
2A

Information

Educator Preparation Committee

Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation 2019-20

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents the 2019-20 Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation (COA).

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenters: Anna Moore and Robert Frelly, COA Co-Chairs, Cheryl Hickey and Erin Sullivan, 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.

Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation 2019-20

Introduction

This agenda item presents the *Annual Accreditation Report of the Committee on Accreditation* (COA). Section I of the report describes the major accomplishments of the Committee's 2019-20 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 2019-20. Section III provides the 2020-21 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. Pursuant to Education Code (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.

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 *Annual Report of the COA 2019-20* was adopted by the COA on October 29, 2020. The report provides an update on all activities undertaken by staff and the COA in 2019-20 to implement the accreditation system.



**Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation
to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

2019-20

Dear Commissioners:

On behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation we are pleased to present the *2019-20 Annual Report on Accreditation*.

This past year was without a doubt amongst the most challenging. The worldwide pandemic impacted every aspect of our lives and upended our educational structure in just a matter of weeks. With little time for advanced preparation, we witnessed colleges and universities, educator preparation programs, teachers, administrators, and other school personnel in this state pull together to shift from face-to-face instruction to distance learning. We have been amazed at, and inspired by, the commitment and dedication of educators and our educational institutions as they not only grappled with the logistics of distance learning, but in seeking to minimize the educational inequities that were magnified by the economic implications caused by COVID-19.

The Commission's accreditation system also had to shift in a matter of weeks from face-to-face visits to virtual visits, with nearly half of the scheduled site visits for 2019-20 taking place entirely through technology. It is with enormous gratitude we recognize the tireless work of the personnel at institutions undergoing a review as well as the countless numbers of team leads, site visit reviewers, program reviewers, members of the COA, and Commission staff who kept the system going in spite of the challenges. Their collective commitment to ensuring quality in educator preparation programs in the midst of a worldwide pandemic is remarkable.

As we enter a new academic year, the continued myriad of challenges before us can seem daunting. Yet, we are hopeful. We teach our new educators to be reflective practitioners and we believe strongly that recent experiences offer exciting, and necessary, opportunities to reflect on ways in which to make education in this state stronger and more equitable for future generations of Californians. As always, we stand with the Commission and the entire California educational community ready to meet these challenges.

Sincerely,

Dr. Anna Moore
Committee Co-Chair

Dr. Robert Frelly
Committee Co-Chair

**The Committee on Accreditation
2019-20**

Jose Luis Alvarado¹

Dean College of Education
California State University, Monterey Bay

Jomeline Balatayo

English Language Development Teacher
Culver City High School

Katrine Czajkowski

Program Manager, Teacher Induction
Sweetwater Union High School District

Robert Frelly

Director of Music Education
Chapman University

Lynn Larsen³

Professor
Brandman University

Anna Moore

Principal
Olivet Elementary Charter School

Iris Riggs²

Professor, Teacher Education and
Foundations
California State University, San Bernardino

Cynthia Amos

College and Career Coach
Los Angeles Unified School District

Cathy Creasia

Director of Accreditation and Credentialing
Rossier School of Education University of
Southern California

Cheryl Forbes^{2,3}

Director of Teacher Education and Lecturer
University of California, San Diego

Michael Hillis

Dean, Graduate School of Education
California Lutheran University

Gerard Morrison

Teacher
Long Beach Unified School District School

Martin Martinez

Director, School of Education
Sacramento County Office of Education

J. Kevin Taylor⁴

Director, School of Education
California Polytechnic State University,
San Luis Obispo

¹Resigned before end of term

²Term ended June 30, 2020

³New Term began July 1, 2020

⁴Filled vacancy left by Alvarado

Table of Contents

Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing	3
<i>The Committee on Accreditation</i>	5
<i>Table of Contents</i>	6
<i>Executive Summary</i>	8
<i>Introduction: Summary of Activities of the Accreditation System</i>	10
<i>Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee’s Work Plan in 2019-20</i>	13
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession	14
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality	16
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards	22
Purpose 4. Fostering Program Improvement	26
<i>Section II: Summary of 2019-20 Accreditation Activities</i>	29
Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Educator Preparation Programs	29
Accreditation Status for Institutions with Site Visits in 2019-20 (31)	29
Institutions Meeting All Standards	30
Institutions Receiving Accreditation with All Common and Program Standards Met, 2019-20	30
Summary of Findings on Common Standards	31
Findings in the Common Standards 2019-20 Accreditation Site Visits (31 institutions)	31
Summary Findings on Program Standards	31
All Program Standards Found to be Met During 2019-20 Site Visits	32
Program Standards that are Not Met or Met With Concern	33
Institutions in 7th Year Follow Up	35
Action taken in 2019-20 on Institutions with Stipulations from Prior Year Site Visits	35
Initial Institutional Approval	36
Initial Approval of New Credential Programs (IPR)	36
New Educator Preparation Programs Sponsored by Provisionally Approved Institutions (5)	37
New Educator Preparation Programs Approved by COA at Existing Commission Approved Program Sponsors (17)	37
Initial Approval of New Subject Matter Programs	38
Inactive Status	38
Reactivation of an Inactive Program	39
Transition of Professional Preparation Program to New Standards	39
Withdrawal of an Approved Program	39
Institutions No Longer Approved Program Sponsors (3)	41
Preconditions Review	41
Program Review and Common Standards	42
Red Cohort Program Review 2019-2020	43
<i>Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2020-21</i>	45
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession	45
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality	46

Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards	48
Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement	49
<i>General Operations</i>	52
<i>Appendix A: Program Sponsors by Accreditation Cohort</i>	53

Executive Summary

The 2019-20 accreditation year was unlike any before it. The academic year had started with enormous promise. Fueled by significant state investments to address the statewide teacher shortage, educational institutions throughout the state were developing and launching new pathways to teaching that offered enormous opportunity to address these shortages and to diversify the teaching profession. The state's fiscal condition was so promising that additional new investments were being proposed to continue and expand these efforts. Deep and significant improvements were made to some credential areas such as Education Specialist and Pupil Personnel Services. Additionally, the Commission's vision for a more streamlined and stronger accreditation process that included an annual accreditation data system and better use of outcomes measures was finally coming to fruition.

But in March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic and the resulting stay-at-home order issued by Governor Newsom necessitated that all TK-12 schools, colleges, and universities shift from face-to-face instruction to online instruction. Additionally, most state agencies were required to complete their work from home using technology whenever possible. The economic hit taken by the state required the Legislature and the Governor to reevaluate funding priorities in light of COVID-19 and redirect limited resources to other state efforts. Plans for new state-funded efforts to address educator shortage areas were eliminated, as new budget cuts were put in place across the entire spectrum of state and local government programs, including cuts to TK-12 schools, colleges, and universities.

The 2019-20 accreditation season's activities, including site visits, were also adjusted to reflect this new reality and to maintain full implementation of the system while continuing efforts to refine the newer aspects of the current system. Below is a summary of some of the major accreditation activities during the 2019-20 year.

Ongoing Accreditation Activities

- Thirty-one (31) of the thirty-four (34) site visits scheduled for 2019-20 were able to be completed prior to June 30, 2020. The remaining three programs were rescheduled and reviewed in fall 2020. Out of the 31 site visits:
 - 26, or 84 percent of, institutions received a status of Accreditation.
 - 5, or 16 percent of, institutions received Accreditation with Stipulations, Major Stipulations, or Probationary Stipulations.
- Progress was monitored and stipulations removed for ten (10) institutions reviewed in previous years including:
 - Eight (8) institutions with Stipulations
 - One (1) institution with Major Stipulations
 - One (1) institution with Probationary Stipulations which was upgraded to Accreditation with Stipulations.
- Staff reviewed preconditions for the 64 institutions in the green and violet cohorts, for a total of 2,015 preconditions (768 general preconditions and 1,247 program-specific preconditions).

- Program review was completed for the 33 institutions in the red cohort, totaling 143 programs and using approximately 210 reviewers.
- Common Standards review was completed for the 33 red cohort institutions with site visits in the 2020-21 year.
- Seventeen (17) new educator preparation programs were approved.
- Five (5) new subject matter programs were approved – three (3) of them Elementary Subject Matter programs, one (1) in Art, and one (1) in Social Science.
- Changes in status were managed for the currently approved programs, including:
 - 12 programs that went inactive across several different credential areas.
 - 31 programs that were withdrawn.
 - Three (3) institutions that ceased offering any educator preparation programs and therefore ceased to be Commission-approved program sponsors.

Continued Progress on Strengthening and Streamlining Project

- Continued the revised Board of Institutional Review Site Visit Trainings for the second year including training approximately 90 additional individuals.
- Continued the use of feedback from the Program Review and Common Standards review for site visit teams.
- Continued the use of survey results to inform team members in developing interview questions and informing team decisions about programs.
- Piloted the Annual Accreditation Data system with the field.
- Developed data dashboards for use by accreditation site visit teams for the institutions and programs they were reviewing.
- Developed improvements that will be implemented in October 2020 to the Initial Program Approval process mirroring the Program Review process.

Introduction: Summary of Activities of the Accreditation System

The 2019-20 year continued the important work of refining and improving the Commission’s accreditation system. Significant progress was made by the Commission, the Committee on Accreditation (COA), and the Commission staff with respect to 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, and this work continued in 2019-20.

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 completers 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 peers assess or evaluate 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 seven-year cycle comprised of the following major components or activities:

Year of the Accreditation Cycle	Corresponding Component or Activity
Annually	Submission of Annual Data to the Accreditation Data System
Years 1 and 4	Preconditions Submission
Year 5, fall	Program Review Submission
Year 5, spring	Common Standards Submission
Year 6	Site Visit
Year 7	Follow up activities to address issues of concern, if needed

Each Commission-approved institution has been assigned to a “color cohort” on a seven year cycle 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, and/or length of program) and outcomes data (such as those from candidates, employers, field experience supervisor surveys, as well as information from assessment results), is an important part of the new accreditation system. The Annual Data Submission by institutions allows the Commission to better identify specific information about credential programs operating in California. The infrastructure for the system was built in 2017 with institutions submitting initial data in summer 2018. Institutions continue the reporting process by identifying program pathways in spring and submitting data every summer.

PRECONDITIONS REVIEW

Preconditions for institutions sponsoring 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 any Precondition.

PROGRAM REVIEW

In fall of Year 5 of the accreditation cycle, each credential program provides specific required evidence or documentation demonstrating that the program is aligned to each of the Commission's adopted program standards for the particular credential area. Documentation is reviewed by trained educators with expertise in the credential area and a conclusion is formed about whether program is 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 information helps focus and inform the accreditation site visit in Year 6. To further ensure transparency, a subset of the experts that reviewed Program Review submissions in Year 5 serve as site visit team members in Year 6.

COMMON STANDARDS REVIEW

In spring of Year 5 of the accreditation cycle, program sponsors submit specific documentation that indicates alignment with the Commission's adopted Common Standards. Reviewers examine the documentation and determine whether the standards are 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 in the review. 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

A team of trained peer evaluators who are members of the Commission's Board of Institutional Reviewers are selected for each site visit. These individuals work together to determine whether the institution and its programs meet the Commission's adopted standards and make an accreditation recommendation to the COA. 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. As part of the site visit, all data, information, and results from review of Preconditions, Program Review, and Common Standards as well as the institution's response to any feedback from these activities are provided to the site visit team not less than 60 days prior to the site visit. At the site visit, in-depth interviews are conducted with program completers, candidates, employers, program faculty and administrators, mentors/supervisors, advisory committees, and other appropriate stakeholders so that team members can triangulate the evidence and data provided during Years 1 to 5 of the accreditation cycle to make determinations on all standards and develop an accreditation recommendation.

DECISION BY THE COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

The COA assists the Commission in the implementation of the accreditation system. This body is comprised of twelve members of the education community – six from postsecondary education and six K-12 practitioners – who have been appointed by the Commission. 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 depends on the commitment of hundreds of experts in the field. Members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers are comprised of those who have a role in preparing educators and practitioners themselves - who are trained and calibrated to review programs and conduct site visits.

This report presents information about the major activities of the accreditation system, the accreditation decisions that were made, and some of the major areas of focus for academic year 2019-20.

Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2019-20

The Commission's Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation Project was a multipronged effort that began late in 2014 and continued throughout 2019-20. Building on the significant work accomplished in prior years, the major activities continued or begun in 2019-20 include the following:

- Adoption of the revised Accreditation Framework.
- Implementation of the redesigned CalTPA and new CalAPA.
- Development and implementation of numerous data dashboards.
- Implementation of surveys to inform program improvement and accreditation decisions – program completers for Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, Administrative Services, teacher induction, administrator induction, as well as employers and master teachers.
- Development and implementation of a new completer survey for other credential areas.
- Implementation of new processes to strengthen oversight of programs such as the ability to close a program (within a larger institution) and the ability to differentiate more frequent site visits for some programs.
- Adoption and transition efforts towards implementation of new Preliminary Education Specialist Program Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations.
- Adoption and transition efforts towards implementation of updated Preconditions, Program Standards, and Performance Expectations for Pupil Personnel Services Credential Programs.
- Development of the revised Single Subject Matter Program Standards and review process.
- Development and implementation of a process used to take action with respect to late documents from approved program sponsors.
- Beginning the review and update of the Accreditation Handbook.
- Development of a process to identify Program Exemplars.
- Development and implementation of the revised Initial Program Review (IPR) process.
- Adoption of the revised CTC/ASHA (American Speech Language-Hearing Association) crosswalk.
- Adoption of the CTC/AAQEP (Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation) Standards Alignment Matrix.
- Distinguished for the COA the approval of new programs for on-going Commission approved program sponsors, and those in Provisional Approval.
- Review of accreditation activities related to inactive programs.

The items that follow represent a summary of the key aspects of the accreditation system undertaken during the 2019-20 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 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 6, 2019	March 26, 2020
October 24, 2019	May 7, 2020
February 21, 2020	June 25, 2020

In response to Governor Newsom’s declaration of a State of Emergency relating to the COVID-19 pandemic and Executive Order N-29-20, the Committee on Accreditation conducted its meeting via webcast for the March, May, and June meetings.

All Committee meetings were held in public and all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act and Governor Newsom’s Executive Order. 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 where possible and appropriate so that those located in various regions of California who are involved in accreditation activities could participate without the time and cost commitments required to travel to the Commission offices. The videoconferencing link is available to anyone who wishes to attend the meeting in real time and the meetings are recorded and available on the Commission’s website soon after the meeting.

[PSD e-News](#). The PSD e-News, developed in 2008, continued to be distributed weekly. This electronic notification has increased its readership each year and now reaches over 3,250 individuals - including all institutions approved by the Commission to offer educator preparation programs - 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 (PSAs) continued to be a primary tool 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. The Commission staff issued the following nine PSAs between July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020:

Program Sponsor Alerts July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020

Number	Issue Date	Title
19-10	August 8, 2019	<u>Streamlining the Single Subject Matter Program Standards and Review Process</u>
19-09	September 5, 2019	<u>Adopted Preconditions, Program Standards and Performance Expectations for Pupil Personnel Services Credential Programs and the Transition Timeline for Programs and Anticipated Regulatory Changes</u>
19-11	December 17, 2019	<u>Dissemination of California Dyslexia Guidelines</u>
19-12	December 17, 2019	<u>Approval of the Alignment Matrix comparing the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing's Common Standards with the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP) standards</u>
20-01	January 30, 2020	<u>Program Sponsor Responsibilities-Updating Contact Information Electronically in the Accreditation Data System</u>
20-02	January 30, 2020	<u>Accreditation Data System (ADS): Implemented Enhancements, Updates to Program Reporting Questions and Resources, and Important Dates for 2019-20</u>
20-03	February 20, 2020	<u>Required Documentation When Recommending a California Prepared Education Specialist Level I Credential Holder for a Clear Credential</u>
20-04	April 28, 2020	<u>COVID-19 Flexibility Provisions for Educator Preparation Programs</u>
20-05	May 21, 2020	<u>Removal of the Prohibition of an Education Major as a Requirement for an Education Specialist Teaching Credential or a Pupil Personnel Services Credential</u>

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 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 [November 2019 Commission meeting](#).

Commission Liaison. The Commission's liaison to the COA provides an important perspective to COA discussions and serves as an effective means of communication between the COA and the Commission. For the 2019-20 year, the liaison to the COA was Commissioner Haydee Rodriguez who attended the COA meetings regularly.

Implementation of an Annual Accreditation Fee and a Fee Recovery System for Certain Accreditation Activities. In 2019-20, 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 2019-20 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.

The Commission continued implementation of a cost recovery plan (regulations effective October 2013) for the review of new programs and for accreditation activities required in addition to the typical accreditation cycle. In addition, in 2019-20 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. The regulatory package was withdrawn by staff based on feedback from the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). Staff will continue to work on this with the OAL in 2020-21.

Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality

Accreditation of Institutions and their Credential Preparation Programs. This is one of the primary ongoing tasks of the COA. 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 scheduled site visits for one year in order to provide time for the institutions to plan and implement the vast number of changes required by the Strengthening and Streamlining Project, including new standards and requirements for programs. Beginning in fall 2017, site visits were reinstated for all Commission-approved programs beginning with the Green Cohort. The effort to phase in new aspects of the accreditation system has taken several years and continued in 2019-20 with the refinement of the data that is submitted by institutions through the Annual Accreditation Data System, enhancements to the system used for Board of Institutional Review assignments, and the inclusion of survey results presented in dashboards to inform the accreditation teams' work.

In 2019-20, thirty-one (31) of the thirty-four (34) institutions with scheduled accreditation visits were able to host visits despite the upheaval brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic. These site visits resulted in the following decisions:

- 26 institutions Accredited, including three (3) with a 7 year follow up report required
- Two (2) institutions Accredited with Stipulations
- Three (3) institutions Accredited with Major Stipulations

Ensuring Institutions Addressed Stipulations. All institutions with stipulations are expected to address any stipulations within one year. The COA may allow additional time if it believes the institution has made sufficient progress and additional time is warranted. In 2019-20, the COA removed the stipulations fully for nine (9) of the 10 institutions with stipulations from the previous year. The remaining institution made significant progress and was given additional time to address the remaining stipulations.

For institutions receiving major stipulations or probationary stipulations, a revisit is often required. In addition, the COA has more frequently required that the institution provide interim reports (quarterly or other) to ensure that the institution is making adequate progress towards addressing the most egregious issues. This was the case in 2019-20. This approach allows the institutions to check with COA to ensure they are moving in the direction that the COA expects, provides some additional leverage with their institutional leadership to ensure the resources or tools to enact change are provided, and allows the COA to provide some suggestions and guidance along the way. From an accountability perspective, it ensures that the institution does not wait a full year before implementing required improvements.

Technical Assistance Efforts. The Commission continued to provide technical assistance throughout 2019-20 for institutional personnel to provide information and support around changes in accreditation processes. 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 about the accreditation system or standards implementation at a variety of stakeholder meetings and conferences throughout the year. A partial listing of these include: the California Induction Conference, the Credential Counselor and Analysts of California Conference (CCAC), the California Council on Teacher Education (CCTE), the Special Education Administrators of County Offices, the Advisory Commission on Special Education at CDE, the statewide Special Education Local Planning Area (SELPA) director's meeting, the California Professors of Special Education (CAPSE), the Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR), the California Council of Academic Programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders (CAPCSD), the California Association of Private Special Education Schools, and the California Association of Professors of Education Administration (CAPEA).

In addition, staff continues to provide critical technical assistance to institutions preparing for site visits. This includes:

- A year out phone call/video conference or in person meeting with key accreditation staff at the institution.
- A minimum of a monthly phone call/video conference with the institution to support them as they prepare final documentation or respond to reviewers' feedback.
- A two month out pre-visit, usually held in person, to ensure that all logistics are scheduled to be handled appropriately and necessary evidence will be available to the team when it arrives.

Technical Assistance for Institutions Preparing for 2019-20 Site Visits (34 Institutions)

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees
Year-Out Pre-visit	Spring 2019 – Summer 2019	Consultant and institution representatives
Monthly Phone/Zoom Conferences	Began Summer 2019, continuing until visit	Consultant and institution representatives
2 Month Out Pre-visit	2 months before each site visit	Consultant, Site Visit Team Lead, and institution representatives

Technical Assistance for Institutions Preparing for Program Review and Common Standards Submissions

Commission staff also held technical assistance sessions for institutions that were preparing to submit for their Common Standards and Program Review documentation. Staff reviewed the required exhibits and answered questions from the institutional representatives.

Activity	Number, Date and/or Location
Preparation for Institutions Submitting Program Review and Common Standards Review	Common Standards Webinar – November 2019

Technical Assistance for the Accreditation Data System (ADS)

Given that the Accreditation Data System was newly implemented in 2019-20, significant technical assistance was needed to ensure that program sponsors understood how to access, change, and upload data to the system as well as how to respond to some of the requirements for the data in unique situations. As a result, the PSD staff instituted a series of office hours in which questions could be asked by institutions. These office hours proved to be instrumental in ensuring that the 2018-19 data was submitted within the timeframe allotted. Because of the success, office hours were instituted again for the current 2019-20 submission period.

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location
ADS Weekly Office Hours (1-2 hours/week)	February 10, 2020 to June 30, 2020 (19 sessions) through videoconferencing

Training Activities for the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR)

The accreditation system is reliant upon a cadre of volunteer educators and educator preparers. Training of these volunteers to serve as reviewers for all of the components of accreditation is essential to the success of the system. The BIR site visit training was entirely redesigned in 2018-19 to align to the new system.

Activity	Number, Date and/or Location
BIR Site Visit Training	August 15-16, 2019 September 12-13, 2019 October 10 and December 13, 2019 June 16-17, 2020
BIR Team Lead Training and Review	August 28, 2019 September 19, 2019 October 9, 2019
Common Standards Reviewer Training and Review	Seven (7) Common Standards Training and Review Sessions between March and June 11, 2020 (Various locations)
Program Review Training and Review	15 Program Review Sessions between October 30, 2019 and March 16, 2020 (Various locations)

Technical Assistance Provided to Institutions Seeking Initial Approval

Attending Accreditation 101, an informational session for entities that are interested in seeking initial institutional approval, is the first requirement of the multi-step Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) process. Institutions must come with a team of individuals including their partner organizations.

Date	Number of Institutions	Types of Institution	Attendees
August 9, 2019	1 institution	1 LEA	5 attendees
December 13, 2019	6 institutions	1 IHE and 5 LEAs	31 attendees
June 30, 2020	4 institutions	1 IHEs and 3 LEAs	19 attendees

Technical Assistance and Guidance for COVID-19

The Professional Services Division continues to provide updates and guidance of actions taken due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This information is posted on the Commission's [COVID-19 webpage](#).

Presentation	Date
Teacher Preparation Program Update based on Executive Order N-66-20	6/8/2020
Administrator Preparation Program Update based on Executive Order N-66-20.	6/5/2020
Executive Order N-66-20	6/1/2020
Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist	5/4/2020
CalTPA (Preliminary Multiple Subject & Single Subject)	4/28/2020
Teacher Induction	4/30/2020

Presentation	Date
CalAPA (Preliminary Administrative Services)	4/29/2020
Administrator Induction	5/1/2020
Pupil Personnel Services and Speech-Language Pathology	5/4/2020
Employers	5/6/2020

Other Related Activities

The Professional Services Division maintains numerous email accounts to ensure that specific, accreditation-related questions are answered quickly and accurately. The following are a list of some of the accreditation related email tools which allow staff to provide ongoing daily, direct technical assistance to institutional and program personnel as questions arise.

Technical Assistance for Individual Institutions. Staff fields numerous questions daily from institutions seeking input on changes they are considering making to their programs, revisions to the standards, particular candidate issues, and a host of other topics. In addition, from time to time, Commission staff travel to institutions with particular challenges (such as one that experiences a large turnover in program or institutional leadership) who need some additional guidance and direction about accreditation and program implementation. This effort is intended to address challenges or resolve issues in a more proactive manner for the benefit of the candidates in these programs. In addition to individual staff emails, the following email addresses are maintained and monitored daily to provide assistance to the field in matters related to the accreditation process:

- Cohort Consultant Email (i.e. PSDRed@ctc.ca.gov)
- Accreditation email (accreditation@ctc.ca.gov) (General accreditation emails)
- Program Review Email (ProgramReview@ctc.ca.gov)
- Common Standards Email (Commonstandardsreview@ctc.ca.gov)
- Annual Accreditation Data System (ADS@ctc.ca.gov)
- Initial Institutional Approval (IJA@ctc.ca.gov)
- Initial Program Approval (IPR@ctc.ca.gov)
- Accreditation Data System (ADS-Support@ctc.ca.gov)

Accreditation Handbook Revisions. The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. In 2018-19, the accreditation system was in full implementation. In these early years of implementation, adjustments were made to some processes to make them more effective and or efficient. As a result, it is necessary to ensure that these refinements are appropriately reflected in the *Accreditation Handbook*. This work continues in 2020-21.

Receive Regular Updates on Commission Activities Related to Accreditation and Provide Commission with Advice on Issues Related to Accreditation. During 2019-20 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 COA. With the efforts to streamline and strengthen accreditation, this function continues to be critically important in 2020-21.

Technical Assistance for Programs Related to the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) and the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)

Support Event	Dates
Office Hours, hosted by the PA Team and ES	CalTPA: Weekly Thurs. 10:00 – 11:00 CalAPA: Weekly Thurs. 11:00 - noon
Virtual Think Tanks	CalTPA: 9 monthly sessions CalAPA: 9 monthly sessions
Lead Assessor Weekly Meetings	CalTPA: Weekly Tues. 3:00-4:00 (Started March 31 st) CalAPA: Weekly Wed. 3:00-4:00 (Started April 1 st)
Coordinator Meetings (Webinar)	CalTPA: March/April and May CalAPA: March and June 3
“Deep Dive” Webinars into Specific PA Cycles	CalTPA: 2 sessions (recorded & posted) CalAPA: 2 sessions (recorded & posted)
Induction Conference (attended & presented)	CalTPA and CalAPA December 2-4, 2019 (attended and presented)
New Assessor Training	CalTPA—4 sessions were held (North and South venues) CalAPA— 12 sessions (2 per cycle held)
Returning Assessor Training	CalTPA—10 sessions were held (North and South venues) CalAPA— 6 sessions held across the state, 2 for each of the three cycles
Faculty Trainings	CalTPA— 4 sessions held across the state CalAPA— 4 sessions held across the state
Conference Attendance	AACTE—February (attended and presented CalTPA) NASDTEC—January 2020 (attended & presented CalAPA) AERA--CalAPA paper accepted, but conference cancelled CAPEA fall 2019 (attended and presented CalAPA) CCAC fall 2019 (attended and presented CalTPA & CalAPA) Cal Council -- fall 2019 (attended and presented CalTPA and CalAPA) Wallace Foundation University Principal Preparation Initiative (UPPI) meeting—winter 2019 (attended and presented CalAPA) CUE Conferences Spring 2019, Fall 2019, Spring 2020 (attended and presented CalTPA online)
Results Analyzer Presentations to CTC Staff	James Santiago & Mary Murray Autry of Evaluation Services presented February to PSD staff

Support Event	Dates
Ed Specialist CalTPA Design Team Meetings	Monthly, February-June 2020
CTC-CDE Joint Informational Meeting	January 2020 (CalAPA)
ELD Meeting for CalTPA with CDE	January 2020 (CalTPA)
Reading of Grant Proposals CSLA-21 (CDE project)	March 2020 (CalAPA)
Bilingual Advisory Meetings	CalTPA--March-June 2020
Response to COVID-19 Webinars	CalTPA--6 sessions, March-May CalAPA—6 sessions, March-May
Online Learning/Teaching Support Seminars (response to COVID-19)	CalTPA and CalAPA --April-June 2020 (14 sessions)

Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards

Review and Take Action to Grant Initial Approval of New Program Sponsors. During 2019-20, the Commission’s new Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) 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 were substantially revised in recent years. The IIA process now includes five stages:

- Stage I – Prerequisites;
- Stage II – Eligibility Requirements;
- Stage III – Common Standards, Preconditions, and Provisional Approval
- Stage IV – Program Approval; and
- Stage V – Full Approval.

Accreditation 101 sessions (Stage I) for institutions exploring whether to seek IIA to offer an educator preparation program continued to be held throughout 2019-20. As anticipated, fewer institutions participated in Accreditation 101 due to the fact that many did so in the previous years. Accreditation 101 was offered three times in 2019-20.

In 2019-20 nine (9) institutions were brought to the Commission for consideration for approval under one or more of the multistep initial institutional approval processes. These institutions are listed in Section II of this report. Many other entities were engaged in the submission and review process.

Review and Take Action to Grant Initial Program Approval for New Credential Programs. This is also one of the major ongoing tasks of the COA. The COA has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs from Commission-approved institutions. Programs are only granted initial approval when reviewers have determined that

all Commission standards are met and after the COA acts to approve. This review process continued in 2019-20. Because institutions may submit program proposals any time throughout the year, the Commission attempts to find reviewers who are 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 from their own schedule, at their homes or offices, working via technology with their initial program review partner. A total of 17 new programs were approved by the COA in 2019-20. The list of these new programs is included in Section II of this report. Staff is currently reviewing ways in which to streamline this process as it is challenging to find a sufficient number of reviewers who are willing to do this work.

Establish New COA Review Process for Initial Program Approval for Institutions Recently Approved for Provisional Approval by the Commission. In 2018-19, the COA began using a new program approval process for institutions that were recently granted provisional approval by the Commission. After the reviewers had determined that all standards for a new program proposal from a provisionally approved institution were met, all of the documentation was provided to the COA for its review prior to the proposed program's approval. Additionally, personnel from the institution were invited to attend the COA meeting to respond to questions about the proposed program. In the past, any documentation on any program proposal was available to the members of COA at their request; however, this new process provides the COA with more information about the program proposal than was made routinely available in the past.

Review of Preconditions. The Commission's new accreditation system requires that responses to preconditions be submitted and reviewed in Years 1 and 4 of the 7-year cycle. For February 2020, institutions in both the Green and the Violet cohorts were required to submit evidence of meeting all relevant preconditions. These two cohorts represent 64 institutions offering 257 different programs. For these two particular groups of institutions, this resulted in a staff review of evidence for 768 general preconditions and 1,247 program specific preconditions for a total of 2,015 preconditions. While this is a significant undertaking, staff review of the information provided helps ensure that programs are complying with state statutes, regulations, and Commission policy and allows the accreditation teams to focus on review of the standards.

Because the timeliness of feedback on preconditions was not optimal in previous years, staff instituted a number of changes to the process over the past two years. While most consultants have responsibility for reviewing the submitted preconditions responses, a single staff member has been designated the responsibility of shepherding the submission process, making follow-through clearer to all staff. In addition, to assist institutions in avoiding submitting unnecessary or inapplicable evidence or responses, staff developed [Evidence Guidance documents](#) to clarify what type of documentation would satisfy the requirements. Staff continues to develop these Evidence Guidance documents for all credential areas. Under the new precondition submission process, staff has been able to identify potential issues early and to begin to work with the institution to address them in a timely manner.

Program Review Process. In 2016-17, the new Program Review process was developed and finalized. Beginning in fall 2017, the Commission transitioned to using this new streamlined Program Review process of submitting very specific evidence with limited narratives describing how the institution was implementing the standards in its programs during the fall of Year 5 of the accreditation cycle. This process was continued for a third year in fall 2019 with the Red cohort.

The feedback from reviewers and institutions alike regarding the revised accreditation system has continued to be 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 guesswork of knowing what is needed and limited the temptation to provide significantly more descriptive information than what is required. Feedback is provided to the institutions in a much timelier manner. One concern that some institutions have expressed is the complexity of developing the course matrix. The course matrix identifies in which courses the TPEs are introduced, practiced and assessed and was the primary means by which the Commission was able to replace the many long narratives in the previous system. Without a matrix linked to syllabi, reviewers will not be able to understand where in the program the TPEs and Commission standards are embedded. Staff will consider ways in which to provide the institutions with assistance in preparing the matrix.

Common Standards Review Process. Commission staff developed, and the COA approved, a new streamlined approach to Common Standards review. As with the new approach to Program Review, Common Standards submissions require prescribed documentation and information as well as limited, but focused, narrative. The new Common Standards review process was implemented for the first time in early 2018 informing site visits that took place in fall 2018 and spring 2019. Like the Program Review process, reviewers continue to express 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 eight and 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 well in advance of the site visit. Keeping the consistency in the reviewer from Common Standards and Program Review through the site visits has helped ensure that questions and potential issues are followed up appropriately at the site visit.

Development and Implementation of the Annual Data System. The development of an annual data system was one of the key components to the Strengthening and Streamlining project. The contractor's work in building the infrastructure of the system, which was intended to allow institutions to provide consistent data about their programs, candidates,

and outcomes was completed in June 2017. Commission staff piloted the system in 2017-18 and it was more fully implemented in 2018-19. The data system is multi-pronged and multi-purposed. Various aspects of the system and the data are being used by institutions, the Commission and its staff, and accreditation teams. In addition, where appropriate, some of the data interfaces with both the public-facing data dashboards and those dashboards which are designed for institutions, Commission staff, and site visit review teams.

Technical Assistance was provided to institutions by Commission staff from February 2020 to June 2020. Staff conducted Accreditation Data System (ADS) office hours on a weekly basis via videoconferencing 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. Office hour dates and times were listed on the [Accreditation Technical Assistance](#) page and provided in the weekly PSD e-News. Staff continuously worked with and provided support to institutions in the use of the ADS. Updates were shared at prior COA 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 an important component to ensuring the inclusion of outcomes in the accreditation system. In 2019-20, surveys continued to play an increasing role in accreditation. Surveys from program completers in Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services, and Teacher Induction programs continued to be implemented and integrated into the online credential application process. Completers may elect to not respond to the survey, yet the response rate remains high. The response rate for the surveys are 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 is open from September 1 to 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 to the Commission on the total number of master teachers that program has that year. The Employer Survey is open in the fall—October to December—and asks employers to provide feedback on an institution's programs if the employer has hired at least two (2) completers from that program in the past three (3) years. More information on the Surveys can be found on this [webpage](#).

New in 2019 was the implementation of the "Other Educators Survey" to capture survey information from program completers for the remaining credential areas not included in teaching or administrator preparation programs. This includes those programs such as Pupil Personnel Services, School Nurse, Teacher Librarian, Speech Language Pathology and Agriculture Specialist, and the Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist credential.

Because the response rate was sufficiently high for the program completer surveys, the results were used by accreditation teams in 2019-20. All accreditation site visit teams were instructed to use the completer surveys to develop questions for 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 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 how to use the results from the various surveys.

Develop and Implement a New Team Lead Training. In fall 2019, the Commission staff held three Team Lead training sessions for those individuals who would be leading site visit teams in 2019-20. 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 updated and repeated in the summer and fall of 2019 for team leads for the Orange Cohort site visits, which began in fall 2019. These trainings were very successful and well attended.

Purpose 4. Fostering Program Improvement

Noting Programs Out of Compliance with Accreditation Timelines. 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 2019-20 at each COA meeting. These included institutions that were late in submitting required preconditions, Common Standards Review, Program Review, Accreditation Fees, 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.

Continued 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.

Continued Partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and Efforts to Collaborate with Other National Accrediting Bodies. A Partnership Agreement between the Commission and CAEP was signed by both parties in May 2015. During 2019-20, 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. 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. The first California institution to undergo a joint Commission/CAEP site visit took place in spring 2019.

Also in 2019-20, the Commission continued discussions with a new national accrediting body, the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP). National accreditation is optional in California and institutions may choose to seek accreditation from any national accrediting body it wishes. Because some institutions in California have expressed an interest in this new accrediting body as an alternative to CAEP, staff has been monitoring the development of this new accrediting body and its standards and requirements. Commission staff continues to work on a draft agreement and, if any institution in California informs the Commission that it will seek AAQEP accreditation, the Commission can also choose to determine the necessary protocols for working formally with this entity on accreditation visits.

Board of Institutional Reviewer's (BIR) Training. Following the substantial revisions to the accreditation system's processes and procedures and the incorporation of outcomes data such as survey results, it became clear that the existing training for both new and veteran members of the BIR needed significant revision. Under the previous BIR training, most of the training took place face-to-face over a period of three to four days and focused significant attention on the review of the voluminous documentation required under the previous accreditation system.

The revised BIR training, first implemented in August 2018, is divided into two major components: 1) Program Review or Common Standards Review, and 2) Site Visit Training. In the Program Review and Common Standards Review component, the reviewers are trained to review and analyze a prescribed set of evidence as part of an institution's/program's required submission and determine, primarily on the basis of the evidence, whether the standards appear to be preliminarily aligned.

Once individuals have completed either the Program Review or Common Standards training and served as a reviewer, they are invited to attend the two-day face-to-face site visit training. The site visit training focuses on the skills and abilities necessary to serve on a site visit team. These include, but are not limited to, understanding the documentation submitted prior to the site visit (Preconditions, Program Review, and Common Standards); the role and importance of standards; conflict of interest, bias, 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 the site visit; decision making for reaching standard findings and making accreditation recommendations; and report writing.

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 candidates seeking a teaching credential 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 completion of a Commission-approved Elementary Subject Matter (ESM) program to count as demonstration of subject matter competence for the Multiple Subject or the Education Specialist credential. This was a reversal of years under the No Child Left Behind Act in which only passage of the CSET for the Multiple Subject or Education Specialist 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 and Education Specialist candidates, the responsibility to review and approve these programs became a priority for the Commission.

In 2019-20, five new subject matter programs were approved by the Commission after review by subject matter experts that determined the programs to be in alignment with the subject matter program standards. Three of these were ESM programs and two were Single Subject matter programs. These are listed in Section II of this report.

General Operations

In addition to the aforementioned 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 2019-20 Accreditation Activities

This section of the report provides more detailed information about results of the 2019-20 Work Plan with a focus on the outcome of the accreditation activities.

Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Educator Preparation Programs

In 2019-20, accreditation site visits were scheduled at 34 institutions in the Orange Cohort. The COVID-19 pandemic caused approximately half of these visits to be completed via technology with three visits postponed until the fall of 2020. 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 information shared with the COA by program leadership and the team lead at a COA meeting. Teams reviewed documentation, interviewed a variety of constituencies (candidates, program completers, faculty, employers, administration, supervisors, etc.), deliberated, came to consensus on findings for all Common Standards, program standards, and made an accreditation recommendation to the COA. Commission consultants, team leads, and institutional representatives attended COA meetings to present the results of the site visit report and respond to questions. Upon review and discussion of the site visit reports, the COA has the authority to accept or modify 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 2019-20:

Accreditation Status for Institutions with Site Visits in 2019-20 (31)

Program Sponsor	Accreditation Decision
Academy of Art University	Accreditation
Alhambra Unified School District	Accreditation
Anaheim Union High School District	<i>Rescheduled due to COVID-19 (October 26-28, 2020)</i>
Aspire Berkley Maynard Academy	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)	Accreditation
California Baptist University	Accreditation with Stipulations
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo	Accreditation
California State University, Sacramento	Accreditation
CalState TEACH	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
Chapman University	Accreditation
Conejo Valley Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations
El Rancho Unified School District	Accreditation
Fontana Unified School District	Accreditation
Fremont Unified School District	Accreditation
Hayward Unified School District	<i>Rescheduled due to COVID-19 (September 28-30, 2020)</i>

Program Sponsor	Accreditation Decision
Keppel Union School District	Accreditation
Kings County Office of Education	Accreditation
Merced Union High School District	Accreditation
Milpitas Unified School District	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Modesto City Schools	Accreditation
Paramount Unified School District	Accreditation
Rialto Unified School District	Accreditation
San Jose State University	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
Santa Barbara County Education Office	Accreditation
School for Integrated Academics and Technology (SIA Tech)	<i>Rescheduled due to COVID-19 (September 21-23, 2020)</i>
St. Mary's College of California	Accreditation
Sweetwater Union High School District	Accreditation
The Master's University	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
Turlock Unified School District (Focused SV)	Accreditation
University of California, Santa Barbara	Accreditation
University of La Verne	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
University of Phoenix	Accreditation
University of the Pacific	Accreditation
West Contra Costa Unified School District	Accreditation

Institutions Meeting All Standards

The institutions listed in the table below hosted an accreditation site visit in 2019-20 which resulted in determining that all Common Standards and all Program Standards for all programs offered by the institution had been met. Of the 31 site visits, 15 institutions (48 percent) with site visits in 2019-20 met all standards applicable for the programs they offer.

Institutions Receiving Accreditation with All Common and Program Standards Met, 2019-20

Program Sponsor (15)	Number of Educator Programs Offered by the Institution
Alhambra Unified School District	1
Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)	1
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo	6
Chapman University	8
El Rancho Unified School District	1
Fontana Unified School District	1
Fremont Unified School District	1
Keppel Union School District	1
Kings County Office of Education	2

Program Sponsor (15)	Number of Educator Programs Offered by the Institution
Merced Union High School District	1
Modesto City Schools	1
Rialto Unified School District	1
Santa Barbara County Education Office	3
Turlock Unified School District (Provisional Focused SV)	1
West Contra Costa Unified School District	1

Summary of Findings on Common Standards

A review of the year’s site visit results serves as information for the COA and staff in determining needs for technical assistance meetings to guide institutions as they prepare for site visits. The information regarding findings using the Common Standards for 2019-20 site visits are presented in the following table.

Findings in the Common Standards¹ 2019-20 Accreditation Site Visits (31 institutions)

Common Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	28	2	1
2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	28	3	0
3: Study, Fieldwork, and Clinical Practice	27	3	1
4: Continuous Improvement	24	5	2
5: Program Impact	29	1	1

¹The language of the Common Standards may be found at [Common Standards](#)

Summary Findings on Program Standards

Analysis of Program Standards Decisions

The table below indicates the number of institutions in which all program standards were met for the program listed and the number of institutions that offer that program.

All Program Standards Found to be Met During 2019-20 Site Visits

Programs	# of Institutions with All Program Standards Met	Total # of Institutions that Offer the Listed Program	Percentage of Programs where All Standards were Met
Adaptive Physical Education Added Authorization	0	1	0%
Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization	1	1	100%
Clear Administrative Services	4	4	100%
Education Specialist: Added Authorization Early Childhood Special Education	2	3	66.7%
Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education, w/Intern	1	2	50%
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, w/intern	7	9	78%
Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe, w/Intern	4	6	67%
Preliminary Administrative Services, w/Intern	6	7	86%
Preliminary Multiple Subject, w/intern	7	11	64%
Preliminary Single Subject, w/intern	7	12	58%
Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance	1	1	100%
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling, w/intern	4	6	67%
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology, w/intern	6	7	86%
Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work	2	2	100%
School Nurse	3	3	100%
Specialist Teaching: Agriculture Specialist Instruction	1	1	100%
Specialist Teaching: Bilingual Authorization	4	4	100%
Specialist Teaching: California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)	1	2	50%
Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	2	2	100%
Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential	2	2	100%
Speech Language Pathology: Language, Speech and Hearing	5	5	100%
Speech Language Pathology: Special Class Authorization	1	1	100%
Teacher Induction	14	19	74%
Teacher Librarian	1	1	100%

Program Standards that are Not Met or Met With Concerns

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 were *Not Met* or were *Met with Concerns* guides the COA and staff in determining what additional technical assistance might be helpful to the field. The full text of all credential program standards adopted by the Commission may be found at: [Commission Adopted Credential Program Standards](#).

Adaptive Physical Education Added Authorization (1 Site Visit)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
8: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options	1	0

Education Specialist: Added Authorization Early Childhood Special Education (1 Site Visit)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Characteristics of Infants, Toddlers and Preschoolers with IFSP and IEPs–	1	0
2: Role of the Family in Early Childhood Special Education	1	0
3: Assessment and Intervention/Instructional Strategies: Birth through Pre-Kindergarten	1	0
4: Experience in Early Childhood Special Education Programs	1	0

Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education w/Intern (1 Site Visit)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
15: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options:	1	0

Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate w/Intern (2 Site Visit)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
4: Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships	1	0
7: Transition and Transitional Planning	1	0
8: Participating in IFSP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning	1	0
15: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options:	1	0

Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe w/Intern (2 Site Visit)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
4: Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships	1	0
7: Transition and Transitional Planning	1	0
8: Participating in IFSP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning	2	0
15: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options:	1	0

Preliminary Administrative Services, w/Intern Standards (1 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Design and Rationale	1	0

Preliminary Administrative Services, w/Intern Standards (1 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
2: Collaboration, Communication and Coordination	1	0
3: Development of Professional Leadership Perspectives	1	0
4: Equity, Diversity and Access	1	0
5: Role of Schooling in a Democratic Society	1	0
6: Preparing Candidates to Master the Administrator Performance Expectations	1	0
7: Nature of Field Experiences	1	0
8: Guidance, Assistance and Feedback	1	0
9: Assessment of Candidate Performance	1	0

Preliminary Multiple Subject w/Intern Standards (4 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
3: Clinical Practice	2	0
5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment	1	9
6: Induction Individual Development Plan	1	0

Preliminary Single Subject w/Intern Standards (5 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)	1	0
3: Clinical Practice	3	0
5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment	1	0

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling, w/Intern Standards (2 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
13: Collaboration and Coordination of Pupil Support Systems	1	0
19: Academic Development	1	0
31: Field Experience	1	0

Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology, w/Intern Standards (1 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
13: Collaboration and Coordination of Pupil Support Systems	1	0
25: Practica	1	0

Specialist Teaching: California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) (1 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Philosophy, Design, and Coordination	1	0

Teacher Induction Standards (6 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System	3	1
5: Determining Candidate Competence for the Clear Credential Recommendation	1	1
6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services	3	1

Institutions in 7th Year Follow Up

In 2019-20, 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.

In 2019-20, the COA closely monitored ten institutions that had stipulations placed on them in 2018-19 as a result of their accreditation site visit. It should be noted that nine of the ten institutions had sufficiently addressed all identified issues such that the COA removed the stipulations in 2019-20 and their status was changed to Accreditation. The other institution made significant progress in addressing the issues identified by the accreditation site visit team and the COA. In that case, a significant number of stipulations were removed, and their accreditation status was upgraded from Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations to Accreditation with Stipulations. The COA continues to monitor this institution in 2020-21.

Action taken in 2019-20 on Institutions with Stipulations from Prior Year Site Visits

Institutions	2018-2019 Decision	2019-2020 COA Decision
Anaheim Elementary School District	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation – February 2020
Fremont Union High School District	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation – October 2019
Lodi Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation – May 2020
Montebello Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation – June 2020
Napa County Office of Education	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation – March 2020
Saddleback Valley USD	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation – June 2020
Santa Clara University	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation – June 2020
Sonoma County Office of Education	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations	Accreditation with Stipulations – June 2020
South San Francisco Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation – June 2020

Institutions	2018-2019 Decision	2019-2020 COA Decision
Summit Preparatory Charter High School	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation – June 2020

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, in Stage IV, for its consideration and action. The following institutions were brought before the Commission for Initial Institutional Approval. The tables below identify at which stage the institution appeared before the Commission and the date of the Commission meeting at which the approval was granted.

Initial Institutional Approval—Eligibility Granted (Stage III)

Institution	Date
Alder Graduate School of Education	08/01/19
Folsom Cordova Unified School District	08/01/19
Lake County Office of Education	08/01/19
Los Angeles Pacific University	09/01/19
New York University Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development	01/01/20
San Benito County Office of Education	01/01/20
Yuba City Unified School District	01/01/20
Newhall School District	04/01/20
San Mateo Union High School District	04/01/20

Initial Institutional Approval—Provisionally Approved (Stage IV)

Institution	Date
Alameda County Office of Education	09/01/19
Stella Middle Charter Academy	11/01/19
Alder Graduate School of Education	01/01/20

Initial Approval of New Credential Programs at Provisionally Approved Institutions (IIA-IPR)

Provisionally-approved institutions submit documentation that indicates how the proposed program will meet each of the Commission-adopted program standards along with supporting evidence to verify alignment with the standards. A team of educators who have expertise in the program area, and are trained for the review process, read the institution’s submission, and consult with one another to determine whether standards are met. If the reviewers jointly agree that standards are met, it is so noted. If the review team agrees that standards are not met, reviewers request additional information.

This feedback is shared with the institution by Commission staff. The institution addresses any concerns and resubmits documentation until the program is found to be aligned with all standards. 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 2019-20 for new institutions in IIA are listed in the tables below.

New Educator Preparation Programs Sponsored by Provisionally Approved Institutions (5)

Program Sponsor	Credential Program
Alameda County Office of Education	Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education
Alder Graduate School of Education	Preliminary Multiple Subject
Alder Graduate School of Education	Preliminary Single Subject
Alder Graduate School of Education	Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate
Stella Middle Charter Academy	Teacher Induction

The Committee on Accreditation granted Initial Program Approval for existing Commission approved program sponsors to the following preparation programs:

New Educator Preparation Programs Approved by COA at Existing Commission Approved Program Sponsors (17)

Program Sponsor	Credential Program
Azusa Pacific University	Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance
Azusa Pacific University	Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work
California State University, Sacramento	Education Specialist Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education
California State University, San Bernardino	Designated Subjects: Adult Education
Concordia University Irvine	Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Intern
Fresno County Superintendent of Schools	Designated Subjects Career Technical Education
Los Angeles Unified School District	Reading and Literacy Added Authorization
Merced County Office of Education	Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Intern
Merced County Office of Education	Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Intern
Mills College	Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Intern
San Diego County Office of Education	Preliminary Education Specialist Early Childhood Special Education Intern

Program Sponsor	Credential Program
San Diego County Office of Education	Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Intern
San Diego County Office of Education	Preliminary Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Intern
Santa Clara County Office of Education	Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Intern
Visalia Unified School District	Clear Administrative Services Induction
Walnut Valley Unified School District	Clear Administrative Services Credential
William Jessup University	Preliminary Administrative Services

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 five programs approved by the Commission in 2019-20 are included in the table below.

New Subject Matter Programs (5)

Institutions	Programs
Dominican University of California	Elementary Subject Matter
California Baptist University	Single Subject Matter - Art
California State University, Bakersfield	Elementary Subject Matter
San Diego State University	Single Subject Matter - Social Science
San Diego State 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 the Administrator of Accreditation. The following 12 programs became inactive in 2019-20.

Programs Entering Inactive Status (12)

Institution	Programs
Azusa Pacific University (2)	Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, with Intern Clear Administrative Services Credential
California Baptist University (1)	Preliminary Administrative Services
California State University, Long Beach (1)	Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
California State University, Los Angeles (1)	Clear Administrative Services

Institution	Programs
Hacienda La Puente Unified School District (1)	Teacher Induction
San Jose State University (1)	Teacher Induction
University of California, Berkeley (1)	California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)
University of Southern California (3)	Multiple Subject Intern Single Subject Intern Teacher Induction
University of the Pacific (1)	Preliminary Administrative Services

Reactivation of an 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 and/or the program standards under which the program was approved have been modified, the institution must address the updated preconditions and/or standards before the program may be reactivated. During 2019-20, four programs previously deemed inactive requested and received reactivation and are, once again, fully approved programs operating in California.

Reactivation Requests (4)

Institution	Programs
California State University, Northridge	Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Added Authorization
United States University	Preliminary Multiple Subject Preliminary Single Subject Bilingual Authorization: Spanish

Transition of Professional Preparation Programs to New Standards

Although new standards were recently adopted by the Commission for both the Education Specialist credential and the Pupil Personnel Services credential, programs are not yet formally transitioning to the new standards. This work will be reflected in future Annual Reports.

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 from withdrawal before a new program proposal will be accepted.

Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (30)

Institution	Programs
California Lutheran University (2)	Education Specialist: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders Clear General Education (MS/SS) Induction
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (1)	Education Specialist: Added Authorization – Autism Spectrum Disorder
California State University, Dominguez Hills (1)	Added Authorization: Education Specialist: Resource Specialist
California State University, Fresno (1)	Teacher Induction
California State University, Long Beach (2)	School Nurse Reading and Literacy Specialist
California State University, Los Angeles (2)	Speech Language Pathology: Special Class Authorization Education Specialist: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders
California State University, San Marcos (1)	Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
Claremont Graduate University (1)	Education Specialist: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders
Dos Palos Oro Loma Joint USD (1)	Teacher Induction
El Dorado County Office of Education (2)	Administrative Services Clear Education Specialist: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders
La Mesa-Spring Valley School District (1)	Teacher Induction
Mt. Diablo Unified School District (4)	Preliminary Administrative Services Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Intern Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern Preliminary Single Subject Intern
Orange County Department of Education (1)	Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
Pepperdine University (1)	Preliminary Administrative Services
San Francisco State University (2)	Education Specialist: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders Education Specialist: Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education
Selma Unified School District (2)	Preliminary Administrative Services Teacher Induction
Sonoma State University (1)	Teacher Induction

Institution	Programs
University of California, Los Angeles (3)	Education Specialist: Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance Education Specialist: Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Intern
University of California, Riverside (1)	Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education

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 (3)

Institution	Effective Date
Dos Palos Oro Loma Joint USD	Closed Educator Preparation in August 2019
La Mesa-Spring Valley School District	Closed Educator Preparation in June 2020
Selma Unified School District	Closed Educator Preparation in June 2020

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, and include general preconditions (institutional level) and program-specific preconditions for each approved program. During 2019-20, institutions in two cohorts (Green and Violet) submitted preconditions for review. Preconditions for only two cohorts of institutions will be reviewed each year. A total of 64 institutions submitted preconditions resulting in 768 general precondition responses and 1,247 program specific precondition responses reviewed after the submission date of March 15, 2020. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the submission date was extended to May 15, 2020 and staff worked with any institution that needed an additional extension. The list below includes the names of institutions that submitted preconditions during this reporting period.

Preconditions – Green Cohort Institutions

Antioch Unified School District	Garden Grove Unified School District
Bakersfield City School District	Hacienda La Puente Unified School District
California Lutheran University	Humphreys University
California State University, Channel Islands	La Mesa-Spring Valley School District
California State University, East Bay	Los Angeles County Office of Education
California State University, San Bernardino	Madera County Superintendent of Schools
Evergreen School District	Merced County Office of Education
Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District	Mills College
Fresno County Superintendent of Schools	Montebello Unified School District

Newark Unified School District
Notre Dame de Namur University
San Bernardino City Unified School District
San Diego County Office of Education
San Juan Unified School District
San Mateo - Foster City School District

Santa Ana Unified School District
Saugus Union School District
Simpson University
Tulare County Office of Education
Westmont College

Preconditions – Violet Cohort Institutions

Antelope Valley Union High School District
Antioch University
Butte County Office of Education
California State University, Fresno
California State University, Monterey Bay
Claremont Graduate University
Compton Unified School District
Cupertino Union School District
El Dorado County Office of Education
Escondido Union High School District
Hebrew Union College
Hope International University
Imperial County Office of Education
Irvine Unified School District
Kern County Superintendent of Schools
La Sierra University
Los Banos Unified School District
Murrieta Valley Unified School District
National University

New Haven Unified School District
Pacific Oaks College
Palo Alto Unified School District
Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District
Sacramento City Unified School District
San Francisco State University
San Francisco Unified School District
Sanger Unified School District
Selma Unified School District
Sequoia Union High School District
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine
University of California, San Diego
University of Southern California
Washington Unified School District
William S. Hart Union High 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 2019-20, the 33 institutions of the Red Cohort identified in the table below responded to Common Standards and completed Program Review. As indicated in the table below, these 33 institutions offer a total of 143 programs. To provide some understanding of the scope of this work, each program is reviewed by two individuals. Reviewing 143 programs then required the effort of 210 reviewers matched by expertise and availability.

Red Cohort Program Review 2019-2020

The blank cells in the following table indicate that the institution does not offer that type of program.

Institution	Initial Teacher Prep*	Teacher Induction	Other Teacher Prep**	Prelim Admin	Clear Admin	Other Services***	Total
Arcadia USD		1					1
Burbank USD		1					1
Campbell Union SD		1					1
Chula Vista ESD		1					1
Concordia University	3	1		1		1	6
Contra Costa COE		1					1
CSU Dominguez Hills	5	1	2	1	1	2	12
CSU Los Angeles	7	1	6	1		5	20
Culver City USD		1					1
Davis Joint USD	3	1	1				5
Hanford ESD		1			1		2
King-Chavez Academy		1					1
Los Angeles USD	5	1	4		1		11
Manteca USD		1					1
Marin COE		1					1
Oakland USD		1					1
Orange USD		1			1		2
Pacific Union College	2						2
Pepperdine University	2						2
Placer COE	2	1		1	1		5
Pleasanton USD		1					1
Point Loma Nazarene University	4	1	8	1	1	1	16
Poway USD		1					1
REACH Institute (Bay Area School of Enterprise)	2	1		1	1		5
Redwood City USD		1					1
Riverside COE	2	1		1	1		5
Sonoma State University	4		3	1		1	9
Sutter County SOS		1	1		1		3
Tulare City SD		1					1
UC Berkeley	2		2	1	1	3	9
UC Los Angeles	2	1	2	1		2	8
UC Santa Cruz	2		1				3

Institution	Initial Teacher Prep*	Teacher Induction	Other Teacher Prep**	Prelim Admin	Clear Admin	Other Services ***	Total
University of San Diego	3					1	4
Total: 33	50	27	30	10	10	16	143

**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, Reading and Literacy Added Authorization, Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential*

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

Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2020-21

The work plan for the Commission and COA for 2020-21 is summarized in this section. The accreditation responsibilities continue in 2020-21 but not without the continuing and profound impact of the worldwide pandemic on education that is anticipated to continue throughout spring 2021. During this time in which candidate preparation has been interrupted by the pandemic, the Commission's priorities have first and foremost been focused on providing as much assistance as possible to move candidates forward, to work with institutions in addressing challenges in meeting standards, and to provide support where needed to ensure that completers are well prepared to enter the workforce, despite the difficulties presented by the limitations on in-person education in the state.

With this context in mind, the Commission moves forward with implementing its oversight responsibilities and with the accreditation system. Accreditation site visits for fall 2020 have begun taking place entirely virtually as will Program Review activities. Team Lead trainings and Board of Institutional Review training will also take place entirely through technology in fall 2020. The decision to conduct the remainder of the spring 2021 visits entirely via technology was made in late September 2020.

Having focused in 2020-21 on implementing many aspects of the new system, the primary objective of 2020-21 will be 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 2020-21, 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 COA meetings will continue to be held in public and all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley- Keene Open Meeting Act and, where necessary, with the Executive Order issued by Governor Newsom as a result of the pandemic which allows for public meetings to be held through technology. 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 COA meetings. The Commission's website will continue to be utilized fully to provide agenda items, notification of meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation. Meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

August 3, 2020	March 4-5, 2021* (likely to be changed)
October 29-30, 2020	May 6-7, 2021
January 28-29, 2021	June 21-22, 2021

The COA's agenda in 2020-21 includes a full schedule of site visits beginning in fall 2020 and continuing well into spring 2021. A hefty site visit year includes institutions in the Red cohort, institutions for which their site visit was postponed due to COVID-19, revisits of institutions

with stipulations from visits that took place in 2019-20, and institutions in provisional status seeking full accreditation. 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 2020-21, the PSD e-News, Program Sponsor Alerts, and any other appropriate and applicable communications platforms 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 December 2020. 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, and regulations proposed. Governor Newsom suspended all accreditation fees in 2020-2021 in order to alleviate some of the financial burden on institutions caused by the pandemic. Further, Commission staff will continue to work with the Office of Administrative Law to move forward the associated regulatory package to address 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.

Postponed Visits – Orange Cohort

As institutions quickly transitioned to distance learning in March 2020, most site visits were able to continue in a virtual setting. However, three institutions sought to postpone their accreditation visits until fall 2020, a request that was granted given the unusual circumstances. These three site visits for institutions in the Orange Cohort were completed by the end of October 2020.

Revisits – Orange Cohort

Three institutions with site visits that took place in 2019-2020 received stipulations that included a revisit. These revisits will take place in 2020-2021 and the COA will consider whether actions taken by the institution to address issues identified by site visit teams has been sufficient to warrant removal of the stipulations.

Regularly Scheduled Site Visits – Red Cohort

Beginning in fall 2020, the 33 institutions in the Red Cohort will undergo a site visit by a trained team of reviewers. This cohort will be the third to undergo accreditation site visits 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.

Site Visit for Provisional Approval

The Commission's current initial institutional approval process requires that institutions operate their approved program on a provisional basis for two to four years, as determined by the Commission. Information is gathered during this time and a focused site visit takes place in the final year of provisional approval. The Commission then acts to provide full accreditation upon a satisfactory focused visit that determines whether standards are being met. The first of these visits under this new process took place in Spring 2020 and four more will take place in Spring 2021.

Program Standards Review – Violet Cohort

Program Review submissions are required for the Violet Cohort by October 15, 2020. The Violet Cohort is comprised of 35 institutions offering numerous educator preparation programs that are currently in Year 5 of the seven-year accreditation cycle. These programs will be reviewed in the 2020-21 year through the Program Review process. As previously described, the Program Review 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 Violet Cohort. The vast majority of these review sessions are scheduled throughout November and December 2020 and early 2021 and will take place via technology, with two BIR members working together from their respective homes or offices in order to review the documents expeditiously. Once the review session has taken place and feedback from the reviewers is provided to the institutions, the programs must provide an addendum 60 days before the site visit which 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 have completed Part I of BIR training, with the site visit training being Part II of BIR training.

Common Standards Submission and Review – Violet Cohort

In February 2021, the 35 institutions that are in the Violet 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 serve as 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 the site visit.

Preconditions Submission – Yellow and Indigo Cohorts

In March 2021, the institutions in the Yellow and Indigo 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 2021. It is anticipated that staff will continue to 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.

Accreditation Framework Regulations. A major accomplishment in 2020 was the review and adoption of a revised *Accreditation Framework*. The Commission staff plans to review this document to determine what aspects of this Framework should be in regulations and will move forward with the promulgation of these regulations.

Review and Revise the [Accreditation Handbook](#). The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. The COA had revised the *Accreditation Handbook in 2016* to ensure that any new or changed aspects of the accreditation system were reflected in this document. However, given that the revised Accreditation Framework has been recently adopted and refinements to the system have been implemented in recent years, a thorough review of the Accreditation Handbook is necessary.

Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards

Review and Take Action to Grant Initial Approval of New Program Sponsors (Initial Institutional Approval). Approximately two to four Accreditation 101 sessions will be held in 2020-21 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.

The exact number of sessions will be determined by demand. Commission staff and BIR members will continue to review proposals for Initial Institutional Approval as they are received.

Additionally, the process for reviewing the institution for Initial Institutional Approval will continue. As indicated in Section II of this report, at this time there are over 20 institutions in various stages of the multi-step process. Four of these will require a site visit in spring 2021 as they are completing their provisional approval period. It is anticipated that there will be additional institutions seeking to begin the process throughout the year. At this time, there are an additional 4 institutions that have submitted a proposal to begin the process in Stage 1.

Review and Take Action to Grant Initial Program Approval for New Credential Programs. Initial Program Review (IPR) 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 2020-21. When possible, the Commission will bring reviewers together for dedicated review time.

The IPR process continues to be one of the most challenging aspects of the current system. For 2020-21, a revised process for new program proposals is implemented beginning in October. This process maintains the rigorous process for new program proposals while aiming to move proposals through the process in a timelier manner. This new process is in alignment with the process for preparing a Program Review submission. New program proposals will continue to be reviewed until a review team determines that all program standards have been aligned.

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, Survey Data, and Performance Assessment Data. The COA will continue to support the Commission's effort to implement and, where necessary, refine the annual survey data collection process. Continued implementation of the following surveys is planned for 2020-21:

- 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. Clear Administrative Services Completer Survey
- f. Teacher Induction Completer Survey

- g. Other Educator Survey
- h. Master Teacher Survey
- i. Employer Survey

Discussions with the COA, BIR, and team members about the appropriate use of that data in accreditation decisions will continue. In addition, significant work remains to be done around the annual data submission, particularly to clarify and define terms. 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.

Additionally, continued effort will be made to incorporate performance assessment data into the data dashboard that is used by the accreditation teams. Currently this data is provided to the team members and the institutions via the Commission staff in the form of a pdf. Staff is currently working on getting performance data incorporated into the dashboard so that all of the available Commission data is in one place for the team members during site visits and for all institutions to use for program improvement.

The Commission staff will focus efforts during 2020-21 on using these data to determine if they indicate any potential areas of concern either with an institution, a standard, or a requirement. Analyzing the data from both the surveys and, to some extent, the annual data submissions, 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 that is completed by site visit reviewers, team leads, and institutions to assess the accreditation system. This data will be collected over the course of the year, with a review of the data taking place in summer/fall 2021. Improvements will be discussed and incorporated into the revised accreditation system.

Continue Partnership with the National and Professional Accrediting Bodies. The Commission's accreditation system will continue its partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP), the two national accrediting bodies. The COA will revise its crosswalk comparison of the Commission adopted Common Standards and the soon to be revised CAEP standards. In addition, the COA will continue to work on the details of the partnership agreement with the newest national body AAQEP in preparation for several institutions that have expressed a desire to seek AAQEP accreditation in association with their state accreditation site visit. Additional work may need to be done to determine any alignment with the AAQEP standards as well. Commission staff will continue to work with institutions that seek to be both nationally accredited, with CAEP or AAQEP, and state accredited to ensure that the process is as streamlined as possible.

Lastly, the COA will be reviewing and approving crosswalks of the 2019 Commission-adopted Pupil Personnel Services Program Standards with the national standards for these credential areas. Significant work has already been undertaken and it is anticipated that the first review of these crosswalks to be in PPS School Psychology in October of 2020, with the PPS School Counseling and PPS School Social Work to be reviewed and approved in the spring of 2021. Further, the process for demonstrating alignment of California PPS standards when an institution is accredited by one of these professional associations is also in need of refinement.

Monitoring the process for Programs to Transition to new Preliminary Education Specialist and Pupil Personnel Services Program Standards.

Although the regulatory packages still need to be moved through the process for both of these credential areas, staff is working with programs to ensure they understand the changes embodied in the new standards and to prepare them for submitting required documentation demonstrating that the program is moving toward alignment of the new standards in summer/fall 2022. For Education Specialist programs a Plan to Implement is due in October 2021 while for PPS the implementation plan can be submitted through January 2022. Staff will review these plans as they are submitted to ensure that the proposed changes are consistent with the new standards and to help guide technical assistance efforts.

Continue Providing Technical Assistance on Accreditation Processes. 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. Additional technical assistance will be provided as continuing work is done on aspects of the system such as building out the Annual Data System to include teaching performance assessment data or data related to additional preparation program pathways. Ensuring that the field understands what is required, and creating opportunities to provide feedback to the Commission staff as the processes are developed has been instrumental in the effective implementation of the system and will continue to play an important role in the future.

Technical Assistance on Commission Flexibilities due to COVID-19

The Commission staff has implemented additional technical assistance for 2020-2021 to support institutions with the flexibilities offered for programs and candidates in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Institutions have requested more routine assistance throughout this unusual time in order to ensure they are implementing the flexibilities and still meeting the standards and expectations required of the Commission's accreditation system. To address this need, technical assistance opportunities are offered in Fall 2020 on approximately a twice a month basis to program personnel by credential areas: 1) Preliminary Multiple/Single Subject; 2) Education Specialist; 3) Intern, and 4) Teacher Induction.

Next Generation of Performance Assessments. As the development of the next generation of teaching performance assessments and the implementation of administrator performance assessments continues, the COA and Commission staff will review the various implications of that work. Providing 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, and any other appropriate use for the data will be important activities in 2020-21.

Establishing and Implementing Processes and Procedures for Identifying Exemplary Practices. In 2018-19, staff and the COA developed a process in which institutions that met the Commission's standards could have the ability to identify, for one or more programs, an area where the program has developed an exemplary practice. However, the workload of the Commission staff and the challenges posed by creating such a system were primary reasons for this project not moving into implementation in 2019-20. Upon further discussions with Commission leadership and given the current urgent and unprecedented situation in which the pandemic has affected all of education, it has been determined that implementing a new major initiative at this time is not advisable and for Commission staff to revisit this topic in 2021-22.

General Operations

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

Appendix A: 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	Indigo	CSU San Bernardino	Green
CSU Channel Islands	Green	CSU San Marcos	Indigo
CSU Chico	Indigo	CSU Stanislaus	Yellow
CSU Dominguez Hills	Red	Humboldt State University	Indigo
CSU East Bay	Green	San Diego State University	Yellow
CSU Fresno	Violet	San Francisco State University	Violet
CSU Fullerton	Blue	San Jose State University	Orange
CSU Long Beach	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 (50)

Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
Academy of Art	Orange	Pacific Union College	Red
Alliant International University	Blue	Pepperdine University	Red
Antioch University	Violet	Point Loma Nazarene University	Red
Azusa Pacific University	Indigo	St. Mary's College of California	Orange
Bard College	Indigo	San Diego Christian College	Yellow
Biola University	Yellow	Santa Clara University	Yellow
Brandman University	Indigo	Simpson University	Green
California Baptist University	Orange	Stanford University	Blue
California Lutheran University	Green	Teachers College of San Joaquin	Indigo
Chapman University	Orange	The Master's College	Orange
Claremont Graduate University	Violet	Touro University	Yellow
Concordia University	Red	United States University	Blue
Dominican University of California	Blue	University of La Verne	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	Red

Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
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	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) (154)

Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
Assoc. of CA School Admin/ASCA	Orange	Mt. Diablo USD	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	Ontario-Montclair SD	Yellow
Aspire Public Schools	Orange	Orange County DOE	Blue
Bakersfield City SD	Green	Orange USD	Red
Baldwin Park USD	Indigo	Palmdale SD	Blue
Bay Area School of Enterprise/REACH	Red	Palo Alto USD	Violet
Bellflower USD	Blue	Palos Verdes Peninsula USD	Violet
Brentwood Union SD	Indigo	Panama-Buena Vista Union SD	Yellow
Burbank USD	Red	Paramount USD	Orange
Butte COE	Violet	Pasadena USD	Indigo
California School of the Deaf/Fremont	Blue	Placentia-Yorba Linda USD	Indigo
Campbell Union SD	Red	Placer COE	Red
Capistrano USD	Yellow	Pleasanton USD	Red
Central USD	Indigo	Pomona USD	Yellow
Ceres USD	Yellow	Poway USD	Red
Chaffey Joint Union HSD	Blue	PUC Schools	Blue
Chino Valley USD	Blue	Redwood City SD	Red

Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
Chula Vista ESD	Red	Rialto USD	Orange
Clovis USD	Yellow	Riverside COE	Red
Compton USD	Violet	Riverside USD	Yellow
Conejo Valley USD	Orange	Sacramento City USD	Violet
Contra Costa COE	Red	Sacramento COE	Indigo
Corona –Norco USD	Blue	Saddleback Valley USD	Yellow
Culver City USD	Red	San Bernardino City USD	Green
Cupertino Union SD	Violet	San Diego COE	Green
Davis 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
Encinitas Union SD	Blue	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 Mateo-Foster City SD	Green
Evergreen SD	Green	San Mateo COE	Blue
Fairfield-Suisun USD	Green	San Ramon Valley USD	Indigo
Fontana USD	Orange	Sanger USD	Violet
Fremont UHSD	Yellow	Santa Ana USD	Green
Fremont USD	Orange	Santa Barbara CEO	Orange
Fresno COE	Green	Santa Clara COE	Blue
Fresno USD	Blue	Santa Clara USD	Yellow
Fullerton SD	Blue	Santa Cruz COE	Yellow
Garden Grove USD	Green	Santa Monica-Malibu USD	Indigo
Glendale USD	Blue	Saugus Union SD	Green
Greenfield Union SD	Yellow	Sequoia Union HSD	Violet
Grossmont Union HSD	Blue	School for Integrated Academics and Technology/SIA Tech	Orange
Hacienda La Puente USD	Green	Shasta COE	Yellow
Hanford ESD	Red	Sonoma COE	Yellow
Hayward USD	Orange	Stanislaus COE	Yellow
High Tech High	Indigo	Stockton USD	Indigo
Imperial COE	Violet	Sutter County SOS	Red
Irvine USD	Violet	Summit Preparatory Charter HS	Yellow
Keppel Union SD	Orange	South San Francisco USD	Yellow

Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
Kern County SOS	Violet	Sweetwater Union HSD	Orange
Kern High SD	Blue	Tehama County DOE	Blue
King Chavez	Red	Temple City USD	Red
Kings COE	Orange	Torrance USD	Blue
Lancaster SD	Indigo	Tracy USD	Indigo
Lodi USD	Yellow	Tulare City SD	Red
Long Beach USD	Blue	Tulare COE	Green
Los Angeles COE	Green	Tustin USD	Blue
Los Angeles USD	Red	Vallejo City USD	Blue
Los Banos USD	Violet	Ventura COE	Indigo
Madera COE	Green	Visalia USD	Indigo
Madera USD	Indigo	Vista USD	Indigo
Manteca USD	Red	Walnut Valley USD	Yellow
Marin COE	Red	Washington USD	Violet
Merced COE	Green	West Contra Costa USD	Orange
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		

The following institutions have earned Provisional Approval during 2019-2020 and may offer one or more programs (see [Institutions Seeking IIA webpage](#) for more information).

- Alameda County Office of Education
- Atwater Elementary School District
- Burton Unified School District
- Fortune School of Education
- High Tech High Graduate School of Education
- Las Virgenes Unified School District
- Santa Barbara Unified School District
- University of California, Merced