the COA and the work in 2010-11 is to complete the review and adoption of the few remaining chapters.
- c) *Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission.* Staff prepares agenda items on issues related to the Commission's work as directed by the Commission or as appropriate. The COA will continue to discuss issues referred to it by the Commission and provides guidance as appropriate.

**Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards**

- a) *Review and take action to grant initial approval of new credential programs.* This is one of the major ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Some of the decisions are made on the basis of expert review panel recommendations and some are made on the basis of staff recommendations. In all cases, programs will not be given initial approval until the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met.
- b) *Conduct and review program assessment activities.* In 2010-11, institutions in the Red cohort will be completing the program assessment process, while those in the Violet cohort will begin the process. Those institutions either completing or beginning program assessment in 2010-2011 are included in Appendix A.
- c) *Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation.* The COA will consider the issues identified by technical assistance review teams in their review of institutions new to the accreditation process in California. Review teams will provide technical assistance to these institutions in preparation for a full accreditation site visit. A list of institutions scheduled for a technical assistance site visit in the 2010-11 year is included in Appendix.
- d) *Disseminate information related to the Commission's Common Standards.* Efforts to assist institutions in understanding the Commission's Common Standards will continue in 2010-11 through a variety of strategies.
- e) *Integrate Induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system.* The COA took action in January 2009 to transition Induction Programs into the Commission's accreditation system beginning July 1, 2009. The first accreditation site visits to induction programs will take place in the 2010-11 year.
- f) *Continue the discussion of how Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system.* With the Commission's action in fall 2006 that all programs that lead to an authorization to teach or provide services in California's public schools need to be reviewed through the Commission's accreditation system, the subject matter programs are the only programs that have not been integrated into the accreditation system. During 2010-11 the COA will discuss and consider the appropriate way to work with the approved subject matter programs.

- g) *Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment.* During 2009-10, the Commission staff, the Committee on Accreditation, and the Teaching Performance Assessment Users Advisory Committee (UAC) began discussing more effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the Teaching Performance Assessment to ensure appropriate implementation. This work will continue in 2010-11 as the proposed strategies are put into place.

#### **Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement**

- a) *Collect, analyze, and report on the biennial reports submitted in fall 2010.* The 2010-2011 academic year will be the third full year of implementation of the biennial report component of the revised accreditation system. All institutions in the Orange, Blue and Violet cohorts are required to submit candidate competence and performance data in 2010. Institutions in the Red, Green and Indigo cohorts will submit a biennial reports by the end of 2011. A list of all institutions required to submit biennial reports is included in Appendix A. A major focus of the effort will be to provide assistance to institutions as they prepare their biennial report and to analyze information from institutions to ensure appropriate responses to the requirements of the biennial report.
- b) *Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.* As the various components of the system are implemented, staff and the COA will continue to work to ensure that additional evaluation components are embedded into the system. Implementing an on-line evaluation form that team members, team leaders, and institutions complete at the conclusion of a site visit, and establishing evaluation mechanisms for program assessment, biennial reporting, as well as other aspects of the system, will be a major focus in 2010-2011.
- c) *Continue Partnership with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate.* The Partnership Agreement with NCATE was renewed in 2007 and is effective through 2014. The COA will continue monitoring the agreement to make certain that the implementation of the partnership results in assuring that state issues are appropriate addressed in each joint NCATE-CTC visit and that the process reduces duplication. In addition with the redesign of NCATE's accreditation process it is critical that the COA revisit the protocol to see if any additional modifications need to be made to ensure that the institutions working with NCATE are completing the appropriate activities of the Commission's accreditation system.
- d) *Monitor the agreement detailing how the Commission's accreditation system can function in alignment with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).* In 2009-10, the COA took action to adopt the initial agreement with TEAC. Chapman University will be the first institution in California undergoing a joint Commission/TEAC accreditation visit. The COA will continue to monitor the agreement before and after this first review to ensure that the process is efficient and effective. In addition, the COA will complete the alignment matrix which identifies which concepts in the Commission's Common Standards are addressed by the TEAC Quality Principles and Standards of Program Capacity and which concepts are not explicitly addressed.

- e) *Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes.* Should requests for analysis of the alignment of national and professional organization standards with those of the Commission be received, the COA will review the analysis, consistent with its responsibilities set forth in the Education Code, and determine issues of comparability. At this time, staff is working with stakeholders on an alignment with the American Speech-Language- Hearing Association (ASHA) standards to the Commission's adopted Speech-Language Pathology program standards. Once the COA adopts an alignment matrix, programs sponsored by California institutions may submit a program proposal using the ASHA standards and address the concepts from the California standards that have been identified as not present in the ASHA standards.

### **General Operations**

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

# Appendix A

## Accreditation Activities 2010-2011

### Biennial Reports Due Fall 2010

#### Orange Cohort

ACSA/SCNTC  
 Antioch Santa Barbara  
 California Baptist University  
 Cal Poly San Luis Obispo  
 Cal State TEACH  
 Chapman University  
 CSU Sacramento  
 The Master's College  
 Occidental College  
 Standards Aligned Instructional  
 Leadership  
 Saint Mary's College  
 Santa Barbara CEO  
 UC Santa Barbara  
 University of La Verne  
 University of the Pacific  
 University of Phoenix

Alhambra USD Induction  
 Anaheim Union HSD  
 Aspire Public Schools  
 Azusa USD Induction  
 Butte COE  
 Conejo Valley USD Induction  
 Downey USD Induction  
 El Rancho USD Induction  
 Fontana USD  
 Fremont USD  
 Hayward USD  
 Kings COE  
 Merced UHSD  
 Milpitas USD  
 Modesto City  
 Paramount USD Induction  
 Rialto USD  
 San Marcos USD  
 Santa Barbara CEO  
 Santa Rosa City Schools  
 SIA Tech  
 West Contra Costa USD

#### Blue Cohort

Alliant International University  
 Argosy University  
 CSU Fullerton  
 Dominican University  
 Fortune School of Education (Mt.  
 Diablo USD)  
 Holy Names University  
 Inter American College  
 Loma Linda University  
 Orange COE  
 Phillips Graduate Institute  
 Stanford University  
 UC Riverside  
 Vanguard University

Bellflower USD Induction  
 Chaffey Jt. Union HSD  
 Corona-Norco USD  
 Elk Grove USD  
 Escondido ESD  
 Fresno USD  
 Glendale USD Induction  
 Greenfield Union SD  
 Grossmont Union HSD  
 Kern High SD  
 Lawndale/Lennox/Hawthorn/Cent.  
 Valley Induction Consortium  
 Long Beach USD Induction  
 Mt. Diablo USD  
 North Coastal Consortium :  
 Encinitas Union ESD  
 North State (Tehama COE)  
 Palmdale ESD  
 San Luis Obispo COE  
 San Mateo County Induction  
 Torrance USD Induction  
 Tulare COE  
 Tustin USD  
 Vallejo City/Solano County  
 (Vallejo City USD)

#### Violet Cohort

Antioch Los Angeles  
 Boston Reed  
 Claremont Graduate University  
 Compton USD  
 CSU Fresno  
 Hebrew Union College  
 Hope International  
 Imperial COE includes BTSA  
 Kern COE includes BTSA  
 La Sierra University  
 National University  
 Pacific Oaks College  
 Salinas Adult  
 San Francisco State University  
 UC Davis  
 UC Irvine  
 UC San Diego

Antelope Valley Union HSD  
 Compton USD Induction  
 El Dorado COE  
 Envision  
 Escondido UHSD  
 Inner City Education Foundation  
 Irvine USD  
 Keppel Union ESD  
 Los Banos Unified  
 Murrieta Valley School District  
 New Haven USD  
 Newport-Mesa USD  
 Norwalk-La Mirada USD  
 Palo Alto USD  
 Sacramento City USD  
 San Francisco USD  
 Sanger Unified  
 Selma USD  
 Sequoia TIPS  
 South Bay Induction Consortium  
 (Palos Verdes)  
 Washington USD  
 Wm. S. Hart UHSD Induction

## **Biennial Reports Due Fall 2011**

### **Red**

Alameda COE  
CSU Dominguez Hills  
CSU Los Angeles  
CSU Monterey Bay  
Concordia University  
Contra Costa COE  
Los Angeles USD  
Metropolitan  
Oakland USD  
Pacific Union  
Pepperdine University  
Point Loma Nazarene University  
REACH  
Sonoma State University  
UC Berkeley  
UC Los Angeles  
UC Santa Cruz  
University of San Diego

Arcadia USD  
Burbank USD  
Chula Vista ESD  
Contra Costa COE  
Culver City-Beverly Hills  
Dos Palos  
Duarte –Temple City  
East County  
Hanford ESD  
LAUSD  
Manteca USD  
Marin COE  
Oakland BTSA  
Orange USD  
Placer COE  
Poway USD  
REACH  
Redwood City  
RIMS BTSA-Riverside COE  
South Bay BTSA  
Tri County (Sutter COE)  
Tri-Valley (Pleasanton)  
Tulare City COE  
Yolo/Solano BTSA

### **Green**

California Lutheran  
CSU Channel Islands  
CSU East Bay  
CSU San Bernardino  
High Tech High Learning  
Communities  
Los Angeles COE  
Mills College  
Notre Dame de Namur  
Patten University  
San Diego COE  
San Diego USD  
Simpson University  
Western Governors University  
Westmont College

Antioch  
Bakersfield City  
Castaic  
East Bay  
Evergreen  
Fairfield Suisun  
Fresno COE  
Garden Grove  
Hacienda La Puente  
La Mesa-Spring Valley  
LACOE  
Merced COE  
Montebello  
North County PDF  
Oceanside SD  
San Bernardino City  
San Juan  
San Mateo-Foster City  
Santa Ana  
Santa Clarita  
South County

### **Indigo**

Azusa Pacific University  
Bethany College  
Brandman University  
Cal Poly Pomona  
Humboldt State University  
CSU Bakersfield  
CSU Chico  
CSU Long Beach  
CSU San Marcos  
Drexel University  
Madera COE  
Mount Saint Mary's College  
Sacramento COE  
San Joaquin COE  
University of Redlands  
University of San Francisco  
University of Southern California  
Ventura COE

Baldwin Park  
Central  
Far East Contra Costa  
Foothill  
High Tech High  
Lancaster ESD  
Madera  
Monterey  
North Orange  
Orange CDOE  
Pasadena  
Placentia- Oceanside  
Sacramento COE  
San Diego USD  
San Dieguito  
San Joaquin  
San Jose  
San Ramon  
Santa Monica Malibu  
Stockton  
Tracy  
Ventura  
Visalia  
Vista  
West Orange  
Westside UESD

## Program Assessment

### **Institutions Completing Process in 2010-11 (Red Cohort)**

CSU Dominguez Hills	Alameda COE	Point Loma Nazarene University
CSU Los Angeles	Chapman University	Metropolitan
CSU Monterey Bay	Concordia University	Oakland USD
UC Berkeley	Los Angeles USD	REACH
UC Los Angeles	Pacific Union	Sonoma State University
UC Santa Cruz	Pepperdine University	University of San Diego

### **Induction Programs**

Arcadia USD	Hanford ESD	REACH
Burbank USD	LAUSD	Redwood City
Chula Vista ESD	Manteca USD	RIMS BTSA-Riverside COE
Contra Costa COE	Marin COE	South Bay BTSA
Culver City-Beverly Hills	Oakland BTSA	Tri County (Sutter COE)
Dos Palos	Orange USD	Tri-Valley (Pleasanton)
Duarte –Temple City	Placer COE	Tulare City COE
East County	Poway USD	Yolo/Solano BTSA

### **Institutions Beginning Process in 2010-11 (Violet Cohort)**

Submissions Due in Fall 2010

Antioch Los Angeles	Hope International	Pacific Oaks College
Boston Reed	Imperial COE	Salinas Adult
Claremont Graduate University	Kern COE	San Francisco State University
CSU Fresno	La Sierra University	UC Davis
Compton USD	National University	UC Irvine
Hebrew Union College		UC San Diego

### **Induction Programs**

Antelope Valley Union HSD	Kern County SOS	San Francisco USD
Compton USD Induction	Los Banos Unified	Sanger Unified
El Dorado COE	Murrieta Valley School District	Selma USD
Envision	New Haven USD	Sequoia TIPS
Escondido UHSD	Newport-Mesa USD	South Bay Induction Consortium
Imperial COE (Consortium)	Norwalk-La Mirada USD Induction	(Palos Verdes)
Inner City Education Foundation	Palo Alto USD	Washington USD
Irvine USD	Sacramento City USD	Wm. S. Hart UHSD Induction
Keppel Union ESD		

## **Site Visits 2010-11**

ACSA/SCNTC  
Antioch Santa Barbara  
Butte COE (*also listed below*)  
California Baptist University  
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo  
Cal State TEACH  
Chapman University

CSU Sacramento  
The Master's College  
Occidental College  
San Jose State University  
SAIL  
Saint Mary's College

Santa Barbara CEO (*also listed below*)  
UC Santa Barbara  
University of La Verne  
University of the Pacific  
University of Phoenix

## **Induction Programs**

Alhambra USD Induction  
Anaheim Union HSD  
Aspire Public Schools  
Azusa USD Induction  
Butte COE  
Conejo Valley USD Induction  
El Rancho USD Induction

Fontana USD  
Fremont USD  
Hayward USD  
Kings COE  
Merced Union High School District  
Milpitas USD  
Modesto City

Paramount USD Induction  
Rialto USD  
San Marcos USD  
Santa Barbara CEO  
Santa Rosa City Schools  
SIA Tech  
West Contra Costa USD

## **Institutions with a Revisit 2010-11**

Alliant University  
CSU East Bay

National Hispanic University  
William Jessup University

San Diego Christian College  
Santa Clara University

## **Institutions with a Technical Assistance Site Visits**

Hebrew Union

Boston Reed