
1H

Action

Public Hearing

Proposed Amendments to Title 5 Regulations Pertaining to Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities

Executive Summary: This agenda item proposes amendments to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations sections 80691 and 80692 pertaining to Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities.

Recommended Action: Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed regulations pertaining to Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities.

Presenter: Lynette Roby, Consultant, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability

- a) Develop and maintain rigorous, meaningful, and relevant standards that drive program quality and effectiveness for the preparation of the education workforce and are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population.

Proposed Amendments to Title 5 Regulations Pertaining to Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities

Introduction

This rulemaking action proposes amendments to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) related to Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities. Proposed amendments update terminology to match that of the newly strengthened and streamlined Accreditation System, remove the fee for Program Assessment beyond three reviews, and add a new fee for the review of eligibility criteria in the first phase of the revised Initial Institutional Approval process.

Background

The Commission adopted Title 5 regulations related to Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities at the [September 27, 2013](#) meeting following the addition of Education Code (EC) section 44374.5 which authorized the Commission to develop and implement a cost recovery plan for extraordinary accreditation activities.

Since the approval of the fee structure, the Commission has undertaken significant work to strengthen and streamline the state's Accreditation System. The changes to the Accreditation System resulted in the need to amend sections 80691 and 80692 of Title 5 of the CCR related to cost recovery fees for extraordinary accreditation activities. At the [December 2016](#) Commission meeting staff proposed amendments to the fee schedule and the Commission directed staff to begin the rulemaking process. A Coded Correspondence and a notice of proposed amendments were published on the Commission webpage on [April 14, 2017](#). Additionally, the Office of Administrative Law published the notice on their website. The proposed amendments include two fee changes and general clean-up to align terms with the Commission's restructured Accreditation System.

Proposed Amendments to Regulations

The proposed amendments include one addition and one deletion to the fee schedule, as well as changes to the fee structure and terminology order. In addition to changes in terminology (i.e. Program Assessment to Document Review) a brief description of the changes to regulations is provided below.

Additional Fee:

The initial institutional approval process now includes multiple stages for which documentation is submitted for review and action by the Commission. This format requires a significant amount of additional staff time to review eligibility requirements, a step that was not part of the previous Accreditation System. An additional fee of \$1,000 is proposed to recover a portion of the funds for staff time allocated to the review of the eligibility requirements and conducting the free

training session to prospective institutions, Accreditation 101, so they understand how to respond to the eligibility requirements. A detailed explanation of how the \$1,000 fee was derived is available in [Coded Correspondence 17-03](#).

Deleted Fee:

The program assessment process has been renamed to “program review” and streamlined to have only one review session. For this reason, fees associated with multiple late reviews are no longer necessary and are proposed to be deleted from the fee structure.

Fee Structure Amendments:

Amendments to the regulations are being proposed due to the changes in the Accreditation System and efforts to update and revise program standards. Currently, the cost recovery fee structure is based on the number of standards required for the submission of a new program and any change in the number of standards a program requires may directly affect the calculation of fees. However, since program standards have been streamlined and strengthened, the number of standards in a program is no longer indicative of the complexity of efforts needed to review the program. As standards were streamlined, they were also strengthened and each standard now addresses multiple competencies. Proposed amendments include categorizing standards based on the type of authorization that results from them (preliminary credential, clear credential, or added authorization) which provides the flexibility needed to continually improve standards without having to amend the fee structure or regulations.

Proposed Changes to Fee Structure:

Below is a table of the relevant current activities and fees as well as proposed changes.

Beyond Standard Accreditation Cycle Activities Education Code §44374.5	Cost Recovery Fee
Current: None Proposed: Review of Eligibility Requirements	Current: None Proposed: \$1,000
Current: Initial Program Review: Programs 12 or more standards Proposed: Initial Program Review: Category I Preliminary/Initial Preparation programs	Current: \$2,000 Proposed: No changes
Current: Initial Program Review: Programs 6-11 standards Proposed: Initial Program Review: Category II Second Tier Preparation programs	Current: \$1,500 Proposed: No changes
Current: Initial Program Review: Programs fewer than 6 standards Proposed: Initial Program Review: Category III Added Authorization programs.	Current: \$1,000 Proposed: No changes
Current: Late Document Reviews Proposed: Late Submission of Documentation	Current: \$500 per program Proposed: No changes
Current: Program Assessment Requiring More than 3 Reviews	Current: \$1,000

Beyond Standard Accreditation Cycle Activities Education Code §44374.5	Cost Recovery Fee
Proposed: Eliminate	Proposed: <i>Eliminate Fee</i>
Current: Full Program Review during Site Visit as a result of not completing program assessment process Proposed: Full Program Review during a Site Visit as a result of not completing the program review process	Current: <i>\$3,000 per program</i> Proposed: <i>No changes</i>

Proposed Amendments and Rationale

The table below describes the current regulation, the proposed amendment, and the rationale for each amendment.

Current Regulation	Proposed Amendment	Rationale
§80691		
§80691(a)	<i>Update:</i> Revision date for incorporated document from 2012 to 2016	Significant revisions to handbook chapter. See Summary of Updates to the Articles Incorporated by Reference table.
§80691(b)	Definition for “Focused site visit” relocated to §80691(f)	Relocated to maintain alphabetical order of definitions.
	<i>Addition:</i> Definition for “Category I: Preliminary/Initial Preparation”	The current fee structure is based on the number of standards required for the submission of a new program. Changes to the number of standards a program requires may directly affect the calculation of fees. Since program standards were streamlined and strengthened, the number of standards in a program is no longer indicative of the complexity of the efforts needed to review the program. As standards were streamlined, they were also strengthened and each standard now addresses multiple competencies. Therefore, language defining the fee to be assessed for initial program review of Category I programs is needed. Preliminary preparation programs are those that lead to an entry-level credential with a limited validity period (typically 5 years), which must

Current Regulation	Proposed Amendment	Rationale
		<p>eventually be “cleared” through a second tier program to receive the full credential.</p> <p>Initial preparation programs are those that only have one level for the full credential (i.e. Speech-Language Pathology, School Nurse).</p> <p>Preliminary and Initial preparation programs have the most rigorous and complex standards and require the most amount of time for review.</p> <p>A table listing each category with the respective programs is provided below.</p>
§80691(c)	Definition for “Initial institutional approval” relocated to §80691(g)	Relocated to maintain alphabetical order of definitions.
	Addition: Definition for “Category II: Second Tier Preparation”	<p>The current fee structure is based on the number of standards required for the submission of a new program. Changes to the number of standards a program requires may directly affect the calculation of fees. Since program standards were streamlined and strengthened, the number of standards in a program is no longer indicative of the complexity of the efforts needed to review the program. As standards were streamlined, they were also strengthened and each standard now addresses multiple competencies. Therefore, language defining the fee to be assessed for section tier program review of Category II programs is needed.</p> <p>Second tier preparation programs lead to a secondary credential. These programs are typically the “journey-level” or “professional-level and are attended by those who already hold a preliminary credential.</p>

Current Regulation	Proposed Amendment	Rationale
		<p>Second tier preparation program standards are slightly less complex and require slightly less time to review than Category I programs.</p> <p>A table listing each category with the respective programs is provided below.</p>
§80691(d)	Definition for “Initial program review” relocated to §80691(h)	Relocated to maintain alphabetical order of definitions.
	<i>Addition:</i> Definition for “Category III: Added Authorizations”	<p>The current fee structure is based on the number of standards required for the submission of a new program. Changes to the number of standards a program requires may directly affect the calculation of fees. Since program standards were streamlined and strengthened the number of standards in a program is no longer indicative of the complexity of the efforts needed to review the program. As standards were streamlined, they were also strengthened and each standard now addresses multiple competencies. Therefore, language defining the fee to be assessed for section tier program review of Category III programs is needed.</p> <p>Added authorization preparation programs lead to an authorization that is added to a pre-existing credential.</p> <p>Added authorization preparation program standards are less complex and require less time to review than Category I and II programs.</p> <p>A table listing each category with the respective programs is provided below.</p>
§80691(e)	Definition for “Institution” relocated to §80691(i)	Relocated to maintain alphabetical order of definitions.

Current Regulation	Proposed Amendment	Rationale
	<i>Addition:</i> Definition for “Eligibility Requirements”	The Commission adopted a strengthened Initial Institutional Approval process which requires submission and review of Eligibility Requirements as the first step in a multi-step approval process. Significant staff and Commissioner time is required to review the Eligibility Requirements and a \$1,000 fee is proposed to cover that cost as it is outside of normally scheduled accreditation activities.
§80691(f)	<i>Update:</i> Revision date updated	Significant revisions to handbook chapter. See Summary of Updates to the Articles Incorporated by Reference table.
	<i>Relocation</i>	Definitions reordered to maintain alphabetical order. Reference to another section updated as a result of reordering of definitions.
	<i>Addition:</i> Language added so that the Commission may request a focused site visit	Language updated to include the Commission as a possible requestor of a focused site visit. The revised accreditation system provides for the Commission to request a focused site visit when a new institution is going through the phases of the Initial Institutional Approval process.
§80691(g) and §80691(h)	<i>Update:</i> Revision date and chapter title updated	Significant revisions to handbook chapter, including the title. See Summary of Updates to the Articles Incorporated by Reference table. Both subsections contain the same updates as the same chapter is referenced.
	<i>Relocation</i>	Definitions reordered to maintain alphabetical order. Reference to another section updated as a result of reordering of definitions.
§80691(i)	<i>Update:</i> Update to subsection reference	Definitions reordered to maintain alphabetical order. Reference to another section updated as a result of reordering of definitions.
§80691(j)	<i>Update:</i> Revision date updated	Significant revisions to handbook chapters, including the titles. See Summary of Updates to the Articles Incorporated by Reference table.

Current Regulation	Proposed Amendment	Rationale
	<i>Relocation</i>	Definitions reordered to maintain alphabetical order. Reference to another section updated as a result of reordering of definitions.
	<i>Update:</i> Definition term updated	Changed from “Late Review” to “Late Submission of Documentation.” Multiple reviews are no longer required. Therefore, language has been changed to a more accurate term that applies to late submission of any document required in the regular accreditation activity cycle.
	<i>Update:</i> Terminology updated	The revised accreditation system requires annual data submission, therefore the term “Biennial Report” is updated to “Annual Data Report.”
	<i>Update:</i> Terminology updated	The revised accreditation system has changed the term “Program Assessment” to “Program Review.” The process has changed from a year four activity to a year five activity, has a different process for submission of program information, and no longer requires multiple reviews. The name change is also intended to communicate to the field that the old process is no longer in place.
§80691(k)	<i>Update:</i> Revision date updated	Significant revisions to handbook chapter. See Summary of Updates to the Articles Incorporated by Reference table.
	<i>Relocation</i>	Definitions reordered to maintain alphabetical order. Reference to another section updated as a result of reordering of definitions.
	<i>Update:</i> Terminology updated and accreditation activity year change	The revised accreditation system has changed the term “Program Assessment” to “Program Review.” The process has changed from a year four activity to a year five activity, has a different process for submission of program information, and no longer requires multiple reviews. The name change is also intended to communicate to the field that the old process is no longer in place.

Current Regulation	Proposed Amendment	Rationale
§80691(m)	<i>Update:</i> Revision date updated	Significant revisions to handbook chapter. See Summary of Updates to the Articles Incorporated by Reference table.
	<i>Relocation</i>	Definitions reordered to maintain alphabetical order. Reference to another section updated as a result of reordering of definitions.
§80691(n)	<i>Update:</i> Revision date updated	Significant revisions to handbook chapter. See Summary of Updates to the Articles Incorporated by Reference table.
§80691(o)	<i>Update:</i> Revision date updated	Significant revisions to handbook chapter. See Summary of Updates to the Articles Incorporated by Reference table.
§80691(p)	<i>Update:</i> Revision date updated	Significant revisions to handbook chapter. See Summary of Updates to the Articles Incorporated by Reference table.
§80692		
§80692(a) (1)	<i>Deletion:</i> Remove fee from location and move to (a)(1)(B)	New Initial Institutional Approval process requires addition of subsections (A) and (B). The Initial Institutional Approval process has been strengthened by creating a multi-step process requiring a multi-level pay schedule.
§80692(a) (1)(A)	<i>Addition:</i> \$1,000 flat fee for review of Eligibility Requirements	The Commission adopted a strengthened Initial Institutional Approval process which requires submission and review of Eligibility Requirements as the new first step in a multi-step approval process. Significant staff and Commissioner time is required to review the Eligibility Requirements and a \$1,000 fee is proposed to cover that cost as it is outside of normally scheduled accreditation activities.
§80692(a) (1)(B)	<i>Relocation:</i> \$2,000 flat fee relocated	Additional flat fee for Eligibility Requirements added, requiring relocation of this subsection.
§80692(a) (2)(A)	<i>Update:</i> Terminology updated	The current fee structure is based on the number of standards required for the submission of a new

Current Regulation	Proposed Amendment	Rationale
		<p>program. Changes to the number of standards a program requires may directly affect the calculation of fees. As program standards were streamlined and strengthened, the number of standards in a program is no longer indicative of the complexity of the effort needed to review the program. As standards were streamlined, they were also strengthened and each standard now addresses multiple competencies. The fee amount is staying the same, however the language is being updated to read: Category I: Preliminary/Initial Preparation program review.</p>
<p>§80692(a) (2)(B)</p>	<p><i>Update:</i> Terminology updated</p>	<p>The current fee structure is based on the number of standards required for the submission of a new program. Changes to the number of standards a program requires may directly affect the calculation of fees. As program standards were streamlined and strengthened, the number of standards in a program is no longer indicative of the complexity of the effort needed to review the program. As standards were streamlined, they were also strengthened and each standard now addresses multiple competencies. The fee amount is staying the same, however the language is being updated to read: Category II: Second Tier Preparation program review.</p>

Current Regulation	Proposed Amendment	Rationale
§80692(a) (2)(C)	<i>Update:</i> Terminology updated	The current fee structure is based on the number of standards required for the submission of a new program. Changes to the number of standards a program requires may directly affect the calculation of fees. As program standards were streamlined and strengthened, the number of standards in a program is no longer indicative of the complexity of the effort needed to review the program. As standards were streamlined, they were also strengthened and each standard now addresses multiple competencies. The fee amount is staying the same, however the language is being updated to read: Category III: Added Authorization program review.
§80692(b) (3) and §80692(b) (3)(A)	<i>Deletion:</i> Delete obsolete language	The Program Assessment process has changed to Program Review. Additionally, the process no longer requires a back and forth review process between readers and institutions. Therefore, this fee and language is obsolete, as multiple reviews have been eliminated.
§80692(b) (3)(B)	<i>Update:</i> Terminology updated and relocation	The deletion of language from subsections §80692(b)(3) and §80692(b)(3)(A) requires moving the language from this subsection to §80692(b)(3). Deleting “Program Assessment” and replacing with “Program Review” to update terminology.
§80692(b) (4)(B)	<i>Update:</i> Revision date updated	Significant revisions to handbook chapter. See Summary of Updates to the Articles Incorporated by Reference table.
§80692(b) (4)(C)	<i>Update:</i> Revision date updated	Significant revisions to handbook chapter. See Summary of Updates to the Articles Incorporated by Reference table.

Program Category Listing

<p>Category I Preliminary/Initial Preparation</p>	<p>Category II Second Tier Preparation</p>	<p>Category III Added Authorizations</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject • Single Subject • Education Specialist- Mild/Moderate • Education Specialist- Moderate/Severe • Education Specialist- Early Childhood • Education Specialist- Deaf and Hard of Hearing • Education Specialist- Visual Impairments • Education Specialist- Physical and Health Impairments • Education Specialist- Language and Academic Development • Administrative Services • School Psychology • School Counseling • School Social Work • Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education • Designated Subjects: Adult Education • Clinical or Other Rehabilitative- Orientation and Mobility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Education Induction • Clear Education Specialist Induction • Administrative Services Induction • California Teachers of English Learners • Bilingual Authorization • Agriculture Specialist • Adapted Physical Education • Early Childhood Specialist • Designated Subjects: Supervision and Coordination • Designated Subjects: Special Subjects • Pupil Personnel Services- Child Welfare and Attendance • Teacher Librarian • School Nurse • Audiology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education Specialist Added Authorization-Autism Spectrum Disorder • Education Specialist Added Authorization-Deaf-Blind • Education Specialist Added Authorization-Early Childhood Special Education • Education Specialist Added Authorization-Emotional Disturbance • Education Specialist Added Authorization-Orthopedic Impairments • Education Specialist Added Authorization-Other Health Impairments • Education Specialist Added Authorization-Resource • Education Specialist Added Authorization-Traumatic Brain Injury • Reading and Literacy Added Authorization • Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist • Mathematics Instructional Added Authorization • Mathematics Instructional Leadership Specialist • Teacher Librarian Special Teaching Authorization • School Nurse Special Teaching Authorization • Speech-Language Pathology Special Teaching Authorization

Summary of Updates and Justification for Updates to the Articles Incorporated by Reference

The Commission adopted a new Accreditation Framework in February 2016, necessitating amendments to several accreditation handbook chapters which were subsequently adopted by the Committee on Accreditation pursuant to EC section 44372. Updates have been made to the articles incorporated by reference in the current approved cost recovery fee regulations. Agenda items from Commission meetings and Committee on Accreditation meetings were relied upon in preparing the summary and justification of the updates to the articles incorporated by reference. All of the articles incorporated fall under the category of Accreditation Handbook Chapters and must be adopted by the Committee on Accreditation. Adoption dates are located in the footer of each chapter.

Important Note

After the initial regulatory packet was submitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) for review and posting of the notice, staff discovered that, due to a technical error, only half of the Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three was posted on the Commission website. Therefore, only the first half of the chapter and the justifications for updates for the first half of the chapter was provided to OAL. Due to this error, should the Commission approve the regulatory language in its entirety, following the public hearing a 15-day notice will be posted to provide interested parties with the opportunity to comment on the second half of chapter three's updates. This agenda item provides the justifications in their entirety for chapter three. Additionally, [the full version of the chapter](#) has been posted for the public on the Commission website.

Global Updates

Throughout all chapters, the acronym for Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) was used. To limit the number of acronyms used throughout the chapters, CTC has been changed to Commission. All chapters have been updated to reflect the month and year the Committee on Accreditation adopted the handbook revisions. Throughout the chapters, terms for Program Assessment and Biennial Reports have been changed to Program Review and Annual Data, respectively. Terminology has changed to align with the adopted Accreditation Framework, however specific justification for terminology changes can be found under each chapter's summary of amendments. Finally, throughout the chapters language was added to reflect that preconditions and common standards review are part of the accreditation cycle. Review of preconditions and common standards documents has always been part of the cycle, however this was not clear in previous handbook chapters. In several locations updated terminology and the inclusion of preconditions and common standards is included. Several of the later chapters required edits to update terminology and clarify existing language. The information below details individual chapter changes and the justification behind the amendments.

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three, Institutional and Program Approval

- Title change: extended title to include “and Change of Status” so program sponsors are aware that chapter three is the chapter that deals with the change of status (i.e. inactive, withdrawn, etc.).
- Introduction: Updated language for clarity.
- I. Initial Institutional Approval: Language added to reflect the new strengthened three part Initial Institutional Approval process which was approved by the Commission, and subsequently the Committee on Accreditation, after development by the Accreditation Advisory Panel.
- STAGE I – Prerequisites: Language added to reflect the new prerequisites required for prospective program sponsors. This process has been strengthened to require prospective programs to show proof of regional accreditation or district approval prior to attending the newly implemented Accreditation 101 training session. Accreditation 101 was added as a requirement so prospective institutions receive a clear understanding of the approval process as well as the requirements of participating in the Accreditation System, including fiscal costs. Training is delivered by a staff Consultant and Administrator and is offered free of charge so those running programs can decide if they want to move forward with accreditation after obtaining detailed information about the Accreditation System and approval process.
- STAGE II – Eligibility Requirements: New language added describing the eligibility requirements that prospective institutions must respond to as part of the Initial Institutional Approval process. These requirements closely mirror the current preconditions that all approved institutions must respond to within the Accreditation System and provides the Commission with a clear picture of the prospective institution’s capacity to meet the rigorous California teacher preparation standards. Responses are reviewed by staff and presented to the Commission. A decision is made by the Commission on whether or not the prospective institution may move forward with the Initial Institutional Approval process.
- STAGE III – Alignment with all Applicable Standards and Preconditions: Language added to reflect the third stage which comes after the Commission grants permission to move forward with the process. This language details the submission information for Common Standards and General Preconditions which are reviewed by volunteers from the Board of Institutional Reviewers. Deleted language pertains to the obsolete process and is being eliminated for clarity.
- Commission Approval: New language added detailing the levels of approval. Provisional approval for two to three years (as determined by the Commission) has been added to provide a “probationary” period for new institutions so data may be collected to determine the institution’s effectiveness in educator preparation. Language on obtaining full approval also added.
- Obsolete language from the outdated Initial Institutional Approval process deleted.
- II. Initial Approval of Programs: Accreditation changed to Approval to indicate that an institution must be accredited before programs may be approved. This change is made throughout the section. (NOTE: This was the last justification provided in the initial packet provided to the Office of Administrative Law. The following are the additional justifications for the remaining half of the chapter.)

- Program Submission and Implementation: Language added to clarify the difference between subject matter program approval and educator preparation program approval. Also added information regarding the two different web pages describing each individual process.
- 1. Review of Preconditions: Removed and rewrote first paragraph since review of preconditions is no longer voluntary and must take place prior to an institution submitting program and common standards for review.
- 2. Review of Common and Program Standards: Added a paragraph to stress the importance of field participation in the review of common and program standards as Commission staff do not perform this function.
- 3. COA Action: Added a bold heading for clarity. Added a sentence clarifying that institutions can rely on Commission staff for information and assistance during the review of common and program standards.
- Appeal of an Adverse Decision: Added the second paragraph to this section and accompanying bullets. The previous handbook chapter did not specify timelines for institution representatives who feel they have adequately addressed the standards while Commission staff or the reviewer panel do not. The handbook now provides a timeline and clearer direction for institutional representatives to appeal reviewer or Commission staff decisions to deny moving a program proposal forward to the COA. Additionally, the steps required for an appeal appeared to apply to the second level (Executive Director) of the appeal process. For clarity, the steps are now listed under the first level of the appeal process. Timeline language was added to the second level of the appeal process (20 business days) to ensure a timely appeal process.
- III. Program Status for Approved Programs: Small amount of clarification added. Stylistic changes to the chart in this section. Withdrawn and Active column were rearranged as authors thought it made more sense to have Active in the first column. Language added to indicate that in the new Accreditation System institutions must submit annual data reports for programs that are inactive but had candidates enrolled in the program during the reporting period. For example, if an institution has candidates finishing a program in the fall semester, yet the program went inactive in the spring semester, they would still need to submit an annual data report. This report would include data from the spring semester, even though at the time of submitting the report the program may be inactive.
- Active Programs: Language change in header from Approved to Active as Active is a stronger description of the program's status for the purposes of this chapter. List of activities for active programs updated to reflect the revised system requirements. Information about the Commission's approved program webpage moved to follow the bullets (was previously before the bullets) as this information is slightly less important than the bulleted list.
- Newly Approved Program Sponsors Authorized to Offer California Credentials: Rewrote first paragraph to align with the new system. Previously, new program sponsors would be placed into the cohort that was in year two of the seven year accreditation cycle. With the multi-stage approval process in place, the Commission decides where to place new program sponsors within the 7 year cycle. For example, if the focused site visit goes well the new program sponsor may be placed into the cohort that is currently in year one or two of the accreditation cycle and will not require a site visit for a longer span of time. However, if the focused site visit

does not go well, the new program sponsor may be placed into the cohort that is currently in year four or five of the accreditation cycle so their next site visit occurs earlier. The Commission decides which year will provide the new program sponsor with the best amount of support. Obsolete language removed.

- Inactive Programs: Language added to indicate that a program may only move to inactive when it has 15 or fewer candidates in the program. This was added to ensure that programs are not moving to inactive status to avoid paying annual accreditation fees and to ensure that a request to move to inactive does not disrupt the candidates in the program. A list of current candidates (lock list) is provided to the Commission so Certification staff will be aware that, even though the program has moved to inactive, the individuals on the lock list are still able to be recommended for credentials.
- Inactive Programs: Language added to indicate that a program may not request to move to inactive status more than six months prior to the date the program notifies the Commission. Previously, programs were able to request to move to inactive as far as 18 months prior to the date of notification. This caused an excessive amount of administrative work to ensure the request was tracked throughout the 18 months and that it was presented to the COA for approval at the meeting closest to the proposed date of withdrawal. Removed link to the Credential Information Guide as the Commission is currently in the process of moving from the Guide as a source of approved program information to the data dashboards that provide information on approved programs. These dashboards are accessible on the Commission website.
- Inactive Programs: A program may hold an inactive status for a span no longer than 5 years, after which the program sponsor must determine if they want to activate or withdraw the program. Language added to clarify that if a program sponsor does not make a decision within the 5 year period, the COA will automatically withdraw the program at the next scheduled meeting. Language also added to clarify that Commission staff will notify the program at least 6 months prior to the end of the 5 year limit so a decision may be made by the institution.
- Reactivating an Approved Inactive Educator Preparation Program: Language added throughout the section to align with the revised accreditation system including what documents must be submitted to reactivate a program. Clarifying language added to indicate that a reactivation must take place at a regularly scheduled COA meeting.
- Withdrawal of Credential Programs: Language added to the first paragraph to emphasize that a program must wait one year from the date of withdrawal before they may reapply for approval. Language added to clarify that a program must teach-out all candidates by the effective date of withdrawal. This has always been the process, however it was not explicitly stated in the handbook. Second bullet rewritten to indicate that a program can only request to withdraw after candidates have completed the program. Previously, programs would provide the date they expected candidates to complete the program. This became problematic as candidates may have encountered unexpected circumstances that did not allow them to complete the program by the date the institution wanted to withdraw. To remedy the possibility of unexpected circumstances disrupting candidates, the Commission now requires the program to teach-out all candidates before withdrawal. This update required the last bullet to be deleted as it is now obsolete.

- Reaccrediting Programs that have been Withdrawn: Added topic header for clarity. Language revised to indicate that institutions must wait one year after withdrawal to submit a program proposal. Previously, institutions were required to wait two years. However, due to the teacher shortage in California, the Commission wants to remove unnecessary barriers to teacher preparation wherever possible. Language added to allow for an institution to petition the COA to waive the one year waiting period.
- Discontinuation (or Closure) of Credential Program by the COA: Additional verbiage added to topic header for clarity. Particularly, the verbiage was added to indicate that the COA may close a program without closing the entire institution and denying accreditation. Language added to third bullet to indicate that if the COA is closing a program, the institution must assist current candidates, if any, with transferring to another institution. Last bullet removed as it is now obsolete.
- Institutional Closure due to Closure of Programs: Header added for clarity and ease of reading. Language changed to indicate that an institution must wait two years from the date of closure before reapplying for initial institutional approval. Previously, an institution could begin the process of initial institutional approval two years from the date of submitting the withdrawal. Language changed because the COA may close a program, or the program may choose to close itself. This new language provides a solution for both options. Additional language added to clarify that in specific situations, institutions that withdrew or had all of their programs closed may request to stay an approved program sponsor without programs for a specified amount of time. This was added because of the complexity of the new initial institutional approval process and the possibility that an institution may stay open for the purposes of participating in accreditation activities that may apply (including annual accreditation fees) while the institution is not operating any programs.

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Four, the Accreditation Cycle

- Introduction: Minor edits for clarity purposes.
- I. Purpose: Added the word preconditions to ensure program sponsors are aligned with all standards and requirements.
- II. Overview: Updated language to provide a broad, yet more detailed, overview of the activities within the new Accreditation Cycle. Updated terminology justifications can be found in the associated chapters below. Removed table with generic cohort chart and replaced with information directing to the Commission website. Other minor language changes. Replaced figure showing accreditation cycle activities with updated chart of accreditation cycle including updated terminology. (The figure appears to be under the “Biennial Reports” header, however that is a formatting error.)
- Biennial Reports: Heading changed from Biennial Reports to Annual Data Analysis. The Biennial data reports were previously due every other year, however the new system has been strengthened to require annual reports to determine possible needed programmatic changes in a timelier manner to ensure program effectiveness. Terminology renamed to reflect the new annual due dates of the reports.
- Precondition Review: Language added to establish the new review cycle requirements for program preconditions.

- Program Assessment: Title changed to Common Standards and Program Review for consistency with new accreditation cycle (see chapter six for justifications). Edits to first paragraph moving program review from year four to year five of the accreditation cycle. Deleted outdated language and replaced with language clarifying the Annual Data process. (Note: this is just a broad overview of the process, see chapter six).
- Site Visit: Updated language to provide a broad, yet more detailed, overview of the activities within the new Accreditation Cycle. Updated terminology justifications can be found in the associated chapters below. Language added to clarify that electronic copies of documentation must be submitted, as the process is now paperless.
- Follow Up: New header added to clarify that the follow up process is not happening during the site visit.
- III. Cohort Activities: Removed the language related to Table 1 which has been removed and now directs program sponsors to the Commission’s website for their cohort assignment.
- Table 1: Deleted, as program sponsors are now directed to the Commission’s website for their cohort assignment.

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Five, Biennial Reports

- Title Change: Title changed to Annual Data Submission. The Biennial data reports were previously due every other year, however the new system has been strengthened to require annual reports to determine possible needed programmatic changes in a timelier manner to ensure program effectiveness. Terminology renamed to reflect the new annual due dates of the reports.
- Introduction: Amended to reflect the purpose of the annual data submission.
- The majority of the chapter has been rewritten to clarify the annual process including the use of the newly implemented data warehouse. Information added to explain how the Commission will collect information electronically and how it will be analyzed within the accreditation process and used by all stakeholders.

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Six, Program Assessment

- Title Change: Title changed to Program Review. The new streamlined process significantly reduced the lengthy narrative that was required in the Program Assessment process, which occurred in year four, which required several revisions and resubmissions. The name was changed to differentiate to the field that the process has changed significantly. This accreditation activity now takes place in year five and it only requires one submission.
- Introduction: Language amended to give a broad overview of the new process.
- Purpose of Program Assessment: Name changed from program assessment to program review. Delete language that described the outdated “assessment process.” New paragraph added describing the new process and how review of the documents will be utilized prior to and during the site visit.
- II. Program Assessment Documentation *and* III. Review of Program Assessment Documents: Both sections combined and retitled to Program Review Submission. All of the section II language deleted, as it is obsolete under the new process. New language outlining the new process added to clarify the type of documentation that needs to be submitted for review. The

new process outlined aligns with the adopted Accreditation Framework and creates a less onerous process for programs while still providing the necessary program specifics to reviewers.

- III. Review of Program Review Submission: This sections includes language that was previously in the section titled Preview of Program Assessment Documents. This section describes how the submitted program documents will be reviewed and includes amendments and new language to align with the updated process. Language added to reflect the cost recovery fee, should additional members be needed on the site visit team due to incomplete document submission. Language added to clarify that the site visit team makes recommendations to the Committee on Accreditation (COA) which then makes the accreditation decision. Sample version of Preliminary Report of Findings updated with minor edits for clarity.
- Additional Information: Amendments clarify how program sponsors can obtain technical assistance.
- IV. Programs that are Transitioning to New Program Standards: Minor language changes to clarify the process when programs are transitioning to newly adopted standards.

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Eight, Accreditation Decisions: Options and Implications

- GLOBAL NOTE: The repeating underlined headings for “Operational Implications” and “Removal of Stipulations” are not new language. They were stylistically underlined in the original chapter for ease while browsing through the chapter for information. They are underlined in the revised chapter as well.
- I. Accreditation Decision Options: Language related to the operation implications of each accreditation decision relocated to page three for better flow of information in the chapter. Table 1 has been relocated to page two and has been restructured to align with the new accreditation system and adopted framework.
- Accreditation with Stipulations: Additional language added to clarify what stipulations may include. Language added clarifying that stipulations requiring the closure of an individual program may not be removed because a closed program requires a minimum waiting period of two years before the institution may reapply to operate the program again.
- Accreditation with Major Stipulations: Language added to explain that the COA will determine whether programs with major stipulations will be required to notify students of the accreditation status. Relocation of language for better flow of information from page 9 to page 8. Language added clarifying that major stipulations requiring the closure of an individual program may not be removed because a closed program requires a minimum waiting period of two years before the institution may reapply to operate the program again.
- Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations: Language added requiring programs with probationary stipulations to notify students of the accreditation status and provide periodic updates to the COA. Language added regarding what an institution with probationary stipulations may do while on probationary status to include the institution’s right to close the program and the prohibition of accepting new candidates into the program. Language added clarifying that probationary stipulations requiring the closure of an individual program may not be removed because a closed program requires a minimum waiting period of two years before the institution may reapply to operate the program again.

- Stipulations Requiring Closure of an Individual Program: Section added to clarify the process that must take place when the COA requires the closing of an individual program.
- Denial of Accreditation: General language edits for clarity and flow of information.
 - NOTE: The underlining of the following sentences are stylistic underlining for ease of locating information and does not indicate new information.
- Page 13: “Part 1: General Definitions, Parameters, Operational Implications for Denial of Accreditation” is a stylistic underlining and does not indicate new information, however the strike through for the word “and” is an indication of a deletion.
- Page 15: “Operational Implications (for either Initial Visits or Revisits)” is not new language. Stylistic underlining only and appears in both chapter versions (new and old). “Part II: Procedures to Be Used by COA Regarding Denial of Accreditation” is not new language, but has been newly underlined for stylistic purposes.
- Page 16: “Process of Re-applying for Initial Institutional Accreditation” is not new language. Stylistic underlining only and appears in both chapter versions (new and old).
- II. Guidance for the Team Recommendation: General language edits for clarity and flow of information.
- Table 2: Numbers have changed to lower numbers due to the change in the number of Common Standards being reduced from nine to five as a result of strengthening and streamlining efforts.

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Nine: Activities during the Seventh Year of the Accreditation Cycle:

- All of the edits in this chapter are general language edits for clarity with the exception of the removal of Table 1. Table 1 was removed because it was not as helpful to the field as the narrative explanations that followed it.

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Eleven, Accreditation Decisions: Board of Institutional Review Member Skills and Competencies:

- The majority of the edits in this chapter are general for clarity so that the chapter aligns with the adopted Accreditation Framework.
- Reading and Analyzing Documents: Paragraphs with the headings “Identify How an Institution Responds to each Standard,” “Note Generalization and Other Vague Language,” “Note Key Forms,” and “Look for Formulas” have been removed. Institutions are no longer required to write a lengthy narrative and include forms and formulas, rather a matrix is utilized, leaving these paragraphs obsolete.
- Identify Whether All Required Documentation is Present: Section added to ensure that key pieces of evidence are included in submissions. This is a reinforced reminder to programs. It has been noted in the past that large institutions with several programs have had difficulty in making sure this happens.
- Determine Relationships: Relocated from previous location as the fourth paragraph in this section. Moved for better flow of information.
- NOTE: The underlined headings above paragraphs are not new language, rather stylistic changes made by the handbook authors for ease while browsing through the chapter for

information. These stylistic changes begin with the underlined heading on page 2 for Initial Program Review (IPR) and continue throughout the chapter.

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Fifteen, The Accreditation Revisit:

- Introduction: Paragraph one moved to paragraph two for better flow of information.
- What is the Relationship Between Stipulations and Standards Decisions in Revisits?: Language added to clarify that institutions may choose to address standards that are less than fully met, even if they are not related to stipulations. Previous language explaining this has been struck out and expanded clarifying language added.
- What Further Action can be Taken Beyond Removal of Stipulations?: Language added providing the ability for the COA to implement a shortened accreditation cycle for institutions with stipulations, and that this may necessitate a change in cohort. This addition has been made to ensure that institutions with demonstrated inability to meet standards is not able to wait the full seven years before an additional site visit is conducted to ensure that candidates are receiving the proper training to become credentialed teachers.
- Sample template removed on page 5, as it is obsolete.

Documents Relied Upon in Preparing Regulations:

Commission Agenda Items

June 2014 Commission Agenda Item 2E:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-06/2014-06-2E.pdf>

October 2014 Commission Agenda Item 3A:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-10/2014-10-3A.pdf>

February 2015 Commission Agenda Item 4D:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-02/2015-02-4D.pdf>

April 2015 Commission Agenda Item 4B:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-04/2015-04-4B.pdf>

June 2015 Commission Agenda Item 5B:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-06/2015-06-5B.pdf>

August 2015 Commission Agenda Item 3C:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-08/2015-08-3C.pdf>

August 2015 Commission Agenda Item 3D:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-08/2015-08-3D.pdf>

October 2015 Commission Agenda Item 2D:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-10/2015-10-2D.pdf>

February 2016 Commission Agenda Item 3B:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2016-02/2016-02-3B.pdf>

February 2016 Commission Agenda Item 3C:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2016-02/2016-02-3C.pdf>

December 2016 Commission Agenda Item 3C:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2016-12/2016-12-3C.pdf>

February 2017 Commission Agenda Item 2C:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2017-02/2017-02-2C.pdf>

Committee on Accreditation (COA) Agenda Items

January 2016 COA Agenda Item 15:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2016-01/2016-01-item-15.pdf>

January 2016 COA Agenda Item 17:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2016-01/2016-01-item-17.pdf>

January 2016 COA Agenda Item 18:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2016-01/2016-01-item-18.pdf>

January 2016 COA Agenda Item 19:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2016-01/2016-01-item-19.pdf>

March 2016 COA Agenda Item 9:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2016-03/2016-03-item-09.pdf>

March 2016 COA Agenda Item 12:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2016-03/2016-03-item-12.pdf>

March 2016 COA Agenda Item 16:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2016-03/2016-03-item-12.pdf>

April 2016 COA Agenda Item 17:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2016-04/2016-04-item-17.pdf>

April 2016 COA Agenda Item 18:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2016-04/2016-04-item-18.pdf>

April 2016 COA Agenda Item 19:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2016-04/2016-04-item-19.pdf>

April 2016 COA Agenda Item 21:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2016-04/2016-04-item-21.pdf>

February 2017 COA Agenda Item 14:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2017-02/2017-02-item-14.pdf>

March 2017 COA Agenda Item 9:

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2017-03/2017-03-item-09.pdf>

Documents Incorporated by Reference:

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three, Institutional and Program Approval (rev. March 2017):

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/2016/AH-Chapter-03.pdf>

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Four, The Accreditation Cycle (rev. March 2016):

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/2016/AH-Chapter-04.pdf>

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Five, Annual Data Submission (rev. February 2017):
<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/2016/AH-Chapter-05.pdf>

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Six, Program Review (rev. April 2016):
<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/2016/AH-Chapter-06.pdf>

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Eight, Accreditation Decisions: Options and Implications (rev. March 2016):
<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/2016/AH-Chapter-08.pdf>

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Nine, Activities during the Seventh Year of the Accreditation Cycle (rev. March 2016):
<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/2016/AH-Chapter-09.pdf>

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Eleven, Board of Institutional Review Member Skills and Competencies (rev. April 2016):
<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/2016/AH-Chapter-11.pdf>

Accreditation Handbook Chapter Fifteen, The Accreditation Revisit (rev. March 2016):
<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook/2016/AH-Chapter-15.pdf>

Objectives and Anticipated Benefits of the Proposed Regulations

The objective is to amend the regulations that permit the Commission to recover costs incurred for extraordinary accreditation activities, including initial institutional approval and new program reviews. Amending the regulations will benefit pupils in California public schools by ensuring high quality educators. Additionally, the proposed amendments will align the fee structure with the strengthened and streamlined Accreditation System and create regulations that will last through the strengthening and streamlining of program standards in the future.

The Commission anticipates that the proposed amendments will benefit the welfare of students attending public schools in the State of California by providing the monetary means to perform its statutorily-mandated accreditation duties, thereby ensuring high quality educator preparation for the instruction of California public school pupils.

The proposed regulations will promote fairness and prevent discrimination by specifying that the cost recovery fees apply to all institutions offering Commission-approved programs, regardless of agency type. The proposed regulations will also increase openness and transparency in government by clarifying the cost recovery fees associated with initial institutional and new program review and accreditation activities in excess of the regularly scheduled data reports, program assessments, and accreditation site visits. The Commission does not anticipate that the proposed regulations will result in the protection of public health and safety, worker safety, or the environment, the prevention of social inequity or an increase in openness and transparency in business.

Determination of Inconsistency/Incompatibility with Existing State Regulations

The Commission has determined that the proposed regulation amendments are not inconsistent or incompatible with existing regulations. There are no other Title 5 CCR sections that specify

cost recovery fees for extraordinary accreditation activities associated with Commission-approved programs.

Disclosures Regarding the Proposed Actions

The Commission has made the following initial determinations:

Costs to any local agency or school districts requiring reimbursement pursuant to Government Code section 17500 et seq: Non Commission-approved Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that elect to offer a program(s) will be required to submit fees to cover the cost of Initial Institutional Approval and Initial Program Review (IPR). Currently approved institutions pursuing additional Commission-approved programs will also be subject to IPR fees. Institutions may avoid all Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities (IPR, late fees, etc.) provided new programs are not proposed and accreditation activity requirements are followed in a timely manner.

Other non-discretionary costs or savings imposed upon local agencies: None.

Cost or savings to any state agency: None.

Cost or savings in federal funding to the state: None.

Significant effect on housing costs: None.

Significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting businesses including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states: None.

These proposed regulations will not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts that must be reimbursed in accordance with Part 7 (commencing with section 17500) of the Government Code.

Cost impacts on a representative private person or business: Non Commission-approved private/independent education entities that elect to offer a program(s) will be required to submit fees to cover the cost of Initial Institutional Approval and IPR. Currently approved institutions pursuing additional Commission-approved programs will also be subject to IPR fees. Institutions may avoid all Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities (IPR, late fees, etc.) provided new programs are not proposed and accreditation activity requirements are followed in a timely manner.

Statement of the Results of the Economic Impact Assessment [Govt. Code §11346.5(a)(10)]: The Commission concludes that it is (1) unlikely that the proposal will create any jobs within the State of California; 2) unlikely that the proposal will eliminate any jobs within the State of California; 3) unlikely that the proposal will create any new businesses within the State of California; 4) unlikely that the proposal will eliminate any existing businesses within the State of California; and 5)

unlikely the proposal would cause the expansion of businesses currently doing business within the State of California.

Benefits of the Proposed Action: The Commission anticipates that the proposed amendments will benefit the welfare of students attending public schools in the State of California by providing the monetary means to perform its statutorily-mandated accreditation duties, thereby ensuring high quality educator preparation for the instruction of California public school pupils.

The Commission anticipates that the proposed regulations will result in an increase in openness and transparency in government by clarifying the cost recovery fees associated with initial institutional and new program review and accreditation activities in excess of the regularly scheduled data reports, program assessments, and accreditation site visits. The Commission does not anticipate that the proposed regulations will result in the protection of public health and safety, worker safety, or the environment, the prevention of social inequity, or an increase in openness and transparency in business.

Effect on Small Business: The proposed regulations will not have a significant adverse economic impact upon small business. The proposed regulations apply only to institutions electing to offer Commission-approved and accredited educator programs or existing Commission-approved educational entities that have not met the requirements of the Accreditation System.

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Mailing List and Responses

Mailing List

- Members of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing
- California County Superintendents of Schools
- Credential Analysts at the California County Superintendents of Schools Offices
- Superintendents of Selected California School Districts
- Deans and Directors at the California Institutions of Higher Education with Commission-approved programs
- Credential Analysts at the California Institutions of Higher Education with Commission-approved programs
- Presidents of Selected Professional Educational Associations
- Interested members of the public

Also placed on the Internet at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov>.

Tally of Responses

As of May 30, 2017, the Commission had received the following written responses to the public announcement:

Support

0 organizational opinions
0 organizational opinions

Opposition

0 organizational opinions
0 personal opinions

Availability of Documents on the Internet

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the text of the regulations can be accessed at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/notices/rulemaking.html>.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed amendments to sections 80691 and 80692 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations pertaining Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities, including the additional chapter three justification text to allow for issuance of a 15-Day Notice pursuant to Government Code §11346.8(c).

CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS
TITLE 5. EDUCATION
DIVISION 8. COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
ARTICLE 3. Other Program Approval Procedures

Subarticle 3. Cost Recovery Fees for Program Approval and Accreditation

§80691. Definitions.

As used in this subarticle, the following terms shall have the meanings as set forth below:

- (a) “Board of Institutional Review member” is an individual who has successfully completed the Commission-provided training detailed in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Eleven, Board of Institutional Review Member Skills and Competencies (rev. ~~4/2012~~6), available on the Commission’s website and hereby incorporated by reference.
- (b) “Category I: Preliminary/Initial Preparation” are preliminary or initial preparation programs.
- (c) “Category II: Second Tier Preparation” are second tier or induction preparation programs.
- (d) “Category III: Added Authorizations” are authorizations that can be added to an existing credential.
- (e) “Eligibility Requirements” are criteria that must be responded to by a prospective institution and reviewed by Commission staff prior to Commission consideration for initial institutional approval as detailed in the Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three, Institutional and Program Approval and Change of Status (rev. 3/2017), available on the Commission’s website and hereby incorporated by reference.
- (~~b~~ f) “Focused site visit” is a site visit requested by the Commission or the Committee on Accreditation when it is determined that the professional preparation program is not complying with the accreditation system activities specified in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Four, The Accreditation Cycle (rev. ~~3/2012~~6), available on the Commission’s website and hereby incorporated by reference.
- (~~e~~ g) “Initial institutional approval” is granted by the Committee on Accreditation when an institution that has not previously prepared educators for certification in California has been deemed to meet the accreditation requirements as explained in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Three, Institutional and Program Approval and Change of Status (rev. ~~3/2012~~7), available on the Commission’s website and hereby incorporated by reference.
- (~~d~~ h) “Initial program review” is the review of a professional preparation program’s formal response to the program standards associated with a specific program type as explained in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Three, Institutional and Program Approval and Change of Status

(rev. 3/20127). Initial program review occurs when a professional preparation program intends to offer a new professional preparation program type or when the Commission revises program standards to such a significant degree that a professional preparation program must rewrite the program document.

- (e j) “Institution” means any of the following categories of agencies which are authorized to seek initial institutional approval as defined in subsection (c) in order to submit a professional preparation program for approval and accreditation as defined in subsection (~~h~~ l):
- (1) A California county superintendent of schools office;
 - (2) A California school district;
 - (3) A charter school as established in Education Code Section 47605;
 - (4) A regionally-accredited college or university;
 - (5) A non-governmental or community-based organization.
- (~~f~~ j) “Late Submission of Documentation review” refers to the submission of an Annual Data a Biennial Report, as defined in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Five, ~~Biennial Reports~~ Annual Data Submission (rev. 2/20127), available on the Commission’s website and hereby incorporated by reference, and/or a Program ~~Assessment~~ Review, as defined in Chapter Six, Program ~~Assessment~~ Review (rev. 20126), available on the Commission’s website and hereby incorporated by reference, after the deadline established pursuant to the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Four, The Accreditation Cycle (rev. 3/20126).
- (~~g~~ k) “Program ~~Assessment~~ Review” is a process that occurs in year ~~four~~ five of the seven year accreditation cycle and requires professional preparation programs to submit to the Commission a clear description of how a program is operating as explained in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Six, Program ~~Assessment~~ Review (rev. 4/20126).
- (~~h~~ l) “Professional preparation program” refers to an institution that has been approved by the Commission and accredited by the Committee on Accreditation to offer a program which leads to the issuance of teaching credentials, services credentials, specialist credentials, added authorizations, or certificates.
- (~~i~~ m) “Site revisit” is an accreditation visit that is conducted as a result of an action taken by the Committee on Accreditation to place stipulations on the accreditation of a professional preparation program as detailed in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Fifteen, The Accreditation Revisit (rev. 3/20126), available on the Commission’s website and hereby incorporated by reference.
- (~~j~~ n) “Site visit” is an accreditation visit conducted in the seventh year of the accreditation cycle as specified in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Four, The Accreditation Cycle (rev. 3/20126).
- (~~k~~ o) “Standard accreditation cycle” refers to the seven-year accreditation cycle specified in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Four, The Accreditation Cycle (rev. 3/20126).

(† p) “Stipulations” are placed on the accreditation of a professional preparation program by the Committee on Accreditation when it is determined that one or more applicable common and/or program standards have not been met or have been met with concerns as explained in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Eight, Accreditation Decisions: Options and Implications (rev. 3/2012~~6~~), available on the Commission’s website and hereby incorporated by reference.

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225, Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225(h), 44370, 44371, 44372, 44373(c) and 44374, Education Code.

§80692. Program Approval and Accreditation Fees

The following fees associated with the activities defined in §80691 shall be submitted to the Commission by the professional preparation program:

(a) Fees for document review beyond the Standard Accreditation Cycle shall be submitted with the professional preparation program’s formal response to the applicable standards as follows:

(1) Initial institutional approval: ~~-\$2,000 flat fee.~~

(A) Review of Eligibility Requirements: \$1,000 flat fee.

(B) Review of Initial Institutional Approval preconditions documents and common standards documents: \$2,000 flat fee.

(2) Initial program review:

(A) Category I: Preliminary/Initial Preparation program review ~~Professional preparation program that addresses twelve or more standards:~~ \$2,000 flat fee.

(B) Category II: Second Tier Preparation program review ~~Professional preparation program that addresses six to eleven standards:~~ \$1,500 flat fee.

(C) Category III: Added Authorization program review ~~Professional preparation program that addresses fewer than six standards:~~ \$1,000 flat fee.

(D) A professional preparation program that provides a number of Board of Institutional Review members that is equal to or greater than two times the number of their program documents submitted for initial program review annually and that assume all travel costs related to the review of the program documents submitted for initial review shall be exempt from payment of the fees associated with this subsection.

(b) Fees for the following activities in excess of the regularly scheduled accreditation activities shall be submitted to the Commission in the year that the extraordinary activities are performed:

(1) Focused site visit: \$1,000 for each individual attending the focused site visit.

(2) Late Submission of Documentation ~~reviews:~~ \$500 per document.

(3) ~~Program assessments:~~

(A) ~~No fee shall be charged for the first three reviews of a program assessment submitted by a professional preparation program. The fee for review of a program assessment beyond the first three reviews: \$1,000 flat fee.~~

(B) A professional preparation program that does not complete the Program Review ~~program assessment~~ process at least six months prior to a scheduled site visit: \$3,000

flat fee for two additional Board of Institutional Review members to review the program during the site visit.

(4) Stipulations:

- (A) Site revisit: \$1,000 per individual attending the site revisit;
- (B) Review of a report due to stipulations that does not require a site revisit as detailed in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Nine, Activities during the Seventh Year of the Accreditation Cycle (rev. 3/2012~~6~~), available on the Commission's website and hereby incorporated by reference: \$500 flat fee;
- (C) Review of a report associated with a site revisit as detailed in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Nine, Activities during the Seventh Year of the Accreditation Cycle (rev. 3/2012~~6~~): \$1,000 flat fee.

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225, Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225(h), 44371, 44372, 44373(c), 44374 and 44374.5, Education Code.