
21

Action

Public Hearing

Proposed Addition to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations Pertaining to Annual Accreditation Fees

AGENDA INSERT

Executive Summary: This agenda item proposes the addition of sections 80693 and 80694 to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations pertaining to annual accreditation fees.

Recommended Action: Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed regulations pertaining to annual accreditation fees.

Presenter: Philip Chen, Director, Fiscal and Business Services and Teri Clark, Director, Professional Services Division.

Strategic Plan Goal

I. Educator Quality

- ◆ Develop, maintain, and promote high quality authentic, consistent educator assessments and examinations that support development and certification of educators who have demonstrated the capacity to be effective practitioners.

October 2014

Proposed Addition to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations Pertaining to Annual Accreditation Fees

Updated Tally of Responses

September 30, 2014

Support

0 organizational opinions
0 personal opinions

Opposition

2 organizational opinions
0 personal opinions

Grand Total Responses: 2

Responses Representing Organizational Opposition

1. Shana Matamala, Associate Dean, California Baptist University (*Comments and Response in full agenda item: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-10/2014-10-21.pdf>*)
2. M.G. Kelly, Dean, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona (*Comments and response below*)

Comments: When querying the stakeholders of our credential programs about this proposal, one wisely stated, "This is a just a case of one impoverished state entity taking money from another impoverished entity." Realistically, if the state is committed to excellence in educator preparation and great teachers for all students, it should fund the CTC appropriately. This solution just shifts funds from the CSUs back to the state with no recourse to backfill those funds within the CSU. The funds all come from the same pot. Private institution can raise tuition, we cannot.

The coin of the realm in the CSU is based on how many course sections we will not be able to teach. This is another unfounded mandate of expenditures. The annual assessment, assuming no late fees, is about equivalent to two course sections at my institution. While I understand the dilemma the commission is in, this is a no-win solution. Rather, it penalizes the public institutions again. This is just another way in which the state is backing out of its responsibility to invest in educator preparation while potentially adding to the debt of students in private institutions.

Additionally, an unanticipated consequence is going to be a reduction in the number of programs that offer low incidence credential programs and those that are expensive to

operate, which also happen to be the credentialed professionals we need most e.g. low incidence special education, speech and language pathology, etc. credentials. As we have to continue to cut costs to balance budget while taking in more students, these programs become low hanging fruit in cost cutting measures.

Aside from the obvious of raising the CTC budget, please consider a simpler approach, such as raising our very low credential fee as a way to spread the costs throughout those who benefit from the CTC work rather than disproportionately impacting the public universities.

Response: SB 858 amended Education Code section 44374.5 which provides the Commission with the authority to charge fees to cover the standard costs of reviewing existing educator preparation programs. The state budget included the anticipated revenue from Annual Accreditation Fees as part of the Commission's overall budget. In setting the fees for accreditation, the Commission is implementing the express direction of the Legislature and the Governor.

Institutions routinely assess whether to offer a particular program based on a number of factors including cost to operate. Annual accreditation fees would be one factor in an institution's decision whether to operate a program. The Commission cannot mandate which programs an institution may choose to sponsor as the choice is a local decision. In the future, should a shortage of highly qualified teachers in specialized areas become an issue the Commission is able to amend the fee structure as specified in the proposed regulations [reference subsections (d), (g), and (f) of section 80694].

The commenter suggests the Commission raise the credential fee rather than charge programs for the cost of accreditation. The credential fee is currently \$70. Under Education Code section 44235, the Commission cannot change that amount without express legislative approval.