
3E

Information/Action

Professional Services Committee

Identifying Exemplary Programs and/or Practices in Educator Preparation Through the Accreditation System

Executive Summary: This item provides possible options for Commission consideration that would augment the accreditation system to include a component that identifies exemplary programs and/or practices.

Policy Question: Should the Commission develop a process for identifying exemplary programs and/or practices in educator preparation?

Recommended Action: Staff requests that the Commission provide direction regarding whether to proceed with modifications to the accreditation system that would allow for the system to be used to identify exemplary programs and/or practices.

Presenters: Cheryl Hickey, Administrator, and Teri Clark, Director, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability

- ◆ Effectively and efficiently monitor program implementation and outcomes and hold all approved educator preparation programs to high standards and continuous improvement through the accreditation process.

March 2013

Identifying Exemplary Programs and/or Practices in Educator Preparation Through the Accreditation System

Introduction

This item provides a further discussion of the possibility of using the accreditation process to identify exemplary programs and/or practices within Commission-approved educator preparation programs and presents several possible options for the Commission's consideration.

Background

The Commission's accreditation system is defined in Education Code §§44370-44374 (Appendix A). The purposes of the accreditation system are stated in the *Accreditation Framework*:

- To be accountable to the public and the educator preparation profession regarding the knowledge, skills, and abilities of educators prepared in California.
- To promote quality - both in educator preparation and in candidate performance.
- To ensure that all educator preparation programs prepare all prospective educators to support students in acquiring the knowledge and skills defined in California's K-12 Student Academic Content Standards.
- To support all programs in focusing on continuous improvement based on the analysis of candidate competence and program effectiveness data.

As indicated above, the Commission adopted its *Accreditation Framework* in December 2007 as the governing policy document for the accreditation system. At its August 2012 meeting, the Committee on Accreditation (COA) developed a one-page document identifying ten tenets of the system (Appendix B). In December 2012, Commission staff presented an agenda item that included these tenets and asked the Commission to discuss whether these tenets were still appropriate. Several Commissioners expressed an interest in the second tenet which states:

- b. Currently, the institutions are held to meeting the specific language of the standard and there is no attempt to identify excellence beyond meeting the standard.

The discussion at the December 2012 Commission meeting indicated that there was some Commission support for changing this tenet such that the accreditation system would include the identification of exemplary programs and/or practices within Commission-approved educator preparation programs as an additional outcome of accreditation. The Commission directed staff to continue to explore possible ways in which to accomplish this task. To begin to identify possible options, staff discussed this topic with the COA at its February 2013 meeting.

The Current Accreditation System

Currently, the visiting teams make one of three possible decisions concerning the degree to which a given program meets the Commission's adopted standards: a) the standard is **Met**, b) the standard is **Met with Concerns** or c) the standard is **Not Met**. These decisions on the Common and the Program Standards, taken as a whole, result in an accreditation recommendation to the COA.

Whereas in the current accreditation system deficiencies in programs are documented in accreditation reports when the Commission's standards are not fully met, there is no parallel standardized procedure in the accreditation system to identify where a program or institution has *exceeded* the Commission's standards or whether the program is exemplary, only that it meets adopted standards. The issue of excellence has not been an explicit part of accreditation; however, in practice, information is often apparent in the accreditation reports about aspects of the program that the institution implements exceptionally well. At this time, these exemplary practices are neither gathered nor reported in a systematic manner.

Why use accreditation to identify exemplary programs?

Accreditation has historically been used to ensure that institutions and programs provide a certain level of quality as determined by a specific profession, agency, or accrediting body. As indicated above, it has not been used to identify those aspects of programs that exceed established standards. Increasingly, however, accrediting bodies are acknowledging the leverage they have to move a profession or institution. In 2010, James Cilbulka, President of the National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) stated the following when discussing the unification of the two federally approved accrediting bodies for educator preparation:

The accreditation system will encourage and assist all institutions and other entities that prepare educators, even those that already exceed that bar, to go beyond it towards excellence by continuously improving the effectiveness of their completers and programs to help P-12 students reach higher levels of achievement demanded by rigorous new student standards and a global marketplace.

NCATE's current accreditation process holds institutions to meet all of the NCATE-adopted standards and, in addition, its Continuous Improvement model requires each institution to identify one standard where the institution is striving to be excellent or meet certain 'Target' expectations. A sample of NCATE's Target rubric is provided in Appendix C. This approach is a recent modification to their accreditation system.

In its discussion on this topic at its February 2013 meeting, the COA expressed an interest in the idea of identifying exemplary practices as a way in which to accomplish several things: 1) To recognize excellence and acknowledge where extraordinary accomplishments were taking place in California; 2) to provide models from which other programs could gain valuable lessons that may be replicable to some degree by other institutions; 3) to move the profession in ways in which the Commission believes to be important; and 4) to offset, by providing actual examples of successful programs and practices, the perception that educator preparation programs may be ineffective in preparing future educators.

What are the challenges to using the accreditation system to identify exemplary programs?

In its February 2013 discussion of this topic, the Committee on Accreditation identified several challenges for the Commission to consider if it were to decide to move forward in this area:

- 1) *Prioritizing accreditation activities in an era of limited resources.* For the second time in a decade accreditation site visits have been suspended in 2012-13 due to budget constraints. There was concern among the COA that the highest priority must be placed on ensuring that the basic functions of the accreditation system are operating and

sufficiently supported prior to embarking on new initiatives.

- 2) *Developing and consistently implementing clear criteria by which to identify exemplary programs and/or practices.* Designating entire programs as “exemplary” (or other similar term) would require clear criteria, training of reviewers to ensure consistency in applying those criteria, and, if such a system was implemented, should only occur after a site visit when all of the evidence can be considered. Because of the potential implications of what being designated as exemplary would imply to members of the public and other institutions, it would be critical to clearly define the criteria that would be used. While few programs may be exemplary in all aspects of program implementation, many programs have specific features that are working well in the local context. If the criteria were to be unevenly applied, the potential for one institution to be deemed exemplary and another not, despite similar efforts, approaches and /or outcomes, could be high and could have the unintended consequence of raising doubts about the accreditation system as a whole.
- 3) *The broad variations in local context in which educator preparation programs operate.* Much of the work of educator preparation is highly contextual. One of the primary reasons for identifying exemplary programs is to allow for better dissemination of those practices and activities so that others may be able to replicate or adapt these with a similar degree of success in their own communities. However, often what works in one community or program is highly context-dependent and may not replicate well in another environmental and educational context.

Possible Options for Identifying Exemplary Programs and/or Practices through the Commission’s Accreditation System

There are multiple ways in which the Commission might approach the recognition of excellence in educator preparation. Several options are provided below for Commission discussion. This is not an exhaustive list of possibilities, but rather a list of ideas intended to support Commission discussion and further idea generation.

1. Designate as exemplary those *institutions* where all standards have been deemed to have been met based on the site visit.
2. Designate a specific Commission-approved educator preparation *program* as exemplary based on criteria to be approved by the Commission.
3. Identify one or more *specific program components* that represent aspects of the standards that are deemed to be implemented in an exemplary manner.
4. Adopt an NCATE-like model of “*target*” (or some similar designation) for each standard, to indicate that the program has exceeded the minimum requirement set by that standard.
5. Adopt an “*inquiry brief approach*” similar to that used by the Teacher Education Accrediting Council (TEAC) (see further description of this process below).
6. Adopt an *outcomes-based model* in which a program demonstrates it has achieved significant candidate outcomes.
7. Adopt a *combination of approaches*.

A brief discussion of each follows:

1. *Designate those institutions with all Common and Program Standards met as having an exemplary institution.* The COA suggested that those institutions which have met all the

Commission’s standards upon an initial site visit could be deemed exemplary. Historically, about half the institutions with site visits receive full accreditation but few institutions receive a finding of all Common Standards and all program standards met upon an initial site visit.

As illustrated in the table below, over the past six years, 60 institutions that offer initial teacher preparation hosted site visits. Of these, 33 earned full *Accreditation* from the COA, but only 13 of the institutions met all of the Commission’s standards—both Common and Program. Meeting all of the Commission’s standards could be one way to identify institutions that are doing an exemplary job of preparing educators. Additional historical data on accreditation decisions is provided in Appendix D.

Year	Total Visits	Total Visits Initial Teacher Preparation	Accreditation Decision				All Standards Met
			Accreditation	Stipulations	Major Stipulations	Probationary Stipulations	
2006-07	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
2007-08	6	6	3	3	0	0	0
2008-09	14	12	7	2	3	2	4
2009-10	13	13	6	3	4	0	4
2010-11	31	10	4	5	0	1	0
2011-12	40	18	12	6	0	0	4
Totals	105	60	33	19	7	3	13

The argument against such a system could be that the standards establish the minimum criteria that must be met for continued approval. Meeting all standards does not, in and of itself, indicate that the institution is doing an “exemplary” job in preparing educators, if the common definition of exemplary is used. Nevertheless, these institutions have, in fact, been found to meet all of the Commission’s standards with no concerns raised by the review team or the COA.

2. *Designate a specific Commission-approved program as exemplary.* Each credential program area has a number of program standards. Most of the Commission’s program standards follow a similar structure – program design standards, curriculum and fieldwork standards, and candidate assessment standards. In order to designate an entire program as exemplary, it is reasonable to assume that all areas of the program would need to be found to be meeting standards and that some number of the standards would be exceeded in some manner, as defined by criteria to be established by the Commission.
3. *Identify specific program components as exemplary.* In the COA discussion there was recognition that nearly all programs have some areas that could be improved and some areas of strength. Allowing review teams to identify components of standards as

implemented by a program – rather than whole standards or entire programs – might mitigate some of the potential political and practical challenges associated with other options, while at the same time accomplishing the major objective of allowing for identification and dissemination of promising practices. Recognizing that a program has, for example, a highly effective master teacher training program might be more useful to another institution looking to improve its master teacher training program than trying to replicate the successes of an entire program in an entirely different local context.

A variation of this concept, and one that could perhaps be accomplished without a major change in the accreditation system, is that the Commission staff could work with the COA and the site visit teams to more explicitly highlight exemplary program components or best practices within the existing team reports. Team members would have flexibility in identifying exemplary programs or practices, but would have to include justification for making that determination.

4. *Adopt an NCATE-like model.* NCATE’s current continuous improvement model requires that an institution identify a particular standard that it believes it not only meets, but exceeds or is well on the way to exceeding in some manner. A rubric for each standard has been adopted by NCATE with three categories for reviewers to consider, “unacceptable,” “acceptable,” and “target.” While somewhat different from exemplary, the “target” category implies that the institution exceeded minimum standards. An example of the three-level rubric for a part of an NCATE standard is included in Appendix B. One advantage of this approach is that the institution may know best where its strengths are, is given the opportunity to identify this area and then demonstrate, with evidence, that it has met the target level. A disadvantage to this approach is that it addresses an entire standard and may restrict a review team from recognizing exemplary practices (aspects that comprise only a portion of an entire standard). This approach would require that the Commission adopt a new rubric for determining the standards findings.
5. *Adopt an approach similar to that used by the Teacher Education Accrediting Council (TEAC).* The TEAC model requires that institutions make a claim about the quality of their program and provide evidence to support their claims. Such a model might be used with programs or aspects of programs that an institution believes it is implementing in an exemplary manner. The review team could, based upon the evidence presented, determine whether the program is, in fact, exemplary. This approach would require the Commission to adopt revised accreditation policies.
6. *Adopt an outcomes-based model.* The Commission could identify criteria that focus on the effectiveness of program outcomes by examining (a) results of candidate performance on authentic instruments that assess their performance and/or (b) evidence of candidate and graduate performance in the field. Institutions that would like to be considered for this exemplary status would present data that make the case that their candidates and graduates are highly effective, as defined in some manner by the Commission. In discussions about this model, members of the COA expressed reservation about this type of approach.
7. *Adopt a combination of approaches.* The Commission could consider adopting a system that allows for multiple or integrated approaches to identifying exemplary programs or

best practices. For example, review teams could have the option of identifying exemplary programs and exemplary practices, and not be limited to one or the other.

If the Commission elects to use any of the above approaches, the information could be provided annually in the COA Report and/or shared on the Commission's webpage. It is important to note that the Commission's accreditation system's site visits are on hiatus for 2012-13 due to budgetary constraints and a number of the identified options would require additional work and resources to implement.

Questions for Commission Consideration:

- 1) Should the identification of exemplary programs and/or practices be incorporated into the Commission's accreditation system and, if so, how could this best be accomplished within the Commission's existing resources?*
- 2) Does the Commission want the staff to work with the COA to develop some additional process outside of or in addition to the current accreditation system that might accomplish the objective of identifying exemplary programs or best practices?*
- 3) If the Commission decides it would like to include identification of exemplary programs and/or practices within the accreditation system's responsibilities, does the Commission have one or more preferences as to the type of system it would like to see implemented?*

Next Steps

If the Commission determines that identification of exemplary programs and/or practices is a priority for the accreditation system, Commission staff will work with the Committee on Accreditation, based on Commission direction, to begin to develop processes and procedures necessary for implementation.

Appendix A

California Education Code §§44370-44374

44370. The Legislature finds and declares that the competence and performance of professional educators depends in part on the quality of their academic and professional preparation. The Legislature recognizes that standards of quality in collegiate preparation complement standards of candidate competence and performance, and that general standards and criteria regarding the overall quality of a candidate's preparation are as essential as the assessment of the candidate's competence and performance.

44371. (a) The system for accreditation of educator preparation shall do all of the following:

- (1) Concentrate on the overall quality of educator preparation in credential programs.
- (2) Hold professional elementary, secondary, and postsecondary educators responsible for quality in the preparation of professional practitioners.
- (3) Contribute to improvements in educator preparation and recognize excellence in preparation programs and institutions.
- (4) Be governed by an accreditation framework that sets forth the policies of the commission regarding the accreditation of educator preparation.

(b) The accreditation framework shall do all of the following:

- (1) Establish broad, flexible policies and standards for accreditation of educator preparation.
- (2) Define the accreditation responsibilities, authority, and roles of the commission and the Committee on Accreditation.
- (3) Establish an accreditation system that is efficient and cost effective.
- (4) Require that accreditation decisions be based on sufficient, reliable evidence about the quality of educator preparation.

44372. The powers and duties of the commission regarding the accreditation system shall include the following:

- (a) Adopt and implement an accreditation framework, which sets forth the policies of the commission regarding the accreditation of educator preparation in California.
- (b) Establish and modify credential-specific standards, experimental program standards, and alternative program standards, as defined in the adopted accreditation framework.
- (c) Rule on the eligibility of an applicant for accreditation when the applying institution has not previously prepared educators for state Certification in California, pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 44227.
- (d) Appoint and reappoint the members of the Committee on Accreditation, in accordance with Section 44373, by selecting among nominees submitted by a panel of distinguished educators.
- (e) Review periodic accreditation reports by the Committee on Accreditation, and refer accreditation issues and concerns to the committee for its examination and response.
- (f) Hear and resolve appeals of accreditation decisions, pursuant to subdivision (e) of Section 44374.
- (g) Allocate resources annually for implementation of the accreditation system.
- (h) With the Committee on Accreditation, jointly design an evaluation of accreditation policies and their implementation.

(i) Inform and advise the Legislature regarding statutory issues related to accreditation, and submit legislative recommendations, after considering the advice of the Committee on Accreditation, educational institutions, and professional organizations.

44373. (a) There is hereby established the Committee on Accreditation consisting of 12 members selected for their distinguished records of accomplishment in education. 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. Membership shall be, to the maximum extent possible, balanced in terms of ethnicity, gender, and geographic regions. The committee shall include members from elementary and secondary schools, and members from public and private institutions of postsecondary education.

(b) The terms of committee members shall be in accordance with the accreditation framework. Appointment of the initial committee members shall be from nominees submitted by a panel of distinguished educators, who are named by a consensus of the commission and the accreditation advisory council, pursuant to Section 44371, as that section read on December 31, 1993. Appointment of subsequent committee members shall be from nominees submitted by a distinguished panel named by a consensus of the commission and the Committee on Accreditation. For each committee position to be filled by the commission, the panel shall submit two highly qualified nominees.

(c) The committee shall do, but shall not be limited to doing, all of the following:

(1) Make decisions about the accreditation of educator preparation. The committee's decision making process shall be in accordance with the accreditation framework.

(2) Make decisions about the initial accreditation of new programs of educator preparation in accordance with procedures established by the committee.

(3) Determine the comparability of standards submitted by applicants with those adopted by the commission, in accordance with the accreditation framework.

(4) Adopt guidelines for accreditation reviews, and monitor the performance of accreditation teams and other aspects of the accreditation system.

(5) Present an annual accreditation report to the commission and respond to accreditation issues and concerns referred to the committee by the commission.

44374.(a) The accreditation framework shall include common standards that relate to aspects of program quality that are the same for all credential programs. The framework shall also include multiple options for program standards.

(b) The accreditation framework shall include provisions regarding well-trained accreditation teams whose members shall be drawn from a pool of California college and university faculty members and administrators, elementary and secondary school teachers and other certificated professionals, and local school board members. For each accreditation visit there shall be one team, whose size, composition, and expertise shall be constituted according to the accreditation framework.

(c) An accreditation team shall present its report and recommendations to the Committee on Accreditation in accordance with the accreditation framework. The committee shall consider the accreditation team report and recommendations, and shall also consider evidence, which may be submitted by the institution, that the team demonstrated bias or acted arbitrarily or capriciously

or contrary to the policies of the accreditation framework or the procedural guidelines of the committee.

(d) The Committee on Accreditation shall make a single decision to accredit, to accredit with stipulations, or to deny accreditation to an institution's credential programs, pursuant to Section 44373 and the accreditation framework.

(e) An institution has the right to appeal to the commission if the procedures or decisions of an accreditation team or the Committee on Accreditation are arbitrary, capricious, unfair, or contrary to the policies of the commission or the procedural guidelines of the committee. An institution also has the right to recommend changes in the accreditation policies of the commission, which shall be considered by the commission in consultation with the executive director and the Committee on Accreditation.

(f) At the request of an institution, the accreditation of an education unit or a specific program by a national accrediting body shall substitute for state accreditation provided that the national accrediting body has satisfied the applicable conditions set forth in the accreditation framework.

Appendix B

Tenets of the Commission's Accreditation System

The Accreditation System is the Commission's means for ensuring that approved programs are preparing educators who are effective and are focused on continuous improvement

Basic tenets of the accreditation system include:

- a. Institutions are held to the adopted standards—both Common and Program—Each standard and each phrase of in each standard
- b. Currently, the institutions are held to meeting the specific language of the standard and there is no attempt to identify excellence beyond meeting the standard
- c. Evidence needs to be provided/collected from multiple sources to support standard decisions and accreditation recommendations
- d. What an institution is asked to do should be beneficial to the institution's educator preparation efforts and the Commission's accreditation- process
- e. When an institution is required to submit something, the submission should be reviewed and feedback provided from the Commission (COA, BIR, staff)
- f. If the CTC has necessary information already, do not request that the institution submit that information again
- g. Many of the activities previously conducted during the 4-day site visit have been distributed across the seven year cycle (Biennial Report, Program Assessment and the shorter site visit)
- h. Only BIR members make standard decisions and accreditation recommendations
- i. Only the COA makes accreditation decisions
- j. Accreditation ensures program quality which leads to better prepared educators

There are clear relationships among:

- 1) effort on part of institution—time preparing documents and in preparation for accreditation activities, and effort on part of BIR and CTC staff—to review, understand and evaluate what the institution submits;
- 2) evidence available for review by BIR members and staff, and confidence in BIR member decisions regarding findings on standards and recommendations on accreditation status, which directly impact
- 3) consistency/accuracy of the COA's decisions on accreditation and stipulations

The system should maximize the reliability, validity and consistency of accreditation decisions while not exceeding a reasonable amount of effort on the part of institutions, members of the BIR, and CTC staff.

Appendix C
Example of an NCATE Rubric

NCATE Standard: 3d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P–12 Schools

Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p>In conventional or distance learning programs, not all candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practices with exceptional students and students from diverse ethnic/racial, gender, language, and socioeconomic groups. The experiences do not help candidates reflect on diversity or develop skills for having a positive effect on student learning for all students.</p>	<p>Field experiences or clinical practice for both conventional and distance learning programs provide experiences with male and female P–12 students from different socioeconomic groups and at least two ethnic/racial groups. Candidates also work with English language learners and students with disabilities during some of their field experiences and/or clinical practice to develop and practice their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for working with all students. Feedback from peers and supervisors helps candidates reflect on their ability to help all students learn.</p>	<p>Extensive and substantive field experiences and clinical practices for both conventional and distance learning programs are designed to encourage candidates to interact with exceptional students and students from a broad range of diverse groups. The experiences help candidates confront issues of diversity that affect teaching and student learning and develop strategies for improving student learning and candidates’ effectiveness as teachers.</p>

Appendix D Summary of Accreditation Decisions

Over the past three years, 41 institutions that offer initial teacher preparation hosted site visits. Of these, 22 earned full Accreditation from the COA, but only 8 of the institutions met all standards—both Common and Program. As identified in the tables below, of the 41 institutions offering initial teacher preparation, the institutions that met all standards over the past three years (2009-10 to 2011-12) are: UC Santa Barbara, UC Santa Cruz, Sonoma State University, San Diego State University, CSU Northridge, CalState TEACH, Loyola Marymount University, and the Stanislaus County Office of Education.

For the six year period from 2006-07 to 2011-12, a total of 60 site visits took place at institutions offering initial teacher preparation, 33 of those institutions earned full Accreditation and 13 met all the Commission’s standard. In addition to those listed above are also: UC Riverside, CSU Fullerton, CSU Fresno, InterAmerican College, and Stanford University.

COA Accreditation Decisions 2011-2012 Visits			
Institution	Decision	Initial Teacher Prep	All Stds Met
Bay Area School for Enterprise/REACH	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
California State University Dominguez Hills	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
California State University Los Angeles	Accreditation	Yes	
California State University Sacramento	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
CalState TEACH	Accreditation	Yes	Yes
Concordia University	Accreditation	Yes	
Los Angeles USD	Accreditation	Yes	
Oakland USD	Accreditation	Yes	
Pacific Union College	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
Pepperdine University	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
Point Loma Nazarene	Accreditation	Yes	
Sonoma State University	Accreditation	Yes	Yes
St. Mary’s College	Accreditation	Yes	
University of California, Los Angeles	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
University of California, Santa Barbara	Accreditation	Yes	Yes
University of California, Santa Cruz	Accreditation	Yes	Yes
University of California, Berkeley	Accreditation	Yes	
University of San Diego	Accreditation	Yes	
Arcadia USD	Accreditation		
Association of California School Administrators	Accreditation		
Burbank USD	Accreditation		
Campbell USD	Accreditation		
Chula Vista ESD	Accreditation		
Contra Costa COE	Accreditation		
Culver City USD	Accreditation		
Davis Joint USD	Accreditation		

COA Accreditation Decisions 2011-2012 Visits			
Institution	Decision	Initial Teacher Prep	All Stds Met
Hanford ESD	Accreditation		
Manteca USD	Accreditation		
Marin COE	Accreditation		
Orange USD	Accreditation		
Placer COE	Accreditation		
Pleasanton USD	Accreditation		
Poway USD	Accreditation		
Redwood City	Accreditation		
Riverside COE	Accreditation		
Sutter COE	Accreditation		
Temple City USD	Accreditation with Stipulations		
Tulare City ESD	Accreditation		

COA Accreditation Decisions 2010-2011 Visits			
Program Sponsor	Decision	Initial Teacher Prep	All Stds Met
Antioch, Santa Barbara	Accreditation With Stipulations	Yes	
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo	Accreditation With Stipulations	Yes	
California Baptist University	Accreditation	Yes	
Chapman University	Accreditation	Yes	
Occidental College	Accreditation With Probationary Stipulations	Yes	
San Jose State University	Accreditation With Stipulations	Yes	
The Masters College	Accreditation With Stipulations	Yes	
University of La Verne	Accreditation	Yes	
University of Phoenix	Accreditation With Stipulations	Yes	
University of the Pacific	Accreditation	Yes	
Alhambra USD	Accreditation		
Anaheim UHSD	Accreditation		
Aspire Schools	Accreditation		
Azusa USD	Accreditation		
Butte COE	Accreditation		
Conejo Valley USD	Accreditation		
El Rancho USD	Accreditation		
Fontana USD	Accreditation		
Fremont USD	Accreditation		
Hayward USD	Accreditation		
Kings COE	Probationary Stipulations		
Merced UHSD	Accreditation		
Milpitas USD	Accreditation		
Modesto City Schools	Accreditation		
Paramount USD	Accreditation		
Rialto USD	Major Stipulations		

COA Accreditation Decisions 2010-2011 Visits			
Program Sponsor	Decision	Initial Teacher Prep	All Stds Met
San Marcos USD	Accreditation		
Santa Barbara CEO	Accreditation		
Santa Rosa City Schools	Accreditation		
SIA Tech Schools	Accreditation		
West Contra Costa USD	Accreditation		

COA Accreditation Decisions 2009-2010 Visits			
Program Sponsor	Decision	Initial Teacher Prep	All Stds Met
Biola University	Accreditation	Yes	
CSU Northridge	Accreditation	Yes	Yes
CSU Stanislaus	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
Fresno Pacific University	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
Loyola Marymount University	Accreditation	Yes	Yes
National Hispanic University	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Yes	
San Diego Christian College	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Yes	
San Diego State University	Accreditation	Yes	Yes
Santa Clara University	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Yes	
Stanislaus COE	Accreditation	Yes	Yes
Touro University	Accreditation	Yes	
Whittier College	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
William Jessup University	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Yes	

COA Accreditation Decisions 2008-2009 Visits			
Program Sponsor	Decision	Initial Teacher Prep	All Stds Met
California Lutheran University	Accreditation	Yes	
CSU, Channel Islands	Accreditation	Yes	
CSU, East Bay	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
CSU, San Bernardino	Accreditation	Yes	
Fresno County Office of Education	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
High Tech Learning Communities	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
Los Angeles County Office of Education	Accreditation	Yes	
Mills College	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
Notre Dame de Namur	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
Patten University	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
San Diego County Office of Education	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
San Diego Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
Simpson College	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	
Western Governors University	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	

COA Accreditation Decisions 2008-2009 Visits			
Program Sponsor	Decision	Initial Teacher Prep	All Stds Met
Westmont College	Accreditation	Yes	

COA Accreditation Decisions 2007-2008 Visits			
Program Sponsor	Decision	Initial Teacher Prep	All Stds Met
Alliant International University	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations	Yes	
Argosy University	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations	Yes	
CSU, Bakersfield	Accreditation	Yes	
CSU, Fullerton	Accreditation	Yes	Yes
Dominican University	Accreditation	Yes	
Holy Names University	Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations	Yes	
InterAmerican College	Accreditation	Yes	Yes
Orange County DOE	Accreditation with Technical Stipulations	Yes	
Project Pipeline	Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations	Yes	
Stanford University	Accreditation	Yes	Yes
UC Riverside	Accreditation	Yes	Yes
Vanguard University	Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations	Yes	
Loma Linda University	Accreditation		
Phillips Graduate Institute	Accreditation with Technical Stipulations		

COA Accreditation Decisions 2006-2007 Visits			
Program Sponsor	Decision	Initial Teacher Prep	All Stds Met
Azusa Pacific University	Accreditation	Yes	
CSU, Chico	Accreditation with Technical Stipulations	Yes	
CSU, Long Beach	Accreditation	Yes	
CSU, Monterey Bay	Accreditation with Technical Stipulations	Yes	
CSU, San Marcos	Accreditation	Yes	
San Francisco State University	Accreditation with Stipulations	Yes	

COA Accreditation Decisions 2006-2007 Visits			
Program Sponsor	Decision	Initial Teacher Prep	All Stds Met
CSU Fresno	Accreditation	Yes	Yes