3A

Information

Educator Preparation Committee

Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents the *2017-18 Annual Accreditation Report* from the Committee on Accreditation (COA).

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenters: Anna Moore, COA Co-Chair, Cheryl Forbes, COA member, Cheryl Hickey and Catherine Kearney, Administrators, 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.

November 2018

Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation

Introduction

This agenda item presents the *2017-18 Annual Accreditation Report* from the Committee on Accreditation (COA). Section I of the report describes the major accomplishments of the Committee's 2017-18 Work Plan, which is organized around the identified purposes of accreditation as defined in the *Accreditation Framework*. Section II of the report presents a summary of the accreditation actions taken in 2017-18. Section III provides the 2018-19 Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation.

Background

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

According to the Commission's 2016 *Accreditation Framework* "accreditation" refers to the process of identifying and verifying the quality of each program that prepares educators for

serving in the public schools, including verifying that each candidate who completes a program meets the qualifications for licensure established by the Commission. The major purpose of accreditation is to assure that those who teach and provide a variety of education-related services in the public schools have the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be effective educators. Additional related purposes of accreditation are below:

- Accreditation assures that the programs meet state standards for professional preparation programs, and, in so doing, are allowed to recommend candidates for state licensure.
- Accreditation assures candidates and the public that educator preparation programs are high quality and effective in preparing candidates to meet licensure requirements.
- Accreditation assures candidates and the public that programs are accountable for the quality and effectiveness of the preparation they provide to candidates.
- Accreditation assures that evidence is reviewed by peers to determine each program's quality and effectiveness in order to retain their accreditation status.
- Accreditation provides the means for programs to continuously improve based on evidence of candidate outcomes, program effectiveness, and on feedback from ongoing peer review processes.

The *2017-18 Annual Accreditation Report* was adopted by the COA on November 7, 2018. The report provides an update on all activities undertaken by staff and the COA in 2017-18 to develop and implement the myriad improvements to the accreditation system as approved and directed by the Commission under the Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation Project. After deferring all site visits in 2016-17 in order to focus on providing the field with extensive technical assistance on the wide range of changes in educator preparation, to provide time for the program sponsors to work within their institutions to ensure comprehensive and substantive changes to programs to align with new standards, and to allow progress to be made on the continued development of the system, 2017-18 represents the first year of implementation of the redesigned strengthened and streamlined accreditation system. While work continues on the development of some aspects of the revised system, the majority of the infrastructure of the new system is now in place. Staff will continue to work with the COA on those aspects of the new system that need further development such as the Annual Data System, more effective use of the survey data to identify potential issues within programs, the identification of exemplary programs, and to see these efforts through to full implementation.

The Committee on Accreditation's Annual Accreditation Report to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing 2017-2018

Dear Commissioners:

On behalf of the Committee on Accreditation (COA), we submit to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) the *2017-18 Annual Accreditation Report* by the Committee on Accreditation in accordance with the provisions of the *Accreditation Framework*. This report presents an overview of the activities and accomplishments of the Committee over the past year, the results of its activities for the year, and its work plan for 2018-19.

As you well know, the Commission's effort to strengthen and streamline the accreditation system has been a large, but important, undertaking. Over this past year, the COA, together with staff, began the implementation of many of the new aspects of the Commission's revised accreditation system which are detailed in the enclosed report. This includes the new streamlined and more efficient approach to reviewing Common Standards which was implemented and used successfully for 29 accreditation site visits. In addition, the new streamlined and more efficient Program Review process was used for the first time and institutions that experienced this new process will undergo a site visit in 2018-19. The Annual Data System became operational in its first pilot year with institutions building their "report decks" and submitting their initial set of data to the Commission. And the first revised Board of Institutional Reviewer training was implemented in June allowing the Commission to expand the pool of experts who understand the goals and objectives of the Commission's revised accreditation system and are ready to bring them to fruition.

As we enter the 2018-19 accreditation year, we will maintain this forward motion by continuing to fully implement, refine, and expand those areas of accreditation that are new or still in development. The COA shares with the Commission the goal of having a strong accountability system that holds educator preparation programs to high standards, recognizes excellence, and encourages innovation. We continue to offer our collective expertise and assistance to the Commission in this important effort to ensure a rigorous and robust system of accreditation that focuses on ensuring that educators emerge from programs prepared to address the complexities of California's K-12 education system.

Sincerely,

Dr. Anna Moore   Dr. Robert Frelly
Committee Co-Chair   Committee Co-Chair

The Committee on Accreditation
2017-18

Jomeline Balatayo English Language Development Teacher Culver City High School	**Margo Pensavalle** Director of Clinical Practice University of Southern California
Suzanne Borgese Education Specialist Placentia-Yorba Linda USD	**Iris Riggs** Professor, Teacher Education and Foundations California State University, San Bernardino
Deborah Erickson Professor and Dean School of Education Point Loma Nazarene University	**Kelly Skon** Director, Coordinator Secondary STEM Saddleback Valley USD
Cheryl Forbes Director of Teacher Education and Lecturer University of California, San Diego	**Yvonne White*** Science Teacher Oakland Unified School District
Robert Frelly Director of Music Education Chapman University	**James Webb*** Induction Coordinator William S. Hart School District
Anna Moore Principal Olivet Elementary Charter School	**Jose Luis Alvarado** Dean College of Education California State University, Monterey Bay
Gerard Morrison Teacher Long Beach Unified School District	

*Yvonne White resigned from the COA in November 2017. James Webb was appointed to fill the vacancy and served the remainder of the term through June 30, 2018.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Summary of Activities of the Accreditation System

The 2017-18 year marked a significant milestone in the future of accreditation activities for educator preparation in California. Important progress was made by the Commission, the Committee on Accreditation, and the Commission staff with respect to beginning the implementation of the revised accreditation system. The accreditation system is the primary means by which the Commission ensures quality in educator preparation in California. Following a multi-year effort to strengthen and streamline accreditation, including the development of new or revised activities and requirements envisioned by the Commission, and a year of substantial technical assistance to the field in 2016-17, the Commission resumed full accreditation activities including site visits in 2017-18.

The major objectives of the revised accreditation system, as outlined in the Accreditation Framework, include the following:

- Accreditation assures that programs meet state standards for professional preparation programs, and, in so doing, are allowed to recommend candidates for state licensure.

- Accreditation assures candidates and the public that educator preparation programs are of high quality and effective in preparing candidates to meet licensure requirements.

- Accreditation assures candidates and the public that programs are accountable for the quality and effectiveness of the preparation they provide to candidates.

- Accreditation assures that evidence is reviewed by peers to determine each program's quality and effectiveness in order to retain their accreditation status.

- Accreditation provides the means for programs to continuously improve based on evidence of candidate outcomes, program effectiveness, and on feedback from ongoing peer review processes.

The current system is designed as a 7-year cycle comprised of several major components or activities:

Annually	Data Submission
Years 1 and 4	Submission of Preconditions Documentation
Year 5, fall	Program Review Submission
Year 5, spring	Common Standards Submission
Year 6	Site Visit
Year 7	Follow Up to address issues of concern

Each Commission-approved institution has been assigned a "color cohort" signifying which component or activity is expected of those institutions in any given year. A full schedule of accreditation activities for each cohort can be found on the Commission's accreditation webpage.

ANNUAL DATA SUBMISSION
Access to consistent data elements from all institutions and programs (such as program enrollment, pathways offered, length of program) including outcomes data (candidate, employer and field experience supervisor surveys, performance assessment results, etc.), is an important part of the new accreditation system. The Annual Data Submission by institutions will allow the Commission to better identify specific information about credential programs operating in California. The infrastructure for the system was built in 2017 with institutions beginning to submit initial data in summer 2018.

PRECONDITIONS SUBMISSION AND REVIEW
Preconditions for institutions offering educator preparation are grounded in California Education Code, Title 5 Regulations, or Commission policy. Responses to preconditions are submitted in Years 1 and 4 by each institution for each program that an institution is approved to offer. Immediate correction is required if an institution is deemed to be out of compliance with Preconditions.

PROGRAM REVIEW
Under the new Program Review process, each credential program provides specific required evidence or documentation demonstrating that the program is aligned to each of the Commission adopted program standards for the particular credential area. Documentation is reviewed by trained educators with expertise in the credential area and a decision is made about whether programs are preliminarily aligned with the Commission's standards. The institution is provided feedback and then must provide an addendum at least 60 days prior to the accreditation Site Visit, addressing any areas that were not found to be preliminarily aligned. This addendum is then used by the site visit team as additional information to consider when determining whether the standard is met. To further ensure transparency, a subset of the experts that reviewed Program Review submissions serve as site visit team members.

COMMON STANDARDS REVIEW
In Year 5 of the cycle, program sponsors submit specific documentation that indicates alignment with the Commission's adopted Common Standards. Reviewers examine the documentation and determine whether the standard is preliminarily aligned. The institution is provided feedback and then must provide an addendum, at least 60 days prior to the Site Visit, addressing any areas that were not found to be preliminarily aligned. This information helps focus and inform the accreditation site visit in Year 6. The same individuals that review the Common Standards in Year 5 serve on the site visit team in Year 6.

SITE VISITS
All data are provided to a trained team of evaluators who are members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers and these evaluators determine whether the standards are met and make an accreditation recommendation for the Committee on Accreditation. Site visits include in-depth interviews of graduates, candidates, employers, and program faculty and administrators. In addition to determining whether standards are met, the purpose of the site visit is to evaluate the extent to which the program is effectively implemented.

The Commission is assisted in the implementation of the accreditation system by the Committee on Accreditation (COA). This body is comprised of twelve members of the education community – six from postsecondary education and six K-12 practitioners. While the Commission sets policy for accreditation, the COA implements the accreditation system and makes accreditation decisions for institutions offering educator preparation in California. Further, the success of the accreditation system also depends on the commitment of hundreds of experts in the field - those who have a role in preparing educators and practitioners themselves - who are trained and calibrated to review program documents and conduct site visits as members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers.

This report presents information about the major activities of the accreditation system, the COA decisions that were made, and some of the major areas of focus for academic year 2017-18.

Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2017-18

The Commission's Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation Project was a multipronged effort that began late in 2014 and continued throughout 2017-18. Among its various critical components were the following:

- Adoption of a new [Accreditation Framework](#)
- Adoption of a revised *Accreditation Handbook*
- Implementation of a new Initial Institutional Approval process
- Adoption of new Common Standards
- Adoption and implementation of new General Preconditions
- Adoption and implementation of new Teaching Performance Expectations for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Programs
- Adoption and implementation of new Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Program Standards
- Adoption of new Administrator Performance Expectations
- Adoption and implementation of new Preliminary Administrator preparation standards
- Adoption and implementation of new Induction standards for teachers and administrators
- Development and implementation of a new data warehouse and new Annual Data Submission system
- Adoption and implementation of new procedures for Common Standards and program standards submission and review
- Implementation of a new review process (Years 1 and 4) of all preconditions
- Adoption and implementation of new California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs)
- Development and implementation of new CalTPA and CalAPA
- Development and implementation of numerous data dashboards
- Development and implementation of surveys to inform program improvement and accreditation decisions – program completers for Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, administrator, teacher induction, employers, and master teachers
- Development and implementation of new surveys for other credential areas
- Implementation of new processes to strengthen oversight of programs such as ability to close a program (within a larger institution) and ability to differentiate more frequent site visits for some programs

The items that follow represent a summary of the key aspects of the accreditation system undertaken during the 2017-18 year. Over the past year, the Commission's Professional Services Division, the Committee on Accreditation, and numerous volunteer experts from the field, have continued to work diligently to implement the vision of the Commission for its accreditation system as defined by the multi-year project to strengthen and streamline the Commission's accreditation system.

Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession
*Maintain public access to the [Committee on Accreditation](). The COA held meetings on the
following dates:
>   August 7, 2017
>   November 17, 2017
>   February 22, 2018
>   March 22, 2018
>   May 10-11, 2018
>   June 28, 2018

All Committee meetings were held in public and all meeting agendas posted in accordance with
the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. The Commission's website was utilized fully to provide
agenda items and notification of meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical
accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation.

As a continuing cost saving measure and to ensure access for all participants videoconferencing
technology was used frequently, where possible and appropriate, in order that those located in
various regions of California who are involved in accreditation activities could participate
without the time and cost commitments required by traveling to the Commission offices.
Unfortunately, recent changes to the Commission's communication system no longer allow for
simultaneous web broadcasting and web conferencing. Because the videoconferencing
capability is a necessity for COA business, the simultaneous web broadcasting had to be
suspended. However, the videoconferencing link is available to anyone who wishes to listen to
the meeting in real time and the meetings are recorded and available on the Commission's
website soon after the meeting.

PSD News. The PSD E-news, developed in 2008, continued to be distributed weekly. This
electronic notification reaches over 2,500 individuals including all approved institutions, to
inform them of accreditation-related activities such as the development and revision of
standards, technical assistance opportunities, and notification of requests for stakeholder
comment.

[Program Sponsor Alerts.]() Program Sponsor Alerts (PSA) continued to be used to provide
important and timely information on specific topics of interest to program sponsors. The
Commission staff used this resource in the 2017-18 year, issuing 6 PSAs. The 6 PSAs issued from
the period July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018 as follows:

Program Sponsor Alerts June 30, 2017-July 1, 2018		
Number	**Issue Date**	**Title**
17-05	August 16, 2017	Teacher Induction: Information on Credential Recommendations
17-06	September 21, 2017	Clinical Practice and Supervision Requirements: Guidance for Teacher Preparation Programs
17-07	December 8, 2017	Process for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teacher Preparation Programs to Change TPA Models [Replaced by PSA 18-02]
17-08	December 21, 2017	Designating a Unit Head Proxy in the Accreditation Data System
18-01	February 28, 2018	Implementation of the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA): Non-Consequential Administration with Full Implementation in the 2019-20 Academic Year
18-02	April 17, 2018	Process for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teacher Preparation Programs to Change TPA Models [Replaces PSA 17-07]

The PSA is used to communicate to program sponsors instructions for a particular task or information about a specific issue such as the adoption of new standards by the Commission or clarification of requirements and deadlines. Program Sponsor Alerts will continue to be used to provide information to the field when necessary as they have served the objective well.

Maintain Public Website of All Accreditation Results and Status for Each Institution. The Commission maintains a website where all accreditation site visit reports and actions taken by the COA are available to the public. The site includes the team report for each institution as well as the letter to the institution with the formal COA Action taken. The website is: https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmp/accreditation/accreditation_reports.php

The website is updated after each COA meeting to reflect any additional actions taken and includes the reports and actions for the most recent accreditation cycle.

Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission. COA Co-Chairs Anna Moore and Robert Frelly presented the COA annual report to the Commission at the December 2017 Commission Meeting.

Commission Liaison. The Commission's liaison provides an important perspective to COA discussions and serves as an effective means of communication between the COA and the Commission. For the 2017-18 year, the liaison to the COA was Commissioner Haydee Rodriguez who attended the COA meetings regularly.

Implementation of a Fee Recovery System for Certain Accreditation Activities and Annual Accreditation Fee. The Commission continued implementation of a cost recovery plan (regulations effective October 2013), for the review of new programs and for accreditation activities outside the typical accreditation cycle. In addition, in 2017-18, the Commission began the process to update this section of Title 5 of the regulations to align with the revised accreditation system approved by the Commission. This work will continue in 2018-19.

In addition, the Commission continued implementation of the Annual Accreditation Fee structure (Emergency regulations became effective in August 2014, followed by permanent regulations that became effective as of April 1, 2015.) As routinely scheduled, in 2017-18, Commission staff calculated the appropriate annual accreditation fees, invoiced institutions, collected the fees, and communicated with institutions when questions or disputes arose. These funds continue to be critical to supporting the infrastructure of the Commission's accreditation system.

Removing Ability to Recommend: Strengthening the Implications for Noncompliance with Accreditation Requirements. The ability to remove an institution's authority to recommend credentials continues to help to ensure that institutions comply with accreditation requirements in a timely manner. This lever has been used effectively to ensure all institutions adhere to timelines for accreditation reports. For late submissions, this lever is used only after multiple attempts to get the institution to comply with the requirements have failed and after notification has been provided to the COA.

Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality
Accreditation of Institutions and their Credential Preparation Programs. This is one of the primary ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of institutions and their credential programs. In 2016-17, the Commission approved the deferment of site visits scheduled for one year in order to provide time for the institutions to plan and implement the vast number of changes required of the Strengthening and Streamlining Project including new standards and requirements for programs. Beginning with the fall 2017, site visits were reinstituted for all Commission-approved programs beginning with the Green Cohort. This first year of implementation of site visits under the new accreditation system included initial implementation of new and updated processes and activities. For instance, the new streamlined process for review of the Common Standards was implemented and teams used program completer survey results for the first to focus the site visit.

Twenty-nine (29) institutions hosted site visits in 2017-18 resulting in the following decisions:
- 22 institutions Accredited including 4 with a 7th year follow up report required
- 4 institutions Accredited with Stipulations
- 1 institutions Accredited with Major Stipulations
- 2 institutions Accredited with Probationary Stipulations

Ensuring Institutions Addressed Stipulations. All institutions with stipulations are expected to address any stipulations within one year. However, the COA may allow additional time if it believes the institution has made sufficient progress and additional time is warranted. Three institutions that had been accredited with stipulations in previous years were given until 2017-18 to continue to make progress in addressing the stipulations. The COA removed the stipulations fully in the 2017-18 for two of them. The remaining institution made significant progress and was given additional time to address the one remaining stipulation.

Technical Assistance Efforts. The Commission continued to provide technical assistance for institutional personnel about changes in accreditation throughout 2017-18, to a lesser degree than the previous year which was almost exclusively focused on developing the new systems and providing technical assistance. The Accreditation Technical Assistance Webpage on the Commission's website continued to be used and stakeholders were kept informed of upcoming technical assistance opportunities through emails and the PSD e-news. Additionally, staff made itself available to present and discuss information at a variety of stakeholder meetings and conferences throughout the year.

The following summary tables indicate the frequency and scope of technical assistance activities in 2017-18.

Technical Assistance for Institutions Preparing for 2018-19 Site Visits

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees
Site Visit Preparation: Yellow Cohort	Webcast	Unknown
Year-Out from Site Visit Consultant Pre-visit	Spring 2017 – Summer 2018	36 institutions
Monthly Phone/Zoom Conferences	Began Summer 2018, continuing until visit	

Technical Assistance for an Accreditation Data System (ADS)

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location
ADS Weekly Office Hours (2 hours/week)	November 2017 to August 2018 – 88 sessions

Technical Assistance to Teacher Induction Programs Transitioning to New Standards

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location
California Teacher Induction Conference	December 4-6, 2017
Regional ("Cluster") Meeting Support	Various Locations and Dates
Ongoing Office Hours for New Programs and Transitioning Programs	Daily and Ongoing

Technical Assistance for California Administrator Performance Assessments (CalAPA)

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees
CalAPA Basics Workshop II	November 14, San Diego	60
CalAPA Basics Workshop III	January 30-31, Santa Clarita	50
CalAPA Design Team	July 12, November 2, January 23, Commission Office	20
CalAPA Office Hours	January 4 – April 28, 1 hour per week (Thursday), Online	Unknown
CalAPA Reg Webinar	January 26, Online	30
CAPEA Fall Conference	October 27-28, San Diego	40
CAPEA Spring Conference	March 3, San Jose	30
Field Assessor Orientation	April 20-27, Online	40
Field Test Support Webinar	April 19, Online	36
Marker Selection Training	April 23, Sacramento	6
SoCal Field Assessor Training	May 1, Sacramento	45
NorCal Field Assessor Training	May 3, Sacramento	42

Technical Assistance for California Teaching Performance Assessments (CalTPA)

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location
CalTPA Assessor Orientation Webinar	January 18-19, Online
CalTPA Assessor Training	March 22, Sacramento April 10, Long Beach April 11, Sacramento
CalTPA Assessor Training Webinar	February 13, Online
CalTPA Assessor Workshop	May 29-June 1, Sacramento
CalTPA Bias Review	August 16, Sacramento
CalTPA CCAC Presentation	April 18, Riverside COE
CalTPA CUE Conference Presentation	March 15, Palm Springs
CalTPA Cycle and Rubric Review	July 19, Sacramento
CalTPA Design Team Meeting	July 11, Commission Office September 13, Online February 18, Commission Office
CalTPA Design Team Webinar	January 24, Online
CalTPA Field Test Support Webinar	October 4, Online
CalTPA Lead Assessor Training	March 6, March 12-13, Sacramento
CalTPA Marker Selection	March 27-28, April 5-6, Sacramento
CalTPA Presentation at Cal Council	October 19-20, San Diego
CalTPA Presentation at CCAC Conference	October 12-13, Double Tree Hotel, Sacramento
CalTPA Subject Matter Expert Panels	July 31-August 1, Online
CalTPA Support Meeting	February 7, Pearson, Sacramento
CalTPA Support Webinar	June 20, Online
CalTPA Weekly Virtual Office Hours	October – December, Online

Technical Assistance Provided to Institutions Seeking Initial Approval

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees
Accreditation 101: Expectations and Responsibilities for Commission Approved Institutions	December 13 / Commission Office	6 institutions / 33 attendees

Other Related Activities

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees
Cohort Consultant Email, program-specific email, and phone calls	Ongoing daily	Unknown*

*Average of 50 per week per consultant

Accreditation Handbook revisions. The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. Throughout 2016-17, as the various components of the new accreditation system were developed, staff and the COA considered what language needed to be included or revised in the *Handbook.* In 2017-18, as the Commission moved into the implementation phase of the new accreditation system and adjustments were made to the processes as this implementation took place, revisions to the *Accreditation Handbook* reflecting these refinements were adopted by the COA.

Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission. During 2017-18 staff continued to prepare agenda items for the COA on issues related to the Commission's work as directed by the Commission or as appropriate to the continuing work of the Committee. With the efforts to streamline and strengthen accreditation this function continued to be critically important in 2017-18.

Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards
Review and take action to grant initial approval of new program sponsors. During 2017-18, the Commission's new initial institutional approval policy for institutions seeking to become a Commission-approved program sponsor of educator preparation programs in California was in full implementation. The requirements for an institution to become a Commission-approved educator preparation program sponsor in California had been substantially revised in recent years. Accreditation 101 sessions for institutions exploring whether to seek initial institutional approval to offer an educator preparation program continued to be held throughout 2017-18. As anticipated, fewer institutions participated in Accreditation 101 due to the fact that many did so in the previous year. Accreditation 101 was offered three times in 2017-18 and five institutions participated.

As a result of the establishment of the new Initial Institutional Approval process, in 2017-18 eight institutions were brought to the Commission for consideration and approval for either Stage II (Eligibility Requirements) or Stage III (Alignment with Standards) of the Initial Institutional Approval process. These institutions are listed in Section II of this report.

Review and take action to grant initial program approval for new credential programs. This is also one of the major ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs for Commission-approved institutions. Programs are only granted initial approval when reviewers have determined that all Commission's standards are met and after COA acts to approve. This review process continued in 2017-18. Because institutions may submit program proposals any time throughout the year, the Commission attempts to find reviewers willing and able to review the documents as soon as possible. As a result, the vast majority of the reviews for new program proposals are conducted remotely with reviewers being sent the documents and devoting time on their own schedule, at their homes or offices, working via technology with their initial program review partner. A total of 25 new programs were approved by the COA in 2017-18. The list of these new programs is included in Section II of this report.

Transition from the former Program Assessment process to the new Program Review process. The Green Cohort was the last of the institutions to submit Program Assessment documents under this process in 2014. These institutions had already submitted documentation under the former system (where lengthy narratives were provided to indicate how programs were addressing every standard) before the Commission had adopted its new more streamlined Program Review approach. Site visits for the Green Cohort were then conducted in 2017-18 as a hybrid between the old and the new accreditation system, in particular using information from the old Program Assessment process and the new streamlined Common Standards review process.

In 2016-17, the streamlined evidence requirements and processes for the new Program Review process were developed and finalized. Beginning in the fall of 2017, the Commission transitioned to using the new streamlined Program Review process of submitting very specific evidence with limited narratives describing how the institution was implementing the standards in its programs. Under the new process the reviewers provide feedback and the institution has an opportunity to provide an addendum 60 days prior to the site visit to respond to any questions. The process was piloted first with the Administrative Services credential programs since the timing of the adoption of new standards and performance expectations proved ideal to pilot the new system prior to going to scale. In the fall of 2017 this new process was used with all the institutions in the Yellow Cohort.

The feedback from reviewers and institutions alike regarding the new accreditation system has been overwhelmingly positive reflecting strong support for the new system. Whereas under the previous system, it could take many weeks or months to complete a review of the voluminous submissions, reviewers are now able to complete the task of reviewing the evidence submitted by institutions in one to two days. Reviewers have also reported a better understanding of the program under this new process. Institutional personnel have communicated that they have a better understanding of the exact types of evidence needed for program submissions and that the new process has removed some of the guess work out of knowing what is needed and limited the temptation to provide significantly more descriptive information than is what is required. Feedback is provided to the institutions in a much timelier manner. This new process

has every indication of meeting the Commission's charge to both strengthen and streamline the accreditation process.

Begin the New Common Standards Review Process. Commission staff developed and the COA approved a new streamlined approach to Common Standards review which included the submission of prescribed documentation and information along with limited and focused narrative. Common Standards submissions for the Yellow Cohort were due in February 2018. The new Common Standards review process was implemented for the first time and was used to inform the site visits that are taking place in 2018-19. Like the Program Review process, reviewers expressed overwhelming positive support for the new process noting that they were able to complete the review process and reach preliminary findings in a much shorter timeframe than the previous process. Additionally, feedback was provided to the institution between 8-10 months prior to their site visit whereas the prior system only allowed for feedback a month or so before the visit. This has allowed institutions to address concerns prior to the site visit. Knowing that the team lead and the Common Standards reviewers who read the submissions would also be at the site visit allowed them to feel confident that any areas needing follow up or further inquiry that resulted from the document review would take place since they were already familiar with the issues and outstanding questions.

Continue the New Process of Review of the Preconditions. The Commission's new accreditation system requires that preconditions be submitted and reviewed in Years 1 and 4 of the 7-year cycle. Two cohorts of institutions submitted preconditions in spring 2018: Orange and Indigo. In addition, those in the Green Cohort were also required to provide their preconditions as they were the cohort that fell within the timeframe of shifting from one accreditation system to another.

In the first year of operation, reviewing these preconditions was a significant endeavor that required the participation of most of the consultants and analysts in the Professional Services Division who added this workload on top of their regular responsibilities. Follow up and corrections were required of many programs and hence a second review was necessary. Under this process, the timeliness of the review and the determination of whether an institution was in compliance was not optimal. Staff then instituted a number of improvements in the submission and review process and, as a result, the timeliness of the review has improved significantly. These included identifying a primary analyst who acted as the single point of contact within the Commission to track and communicate with institutions about their submission. In addition, changes were made to the directions for institutions that clarified the expectations around the responses and the types of evidence required to demonstrate alignment with preconditions for the General Preconditions and some of the credential areas. This clarification was welcomed by the field and was successful and contributed to making the review of the preconditions much easier and more efficient. Staff will continue to expand this guidance to the other credential areas in 2018-19.

Development of the new Annual Data System. The development of a new annual data system was one of the key components to the work plan for 2016-17. The Commission entered into an

agreement with a technology contractor who worked closely with the Commission staff over the course of the year to build the infrastructure necessary to allow institutions to provide consistent data about their programs, candidates, and outcomes. The data system is multi-pronged and multi-purposed. Various aspects of the system and the data will be used by institutions, the Commission and its staff, and accreditation teams. In addition, in the future, where appropriate, some of the data will interface with the data dashboards and be available to members of the public.

The contractor's work in building the infrastructure of the system was completed in June of 2017 and the Commission staff worked since that time to prepare for the first pilot year of implementation in 2017-18. First year efforts included establishing institutional logins, designating the type of access individuals from each institution will have within the system, and beginning to establish program "sets" with basic data (pathways offered, enrollment, completion information, etc.). As the data system is more developed over time, additional information, particularly outcomes-based data, will be included in the annual data system.

Technical Assistance was provided from November 2017 to August 2018. Staff conducted Accreditation Data System (ADS) office hours on a weekly basis held via video conferencing technology. These office hours were to support institutions in accessing the ADS, creating accounts, connecting individuals to the institution, giving individuals appropriate roles and answering questions related to the data questions. On average, 23 individuals participated during each set of office hours. Office hour dates and times were listed on the Accreditation Technical Assistance page. Staff continuously worked with and provided support to institutions in the use of the ADS. Updates were shared at prior Committee meetings. Staff also developed ADS resources such as guidance documents, FAQs and video presentations to support institutions in understanding the ADS.

Implementation of Survey Instruments. Using data from survey instruments is one important component to increasing the focus on outcomes in the accreditation system. In 2016-17 the Completer Surveys (Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist and Administrative Services as well as Clear Admin Services, General Education Induction, and Clear Education Specialist Induction) were integrated into the credential recommendation process and program completers are provide access to the survey as part of their application for a credential. A completer may elect to not respond to the survey, but the number of completers who have done this is small. As a result of this change, the response rate for the surveys increased such that the results are now useable for accreditation purposes. Completer Surveys are open from September 1 to August 31 annually with the survey results (Program Reports) being sent to institutions in October for the prior year.

In addition to these program completer surveys, the Commission administers both a Master Teacher Survey and an Employer Survey. The Master Teacher survey was in its third year of administration while the Employer Survey was piloted in 2016-17. The Master Teacher Survey is open from September 1-August 31 annually. Preliminary teacher preparation programs send the link to the Master Teacher Survey to all their master teachers as well as submit information

on the total number of master teachers that program has that year. The Employer Survey is open in the fall—October-December—and asks employers to provide feedback on an institution's programs if the employer has hired at least 2 completers from that program in the past 3 years. More information on the Surveys can be found on this [webpage](#):

Because the response rate was sufficiently high for the program completer surveys, the results were used by accreditation teams in 2017-18. All accreditation site visit teams were instructed to use the completer surveys to develop questions for further interviews, to inform their understanding of the program's possible areas of strength and areas in potential need of improvement, and to discuss results with the program personnel. In addition, the results could be used to streamline the accreditation process. When the response rate is high and the feedback positive for an institution and its programs, a smaller number of program completers may be needed for interviews during the site visit. Staff built into the new BIR training some time to discuss with potential reviewers how to use the results from the various surveys. Expanded use of surveys has been a focus of 2018-19 and will be discussed further in this report.

Develop and Implement a New Team Lead Training. In early Fall of 2017, the Commission staff held two Team Lead training sessions for those individuals who would be leading site visit teams in 2017-18 with the Green Cohort institutions. This training covered a variety of topics including the overall approach of the new accreditation system, an overview of new aspects of the standards, and the new processes and procedures required. This training was repeated in the Spring 2018 for team leads for the Yellow Cohort site visits which began in fall 2018. These trainings were very successful and well attended.

Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement
Noting Late Submission. Providing a report on institutions that have not complied with the required timelines and due dates has become a standard agenda item for the COA. Staff continued the reports in 2017-18 at each COA meeting. These included institutions that were late in submitting required transition plans for the transition to new standards, preconditions, Common Standards, Program Review, and Annual Data submissions. This information has improved the COA's understanding of institutions that have not complied with the Commission's timelines for accreditation activities and has served as additional leverage with institutions to ensure compliance.

Continue implementation of the evaluation system for the accreditation system. Staff has been monitoring how effective and efficient the new processes and procedures are with each new implementation effort. Staff frequently requests information from reviewers and institutions on these new processes. Some changes and "tweaks" to the system have been instituted as a result of feedback from reviewers and institutions. In addition, post site visit evaluations are completed by team leads, consultants, all team members, and institutional personnel. This information is used to make improvements to the system, to identify possible team leads in the future, to identify any future additions to training and technical assistance opportunities, and to

address any concerns that may exist as a result of the manner in which the Commission's accreditation processes have been implemented.

Continue partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate. A new Partnership Agreement between the Commission and CAEP was signed by both parties in May 2015. During 2017-18, Commission staff continued to work with the CAEP staff to better understand new CAEP standards and processes and to determine their applicability to California's context. Commission staff communicated with CAEP staff on issues as they arose and were able to postpone site visits to align with the Commission's timeline for deferment of site visits by one year as institutions participated in extensive technical assistance activities. In addition, Commission staff attended both the CAEP clinic for state agencies charged with the responsibility of program approval and accreditation and the annual CAEP conference. These meetings ensure staff has an understanding of the requirements of CAEP review and are able to identify any work necessary to maintain a joint review process for institutions seeking both state and national accreditation. This work continues with the first institution to seek CAEP accreditation undergoing a joint site visit in spring 2019.

Board of Institutional Reviewer's (BIR) Training. Following the substantial revisions to processes and procedures and to incorporate outcomes data such as survey results, it became necessary to significantly revise the training for both new and veteran reviewers. Under the previous BIR training, most of the training took place face to face over a period of 3-4 days and focused significant attention on the review of the voluminous documentation required under the previous accreditation system.

The revised reviewer training is divided into two major components: 1) Program Review or Common Standards Review, and 2) Site Visit Training. With the Program Review and Common Standards Review process, the reviewers are trained to review and analyze a prescribed set of evidence that is required to be submitted by institutions and programs and determine, primarily on the basis of the evidence alone with very limited narrative, whether the standards appear to be preliminarily aligned.

Once individuals have completed either the Program Review training and review or the Common Standard training and review, they are invited to attend the two-day face to face site visit training. The site visit training focuses on reviewing those skills and abilities necessary to serve on a site visit team. This includes, but is not limited to, understanding the documentation submitted under the previous components of the accreditation system (preconditions, program review, and Common Standards), the role and importance of standards, conflict of interest and confidentiality, the use of program completer survey results and other survey data, the role of the data submitted by institutions in the Annual Data submission process, interview techniques for accreditation, decision making for reaching standard findings and accreditation recommendations, and report writing.

The first revised BIR training took place in August 2018 with approximately 30 individuals. Two more trainings have taken place in 2018-19 for a total of 90 new individuals trained as BIR members. The revised training has been well received.

Other Activities Not Directly in the Accreditation System
Review and Approve Subject Matter Programs - Elementary Subject Matter Programs (ESM) and Single Subject Matter Programs. Subject Matter programs do not fall within the Commission's accreditation system, nevertheless, since reviewing subject matter programs is an important function of the Professional Services Division and approving these programs is an important function of the Commission, this activity is reported here. All teaching candidates must demonstrate subject matter competence. In 2016, the Commission approved regulations, which were subsequently approved by the Office of Administrative Law in 2017, to allow passage of a Commission approved Elementary Subject Matter program to count as demonstration of subject matter competence for the Multiple Subject credential, reversing years under the No Child Left Behind Act in which only passage of the CSET for the Multiple Subject credential was allowed. With the change in policy that once again allowed for Commission approved subject matter programs to waive the CSET examination for demonstration of subject matter competence for multiple subject candidates, the responsibility to review and approve these programs once again became a priority for the Commission. In 2017-18, seven institutions were approved by the Commission after review by subject matter experts that determined the programs to be in alignment with the Subject Matter standards. An additional subject matter program was approved in 2017-18 in Agriculture. In addition, the Commission continues to review and approve all proposals submitted for Single Subject Matter programs. These programs are included in Section II.

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

Section II: Summary of 2017-18 Accreditation Activities

This section of the report provides more detailed information about results of the 2017-18 Work Plan with a focus on accreditation activities.

Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Credential Preparation Programs
In 2017-18, accreditation site visits resumed with the 29 institutions in the Green Cohort. Accreditation decisions were made based upon the written reports of the evidence gathered at the site visit, recommendations made by the site visit team, and the COA interview of program leadership and the team lead. Teams reviewed documentation, interviewed a variety of constituencies (candidates, program completers, faculty, employers, administration, supervisors, etc.), deliberated, and came to consensus on findings for all Common Standards, program standards, and an accreditation recommendation. Commission consultants, team leads, and institutional representatives attended Committee on Accreditation meetings to present the results of the site visit report and respond to questions. Upon review and discussion the COA accepts or modifies the team's accreditation recommendation. Copies of the site visit team reports are available on the Commission's website.

The COA made the following accreditation determinations in 2017-18:

Accreditation Status for Institutions with Site Visits in 2017-18 (29)	
Program Sponsor	**Accreditation Status**
Antioch Unified School District	Accreditation
Bakersfield City School District	Accreditation
California Lutheran University	Accreditation
CSU Channel Islands	Accreditation with Stipulations
CSU East Bay	Accreditation
CSU San Bernardino	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
Evergreen Elementary School District	Accreditation
Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District	Accreditation
Fresno County Superintendent of Schools	Accreditation
Garden Grove Unified School District	Accreditation
Hacienda La Puente Unified School District	Accreditation
Humphreys University	Accreditation
La Mesa Spring Valley School District	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Los Angeles County Office of Education	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
Madera County Superintendent of Schools	Accreditation
Merced County Office of Education	Accreditation
Mills College	Accreditation with Stipulations
Montebello Unified School District	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations
Newark Unified School District	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations
Notre Dame de Namur University	Accreditation with Stipulations
San Bernardino City Unified School District	Accreditation

Accreditation Status for Institutions with Site Visits in 2017-18 (29)	
San Diego County Office of Education	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
San Juan Unified School District	Accreditation
San Mateo Foster City School District	Accreditation
Santa Ana Unified School District	Accreditation
Saugus Union School District	Accreditation with Stipulations
Simpson University	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
Tulare County Office of Education	Accreditation
Westmont College	Accreditation

Institutions Meeting All Standards

The institutions listed in the table below hosted an accreditation site visit in 2017-18 which resulted in determining that the institution had met all Common and program standards for all programs offered by the institution. Of the 29 site visits, 14 institutions (48%) with site visits in 2017-18 met all standards applicable for the programs they offer.

Institutions Receiving Accreditation with All Common and Program Standards Met 2017-18 Visits	
Program Sponsor	**Number of Programs**
Antioch Unified School District	1
Bakersfield City School District	1
California Lutheran University	8
Evergreen Elementary School District	1
Fresno County Superintendent of Schools	2
Garden Grove Unified School District	1
Hacienda La Puente Unified School District	1
Humphreys University	1
Merced County Office of Education	2
San Bernardino City Unified School District	1
San Juan Unified School District	1
San Mateo Foster City	1
Santa Ana Unified School District	1
Westmont College	2

Summary of Findings on Common Standards

A review of the year's visit results serves as information for the COA and staff in determining needs for technical assistance meetings as a guide for institutions as they prepare for site visits. The information regarding findings using the new Common Standards for 2017-18 site visits are presented in the following table.

Findings in the Common Standards[1] 2017-18 Accreditation Site Visits (29 Institutions)	Standard Findings		
	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	21	6	2
2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	27	2	0
3: Study, Fieldwork, and Clinical Practice	24	5	0
4: Continuous Improvement	23	2	4
5: Program Impact	28	1	0

[1]The language of the Common Standards may be found at: Common Standards

Summary Findings on Program Standards

Analysis of Program Standards Decisions
The chart below indicates the number of institutions that hosted site visits in 2017-18 that offered the program listed and the number of institutions where all of the program standards were found to be met in that credential area.

All Program Standards Found to be Met 2017-18 Site Visits		
Program	# Institutions with All Program Standards Met	Total # Institutions
Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders	5	5
Added Authorization: Deaf-Blind	1	1
Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education	5	5
Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance	2	2
Added Authorization: Orthopedic Impairment	2	2
Added Authorization: Reading and Literacy	1	1
Added Authorization: Traumatic Brain Injury	1	1
Bilingual Authorization	2	2
Clear Administrative Services Credential	6	6
Clear General Education (MS/SS) Teacher Induction	1	1
Designated Subjects: Adult Education	1	2
Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education	3	4
Designated Subjects: Special Subjects	2	2
Designated Subjects: Supervision and Coordination	3	3
Education Specialist Deaf and Hard of Hearing	1	1
Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education w/Intern	4	4
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Disabilities Intern	7	7
Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Disabilities w/Intern	5	6

All Program Standards Found to be Met 2017-18 Site Visits		
Program	**# Institutions with All Program Standards Met**	**Total # Institutions**
PPS-Child Welfare and Attendance	1	1
PPS -School Counseling with Intern	3	3
PPS-School Psychologist with Intern	2	2
Preliminary Administrative Services	9	10
Preliminary Multiple Subject with Intern	8	11
Preliminary Single Subject with Intern	7	10
Specialist Teaching: Adapted Physical Education	1	1
Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist	1	1
Speech-Language Pathology	1	1
Teacher Induction	13	18

Program Standards

The summary of the information gathered on all educator preparation programs with determinations of *Met with Concerns* or *Not Met* are presented in the tables below. If a standard is not listed, all institutions met that standard. As with the information about the Common Standards, this information about standards that we *Not Met* or were *Met with Concerns* guides the COA and staff in determining what additional technical assistance might be helpful to the field. The full text of all credential program standards adopted by the Commission may be found at: Commission Adopted Credential Program Standards.

Designated Subjects: Adult Education Standards (2 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
8: Curriculum and Instruction Planning	1	-
10: Instructional Practices (A,B, D)	1	-

Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education Standards (4 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Design and Rationale	1	-
6: Determination of CTE Teacher Competence	1	-
7: Advanced Programs of Preparation	1	-

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Standards (10 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
5: Role of Schooling in a Democratic Society	1	-

Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Disabilities Standards (6 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
4: Assessment, Program Planning and Instruction	1	-
5: Assessment of Students	1	-
8: Augmentative and Alternative Communication	-	1

Preliminary Multiple Subject Standards (11 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Design and Curriculum	2	-
2: Preparing Candidates towards the Mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations	2	-
3: Criteria for the Selection of District - employed Supervisors	1	-

Preliminary Single Subject Standards (18 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
2: Preparing Candidates towards the Mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations	2	-
3: Criteria for the Selection of District - employed Supervisors	2	-
5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment	1	-

Teacher Induction Standards (15 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Purpose	1	-
3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System	1	1
4: Qualifications, Selection, and Training of Mentors	1	1
5: Determining Candidate Competence	2	-
6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services	2	2

Institutions in 7th Year Follow Up

In 2017-18, the COA continued to monitor progress made in addressing stipulations for any institutions with outstanding issues from previous year's visits. Although any institution with stipulations must address all stipulations within one year, the COA may choose to allow the institution more time if the COA is satisfied that significant progress is being made to address the stipulations. Because site visits did not take place in 2016-17, the institutions listed below were allowed additional time by the COA to continue to address specific stipulations. It should be noted that all three of the institutions had the majority of their stipulations removed in 2016-17- one year after their site visit and two of the three had full accreditation in 2017-18.

2017-18 Accreditation Follow-Up for Institutions that Hosted Site Visits in Prior Years				
Revisits				**Current Status for Institutions with Stipulations Remaining**
Program Sponsor	**2015-2016 Decision**	**2016-2017 Revisit Decision**	**2017-2018 Revisit Decision**	
California School for the Deaf	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation with Stipulations COA removed 3 of 5 stipulations (6/2017)	Accreditation	COA removed the final stipulation and granted accreditation (06/2018)
Holy Names University	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation with Stipulations COA removed 7 of 8 stipulations (6/2017)	Final Stipulation will be reviewed at the November 7, 2018 COA meeting	To be reviewed at the COA meeting on November 7, 2018
Tehama Department of Education	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation with Stipulations COA removed 5 of 6 stipulations (6/2017)	Accreditation	COA removed the final stipulation and granted accreditation (06/2018)

Initial Institutional Approval (IIA)

The Committee on Accreditation does not have authority to approve the eligibility of institutions to offer educator preparation programs in California. Rather, Initial Institutional Approval is within the purview of the Commission. Once the Commission determines that an institution is eligible to offer educator preparation in California, the program proposals by those institutions are brought forward to the COA for its consideration and action. The following institutions were brought before the Commission for Initial Institutional Approval. The table identifies the Stage that was approved.

Initial Institutional Approval (9)			
Institution	**Stage**	**Approval**	**Approved**
University of Antelope Valley	Stage II – Eligibility Requirements	Eligibility Approved	6/14/18
Atwater Elementary School District	Stage II – Eligibility Requirements	Eligibility Approved	10/26/17
Hollister School District	Stage II – Eligibility Requirements	Eligibility Approved	6/14/18
University of California, Merced	Stage II – Eligibility Requirements	Eligibility Approved	9/7/17
Las Virgenes Unified School District	Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions	Provisional Approval	9/7/17

Initial Institutional Approval (9)			
Santa Barbara Unified School District	Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions	Provisional Approval	12/7/17
University of California, Merced	Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions	Provisional Approval	4/12/18
Fortune School of Education	Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions	Provisional Approval	4/12/18
High Tech High Graduate School of Education	Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions	Provisional Approval	2/8/18

Initial Approval of New Credential Programs (IPR)

Institutions seeking Initial Program Approval for new credential programs submit a response to Common Standards document (or a Common Standards addendum if the institution has recently submitted Common Standards) and a documentation that indicates how the proposed program will meet each of the Commission-adopted program standards along with supporting documents that serve as evidence to verify the claims made. A team of educators who have expertise in the program area and are trained for the review process read the standards documents and consult with one another to determine whether standards are aligned. If the reviewers jointly agree that standards are met, it is so noted. If the review team agrees that standards are not met, reviewers request specifically what additional information is needed. This feedback is shared with the institution by the Commission staff. The institution addresses any concerns and resubmits until the program is found to be aligned with all standards. Additionally, the institution submits a response to all relevant program specific preconditions, which are reviewed by Commission staff. When all standards are found to be met and all relevant preconditions are determined to be addressed, the COA takes action to grant or deny program approval at its next scheduled meeting.

Initial Program Approval actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation in 2017-18 for new institutions are listed in the tables below.

New Educator Preparation Programs Sponsored by Provisionally Approved Institutions(5)	
Institutional Sponsor	**Credential Program**
Las Virgenes Unified School District	Administrative Services Credential Clear Induction (1)
Las Virgenes Unified School District	Preliminary Administrative Services (1)
High Tech High Graduate School of Education	Preliminary Multiple Subject/Single Subject (1)
Las Virgenes Unified School District	Teacher Induction (2)
Santa Barbara Unified School District	

The Committee on Accreditation granted Initial Program Approval for current institutions to the following preparation programs:

Preparation Programs Approved by COA (20)	
Institutional Sponsor	**Credential Program**
Capistrano Unified School District	Administrative Services Clear Induction (2)
Corona-Norco Unified School District	
Loyola Marymount University	Bilingual Authorization – Cantonese (1)
CSU Monterey Bay	Bilingual Authorization – Spanish (2)
Los Angeles Unified School District	
Placer County Office of Education	Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Intern (2)
Davis Joint Unified School District	
Davis Joint Unified School District	Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Intern (1)
Los Angeles Unified School District	Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education Intern (1)
California State University, Monterey Bay	Preliminary Administrative Services (2)
Sonoma County Office of Education	
Preliminary General Education Multiple Subject Intern (2)	Humphreys University
	Santa Clara University
Santa Clara University	Preliminary General Education Single Subject Intern (1)
Loyola Marymount University	Pupil Personnel Services Child Welfare and Attendance (2)
California State University, Monterey Bay	
California State University, Monterey Bay	Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work (2)
Humboldt State University	
California Baptist University	Speech-Language Pathology (1)
University of Southern California	Teacher Induction (1)

Initial Approval of New Subject Matter Programs

Although subject matter programs are not part of the accreditation system, reviewing new program proposals is a significant part of the Professional Services Division priorities. The eight programs approved by the Commission in 2017-18 are included in the table below.

New Subject Matter Programs (8)	
California State University, Fresno	Elementary Subject Matter
California State University, Los Angeles	Elementary Subject Matter
California State University, Monterey Bay	Elementary Subject Matter
California State University, Sacramento	Elementary Subject Matter
Point Loma Nazarene University	Elementary Subject Matter
San Francisco State University	Elementary Subject Matter
University of California, Davis	Single Subject - Agriculture
Vanguard University	Elementary Subject Matter

Inactive Status
Institutions may temporarily cease offering an approved program for a variety of reasons such as decreased need in the service area or changes in faculty with expertise in the area. Inactive programs may be teaching out the remaining candidates but are not enrolling additional students. A program may be declared inactive for a maximum of five years. Inactive status does not excuse an institution from accreditation activities. All inactive programs must participate in accreditation activities in a modified manner as determined by the COA and Administrator of Accreditation. The following 18 programs noted below were declared to be in an Inactive status in 2017-18.

Programs Entering Inactive Status (18)	
Institution	**Program**
California State University, East Bay (1)	Early Childhood Special Education – Added Authorization
California State University, Long Beach (2)	Teacher Induction
	Clear Education Specialist
La Mesa - Spring Valley School District (1)	Teacher Induction
Pepperdine University (2)	Preliminary Administrative Services
	Clear Administrative Services
San Diego State University (2)	School Nurse
	Autism Spectrum Disorders – Added Authorization
San Diego Unified School District (1)	Teacher Induction
Santa Clara University (1)	Clear General Education Induction
University of California, Los Angeles (6)	Early Childhood Special Education – Added Authorization
	Emotional Disturbance – Added Authorization
	Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Intern
	Multiple Subject Intern
	Single Subject Intern
	Education Specialist - Mild/Moderate Traditional
University of California, Riverside (1)	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education
University of Phoenix (1)	Preliminary Administrative Services

Reactivation of Inactive Program
An inactive program may be reactivated only when the institution submits a request to the COA and the COA has taken action to reactivate the program. If the preconditions or the program standards under which the program was approved have been modified, the institution or program sponsor must address the updated preconditions or standards before the program may be reactivated. During 2017-18, one program previously deemed inactive requested and received reactivation and is once again a fully approved program operating in California.

Reactivation Requests (1)	
Institution	**Program**
University of San Francisco	Preliminary Administrative Services

Transition of Professional Preparation Program

In 2016, the Commission adopted new Teacher Induction program standards and all induction programs were required to transition to these standards. The following charts indicate 1) the institutions that have chosen to continue to serve only special education preliminary credential holders, 2) the institutions that have chosen to continue to serve only general education credential holders, and 3) the programs that will serve both general education and special education credential holders.

Transition of Professional Preparation Program (3)	
Program Sponsor	**Program Type**
California State University, Fresno	Teacher Induction – Special Education only
San Jose State University	Teacher Induction – Special Education only
Santa Clara County Office of Education	Teacher Induction – Special Education only

Transition of Professional Preparation Program (11)	
Program Sponsor	**Program Type**
Biola University	Teacher Induction – General Education only
Central Unified School District	Teacher Induction – General Education only
Chaffey Joint Union High School District	Teacher Induction – General Education only
Fresno Unified School District	Teacher Induction – General Education only
Hebrew Union College	Teacher Induction – General Education only
Loyola Marymount University	Teacher Induction – General Education only
Redwood City School District	Teacher Induction – General Education only
Rowland Unified School District	Teacher Induction – General Education only
Santa Clara University	Teacher Induction – General Education only
Vallejo City Unified School District	Teacher Induction – General Education only
Whittier College	Teacher Induction – General Education only

Transition of Professional Preparation Program (57)	
Program Sponsor	**Program Type**
Anaheim Elementary School District	Teacher Induction
Anaheim Union High School District	Teacher Induction
Animo Leadership Charter High School	Teacher Induction
Antioch University	Teacher Induction
Arcadia Unified School District	Teacher Induction

Transition of Professional Preparation Program (57)	
Baldwin Park Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Bay Area School of Enterprise (REACH Institute)	Teacher Induction
Bellflower Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Burbank Unified School District	Teacher Induction
California State University, Dominguez Hills	Teacher Induction
California State University, Long Beach	Teacher Induction
California State University, Monterey Bay	Teacher Induction
CalState TEACH	Teacher Induction
Ceres Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Chula Vista Elementary School District	Teacher Induction
Compton Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Encinitas Union School District	Teacher Induction
Escondido Union High School District	Teacher Induction
Escondido Union School District	Teacher Induction
Evergreen School District	Teacher Induction
Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Fullerton School District	Teacher Induction
Garden Grove Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Glendale Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Green Dot Public Schools	Teacher Induction
Greenfield Union School District	Teacher Induction
Grossmont Union High School District	Teacher Induction
Hanford Elementary School District	Teacher Induction
Imperial County Office of Education	Teacher Induction
Keppel Union School District	Teacher Induction
La Mesa-Spring Valley Schools	Teacher Induction
Lodi Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Madera Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Manteca Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Merced County Office of Education	Teacher Induction
Milpitas Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Montebello Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Mount St. Mary's University	Teacher Induction
Ontario-Montclair School District	Teacher Induction
Palo Alto Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Paramount Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Pasadena Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District	Teacher Induction

Transition of Professional Preparation Program (57)	
Pomona Unified School District	Teacher Induction
PUC Schools	Teacher Induction
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	Teacher Induction
San Francisco Unified School District	Teacher Induction
San Gabriel Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Sanger Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Sonoma State University	Teacher Induction
South San Francisco Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Sweetwater Union High School District	Teacher Induction
Torrance Unified School District	Teacher Induction
University of California, San Diego	Teacher Induction
Visalia Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Washington Unified School District	Teacher Induction

Withdrawal of an Approved Program

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

Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (34)	
Institution	**Program**
Azusa Unified School District	General Education (Multiple/Single Subject) Induction
California State University, Long Beach	Designated Subjects – Special Subjects
	Designated Subjects – Supervision and Coordination
	Specialist Teaching – California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)
California State University, San Marcos	Specialist Teaching – California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)
Chapman University	Preliminary Administrative Services Credential with Intern
Fresno Pacific University	Education Specialist (Level II) Moderate/Severe Program
	Education Specialist (Level II) Mild/Moderate Program
Loyola Marymount University	General Education (MS/SS) Induction
Oakland Unified School District	Education Specialist- Mild/Moderate Intern
Pacific Union College	General Education MS/SS Induction Program
Saint Mary's College of California	Specialist Teaching – Added Authorization: Reading and Literacy
	Specialist Teaching – Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist

Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (34)	
Institution	**Program**
San Joaquin County Office of Education[1]	Education Specialist – Early Childhood Special Education Intern
	Education Specialist – Mild/Moderate Intern
	Education Specialist – Mild/Moderate Level II Intern
	Education Specialist – Moderate Severe Intern
	Education Specialist – Moderate Severe Level II Intern
	Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern
	Preliminary Single Subjects Intern (all subject areas)
San Marcos Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Santa Rosa City Schools	General Education (Multiple/Single Subject) Induction
	Clear Education Specialist Induction
Stanislaus County Office of Education	Education Specialist Intern Mild/Moderate
	Education Specialist Mild/Moderate – Level II
	Education Specialist Intern Moderate/Severe
	Education Specialist Moderate/Severe – Level II
	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education
University of California, Riverside	General Education (Multiple Subject/Single Subject) Clear Credential Program
Ventura County Office of Education	Designated Subjects – Supervision and Coordination Credential
	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education
Whittier College	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder

[1]*While these programs were closed as operated under the LEA (San Joaquin COE), they are now operating under the purview of Teachers College of San Joaquin.*

Automatic Withdrawal
Programs that have been declared inactive and been on inactive status for the maximum five-year period allowable by the accreditation system are automatically withdrawn. The following program was automatically withdrawn:

Automatic Withdrawal for Programs of Professional Preparation (1)	
Institution	**Program**
Magnolia Public Schools	Preliminary Single Subject Teaching Credential

Institutions that are No Longer Approved Program Sponsors
The following institutions are no longer approved program sponsors as a result of withdrawing all of their remaining approved programs.

Institutions No Longer Approved Program Sponsors (5)	
Azusa Unified School District	Closed Educator Preparation in June 2018
Magnolia Public Schools	Automatic Withdrawal in June 2018
San Joaquin County Office of Education[2]	Closed Educator Preparation in June 2018
San Marcos Unified School District	Closed Educator Preparation in June 2018
Santa Rosa City Schools	Closed Educator Preparation in June 2018

 [2]*San Joaquin COE ceased to operate as a Commission approved program sponsor; however, many of the programs are now operating under the purview of Teachers College of San Joaquin.*

Preconditions Review
During Year 1 and Year 4 of the accreditation cycle institutions must respond to all relevant preconditions. Preconditions are grounded in statute, regulations and/or Commission policy, for each approved program. During 2017-18, institutions in three cohorts (Green, Orange and Indigo) submitted preconditions for review. Green preconditions were necessary because these cohort activities fell between the former accreditation system and the new accreditation system and the preconditions for institutions in this cohort had not been reviewed since their last accreditation visit. In future years, preconditions for only two cohorts of institutions will be reviewed each year.

Green Cohort (29)		
Antioch Unified School District	Hacienda La Puente Unified School District	San Bernardino City Unified School District
Bakersfield City School District	Humphreys University	San Diego County Office of Education
California Lutheran University	La Mesa Spring Valley School District	San Juan Unified School District
California State University, Channel Island	Los Angeles County Office of Education	San Mateo Foster City School District
California State University, East Bay	Madera County Superintendent of Schools	Santa Ana Unified School District
California State University, San Bernardino	Merced County Office of Education	Saugus Union School District
Evergreen School District	Mills College	Simpson University
Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District	Montebello Unified School District	Tulare County Office of Education

Green Cohort (29)		
Fresno County Superintendent of Schools	Notre Dame de Namur University	Westmont College
Garden Grove Unified School District	Newark Unified School District	

Indigo Cohort (36)		
Animo Green Dot Public Schools	High Tech High	San Ramon Valley Unified School District
Argosy University	Humboldt State University	Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District
Azusa Pacific University	Lancaster School District	Stockton Unified School District
Baldwin Park Unified School District	Madera Unified School District	Teachers College of San Joaquin
Brandman University	Mount Saint Mary's University	Tracy Unified School District
Brentwood Union School District	Pasadena Unified School District	University of Redlands
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District	University of San Francisco
California State University, Bakersfield	Sacramento County Office of Education	Ventura County Office of Education
California State University, Chico	San Diego Unified School District	Visalia Unified School District
California State University, Long Beach	San Dieguito Union High School District	Vista Unified School District
California State University, San Marcos	San Joaquin County Office of Education	West Covina Unified School District
Central Unified School District	San Jose Unified School District	Westside Union School District

Orange Cohort (36)		
Academy of Art University	El Rancho Unified School District	San Marcos Unified School District- Discontinued Program
Alhambra Unified School District	Fontana Unified School District	Santa Barbara County Education Office
Anaheim Union High School District	Fremont Unified School District	Santa Rosa City Schools

Orange Cohort (36)		
Aspire Public Schools	Hayward Unified School District	School for Integrated Academics and Technology (SIA Tech)
Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)	Keppel Union School District	St. Mary's College of California
Azusa Unified School District	Kings County Office of Education	Sweetwater Union High School District
California Baptist University	Merced Union High School District	The Master's University
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo	Milpitas Unified School District	University of California, Santa Barbara
California State University, Sacramento	Modesto City Schools	University of La Verne
CalState TEACH	Paramount Unified School District	University of Phoenix
Chapman University	Rialto Unified School District	University of the Pacific
Conejo Valley Unified School District	San Jose State University	West Contra Costa Unified School District

Program Review and Common Standards

During Year 5 of the accreditation cycle institutions must respond to the Common Standards and complete Program Review. Program Review is the activity during which key program evidence is reviewed to determine whether the educator preparation program appears to be aligned to program standards. During 2017-18, the 36 institutions of the yellow cohort identified in the table below responded to Common Standards and completed Program Review. As indicated in the table below, these 36 institutions offer a total of 137 programs. To provide some understanding of the scope of this work, each program is reviewed by two individuals. Reviewing 137 programs then required the effort of over 270 reviewers matched by expertise and availability.

Yellow Cohort Program Review 2017-2018

Institution	Initial Teacher Prep*	Teacher Induction	Other Teacher Prep**	Prelim Admin	Clear Admin	Other Services***	Total
Anaheim City SD		1					1
Biola University	3	1				1	5
Capistrano USD		1					1
Ceres USD		1					1
Clovis USD		1					1
CSU Northridge	6	1	7	1		2	17
CSU Stanislaus	4		4	1		1	10
Etiwanda SD		1					1

Institution	Initial Teacher Prep*	Teacher Induction	Other Teacher Prep**	Prelim Admin	Clear Admin	Other Services***	Total
Fremont UHSD		1					1
Fresno Pacific University.	5		6	1	1	2	15
Greenfield Union SD		1					1
Lodi USD		1					1
Loyola Marymount University	3	1	4	1		3	12
Napa COE		1					1
Ontario-Montclair SD		1					1
Panama Buena Vista USD		1					1
Pomona USD		1			1		2
Riverside USD		1					1
Rowland USD		1					1
Saddleback Valley USD		1					1
San Diego Christian College	2						2
San Diego State University	5	1	5	1	1	6	19
San Gabriel USD		1					1
Santa Clara University	2	1	1	1	1		6
Santa Clara USD		1					1
Santa Cruz COE		1					1
Shasta COE				1			1
Sonoma COE	3	1	4		1		9
South San Francisco USD		1					1
Stanislaus COE		1			1		2
Summit Public Schools	1	1					2
Touro University	4			1	1		6
Walnut Valley USD		1					1
Western Governors University	2						2
Whittier College	4	1	1				6
William Jessup University	2						2
Total: 36	**46**	**29**	**32**	**8**	**7**	**15**	**137**

*__Initial Teacher Prep -__ *Traditional/Intern Preliminary Multiple, Preliminary Single Subject, and Preliminary Education Specialist*

**__Other Teacher Prep -__ *All Education Specialist Added Authorizations, Bilingual Authorizations, CTEL, Teacher Librarian, Designated Subjects*

***__Other Services -__ *Pupil Personnel Services, School Nurse, Speech and Language Pathology*

Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2018-19

The work plan for the Commission and COA for 2018-19 is summarized in this section. Having focused 2017-18 on the first year implementation of many aspects of the new system and reinstituting accreditation site visits, the primary objective of 2018-19 will the continued implementation of these new processes, refining them as needed, and the further development and implementation of those aspects of the system that have yet to be implemented fully.

For 2018-19, the COA identifies the following priorities.

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

Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation. All Committee meetings will continue to be held in public and all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. In addition, meetings will be broadcast to allow any individual with access to the Internet the ability to hear live or recorded broadcasts of all Committee meetings. The Commission's website will continue to be utilized fully to provide agenda items, notification of meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation. Meetings are scheduled for the following dates:
> August 6, 2018
> November 7, 2018
> January 31-February 1, 2019
> March 14-15, 2019
> May 2-3, 2019
> June 27-28, 2019

The Committee's agenda in 2018-19 includes a full schedule of site visits beginning in the fall of 2018 and continuing well into the spring. Thirty-six institutions are scheduled for site visits. This schedule will take place while also implementing, and refining as needed, all aspects of the new accreditation system such as Program Review, Annual Data Submission, Preconditions Review, and Common Standards Review.

Continuing in 2018-19, the *PSD ENews*, Program Sponsor Alerts, and press releases will be routinely used to ensure a transparent accreditation process.

Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission. The Committee on Accreditation will present its annual report to the Commission in November 2018. Additional updates and reports to the Commission will be provided as necessary and appropriate throughout the year.

Commission liaison. Maintaining a liaison from the Commission to the COA continues to be key to ensuring that the work of the COA and the accreditation system are aligned with the objectives and vision for the new accreditation system set forth by the Commission. The Commission's liaison will continue to provide an important perspective to COA discussions and serve as an effective means of communication between the COA and the Commission.

Continued Implementation of a fee recovery system for certain accreditation activities and an annual accreditation fee system. The Commission adopted a cost recovery plan, and regulations, for the review of new programs and for accreditation activities outside the typical accreditation cycle in October 2013. In addition, in 2014, the Commission implemented an annual accreditation fee. The annual accreditation fee structure was reviewed in 2016 by the Commission in light of new standards, requirements, regulations proposed. The Commission staff will continue to work with the Office of Administrative Law to ensure that the regulations are promulgated and fit the various aspects of the new accreditation system.

Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality

Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs. This is one of the primary ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing accreditation of education institutions and their credential programs.

Site Visits – Yellow Cohort

Beginning in the fall of 2018, the Yellow Cohort, comprised of 36 institutions, will undergo a site visit by a trained team of reviewers. This cohort will be the first to undergo an accreditation site visit having completed the new more efficient Program Review process for reviewing credential program documentation. The information from this process will be used by the site visit team to inform them about the programs prior to the site visit and a subset of the program reviewers have been chosen to serve on the site visit team.

Program Standards Review – Orange Cohort

Program Review submissions were required for the Orange Cohort by October 15, 2018. The Orange Cohort is comprised of 36 institutions offering numerous educator preparation programs. These programs will be reviewed in the 2018-19 year through this Program Review process. This Program Review process, like the new Common Standards process, focuses on very specific evidence and documentation submitted that allows reviewers to determine, without extensive narrative, whether the program is preliminarily aligned to program standards. This information will be used to inform the site visit in Year 6.

The Commission staff has coordinated and assigned at least two experts in each of the credential areas to review each program submission from the Orange Cohort. The vast majority of these review sessions are scheduled throughout November and December 2018 and early 2019 and will take place in a face to face manner at different locations in the state in order to review the documents expeditiously. Once the review session has taken place, the programs must provide an addendum 60 days before the site visit whish responds to any areas of concern or areas needing additional information. This addendum will be used by the site visit team to determine whether the standards are met. The Program Review sessions also serve as Part I of a two part BIR training. Those who participate either in Program Review or Common Standards review will be considered to have completed Part I BIR training, with the site visit training being Part II of BIR training.

Common Standards Submission and Review – Orange Cohort
In February 2019, the 36 institutions that are in the Orange Cohort will submit their documentation with evidence, in accordance with the new procedures, to demonstrate alignment with the Common Standards. One to two Common Standards reviewers and a Team Lead are selected for each institution and will be brought together in the spring to review these submissions. The institutions must provide additional information in the form of an addendum 60 days prior to the site visit to respond to concerns or questions from reviewers. This addendum will serve to further inform the site visit reviewers. The Common Standards reviewers and the team lead that reviewed the Common Standards, will also be the Common Standards team and the team lead for the site visit so they will be very familiar with the evidence and documentation prior to arriving on site for the site visit.

Preconditions Submission – Red and Blue Cohorts
In March 2019, the institutions in the Red and Blue cohorts will submit their preconditions responses. Staff will review these preconditions and require follow up as soon as it is determined that there are questions involving any preconditions. If some preconditions responses are unresolved, the COA will be notified and further action will be taken as deemed appropriate by the COA.

Annual Data Submission
All Commission approved program sponsors will submit required data in 2019. It is anticipated that staff will work closely with the COA, the Commission and the field in general to further refine and clarify the information that is required in the Annual Data System. In addition, further work will be done to determine what data should be incorporated into the data dashboards with easy access for the general public.

Review and revise the [Accreditation Handbook](.). The Accreditation Handbook explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. The COA has already completed a comprehensive review and update of the *Accreditation Handbook* to ensure that any new or changed aspects of the accreditation system were reflected in this document. As the new system is implemented, if any language needs to be adjusted in the *Handbook* to reflect these changes, Commission staff with the COA will make sure the language is clear. In addition, there is likely to need to be some clarification of language in the *Handbook* in order to ensure approval of the cost recovery regulations and to satisfy the Office of Administrative Law.

Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards
Review and take action to grant initial approval of new program sponsors. Approximately 2-4 Accreditation 101 sessions will be held in 2018-19 for institutions interested in becoming a Commission-approved program to better understand the expectations and responsibilities of being a program sponsor and to begin the approval process. Commission staff and BIR members will continue to review proposals for Initial Institutional Approval as they are received.

Review and take action to grant initial program approval for new credential programs. This is also one of the major ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Programs are only being given initial approval when the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met. This review process will continue in 2018-19. When possible, the Commission will bring reviewers together for dedicated review time.

Continue to *Review and Approve Subject Matter Programs.* Although subject matter programs are not fully part of the accreditation system, there is a continued need to review and approve subject matter programs to allow completion of a subject matter program to waive the subject matter examination. Given the significant and continuing interest in this effort, it is anticipated that the Commission will continue to need numerous trained reviewers and dedicated review time to ensure that this activity is conducted efficiently in order to allow these programs to begin operations quickly. In addition, the Commission will continue to review and approve other subject matter programs as they are submitted.

Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement
Data – Annual Data Submission and Survey Data. The Commission will continue to develop and refine the annual survey data collection process and hold discussions with the COA about the appropriate use of that data in accreditation decisions. In addition, there remains significant work to be done around the annual data submission. These discussions will continue this year and it is anticipated that specific data elements, definitions for data sources, and means of collecting, reporting, and analyzing within the newly developed data system and data dashboards will take place. The technical advisory committee convened in 2018 will be consulted as necessary as the further development and implementation of the Annual Data System progresses.

In addition, the Commission staff will focus efforts during 2018-19 on using these data to determine if they indicate any potential areas of concern either with an institution or with a standard or requirement. Analyzing the data for both the survey data and, to some extent, the annual data submission, may allow the Commission to better understand if concerns are distributed evenly across institutions or concentrated in single institutions, suggesting that there may need to be a focused site visit or further exploration of an institution's programs.

Continued implementation of the evaluation system for the accreditation system. The COA will continue to use and examine the results of the evaluation tool that is used by site visit reviewers, team leads, and institutions to evaluate the accreditation system. This data will be collected over the course of the year, with a review of the data taking place in the summer of 2019. Improvements will be discussed and incorporated into the revised accreditation system.

Continue partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate. Recent actions by CAEP call for states to reexamine the partnership agreement in 2019. As a result, the COA will

engage in reviewing the agreement and determining whether any changes will be necessary going forward. Because the first California institution is undergoing a CAEP/CTC joint site visit in spring 2019 and because CAEP standards and protocols are more developed than when the agreement was signed a few years ago, it is an opportune time to revisit the language of the agreement.

In addition, the Commission staff will continue to work with institutions that seek to be both nationally accredited and state accredited as well as with CAEP and any other potential accrediting bodies, to ensure that the process is as streamlined as possible. The Commission staff continues to keep abreast with changes to the CAEP accreditation system, determine the alignment or misalignment with California's process and standards, and to clarify areas of uncertainty with respect to some of the CAEP standards for applicability to California's institutions.

Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes. In 2018, the Commission worked with an advisory panel to reexamine and recommend changes in the Pupil Personnel Program standards and requirements. If and when the Commission takes action to revise these standards, additional work to develop a crosswalk with national accrediting bodies in these professions will have to be developed.

Continue Development and Implementation of the Revised Accreditation System
Section 1 of this report provides information about the many aspects of the new accreditation system developed and/or implemented in 2017-18. The list below provides some brief information on some of the remaining aspects of the work that will need to continue in order to realize the full vision of the Commission for its accreditation system.

1. *Provide Technical Assistance.* Further technical assistance targeted to certain cohorts will be necessary over the course of the next year as each experience a new aspect of the accreditation system. In addition, additional technical assistance will be provided as additional work is done on aspects of the system such as building out Annual Data System to include teaching performance assessment data or data related to additional pathways. Ensuring that the field understand what is required as well as to provide feedback to the Commission staff as the processes are developed have been instrumental in the effective implementation of the system and will continue to play an important role in the future.

2. *Continue Discussing the Role, Purpose, and Specificities of Annual Data.* A focus for 2017-18 will be to continue the discussion about the types of required data that institutions should submit annually, the expectations around that data, and its uses in accreditation. Staff will work to establish the specific protocols necessary to ensure smooth submission of the data into the data system and identify which data elements are part of the data dashboard. In addition, BIR members will need to be trained in how to analyze and use the data appropriately in accreditation.

3. *Continued implementation of surveys for the following constituencies:*
   a.   Preliminary Multiple Subject Completer Survey
   b.   Preliminary Single Subject Completer Survey
   c.   Preliminary Education Specialist Completer Survey
   d.   Preliminary Administrative Services Completer Survey
   e.   Teacher Induction Completer Survey
   f.   Other Credential Programs Survey-Pilot Year
   g.   Master Teacher Survey
   h.   Employer Survey

In the 2018-19 year, the Education Specialist and General Education Induction Program Completer survey was combined into a single Teacher Induction Survey. Additionally, a completer survey was developed and will be implemented to capture program completer information from all other credential areas.

The Commission staff and the COA will continue to ensure the appropriate use of survey data in accreditation activities. Further work will continue on the analysis of the data itself and the determination of processes and timelines for that analysis, the identification of any possible issues and trends, and the next steps in addressing these issues will be a focus for 2018-19.

4. *Next generation of performance assessments* – As the development of the next generation of teaching performance assessments and the development of administrator performance assessments continues, the COA and Commission staff will review the various implications of that work. Providing some guidance for reviewers, and ensuring that both institutions and reviewers understand the new models and related expectations as articulated in the standards, incorporating the rubric level data into the Annual Data system as well as any other appropriate use for the data will be an important activity in 2018-19.

5. *Establishing and implementing processes and procedures for identifying exemplary practices.* In 2017-18, staff and the COA developed a process where institutions that met the Commission's standards in the 2017-18 site visits have the ability to identify, for one or more programs, an area where the program has developed an exemplary practice. The program will submit information on the practice with supporting data and documentation. A committee of experienced educators will review the submissions and identify the initial set of program exemplars. Institutions with programs that have exemplary practices will be featured on a new page for Program Exemplars and available to provide technical assistance to other institutions interested in learning about how the practice has been effective and how it may be able to implement a similar practice at their own institution.

Building on the discussions that have taken place thus far, the Commission will begin implementation of this process to identify exemplary programs and continue to explore ways in which those institutions with particularly strong or innovative practices are able to be recognized and share their experiences and accomplishments with the broader education community. The Committee on Accreditation will provide feedback on the system as it continues to develop and in its early implementation.

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

Program Sponsors by Accreditation Cohort

California State University (23)			
Institution	**Cohort**	**Institution**	**Cohort**
Cal Poly, Pomona	Indigo	CSU Monterey Bay	Violet
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo	Orange	CSU Northridge	Yellow
CalState TEACH	Orange	CSU Sacramento	Orange
CSU Bakersfield*F	Indigo	CSU San Bernardino	Green
CSU Channel Islands	Green	CSU San Marcos	Indigo
CSU Chico*S	Indigo	CSU Stanislaus	Yellow
CSU Dominguez Hills	Red	Humboldt State University	Indigo
CSU East Bay	Green	San Diego State University	Yellow
CSU Fresno*S	Violet	San Francisco State University	Violet
CSU Fullerton*F	Blue	San Jose State University	Orange
CSU Long Beach*S	Indigo	Sonoma State University	Red
CSU Los Angeles*F	Red		

University of California (8)			
Institution	**Cohort**	**Institution**	**Cohort**
UC Berkeley	Red	UC Riverside	Blue
UC Davis	Violet	UC San Diego	Violet
UC Irvine	Violet	UC Santa Barbara	Orange
UC Los Angeles	Red	UC Santa Cruz	Red

Independent Institutions (56)			
Institution	**Cohort**	**Institution**	**Cohort**
Academy of Art	Orange	Pacific Union College	Red
Alliant International University	Blue	Pepperdine University	Red
Antioch University	Violet	Phillips Graduate Institution	Blue
Azusa Pacific University*S	Indigo	Point Loma Nazarene University*S	Red
Bard College	Blue	St. Mary's College of California	Orange
Biola University	Yellow	San Diego Christian College	Yellow
Brandman University*S	Indigo	Santa Clara University	Yellow
California Baptist University	Orange	Simpson University	Green
California Lutheran University	Green	Stanford University	Blue
Chapman University	Orange	Teachers College of San Joaquin	Indigo
Claremont Graduate University	Violet	The Master's College	Orange
Concordia University	Red	Touro University	Yellow
Dominican University of California	Blue	United States University	Blue
Fielding Graduate University	Indigo	University of La Verne*S	Orange
Fresno Pacific University	Yellow	University of Phoenix	Orange
Hebrew Union College	Violet	University of Redlands	Indigo
Holy Names University	Blue	University of San Diego*F	Red
Hope International University	Violet	University of San Francisco	Indigo
Humphreys College	Green	University of Southern California	Violet
La Sierra University	Violet	University of the Pacific	Orange
Loma Linda University	Blue	Vanguard University	Blue

Loyola Marymount University*S	Yellow	Western Governors University	Yellow
Mills College	Green	Westmont College	Green
Mount St. Mary's College	Indigo	Whittier College	Yellow
National University	Violet	William Jessup University	Yellow
Notre Dame de Namur University	Green		
Pacific Oaks College	Violet		

Other Program Sponsors (Districts/County Offices/Other) (168)			
Institution	**Cohort**	**Institution**	**Cohort**
Assoc. of CA School Admin/ASCA	Orange	Mt. Diablo USD: Fortune School of Education	Blue
Alhambra USD	Orange	Murrieta Valley USD	Violet
Anaheim City SD	Yellow	Napa COE	Yellow
Anaheim Union HSD	Orange	New Haven USD	Violet
Animo Leadership Charter HS	Indigo	Newark USD	Green
Antelope Valley Union HSD	Violet	Oak Grove SD	Blue
Antioch USD	Green	Oakland USD	Red
Arcadia USD	Red	Ocean View SD	Blue
Aspire Public Schools	Orange	Oceanside USD	Green
Azusa USD	Orange	Ontario-Montclair SD	Yellow
Bakersfield City SD	Green	ORANGE County DOE	Blue
Baldwin Park USD	Indigo	ORANGE USD	Red
Bay Area School of Enterprise/REACH	Red	Palmdale SD	Blue
Bellflower USD	Blue	Palo Alto USD	Violet
Brentwood Union SD	Indigo	Palos Verdes Peninsula USD	Violet
Burbank USD	Red	Panama-Buena Vista Union SD	Yellow
Butte COE	Orange	Paramount USD	Orange
California School of the Deaf/Fremont	Blue	Pasadena USD	Indigo
Campbell Union SD	Red	Placentia-Yorba Linda USD	Indigo
Capistrano USD	Yellow	Placer COE	Red
Central USD	Indigo	Pleasanton USD	Red
Ceres USD	Yellow	Pomona USD	Yellow
Chaffey Joint Union HSD	Blue	Poway USD	Red
		PUC Schools	Blue
Chino Valley USD #	Yellow	Redwood City SD	Red
Chula Vista ESD	Red	Rialto USD	Orange
Clovis USD	Yellow	Riverside COE	Red
Compton USD	Violet	Riverside USD	Yellow
Conejo Valley USD	Orange	Rowland USD	Yellow
Contra Costa COE	Red	Sacramento City USD	Violet
Corona –Norco USD	Blue	Sacramento COE	Indigo
Culver City USD	Red	Saddleback Valley USD	Yellow
Cupertino Union SD	Violet	San Bernardino City USD	Green
Davis Joint USD	Red	San Diego COE	Green
Dos Palos Oro Loma Joint USD	Red	San Diego USD	Indigo
El Dorado COE	Violet	San Dieguito Union HSD	Indigo
El Rancho USD	Orange	San Francisco USD	Violet
Elk Grove USD	Blue	San Gabriel USD	Yellow

Other Program Sponsors (Districts/County Offices/Other) (168)			
Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
Encinitas Union SD	Blue	San Joaquin COE	Indigo
Envision Schools	Violet	San Jose USD	Indigo
Escondido Union SD	Blue	San Juan USD	Green
Escondido Union HSD	Violet	San Luis Obispo COE	Blue
Etiwanda SD	Yellow	San Marcos USD	Orange
Evergreen SD	Green	San Mateo-Foster City SD	Green
Fairfield-Suisun USD	Green	San Mateo COE	Blue
Fontana USD	Orange	San Ramon Valley USD	Indigo
Fremont UHSD	Yellow	Sanger USD	Violet
Fremont USD	Orange	Santa Ana USD	Green
Fresno COE	Green	Santa Barbara CEO	Orange
Fresno USD	Blue	Santa Clara COE	Blue
Fullerton SD	Blue	Santa Clara USD	Yellow
Garden Grove USD	Green		
Glendale USD	Blue	Santa Cruz COE	Yellow
Greenfield Union SD	Yellow	Santa Monica-Malibu USD	Indigo
Grossmont Union HSD	Blue	Santa Rosa City Schools	Orange
Hacienda La Puente USD	Green	Saugus Union SD	Green
Hanford ESD	Red	Selma USD	Violet
Hayward USD	Orange	Sequoia Union HSD	Violet
High Tech High	Indigo	School for Integrated Academics and Technology/SIA Tech	Orange
Imperial COE	Violet	Shasta COE	Yellow
Inner City Education Foundation (ICEF/LAUSD)	Violet	Sonoma COE	Yellow
Irvine USD	Violet	Stanislaus COE	Yellow
Keppel Union SD	Orange	Stockton USD	Indigo
Kern County SOS	Violet	Sutter County SOS	Red
Kern High SD	Blue	Summit Public Schools	Yellow
King Chavez	Green	South San Francisco USD	Yellow
Kings COE	Orange	Sweetwater Union HSD	Orange
La Mesa-Spring Valley SD	Green	Tehama County DOE	Blue
Lancaster SD	Indigo	Temple City USD	Red
Lawndale ESD	Blue	Torrance USD	Blue
Lodi USD	Yellow	Tracy USD	Indigo
Long Beach USD	Blue	Tulare City SD	Red
Los Angeles COE	Green	Tulare COE	Green
Los Angeles USD	Red	Tustin USD	Blue
Los Banos USD	Violet	Vallejo City USD	Blue
Madera COE	Green	Ventura COE	Indigo
Madera USD	Indigo	Visalia USD	Indigo
Magnolia Public Schools: Pacific Tech Schools-Orange County #	Blue	Vista USD	Indigo
Manteca USD	Red	Walnut Valley USD	Yellow
Marin COE	Red	Washington USD	Violet
Merced COE	Green	West Contra Costa USD	Orange

Other Program Sponsors (Districts/County Offices/Other) (168)			
Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
Merced Union HSD	Orange	West Covina USD	Indigo
Milpitas USD	Orange	Westside Union SD	Indigo
Modesto City Schools	Orange	Wm S Hart Union HSD	Violet
Montebello USD	Green		
Monterey COE	Blue		

Those institutions highlighted are nationally accredited (NCATE/TEAC) and currently moving toward CAEP accreditation.

#Inactive program