
2A

Information

Educator Preparation Committee

Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation 2021-22

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents the 2021-22 Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation (COA).

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenters: Martin Martinez 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 2021-22

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 2021-22 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 2021-22. Section III provides the 2022-23 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 2021-22* was adopted by the COA on October 27, 2022. The report provides an update on all activities undertaken by staff and the COA in 2021-22 to implement the accreditation system.



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

2021-22

Dear Commissioners:

On behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation we are pleased to present the *2021-22 Annual Report on Accreditation*.

In 2021-22, California educational institutions emerged from the height of the pandemic with educators and school personnel across the state working with passion and commitment to bring back a sense of normalcy to our school communities. The challenges were seemingly endless. Continued COVID surges caused by the Omicron variants impacted local communities at different times and to different extents, divergent and strong perspectives on mask and vaccine mandates permeated school board discussions and classroom protocols, and substitute and staffing shortages caused significant and warranted concern about the possibility of additional school closures.

Educator preparation programs were not immune to these challenges as many of these issues affected their efforts in profound ways. With the enrollment of a new cohort of candidates in summer and fall of 2021, many programs were faced with significant difficulties finding enough mentors and clinical practice placements to support candidates as schools faced significant personnel shortages. Additionally, employers necessarily turned to student teachers to meet dire staffing needs, prompting all to engage in conversations of how to ensure that candidates could continue to complete their programs and earn their credential while helping with staffing shortages. Educator preparation programs continued to problem solve around meeting the needs of candidates who had completed their programs under the flexibilities afforded by the Commission, the Governor, and the Legislature, and who were now attempting to satisfy preliminary credential requirements.

Despite the many obstacles, there was a sense of celebration, a renewed appreciation for our school communities and for all the opportunities that learning brings to each child. There was also a renewed sense of confidence and optimism that despite the exhaustion educators faced over the past couple of years, together, we can handle the next chapter – more willing to incorporate new approaches, new mindsets, that we are not afraid to rethink how we've been doing things, and a renewed commitment to coming back stronger.

We thank everyone at educational institutions for their passion, persistence, and dedication to high quality educator preparation in the Golden State. We acknowledge the Commission for its leadership during these trying times. We recognize the dedicated members of the Committee on Accreditation, the Commission staff, and the hundreds of volunteer educators who make up the Board of Institutional Review. Through it all they have continued to share their time and expertise and by doing so have helped ensure that California's PK-12 students will continue to have access to high quality educators who teach, lead, and inspire.

Sincerely,



Dr. Martin Martinez
Committee Co-Chair
COA Annual Report 2021-22



Dr. Robert Frelly
Committee Co-Chair

**The Committee on Accreditation
2021-22**

J. Kevin Taylor

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

Cathy Creasia

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

Cheryl Forbes

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

Robert Frelly

Director of Music Education
Chapman University

Michael Hillis

Dean, Graduate School of Education
California Lutheran University

Lynn Larsen

Professor
UMass Global University

Cynthia Amos

College and Career Coach
Los Angeles Unified School District

Jomeline Balatayo

English Language Development Teacher
Culver City High School

Katrine Czajkowski

Teacher, Induction Mentor
Sweetwater Union High School District

Jason A. Lea

Executive Director
Sonoma County Office of Education

Gerard Morrison

Teacher
Long Beach Unified School District School

Martin Martinez

Director, School of Education
Sacramento County Office of Education

Table of Contents

Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation 2021-22	1
<i>Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation</i>	1
<i>2021-22</i>	1
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	1
<i>The Committee on Accreditation 2021-22</i>	3
<i>Table of Contents</i>	4
<i>Executive Summary</i>	5
<i>Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee’s Work Plan in 2021-22</i>	10
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession	11
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality	13
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards	19
Purpose 4. Fostering Program Improvement.....	22
<i>Section II: Summary of 2020-21 Accreditation Activities</i>	25
<i>Section III: Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2021-22</i>	43
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession	44
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality	45
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards	47
Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement	48
<i>Appendix A: Program Sponsors by Accreditation Cohort</i>	51

Executive Summary

The 2021-22 accreditation year continued to be impacted in significant ways by the ongoing nature of the worldwide COVID-19 pandemic. All accreditation activities, including site visits, were adjusted to reflect this new reality while maintaining full implementation of the system. Below is a summary of some of the major accreditation activities during the 2021-22 year.

Ongoing Accreditation Activities

The thirty-three (33) institutions in the Violet cohort completed site visits in 2021-22. Out of the 33 site visits:

- 22 or 67 percent, received a status of Accreditation.
 - 11 or 33 percent, received Accreditation with Stipulations or Major Stipulations.
 - No institutions received a decision of Probationary Stipulations in 2021-22.
- Additionally, site visits took place at:
 - Three (3) institutions with stipulations from visits in 2020-21 that required revisits in 2021-22.
 - Four (4) institutions in provisional status seeking Initial Institutional Approval.
 - Progress was monitored and stipulations removed for nine (9) institutions (including the 3 with revisits) reviewed in previous years. In all cases, the COA removed stipulations and full accreditation was granted. These included:
 - Seven (7) institutions with Stipulations.
 - One (1) institution with Major Stipulations.
 - One (1) institution with Probationary Stipulations.
 - Preconditions Review: Staff reviewed preconditions during spring/summer 2022 for 68 institutions (Orange and Blue cohorts) totaling 1,962 preconditions (816 general preconditions and 1,146 program-specific preconditions).
 - Program Review was completed during fall/winter 2021 for the 31 institutions in the Indigo cohort, totaling 150 programs using approximately 280 reviewers.
 - Education Specialist programs were preparing to transition by July 1, 2022, to the new standards adopted by the Commission in 2018. Separate program review sessions were held for these programs to provide reviewers with individualized calibration and to provide focused attention on the transition of these programs.
 - Common Standards review was completed during spring 2022 for the 31 institutions in the Indigo cohort.
 - New Credential Program Approvals: Twenty (29) new educator preparation programs were approved.

- New Subject Matter Program Approvals: Five (5) new subject matter programs were approved – one (1) Elementary Subject Matter program, one (1) in Foundational Level General Science, one (1) in Music, one (1) in Social Science, and one (1) in Theatre.
- Changes in status were managed for the currently approved programs, including:
 - 14 programs that went inactive across five (5) institutions and several different credential areas.
 - 18 programs that were withdrawn across 12 institutions.
 - 33% (6) of these were Designated Subjects programs.
 - 17% (3) of the withdrawn programs were Education Specialist: Added Authorization Autism Spectrum Disorders.
 - 11% (2) were Clear Administrative Services.
 - The remainder included one each of Preliminary Administrative Services, Teacher Librarian, Bilingual Authorization, Early Childhood Special Education, Reading and Literacy Added Authorization, Single Subject: Industrial & Technology Education, and Teacher Induction.
 - One (1) institution that closed and ceased offering any educator preparation programs and therefore ceased to be a Commission-approved program sponsor.
 - One (1) institution that requested reactivation of a Teacher Induction program.
- 14 institutions were brought before the Commission for 1 of 5 stages of the Initial Institutional Approval process.

Continued Progress on Other Aspects of Implementation of the Accreditation System

- Continued the Board of Institutional Review (BIR) Site Visit Trainings that resulted in approximately 61 additional individuals trained in 2021-22 and available for accreditation site visits in the future.
- Continued to implement an extensive technical assistance program of weekly office hours, webinars, and one-on-one assistance for programs.
- Continued to use feedback from the Program Review and Common Standards review processes for site visit teams.
- Continued to implement a system of surveying program completers, employers, and master teacher/mentors and using these survey results to inform team decisions about programs.
- Continued to implement and refine the annual Accreditation Data System.
- Continued building out performance assessment (CalTPA and CalAPA) data in the accreditation data dashboards.
- Continued to refine and develop additional data dashboards using data available from the Accreditation Data System, surveys, and performance assessments for use by institutions, programs, and accreditation site visit teams for the institutions and programs they are reviewing.

- Implemented improvements to the Initial Program Approval process to more closely mirror the Program Review process.
- Implemented refinements to the Initial Institutional Approval process to improve the process for institutions, the Commission, and the Committee on Accreditation.

Summary of Activities of the Accreditation System

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

- Accreditation assures that programs meet state standards for professional preparation programs, and, in so doing, are allowed to recommend candidates for state licensure.
- Accreditation assures candidates and the public that educator preparation programs are of high quality and effective in preparing candidates to meet licensure requirements.
- Accreditation assures candidates and the public that programs are accountable for the quality and effectiveness of the preparation they provide to candidates.
- Accreditation assures that peers 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.

Currently, there are 254 Commission approved program sponsors offering 884 different educator preparation programs and many of those are offered through various pathways. 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 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 data system was built in 2017 with institutions submitting initial data in summer 2018. Institutions continue the reporting process by submitting data every summer and the system is refined and improved each year. Data Dashboards have been developed to ensure more effective use of the data contained in the data system.

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 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 programs are preliminarily aligned with the Commission's standards. The institution is provided feedback and then must provide an addendum at least 60 days prior to the accreditation site visit addressing any areas that were not found to be preliminarily aligned. This 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 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. 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 constituents so that team members can triangulate the evidence and data provided during Years 1 to 5 of the accreditation cycle.

DECISION BY THE COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

The Committee on Accreditation (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 COA decisions that were made, and some of the major areas of focus for academic year 2021-22.

Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2021-22

While the activities of 2021-22 were focused on the immediate needs posed by the pandemic, the Commission continued to work to implement and refine the vision set forth in the Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation Project that began late in 2014 and that has continued ever since. Some of the significant work accomplished over the years include the following:

- Adoption of the revised Accreditation Framework
- Development and implementation of the redesigned CalTPA and new CalAPA
- Development and implementation of numerous data dashboards
- Development and implementation of surveys to inform program improvement and accreditation decisions – program completers for Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, Administrative Services, teacher induction, administrator induction, as well as employers and mentor teachers
- Development and implementation of a new 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 of 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 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
- Review of accreditation activities related to inactive programs
- Adoption of revised COA Procedures Manual
- Review of Refinements to the Initial Institutional Approval Process – Stage V

In 2021-22, some of the major accomplishments included:

- Continued implementation of program flexibilities due to COVID-19
- Adoption of new Bilingual Authorization Program Standards and Bilingual Teaching Performance Expectations
- Development of and piloting a new Education Specialist TPA
- Monitored the progress of the revisions adopted related to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) educator preparation standards
- Adoption of PPS School Counseling/Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related

Educational Programs (CACREP) Crosswalk

- Adoption of PPS School Social Work/Council on Social Work Education Educational Policy Standards and Accreditation Standards (CSWE-EPAs) Crosswalk
- Adoption of PPS School Psychology/National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) Crosswalk
- Preparation for the first Association for the Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP) concurrent site visit in California

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 16, 2021

October 28, 2021

February 3, 2022

March 17, 2022

May 5-6, 2022

June 29, 2022

All Committee meetings were held in public in accordance with the Covid allowances for public meetings pursuant to executive orders or state statute and all meeting agendas were posted on the Commission's website in accordance with the timeframe required by those statutes. Pursuant to these laws, all meetings were held virtually through March 17, then held in person in May and June 2022. The public was able to access meetings through Zoom webcasts. Those without computer access were able to participate by telephone via the US Toll-Free call-in numbers delineated in the meeting agenda. The Commission's website was used 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.

[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 4,037 individuals, including all approved institutions, to inform them of accreditation-related activities such as the development and revision of standards, technical assistance opportunities, and notification of requests for public comment.

[Program Sponsor Alerts](#). Program Sponsor Alerts (PSAs) continued to be a primary tool used to communicate to program sponsors information about a specific issue such as the adoption of new standards by the Commission or clarification of requirements and deadlines. This has served particularly useful during 2021-22 in communicating information to the field as the education community navigated the pandemic and the various and changing new laws and flexibilities. Program Sponsor Alerts will continue to be used to provide information to the field when necessary as they have served this objective well. The Commission staff issued the following 15 PSAs between July 1, 2021, to June 30, 2022:

Program Sponsor Alerts July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022

Issue Date	Number	Title
July 14, 2021	21-06	<u>Suspension of Accreditation Fees for the 2021-22 Fiscal Year</u>
July 15, 2021	21-07	<u>Authorization to Teach Theater and/or Dance – Update to PSA 21-04</u>
July 15, 2021	21-08	<u>2021-22 State Budget Act Extends Testing Flexibilities for Candidates Impacted by Continuing COVID-19 Pandemic</u>
August 24, 2021	21-09	<u>AB 130 Clarification on Exemption from Basic Skills Proficiency Examination</u>
September 3, 2021	21-10	<u>Implementation of New Options for Meeting the Statutory Subject Matter Competence Requirement</u>
October 13, 2021	21-11	<u>Update on Implementation of AB 130 Subject Matter Requirement</u>
October 22, 2021	21-12	<u>Reminder of Circumstances Authorizing Deferral of Completion of Required Performance Assessments Until Induction</u>
December 17, 2021	21-13	<u>COVID Flexibilities Extended</u>
January 20, 2022	22-01	<u>Executive Order N-3-22 and Student Teachers</u>
February 11, 2022	22-02	<u>Teaching Performance Assessment Requirement for Education Specialist Credential Candidates</u>
March 11, 2022	22-03	<u>AB 320 Impact on Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist Educator Preparation Programs</u>
April 29, 2022	22-04	<u>Update on Subject Matter Competence and Student Teaching</u>
May 17, 2022	22-05	<u>Reminder of Sunset Date for Deferral of a Performance Assessment or Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) Examination for Preliminary Credential Candidates</u>
June 13, 2022	22-06	<u>Timeline for Institutions to Transition Bilingual Authorization Programs to the Updated Bilingual Authorization Program Standards and New Bilingual Teaching Performance Expectations</u>
June 24, 2022	22-07	<u>Extension of Suspension of Preconditions Requiring Demonstration of Subject Matter Competence Prior to Daily Whole Class Instruction</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 indicating the formal action taken by the COA.

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 Robert Frelly and Martin Martinez presented the 2020-21 COA annual report to the Commission at the [December 2021](#) 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 2021-22 year, there was no Commissioner liaison to the COA.

Implementation of an Annual Accreditation Fee and a Fee Recovery System for Certain Accreditation Activities. The annual accreditation fee structure was originally established through emergency regulations effective in August 2014, followed by permanent regulations that became effective as of April 1, 2015. In 2020-21 and again in 2021-22, the California State Budget suspended all accreditation fees which include annual accreditation fees as well as cost recovery accreditation fees for the period between July 1, 2020, and June 30, 2022. Fees were resumed beginning in July 2022.

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 2021-22, a total of forty (40) institutions had various types of site visits. This included thirty-three (33) accreditation site visits for the Violet cohort institutions, four (4) provisional site visits, and three (3) revisits.

The results of the 33 regular site visits conducted are as follows:

- 22 institutions Accredited, including six (6) with a 7th year follow up report required
- Eight (8) institutions Accredited with Stipulations
- Three (3) institution Accredited with Major Stipulations
- No institution is Accredited with Probationary Stipulations

Ensuring Institutions Addressed Stipulations. All institutions with stipulations are expected to address all 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 2021-22, the COA removed the stipulations fully for nine (9) institutions with stipulations from the previous year.

One institution had its site visit in 2018-19, had many stipulations removed in 2019-20, but some remained. The COA granted the institution more time given the progress that had been made addressing the stipulations, and the remaining stipulations were removed in 2020-21.

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 and timely progress towards addressing the most egregious issues. This was the case in 2021-22. This approach allows the institutions to regularly check in with the 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, requiring interim reports 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 2021-22 for institutional personnel to provide information and support around changes in accreditation and to address challenges related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Accreditation Technical Assistance webpage on the Commission's website continued to be used and institutions and program personnel 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 organizational meetings and conferences throughout the year. These typically include, but are not limited to: the California Induction Conference, the Credential Counselors and Analysts of California (CCAC) Conference, 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), Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR), California Council of Academic Programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders (CAPCSD), California Association of Private Special Education Schools, and the California Association of Professors of Education Administration.

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 help them as they prepare final documentation or respond to reviewers' feedback
- A 2 month out pre-visit 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 Site Visits

Technical Assistance Activity	Attendees
Year-Out Pre-visit	Consultant and institution representatives
Monthly Phone/Zoom Conferences	Consultant and institution representatives
2 Month Out Pre-visit	Consultant, Site Visit Team Lead, and institution representatives

Technical Assistance for Institutions Preparing to Submit Common Standards

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

Activity	Date and/or Location
Preparation for Institutions Submitting Common Standards Review	November 9, 2021 - Virtual
	December 2, 2021 - Virtual
	January 12, 2022 - Virtual
	January 27, 2022 – Virtual
	February 8, 2022 - Virtual

Technical Assistance for the Accreditation Data System (ADS)

The Professional Services Division (PSD) staff conducted a series of Accreditation Data System (ADS) office hours to answer ADS related questions. The virtual office hours are essential to ensure program sponsors can access, update, and upload data to the system. The office hours have proven to be instrumental in ensuring the Annual Data Submission was submitted within the timeframe allotted.

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location
Accreditation Data System (ADS) Weekly Office Hours (30 mins-1 hour per week)	April 14, 2022, to September 15, 2022 (23 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 current system. In 2021-22, these trainings resulted in 61 new BIR trained reviewers that have contributed to the success of the system.

Activity	Number, Date and/or Location
BIR Site Visit Training	July 20 – 22, 2021
	September 22 – 24, 2021
	January 26 – 28, 2022
	April 19 – 20, 2022

Activity	Number, Date and/or Location
BIR Team Lead Training and Review	August 31, 2021 January 21, 2022
Common Standards Reviewer Training and Review	8 Common Standards Training and Review Sessions between March 11 and May 6, 2022 (Virtual)
Program Review Training and Review	18 Program Review Sessions between October 2021 and February 2022 (Virtual)

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. This year a new Accreditation 201 session was added to provide support to all institutions throughout Stage 5 of the IIA process. Four sessions of Accreditation 101 and one session of Accreditation 201 were held in 2021-22.

Date	Session	Number of Institutions	Types of Institution	Attendees
July 6, 2021	Accreditation 101	4 institutions	3 LEA/1 IHE	11 attendees
November 30, 2021	Accreditation 101	4 institutions	3 LEA/1 IHE	9 attendees
March 16, 2022	Accreditation 101	1 institution	1 IHE	5 attendees
June 21, 2022	Accreditation 101	2 institutions	1 LEA/1 IHE	2 attendees
January 11, 2022	Accreditation 201	11 institutions	8 LEA/3 IHE	34 attendees

Technical Assistance Office Hours for Programs

Since the beginning of the pandemic, the Professional Services Division staff began hosting a variety of office hours to provide technical assistance and support the sharing of best practices by programs. These sessions have been well received by the field and have allowed the Commission to better understand and address the challenges facing institutions during COVID. Staff has continued to hold these sessions and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future. This includes the following:

Program Area	Day
Early Childhood Education	1 st Tuesdays 3 rd Tuesdays
Preliminary Multiple & Single Subject	1 st and 3 rd Tuesdays
Interns	1 st and 3 rd Tuesdays
Preliminary Education Specialist	2 nd and 4 th Mondays
Induction	1 st and 3 rd Thursdays
Pupil Personnel Services	2 nd Thursday of the Month

Technical Assistance and Guidance for COVID-19

The Professional Services Division continued to provide updates and guidance about actions taken by the Commission, the Governor, and the legislature due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This information was posted on the Commission's [COVID-19 webpage](#). Additionally, this

information was made available in the PSD e-News and in numerous Program Sponsor Alerts.

Other Related Activities

Technical Assistance for Individual Institutions. The Professional Services Division maintains numerous email accounts to ensure that specific, accreditation-related questions are answered quickly and accurately. 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, Commission staff work with institutions on 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:

- Professional Services Division (PSDInfo@ctc.ca.gov)
- 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)
- Accreditation Data System (ADS@ctc.ca.gov)
- Initial Institutional Approval (IIA@ctc.ca.gov)
- Initial Program Review (IPR@ctc.ca.gov)
- Commission Standards Review CommonStandardsReview@ctc.ca.gov

Technical Assistance Related to the Implementation of Performance Assessments. Numerous technical assistance sessions have been held by staff to ensure that programs understand and are provided necessary support around the implementation of performance assessments. These sessions are listed in the chart below:

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

Support Event	Dates (July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022)
Candidate Office Hours	GenEd CalTPA: Weekly Wednesday 4:15-5:00 pm CalAPA: Weekly Wednesday 5:00-5:45 pm
Preliminary Teacher Prep and PASC Office Hours, hosted by the PA Team and ES	GenEd CalTPA: Weekly Thurs. 10:00-11:00 am CalAPA: Weekly Thurs. 11:00-noon
EdSp CalTPA Office Hours	EdSp CalTPA: Weekly Fri 10-11am
Clear Induction Office Hours, hosted by the PA Team and ES	Teacher Induction: Weekly Thurs. 9:00-9:45 am Admin Induction: Weekly Thurs. 8:00-9:00 am
ECE CalTPA Pilot Coordinator Office Hours	ECE CalTPA: Weekly Friday 9:00-9:30 a.m.
Virtual Think Tanks	GenEd CalTPA: 1 monthly session held in September 2021
Digging Deeper: Evidence-based Practices in Performance Assessment	Quarterly Professional Development held in Fall, Winter and Spring (November, February, April)

Support Event	Dates (July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022)
Lead Assessor Meetings	GenEd CalTPA: Bi-weekly Mon. 3:00-4:00, Tue. 4:00-5:00 CalAPA: Bi-weekly Thursday, 3:00-4:00
Coordinator Meetings (Webinar)	GenEd CalTPA: September, January, March, June CalAPA: September, January, March, and June
“Deep Dive” Webinars into Specific PA Cycles	GenEd CalTPA: 2 sessions, September 2021 CalAPA: 3 sessions, September 2021
Induction Conference (online)	GenEd CalTPA and CalAPA December 6-8, 2021
New Assessor Training	GenEd CalTPA: 11 sessions, October; 7 sessions, December/January CalAPA: 12 sessions (2/cycle), January and February 2021
Returning Assessor Training	GenEd CalTPA: 4 general sessions, 18 content area sessions; September/October/November 2021 CalAPA: 3 general sessions, 3 cycle-specific sessions; October 2021
Marker Assessor Training for EdSp CalTPA Field Test	February 2022 for MMSN April 2022 for ESN
Assessor Training for EdSp CalTPA Field Test	March 2022 for MMSN May 2022 for ESN
Marker Assessor Training and Consensus Scoring for EdSp CalTPA Pilot Study	Cycle 1 (MMSN, ESN, ECSE, VI): January/February 2021 Cycle 2 (MMSN, ESN) & Cycle 1 (DHH, VI): May/June 2021
Conference Attendance	CAPEA: Fall 2021 (CalAPA) CCAC: January 2022 (CalTPA & CalAPA) Cal Council: Fall 2021 (CalTPA and CalAPA) CAPSE: January 2022 (Education Specialist CalTPA)
ECE CalTPA Design Team Meetings	July 27-28, 2021 September 21-22, 2021 October 19-20, 2022 December 7, 2021 March 22, 2022 May 10, 2022
ECE CalTPA Pilot Orientation Meetings (Draft Cycle Walk Throughs with pilot programs)	Cycle 1: January 25, 2022 Cycle 2: January 26, 2022 Cycle 3: January 26, 2022
ECE CalTPA Pilot Submission Scoring & Assessor Training	July 18, 2022: Cycle 1 scoring July 19, 2022: Cycle 2 scoring July 20, 2022: Cycle 3 scoring

Support Event	Dates (July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022)
EdSp CalTPA Design Team Meetings	July 13, 2021 September 14, 2021 November 9, 2021 April 19, 2022
Final EdSp CalTPA Design Team Meeting	May 23, 2022
Standard Setting Panel	May 24-25, 2022 for EdSp MMSN May 26-27, 2022 for EdSp ESN
EdSp CalTPA Transition Webinar	June 1, 2022 for EdSp MMSN June 2, 2022 for EdSp ESN

Receive Regular Updates on Commission Activities Related to Accreditation and Provide Commission with Advice on Issues Related to Accreditation. During 2021-22, staff continued to prepare agenda items for the COA on issues related to the Commission’s work as directed by the Commission or as appropriate to the continuing work of the Committee. With the unique challenges presented by the pandemic, this function continued to be especially important in 2021-22.

Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards

Review and Take Action to Grant Initial Approval of New Program Sponsors. The requirements for an institution to become a Commission-approved educator preparation program sponsor in California had been substantially revised in recent years. The IIA process 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 2021-22. As previously noted, four Accreditation 101 sessions and one Accreditation 201 session were held in 2021-22 for interested institutions.

In 2021-22 fourteen (14) institutions were brought to the Commission for consideration for approval under one or more of the multi-step initial institutional approval process. Seven of these were in some stage between II and IV. Seven others completed the provisional period and were brought forward for consideration and approval by the Commission at the completion of Stage V. Of those 7 institutions that completed the process in 2021-22, four of those had provisional site visits in 2021-22 while the other three had site visits in the previous year. These institutions are listed in Section II of this report.

Review and Take Action to Grant Initial Program Approval for New Credential Programs. This is also one of the major ongoing tasks of the 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 2021-22. Because institutions may submit program proposals any time throughout the year, Commission staff attempts to find reviewers willing and able to review the documents as soon as possible. These reviews 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 29 new programs were approved by the COA in 2021-22. 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.

Implementation of COA Review Process for Initial Program Approval. Since 2018-19, the documentation provided to the COA to inform their decision about program approval was changed. The COA began receiving all of the program proposal documentation for institutions that had recently received provisional approval from the Commission to inform the COA's review and approval. Additionally, personnel from the institution attend the COA meeting to respond to questions about the proposed program. This process provides the COA with opportunity to gather sufficient information about the program proposal to make determinations.

Review of Preconditions. The Commission's accreditation system requires that responses to preconditions be submitted and reviewed in Years 1 and 4 of the 7-year cycle. For the 2021-22 year, institutions in both the Orange and Blue cohorts were required to submit evidence of meeting all relevant preconditions. These two cohorts represent 68 institutions. For these two particular groups of institutions, this resulted in a staff review of evidence for 816 general preconditions and 1,146 program specific 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.

Program Review Process. The current Program Review process is designed to identify the extent to which programs are preliminarily aligned to Commission adopted program standards and includes the submission of specified evidence with limited narratives describing how the institution is implementing the standards in its programs. This process has continued with success to the present time.

The feedback from reviewers and institutions alike regarding the revised accreditation system has continued to be positive, reflecting strong support for the current system. Institutional personnel express appreciation for having a clear understanding of the exact types of evidence needed for program submissions and that the current process has removed some of the guesswork from 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 timely manner.

Common Standards Review Process. As with the approach to Program Review, Common

Standards submissions require prescribed documentation and information as well as limited, but focused, narrative. The Common Standards review process was implemented for the first time in early 2018. Like the Program Review process, reviewers continue to express overwhelmingly positive support for the 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 is 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 allows institutions to address concerns well in advance of the site visit and to make program improvements much more quickly. Keeping the consistency in the reviewers from Common Standards and Program Review through the site visits has helped ensure that questions and potential issues are followed up on appropriately at the site visit.

Implementation of the Accreditation Data System. The development of an annual data system was one of the key components to the revised accreditation system. 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 continues to be refined and used ever since. 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 continues to be provided to institutions on the system. Staff conducted Accreditation Data System (ADS) office hours 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 2021-22, surveys continued to play an important 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. Completer Surveys are open from September 1 to August 31 annually with the survey results (Program Reports) available in the Commission's Accreditation Data Dashboard (ADD). Survey results from the prior year will be updated in the ADD annually each fall.

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 and 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, and continuing for the third year in 2021, 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 2021-22. All accreditation site visit teams were instructed to use the completer surveys to develop questions for further interviews, to inform their understanding of the program’s possible areas of strength and areas in potential need of improvement, and to discuss results with program personnel. In addition, the results could be used to streamline the accreditation process and require fewer program completers for interviews. 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 2021, the Commission staff held two Team Lead training sessions for those individuals who would be leading site visit teams in 2021-22. This training covered a variety of topics including logistics involved in conducting virtual site visits given that the pandemic required that all visits be held virtually. 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 2021-22 at each COA meeting. These included institutions that were late in submitting required preconditions, Common Standards Review, Program Review, annual data submissions, and in previous years, accreditation fees. 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. Since implementation of this requirement, staff has seen an overall increase in compliance with the required timeframes for accreditation activities and only a small number of institutions were reported in 2021-22.

Continued Implementation of the Evaluation System for the Accreditation System. Staff monitors the accreditation system in different ways. 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 National Accrediting Bodies. A Partnership Agreement between the Commission and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) was signed by both parties in May 2015 and is due to be updated in fall 2022. During 2021-22, Commission staff continued to work with CAEP staff to better understand new CAEP standards and processes and to determine their applicability to California's context. The first California institution to undergo a joint Commission/CAEP site visit took place in spring 2019 and no joint CAEP/CTC site visits took place in 2021-22.

Also in 2021-22, the Commission continued discussions with a new national accrediting body, the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP). AAQEP received approval by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) in 2021. Several institutions in California have expressed an interest in this new accrediting body as an alternative to CAEP. Staff has had numerous conversations and meetings with AAQEP staff and institutions who will be seeking AAQEP accreditation in addition to Commission accreditation. An agreement was reached in 2020 with AAQEP that outlines the manner and protocols for working formally with this entity on accreditation visits. The first two concurrent site visits took place in spring 2022.

Board of Institutional Reviewer's (BIR) Training. The current 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 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 use of performance assessment 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 teaching candidates must demonstrate subject matter competence.

In 2021-22, 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. One of these was an Elementary Subject Matter (ESM) program and four were Single Subject Matter programs (Foundational Level General Science, Music, Social Science, and Theater). 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 2020-21 Accreditation Activities

This section of the report provides more detailed information about results of the 2021-22 Work Plan with a focus on the outcome of the accreditation activities.

Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Educator Preparation Programs

In 2021-22, 40 accreditation related site visits took place. Thirty-three of these were institutions in the Violet cohort that were scheduled for visits in 2021-22. Additionally, three institutions with stipulations from a 2020-21 visit received a revisit in 2021-22. And finally, four additional institutions in the provisional period of initial institutional approval received a site visit in 2021-22.

The COVID-19 pandemic made it necessary for all site visits to be completed via technology. During the site visits, teams reviewed documentation and data, interviewed a variety of constituencies (candidates, program completers, faculty, employers, administration, supervisors, etc.), deliberated, came to consensus on findings for all Common Standards and 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 reports 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. Accreditation decisions were made by the COA after consideration of the written reports of the evidence gathered at the virtual site visit, recommendations made by the site visit team, and the information shared by program leadership and the team lead at the COA meeting. Copies of the [site visit team reports](#) are available on the Commission’s website.

The table below lists the accreditation decisions made by the COA for institutions in the Violet Cohort:

Accreditation Status for Institutions with Site Visits in 2021-22 (33)

Violet Cohort Institutions

Program Sponsor	Accreditation Decision
Antelope Valley Union High School District	Accreditation
Butte County Office of Education	Accreditation
California State University, Fresno*	Accreditation with Stipulations
California State University, Monterey Bay	Accreditation with Stipulations
Claremont Graduate University	Accreditation with Stipulations
Compton Unified School District	Accreditation
Cupertino Union School District	Accreditation
El Dorado County Office of Education	Accreditation (7th Year Report)
Escondido Union High School District	Accreditation (7th Year Report)
Hebrew Union College	Accreditation (7th Year Report)
Hope International University	Accreditation with Stipulations

Program Sponsor	Accreditation Decision
Imperial County Office of Education	Accreditation with Stipulations
Irvine Unified School District	Accreditation
Kern County Superintendent of Schools	Accreditation with Stipulations
La Sierra University	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Los Banos Unified School District	Accreditation
Murrieta Valley Unified School District	Accreditation
National University*	Accreditation (7th Year Report)
New Haven Unified School District	Accreditation
Pacific Oaks College	Accreditation
Palo Alto Unified School District	Accreditation
Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Sacramento City Unified School District	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
San Francisco State University	Accreditation
San Francisco Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations
Sanger Unified School District	Accreditation
Sequoia Union High School District	Accreditation (7th Year Report)
University of California, Davis	Accreditation
University of California, Irvine	Accreditation
University of California, San Diego	Accreditation
University of Southern California	Accreditation with Stipulations
Washington Unified School District	Accreditation
William S. Hart Union High School District	Accreditation (7 th Year Report)

**For these institutions a concurrent site visit was conducted in conjunction with the Association for the Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP)*

Institutions Meeting All Standards

The institutions listed in the table below hosted an accreditation site visit in 2021-22 which resulted in a determination that all Common Standards and all Program Standards for all programs offered by the institution had been met. Of the 33 site visits, 16 institutions (48 percent vs. 56 Percent in 2020-21) with site visits in 2021-22 met all standards applicable for the programs they offer.

Institutions Receiving Accreditation with All Common and Program Standards Met, 2021-22

Program Sponsor (16)	Number of Educator Programs Offered by the Institution
Antelope Valley Union High School District	1
Butte County Office of Education	1
Compton Unified School District	1
Cupertino Union School District	1
Irvine Unified School District	2
Los Banos Unified School District	1
Murrieta Valley	1

Program Sponsor (16)	Number of Educator Programs Offered by the Institution
New Haven Unified School District	1
Pacific Oaks College	3
Palo Alto Unified School District	1
San Francisco State University	15
Sanger Unified School District	1
University of California, Davis	4
University of California, Irvine	5
Washington Unified School District	1
William S. Hart Union High School District	2

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 2021-22 site visits are presented in the following table.

Findings on Common Standards¹ 2021-22 Accreditation Site Visits (33 institutions)

Common Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	27	6	0
2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	29	4	0
3: Study, Fieldwork, and Clinical Practice	29	4	0
4: Continuous Improvement	27	4	2
5: Program Impact	32	1	0

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 for 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 2021-22 Site Visits

Programs	# of Institutions that Offer the Listed Program	# of Institutions with All Program Standards Met by Program	% of programs with all Program Standards Met
Added Authorization Autism Spectrum Disorder	2	2	100%
Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education	1	1	100%
Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance	1	1	100%

Programs	# of Institutions that Offer the Listed Program	# of Institutions with All Program Standards Met by Program	% of programs with all Program Standards Met
Added Authorization: Orthopedic Impairments	2	2	100%
Added Authorization: Other Health Impairments	1	1	100%
Added Authorization: Traumatic Brain Injury	1	1	100%
Added Authorization Adapted Physical Education	2	1	50%
Added Authorization Reading and Literacy	5	4	80%
Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist	1	0	0%
Specialist Teaching: Agriculture Specialist Instruction	1	1	100%
Clear Administrative Services	9	3	33%
Clinical or Rehabilitative Services: Orientation and Mobility	1	1	100%
Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing	2	0	0%
Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education, w/Intern	1	1	100%
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, w/intern	10	2	20%
Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe, w/Intern	6	2	33%
Preliminary Administrative Services, w/Intern	10	2	20%
Preliminary Multiple Subject, w/intern	16	4	25%
Preliminary Single Subject, w/intern	13	3	23%
Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance	2	2	100%
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling, w/intern	5	1	20%
Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work	4	4	100%
School Nurse	1	1	100%
Specialist Teaching: Bilingual Authorization	9	1	11%
Specialist Teaching: California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)	1	1	100%
Speech-Language Pathology	2	2	100%
Teacher Induction	25	7	28%

Program Standards that are Met with Concerns or Not Met

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 *Met with Concerns* or *Not Met* 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](#).

Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization (2 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 11: Motor Behavior as Applied to Adapted Physical Education	1	0

Bilingual Authorization (9 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the Bilingual Teaching Performance Expectations	1	0
Standard 3: Field Experience	1	0

Clear Administrative Services (7 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 2: Program Collaboration, Communication, and Coordination	1	0
Standard 3: Selection and Training of Coaches	2	0
Standard 4: Professional Learning	3	0

Preliminary Administrative Services, w/intern (8 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 2: Collaboration, Communication and Coordination	1	1
Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences	0	1
Standard 8: Guidance, Assistance and Feedback	0	1

Preliminary Ed Specialist: Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing, w/intern (2 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 1: Characteristics of Learners	1	0
Standard 2: Development of Professional Perspectives	0	1
Standard 5: Specialized Assessment	0	1
Standard 6: Instructional Techniques	1	0
Standard 7: Early Childhood Intervention and Education	0	1
Standard 8: Hearing Loss and Additional Disabilities	0	1
Standard 9: Managing Student Behavior and Social Interaction Skills	1	0
Standard 10: Transition and Transitional Planning	0	1
Standard 11: Collaborative Partnerships	0	1

Preliminary Multiple Subject w/Intern (14 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)	1	0
Standard 3: Clinical Practice	1	1
Standard 4: Monitoring, Supporting, and Assessing Candidate Progress towards Meeting Credential Requirements	0	1
Standard 5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment	0	1

Preliminary Single Subject w/Intern (11 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 3: Clinical Practice	1	1
Standard 4: Monitoring, Supporting, and Assessing Candidate Progress towards Meeting Credential Requirements	0	1
Standard 5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment	0	1

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling, w/intern (4 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 17: Foundations of the School Counseling Profession	1	0

Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential and Added Authorization (5 Site Visit)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination	1	0
Standard 6: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination	1	0
Standard 9: Integrating the Curriculum through Clinical Experiences	1	0
Standard 10: Planning, Organizing, Providing and Leading Literacy Instruction	1	0

Teacher Induction Standards (15 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 1: Program Purpose	1	0
Standard 2: Components of the Mentoring Design	1	0
Standard 3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System	3	0
Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors	6	0
Standard 5: Determining Candidate Competence for the Clear Credential Recommendation	3	0
Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services	4	0

Institutions in 7th Year Follow Up

The COA continues to monitor progress made in addressing stipulations for institutions with outstanding issues from previous years' visits. Although any institution with stipulations must address all stipulations within one year, the COA may choose to allow an institution more time if the COA is satisfied that significant progress is being made to address the stipulations.

In 2021-22, the COA closely monitored eight institutions that had stipulations placed on them as a result of their accreditation site visit in 2020-21. Additionally, the COA continued to monitor one program sponsor, Aspire Berkley Maynard, that had one stipulation remaining from their site visit in 2019-20. Many of the stipulations placed on this institution had been addressed in 2020-21 but the institution was granted additional time by the COA to continue making progress in addressing the one remaining stipulation and the COA continued to monitor the institution during this time. All nine of the program sponsors addressed all identified issues such that the COA removed the stipulations in 2021-22 and their status was changed to Accreditation. This information is summarized in the table below.

Action taken in 2021-22 on Institutions with Stipulations from Prior Year Site Visits

Institutions	2020-2021 Decision	2021-2022 COA Decision
Aspire Berkley Maynard	Accreditation w/ Stipulations (2019-2020 Decision)	Accreditation - August 2021
California State University Dominguez Hills	Accreditation w/ Stipulations	Accreditation - October 2021
Anaheim Union High School District	Accreditation w/ Stipulations	Accreditation - February 2022
High Tech High Graduate School of Education	Accreditation w/ Stipulations	Accreditation - February 2022
University of California, Merced	Accreditation w/ Stipulations	Accreditation - February 2022
Bay Area School of Enterprise (Revisit)	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation - May 2022
Pacific Union College	Accreditation w/ Stipulations	Accreditation - May 2022
Point Loma Nazarene University (Revisit)	Accreditation w/ Stipulations	Accreditation - May 2022
Pleasanton Unified School District (Revisit)	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulation	Accreditation - June 2022 with 2 follow up reports

Initial Institutional Approval (IIA)

When a new institution wishes to offer an educator preparation program in California, that process falls within the purview of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The Commission requires that institution to first be approved for initial accreditation as a program sponsor by completing the Initial Institution Approval (IIA) process. Once the Commission determines that an institution is eligible to offer educator preparation in California (Stages I-III), the institution's responses to standards that have been reviewed by the Board of Institutional Review are brought forward to the COA in Stage IV for its consideration and action. If approved by the COA,

the institution operates the program for a provisional period of time from 2-4 years and is brought back before the Commission for full approval.

This process includes the following five stages:

- Stage I - Prerequisites
- Stage II - Eligibility Requirements
- Stage III - Common Standards and Preconditions
- Stage IV - Program Approval (COA)
- Stage V – Implementation and Provisional Site Visit

A full description of the IIA process is available at: [Initial Institutional Approval](#).

The following fourteen (14) institutions were brought before the Commission for Initial Institutional Approval in 2021-22. The table identifies at which stage the institution appeared before the Commission, the type of approval, and the date of the Commission meeting at which the approval was granted.

Approval Date	Program Sponsor (14)	Stage	Approval Status
08/06/21	Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District	Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions	Provisional Approval
08/06/21	High Tech High Graduate School of Education	Stage V - Full Approval	Full Approval
08/06/21	University of California, Merced	Stage V - Full Approval	Full Approval
08/06/21	Las Virgenes Unified School District	Stage V - Full Approval	Full Approval
09/30/21	Los Altos School District	Stage II – Eligibility Requirements	Move to Stage III
12/10/21	Burton School District	Stage V - Full Approval	Full Approval
04/07/22	Santa Maria Bonita School District	Stage II – Eligibility Requirements	Move to Stage III
04/07/22	Los Altos School District	Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions	Provisional Approval
04/07/22	Atwater Elementary School District	Stage V - Full Approval	Full Approval
04/07/22	Santa Barbara Unified School District	Stage V - Full Approval	Full Approval
04/07/22	Fortune School	Stage V - Full Approval	Full Approval
06/16/22	Santa Maria Bonita School District	Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions	Provisional Approval

Approval Date	Program Sponsor (14)	Stage	Approval Status
06/16/22	Gateway High School	Stage II – Eligibility Requirements	Move to Stage III
06/16/22	The Charter School of San Diego	Stage II – Eligibility Requirements	Move to Stage III

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

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. If the COA approves the program, the institution may operate the program for the specified provisional period of time as determined by the Commission. Typically, this is 2-4 years after which the institution will host a site visit and an accreditation team will determine findings that are used to inform the Commission’s approval of the institution as a program sponsor in the last stage of IIA.

Initial Program Approval actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation in 2021-22 for new institutions in IIA are listed in the tables below.

New Educator Preparation Programs Sponsored by Provisionally Approved Institutions (8)

Once the Commission grants the institution provisional approval, the institution is allowed to submit a program proposal for approval. The following institutions submitted documentation for new programs in 2021-22 which were reviewed by experts in the field and received approval from the COA to begin offering the programs during their provisional period.

Program Sponsor	Credential Program
Lake County Office of Education	Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern
Newhall School District	Teacher Induction
University of Antelope Valley	Preliminary Single Subject (Math and Science)
Huntington Beach Union High School District	Teacher Induction
San Mateo Union High School District	Teacher Induction
Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Folsom Cordova Unified School District	Teacher Induction
Los Angeles Pacific University	Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern

Provisional Site Visits

In 2021-22, accreditation site visits were conducted at four (4) institutions in the final stage (Stage V) of the Initial Institutional Approval process. Additionally, the COA considered action for the three site visits that took place late spring 2021. At the end of a provisional period of between two and four years, an institution in provisional status hosts an accreditation site visit team that determines how the institution and program are aligned to the Commission’s adopted standards and preconditions. The information resulting from the provisional site visit is provided to the Commission to inform their decision as to whether to approve the institution in this final stage of IIA. The chart below includes information on the institutions that completed their provisional period, the results of the accreditation site visit, and the Commission action.

Institution in Stage IV	Status of Accreditation	Commission Action
High Tech High Graduate School of Education	Full Approval	August 2021
University of California, Merced	Full Approval	August 2021
Las Virgenes Unified School District	Full Approval	August 2021
Burton School District	Full Approval	December 2021
Atwater Elementary School District	Full Approval	April 2022
Santa Barbara Unified School District	Full Approval	April 2022
Fortune School	Full Approval	April 2022

Initial Program Approval for Existing Commission Approved Educator Preparation Programs

The Committee on Accreditation granted approval to the following 21 new preparation programs at institutions that are existing Commission approved program sponsors.

Program Sponsor	Credential Program
Alliant International University	Bilingual Authorization: Spanish and Mandarin
Biola University	Bilingual Authorization: Spanish
California State University, Monterey Bay	Speech-Language Pathology Services
Humboldt State University	Multiple Subject Credential Intern
King Chavez Academy of Excellence	Preliminary Multiple Subject, Intern
Los Angeles Pacific University	Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern
Modesto City Schools	Clear Administrative Services Credential
Riverside County Office of Education	Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education
Santa Ana Unified School District	Clear Administrative Services Induction Program
Simpson University	Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern
Simpson University	Preliminary Single Subject Intern
Summit Preparatory Charter High School	Preliminary Multiple Subject
Summit Preparatory Charter High School	Preliminary Education Specialist MMSN
Tulare City School District	Clear Administrative Services Induction Program
University of California, Berkeley	Bilingual Authorization: Spanish

Program Sponsor	Credential Program
University of California, Los Angeles	Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education Bilingual Authorization: French
University of California, Santa Barbara	Bilingual Authorization: Spanish
University of La Verne	Bilingual Authorization: Spanish
University of Southern California	Speech Language Pathology Services
Whittier College	Bilingual Authorization: Spanish

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 2021-22 are included in the table below.

New Subject Matter Programs (5)

Institutions	Programs
California State University, Polytechnic University, Humboldt	Elementary Subject Matter Program
San Francisco State University	Single Subject Matter Program - Social Science
Sonoma State University	Single Subject Matter Program - Foundational Level General Science
California State University, Stanislaus	Single Subject Matter Program - Music
California State University, San Bernardino	Single Subject Matter Program - Theatre

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 Administrator of Accreditation. The following 14 programs became inactive in 2021-22.

Programs Entering Inactive Status (14)

Institution	Programs
Antioch University	Preliminary Multiple Subject
Antioch University	Teacher Induction
Antioch University	Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate with Intern
California State University, Long Beach	Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education
Green Dot Public School	Preliminary Administrative Services
Azusa Pacific University	Teacher Librarian
Azusa Pacific University	Teacher Librarian: Special Class Authorization

Institution	Programs
Mills College	Education Specialist: Added Authorization Autism Spectrum Disorder
Mills College	Education Specialist: Added Authorization Autism Emotional Disturbance
Mills College	Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education
Mills College	Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern
Mills College	Preliminary Multiple Subject
Mills College	Preliminary Administrative Services
California State University, Fresno	Specialist Teaching: Early Childhood Education Specialist

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 2021-22, only one program previously deemed inactive requested and received reactivation and, once again, has fully approved programs operating in California.

Reactivation Requests (1)

Institution	Program
Hacienda La Puente USD	Teacher Induction

Transition of Professional Preparation Program to New Standards

All Education Specialist Preliminary programs with the exception of those in the indigo cohort, submitted plans for implementation as part of a transition process in the Fall of 2021. (Indigo cohort programs experienced a complete Program Review as part of the regular accreditation cycle.) These plans provided evidence documenting how programs were implementing the 2018 Education Specialist Program Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations. The Plans for Implementation that were submitted took key elements from the Program Review process. There were 7 required elements and 18 specific exhibits. To assist with the review of the submissions, experts from the field volunteered to review the submitted plans. Over the course of 14 days, 43 individuals volunteered their time, often for more than one of the scheduled dates to review the programs submitted. Staff followed up with the programs whose submissions were either incomplete or were missing evidence.

Altogether, the following 72 institutions were approved to transition their 140 Education Specialist credential programs to the 2018 standards beginning July 1, 2022.

Cal Poly San Luis Obispo	CSU East Bay
Cal Poly Pomona	CSU Fresno
CSU Bakersfield	CSU Fullerton
CSU Channel Islands	CSU Long Beach
CSU Chico	CSU Los Angeles
CSU Dominguez Hills	CSU Monterey Bay

CSU Northridge	Pacific Oaks College
CSU Sacramento	Point Loma Nazarene University
CSU San Bernardino	St. Mary's College
CSU San Marcos	Teachers College of San Joaquin
CSU Stanislaus	Touro University
Humboldt State University	University of La Verne
San Diego State University	University of Redlands
San Francisco State University	University of San Diego
San Jose State University	University of San Francisco
Sonoma State University	University of Southern California
UC Riverside	University of the Pacific
UC San Diego (DHH)	Whittier College
UC Santa Barbara	Mills College (ECSE)
Alder Graduate School of Education	High Tech High
Alliant International University	Los Angeles County Office of Education
Azusa Pacific University	Los Angeles Unified School District
Biola University	Placer County Office of Education
UMass Global	Santa Clara County Office of Education
California Baptist University	Tulare County Office of Education
California Lutheran University	Ventura County Office of Education
Chapman University	Sacramento County Office of Education
Claremont Grad University	San Francisco Unified School District
Concordia University	Sonoma County Office of Education
Dominican University	Davis Joint Unified School District
Fresno Pacific University	Riverside County Office of Education
Holy Names University	Fortune School
Loyola Marymount University	San Diego County Office of Education
Mount Saint Mary's University	Merced County Office of Education
National University	Kings County Office of Education
Notre Dame de Namur University	Madera County Superintendent of Schools

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. The program is then no longer considered a Commission-approved program and the institution can no longer recommend for that credential area. This action removes the program from the Commission's accreditation system. Institutions withdrawing a program must not submit a program proposal for the same credential area for a time period of one year. The following 18 programs at 12 institutions were withdrawn in 2021-22 and are no longer offered at the institution.

Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (18)

Institution	Programs
California Polytechnic State University, Pomona	Education Specialist: Added Authorization Autism Spectrum Disorders
Fresno Pacific University	Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education
Fresno Pacific University	Designated Subjects: Special Subjects,
Fresno Pacific University	Designated Subjects: Supervision and Coordination
University of Redlands	Clear Administrative Services,
Capistrano Unified School District	Education Specialist - Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
Santa Clara University	Education Specialist - Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
Saugus Union School District	Teacher Induction
Sonoma County Office of Education	Designated Subjects – Special Subjects
Sonoma County Office of Education	Designated Subjects – Supervision and Coordination
CSU, Long Beach	Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education
Chapman University	Bilingual Authorization: Spanish
National University	Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Added Authorization
National University	Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization
Teachers College of San Joaquin	Single Subject: Industrial and Technology Education
Azusa Pacific University	Clear Administrative Services
Azusa Pacific University	Preliminary Administrative Services
Azusa Pacific University	Teacher Librarian

Institutions that are No Longer Approved Program Sponsors

The following institution is no longer an approved program sponsors as a result of withdrawing all of its remaining approved programs.

Institutions No Longer Approved Program Sponsors (1)

Institution	Effective Date
Saugus Union School District	Closed Educator Preparation in October 2021

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 2021-22, institutions in two cohorts (Orange and Blue)

submitted preconditions for review. For these two cohorts, a total of 68 institutions submitted preconditions resulting in 816 general precondition responses and 1,146 program specific precondition responses reviewed after the submission date of March 2022. The list below includes the names of institutions that submitted preconditions during this reporting period.

Preconditions – Orange Cohort Institutions

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

Preconditions – Blue Cohort Institutions

Alliant International University	Loma Linda University
Bellflower Unified School District	Long Beach Unified School District
California School for the Deaf, Fremont	Monterey County Office of Education
California State University, Fullerton	Mt. Diablo Unified School District
Chaffey Joint Union High School District	Oak Grove School District
Chino Valley Unified School District	Orange County Department of Education
Corona-Norco Unified School District	Palmdale School District
Dominican University of California	PUC Schools
Elk Grove Unified School District	San Luis Obispo County Office of Education
Encinitas Union School District	San Mateo County Office of Education
Escondido Union School District	Santa Clara County Office of Education
Fresno Unified School District	Stanford University
Fullerton School District	Tehama County Department of Education
Glendale Unified School District	Torrance Unified School District
Grossmont Union High School District	University of California, Riverside
Holy Names University	Vallejo City Unified School District
Kern High School District	Vanguard University

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 2021-22, the 31 institutions of the Indigo cohort identified in the table below responded to Common Standards and completed Program Review. As indicated in the table below, these 31 institutions offer a total of 125 programs. To provide some understanding of the scope of this work, each program is reviewed by two individuals. Reviewing 125 programs required the effort of over 250 reviewers matched by expertise and availability.

Indigo Cohort Program Review 2021-2022

Below are the institutions in the indigo cohort that participated in program review in 2020-21. The cells in the following table that have a n/a indicate that the institution does not offer that type of program.

Institution	Initial Teacher Prep¹	Teacher Induction	Other Teacher Prep²	Prelim Admin	Admin Induction	Other Services₃	Total
Animo Leadership Charter High School (Green Dot Public Schools)	n/a	1	n/a	1	1	n/a	3
Azusa Pacific University	4	0	1	n/a	n/a	5	10
University of Massachusetts Global	5	n/a	3	1	1	2	12
Brentwood Union School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	4	n/a	3	1	n/a	n/a	8
California State University, Bakersfield	4	n/a	3	1	n/a	1	9
California State University, Chico	4	n/a	3	1	n/a	2	10
California State University, Long Beach	4	n/a	5	1	n/a	5	15
California State University, San Marcos	4	n/a	3	1	n/a	3	11

Institution	Initial Teacher Prep¹	Teacher Induction	Other Teacher Prep²	Prelim Admin	Admin Induction	Other Services₃	Total
Central Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
High Tech High	3	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4
California State Polytechnic, Humboldt	4	n/a	1	1	n/a	2	8
Lancaster School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Madera Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Mount Saint Mary's University	4	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5
Pasadena Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Sacramento County Office of Education	3	n/a	n/a	1	1	n/a	5
San Dieguito Union High School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
San Jose Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
San Ramon Valley Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Stockton Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Teachers College of San Joaquin	5	1	4	1	1	n/a	12
Tracy Joint Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
University of Redlands	3	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	2	6
University of San Francisco	3	n/a	2	1	n/a	1	7

Institution	Initial Teacher Prep¹	Teacher Induction	Other Teacher Prep²	Prelim Admin	Admin Induction	Other Services₃	Total
Ventura County Office of Education	1	1	4	n/a	1	n/a	7
Visalia Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	2
West Covina Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	2
Westside Union School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	2
Total 31	55	20	32	12	8	23	150

¹**Initial Teacher Prep** - Traditional/Intern Preliminary Multiple, Preliminary Single Subject, and Preliminary Education Specialist

²**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

³**Other Services** - Pupil Personnel Services, School Nurse, Speech and Language Pathology

Section III: Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2021-22

The work plan for the Commission and COA for 2022-23 is summarized in this section. The accreditation responsibilities continue with lingering issues and complexities caused by the recent Covid-19 pandemic. The Commission continues to work closely with the field to address these impacts. With this context in mind, the Commission moves forward with implementing its oversight responsibilities and with the accreditation system. Because accreditation activities require significant advanced planning and the uncertainty last year of what the state of the pandemic would be in 2022-23 many of the accreditation activities are continuing to be conducted virtually, while planning for more face to face and hybrid activities next academic year.

Among the major routine accreditation activities for 2022-23 will be:

- Conduct Precondition Review
- Conduct Program Review
- Conduct Common Standards Review
- Conduct Accreditation Site Visits
- Implement the Annual Data Submission process
- Review and approval of new educator preparation programs
- Review of new subject matter programs to go to the Commission for approval
- Review institution for Initial Institutional Approval by the Commission
- Technical Assistance for institutions with site visits in one year (2023-2024)
- Board of Institutional Review Training
- Team Lead Training and Refreshers

Among the other accreditation related priorities are:

- Rethinking site visit structure with possible hybrid options
- Continued assistance to Pupil Personnel Services programs in their first year of transitioning to the new standards
- Continued assistance to Education Specialist programs in their first year of transitioning to new standards and implementation of the teaching performance assessment
- Continued assistance to programs regarding lingering Covid 19 pandemic issues
- Refining the ADS system – adding edTPA, clarity in data requirements
- Refining the language of completer surveys to ensure accuracy in data
- Continued discussion about mining statewide data and how that data should be incorporated into the accreditation system.
- Update the accreditation fee structure and promulgate regulations in this area
- Revise partnership agreement with the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)
- Continue to implement reviews with the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP).

Areas where the accreditation system is critical in implementation of new initiatives

PK3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist Credential

- Develop Initial Program Review process for new program proposals, including evidence required
- Recruitment and Training of Reviewers
- Beginning review and, upon Office of Administrative Law approval of regulations, approval process for new program proposals

Continued Implementation of SB 488 pertaining to Reading Instruction and Literacy

- Determine Evidence Needed to Review new program proposals beginning in 2023 for the new literacy standard and TPEs
- Recruitment and Training of Reviewers on this standard
- Develop the Certification process for all programs for 2024

Continued Implementation and Oversight of New Subject Matter Requirements

- Providing assistance to institutions implementing all the new options available to candidates in law
- Ensuring that recently adopted preconditions on the Subject Matter Requirement are widely known and being implemented

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

Maintain Public Access to the Committee on Accreditation. All Committee meetings will continue to be held in public and all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act and, where necessary, any other laws or directives received by the Legislature and Governor regarding public meetings during the pandemic which has allowed for more flexibility in participation by members and the public through technology. Meetings will continue to be broadcast to allow any individual with access to the internet the ability to hear live or recorded broadcasts of all Committee meetings as well as providing a toll-free phone number for members of the public without internet or computer access to be able to join the meeting and comment. The Commission's website will continue to be used to provide agenda items, notification of meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation. For 2022-23, meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

August 4, 2022
October 27, 2022
January 26-27, 2023
March 9-10, 2023
May 4-5, 2023
June 8-9, 2023

The Committee's agenda in 2022-23 includes a full schedule of site visits beginning in fall 2022 and continuing well into spring 2023. A hefty site visit year includes institutions in the Indigo cohort, revisits, and institutions in provisional status seeking full accreditation. This schedule

will take place while also implementing, and refining as needed, all aspects of the accreditation system such as Program Review, Annual Data Submission, Preconditions Review, and Common Standards Review.

Continuing in 2022-23, the PSD e-News, Program Sponsor Alerts, and any other appropriate and applicable communications platforms will continue to be routinely used to provide consistent and accurate information to preparation programs about the accreditation system, changes in credentialing and standards, and other critical information.

Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission. The Committee on Accreditation will present its annual report to the Commission in December 2022. 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 accreditation system set forth by the Commission. Commissioner Christopher Davis has agreed to assume this role for the year and was present at the October 2022 COA meeting. 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.

Fee Recovery System for Certain Accreditation Activities and an Annual Accreditation Fee System. Governor Newsom and the legislature suspended all accreditation fees in 2020-21 and extended the suspension for 2021-22 in order to alleviate some of the financial burden on institutions caused by the pandemic. These fees were reinstated with the 2022-23 state budget and the Commission began assessing these fees once again. The regulations related to the fees are in need of updating and the Commission staff has identified this as a priority for its workplan for 2022-23.

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 decisions regarding the continuing accreditation of education institutions and their credential programs. Specifically, these include:

Revisits – Red Cohort

Three institutions with site visits that took place in 2021-22 received stipulations that included a revisit. These revisits will take place in 2022-23 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 –Indigo Cohort

Beginning in fall 2022, the 31 institutions in the Indigo cohort will undergo a site visit by a trained team of reviewers. The information from the Program Review and Common Standards

review processes, data in the Accreditation Data System and the related data dashboards including survey results and performance assessment data, as well as interviews and documentation available on an institution's accreditation website will be used by the site visit team to inform them about the programs prior to the site visit.

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. 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. This phase of the Initial Institutional Approval process has only been implemented over the past several years as it represents the last phase in a multistep, multiyear process. In 2022-23, two (2) institutions will undergo a site visit during their provisional period of Initial Institutional Approval in preparation for Commission consideration of full Initial Institutional Approval.

Program Standards Review –Blue Cohort

Program Review submissions were required for the Blue cohort by October 15, 2022. The Blue cohort is comprised of 33 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 2022-23 year through the Program Review process which focuses on 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 visits 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 Indigo cohort. The vast majority of these review sessions are scheduled from November 2022 through January 2023 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 help 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 –Blue Cohort

In February 2023, the 33 institutions that are in the Blue cohort will also submit their documentation with evidence to demonstrate alignment with the Common Standards. One to two Common Standards reviewers and a Team Lead are selected for each institution and 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 –Red and Green Cohorts

In March 2023, the institutions in the Red and Green 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. 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 Accreditation 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. Performance Assessment data (CalTPA and CalTPA) will continue to be available for the second year on the Accreditation Data Dashboards. Staff will continue to work to incorporate additional performance assessments including the EdTPA data in the dashboards.

Review and Revise the Accreditation Handbook

The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. The last revision of the *Accreditation Handbook* took place in 2016. However, given that the revised Accreditation Framework was adopted by the Commission in June 2020 and refinements to the system have been implemented in recent years, a thorough review of the Accreditation Handbook is critical. The COA is on schedule to complete this revision to the Accreditation Handbook in October 2022.

Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards

Review and Take Action to Grant Initial Approval of New Program Sponsors (Initial Institutional Approval).

- *Facilitating Accreditation 101 Sessions*
Approximately two to three Accreditation 101 sessions will be held in 2022-23 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.
- *Facilitating Accreditation 201 Sessions*
In addition, staff will continue to offer and refine the newly developed Accreditation 201 to assist programs that have been granted provisional status and are operating program during the provisional period specified by the Commission. This session was

implemented for the first time in 2022. This session is to be tailored to the programs in attendance to assist them with understanding the expectations of being an approved program sponsor and to prepare them for a provisional site visit.

- *Reviewing Initial Institutional Proposals*

Additionally, the process for reviewing institutions for Initial Institutional Approval will continue. As indicated in Section II of this report, at this time there are numerous institutions in various stages of the multi-step process. Some of these will require a site visit in 2021-22 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.

Review and Take Action to Grant Initial Program Approval for New Credential Programs.

- *Initial Program Review (IPR)*

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. The COA only granted initial approval when the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met and after consideration of the proposal at a COA meeting. This review process will continue in 2022-23.

Continue to Review and Approve Subject Matter Programs.

- *New Subject Matter Programs.*

Institutions seeking to offer one or more subject matter programs are reviewed and, once determined to be aligned to standards, are taken to the Commission for approval. Completion of a subject matter program is one option for candidates demonstrating subject matter. It is anticipated that the Commission will continue to need trained reviewers and dedicated review time to ensure that this activity is conducted efficiently in order to allow these programs to begin operations.

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 2022-23:

- Preliminary Multiple Subject Completer Survey
- Preliminary Single Subject Completer Survey
- Preliminary Education Specialist Completer Survey
- Preliminary Administrative Services Completer Survey
- Clear Administrative Services Completer Survey
- Teacher Induction Completer Survey
- Other Educator Survey
- Master Teacher Survey
- 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 continues around the annual data submission, particularly clarifying terms and questions for particular pathways.

Additionally, continued effort will be made to incorporate performance assessment data into the data dashboard that is used by the accreditation teams 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 continue to focus efforts during 2022-23 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.

A few notable objectives related to the ADS system for 2022-23 is as follows:

- Continued incorporation of performance assessments data into the data dashboards, in particular, data from non-Commission sponsored performance assessment models (such as EdTPA)
- Review and revision of question construction or language used in questions that are unclear for particular pathways to improve the validity of the data being reported. Questions will be reviewed for clarity and applicability, particularly for induction and intern programs
- *Using the Data in ADS to Better Understand Issues Statewide*
The ADS system and its related data dashboards have been used well in the past few years by teams for accreditation visits. More work is needed in the 2022-23 year to ensure that these data are used more consistently across all visits as well as articulated in accreditation reports. In addition, the Commission intends to develop and improve systems whereby the data is examined on a statewide and institutional basis allowing for targeted technical assistance or even more effective oversight.

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 the fall 2022

New Partnership Agreement with Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and continued implementation of partnership with Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP). Commission staff will continue to work to finalize a new partnership agreement with CAEP since the current one expires on November 1, 2022. In addition, staff will continue to work with institutions seeking AAQEP accreditation and with AAQEP itself to refine and improve the concurrent visit structure and aspects of the partnership agreement. Only two institutions in California thus far have sought AAQEP accreditation, however, additional

institutions will be seeking accreditation in the next couple of years allowing the Commission to analyze what aspects of the agreement may need improvement.

Monitoring the first full year of implementation of the new Preliminary Education Specialist and Pupil Personnel Services Program Standards. All programs have transitioned to the new standards and staff will pay particular attention to assisting institutions and reviewers on changes embodied in these new standards. Additionally, staff will monitor the areas of particular challenges and provide focused technical assistance where necessary.

For Pupil Personnel Services programs, the implementation plans are being 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. Technical assistance will continue to be targeted to certain cohorts and focused on particular aspects of accreditation as needed. Office hours, started during the pandemic, will continue to be held for as long as they are found to be advantageous by the field. Additional technical assistance will be provided as necessary on a variety of topics.

Monitoring Program Implementation of New Performance Assessments. As new performance assessments are developed and implemented such as those for Education Specialists, literacy and early childhood education, the COA and Commission staff will review the various implications of that work. Efforts to provide guidance for reviewers and ensure that both institutions and reviewers understand the new assessments and related expectations as articulated in the standards, incorporating the data into the Accreditation Data System, and other appropriate use for the data will be important activities in 2022-23.

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	Red	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	Cal Poly, Humboldt	Indigo
CSU East Bay	Green	San Diego State University	Yellow
CSU Fresno - AAQEP	Violet	San Francisco State University	Violet
CSU Fullerton - AAQEP	Blue	San Jose State University	Orange
CSU Long Beach	Indigo	Sonoma State University	Red
CSU Los Angeles	Red		

University of California (9)

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
UC Merced	Violet		

Independent Institutions (49)

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

Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
Fresno Pacific University	Yellow	University of Phoenix	Orange
Hebrew Union College	Violet	University of Redlands	Indigo
High Tech High Graduate School of Education	Violet	University of San Diego	Red
Holy Names University	Blue	University of San Francisco	Indigo
Hope International University	Violet	University of Southern California *F - CAEP	Violet
Humphreys College	Green	University of the Pacific	Orange
La Sierra University	Violet	Vanguard University	Blue
Loma Linda University	Blue	Western Governors University	Yellow
Loyola Marymount University*S - CAEP	Yellow	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		
Pacific Union College	Red		

Other Program Sponsors (Districts/County Offices/Other) (159)

Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
Assoc. of CA School Admin/ASCA	Orange	Murrieta Valley USD	Violet
Alhambra USD	Orange	Napa COE	Yellow
Anaheim City SD	Yellow	New Haven USD	Violet
Anaheim Union HSD	Orange	Newark USD	Green
Animo Leadership Charter HS	Indigo	Oak Grove SD	Blue
Antelope Valley Union HSD	Violet	Oakland USD	Red
Antioch USD	Green	Ontario-Montclair SD	Yellow
Arcadia USD	Red	Orange County DOE	Blue
Aspire Berkley Maynard Academy	Orange	Orange USD	Red
Atwater Elementary	Violet	Palmdale SD	Blue
Bakersfield City SD	Green	Palo Alto USD	Violet
Baldwin Park USD	Indigo	Palos Verdes Peninsula USD	Violet
Alternatives in Action/REACH	Red	Panama-Buena Vista Union SD	Yellow
Bellflower USD	Blue	Paramount USD	Orange
Brentwood Union SD	Indigo	Pasadena USD	Indigo
Burbank USD	Red	Placentia-Yorba Linda USD	Indigo
Burton School District	Violet	Placer COE	Red
Butte COE	Violet	Pleasanton USD	Red
California School of the Deaf/Fremont	Blue	Pomona USD	Yellow
Campbell Union SD	Red	Poway USD	Red

Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
Capistrano USD	Yellow	PUC Schools	Blue
Central USD	Indigo	Redwood City SD	Red
Ceres USD	Yellow	Rialto USD	Orange
Chaffey Joint Union HSD	Blue	Riverside COE	Red
Chino Valley USD	Blue	Riverside USD	Yellow
Chula Vista ESD	Red	Sacramento City USD	Violet
Clovis USD	Yellow	Sacramento COE	Indigo
Compton USD	Violet	Saddleback Valley USD	Yellow
Conejo Valley USD	Orange	San Bernardino City USD	Green
Contra Costa COE	Red	San Diego COE	Green
Corona –Norco USD	Blue	San Dieguito Union HSD	Indigo
Culver City USD	Red	San Francisco USD	Violet
Cupertino Union SD	Violet	San Gabriel USD	Yellow
Davis Joint USD	Red	San Jose USD	Indigo
El Dorado COE	Violet	San Juan USD	Green
El Rancho USD	Orange	San Luis Obispo COE	Green
Elk Grove USD	Blue	San Mateo-Foster City SD	Green
Encinitas Union SD	Blue	San Mateo COE	Blue
Escondido Union SD	Blue	San Ramon Valley USD	Indigo
Escondido Union HSD	Violet	Sanger USD	Violet
Etiwanda SD	Yellow	Santa Ana USD	Green
Evergreen SD	Green	Santa Barbara CEO	Orange
Fairfield-Suisun USD	Green	Santa Barbara Unified	Violet
Fontana USD	Orange	Santa Clara COE	Blue
Fortune School	Violet	Santa Clara USD	Yellow
Fremont UHSD	Yellow	Santa Cruz COE	Yellow
Fremont USD	Orange	Santa Monica-Malibu USD	Indigo
Fresno COE	Green	Sequoia Union HSD	Violet
Fresno USD	Blue	School for Integrated Academics and Technology/SIA Tech	Orange
Fullerton SD	Blue	Shasta COE	Yellow
Garden Grove USD	Green	Sonoma COE	Yellow
Glendale USD	Blue	Stanislaus COE	Yellow
Greenfield Union SD	Yellow	Stockton USD	Indigo
Grossmont Union HSD	Blue	Sutter County SOS	Red
Hanford ESD	Red	Summit Preparatory Charter HS	Yellow
Hayward USD	Orange	South San Francisco USD	Yellow
High Tech High	Indigo	Sweetwater Union HSD	Orange
Imperial COE	Violet	Tehama County DOE	Blue
Irvine USD	Violet	Torrance USD	Blue
Keppel Union SD	Orange	Tracy Joint USD	Indigo
Kern County SOS	Violet	Tulare City SD	Red

Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
Kern High SD	Blue	Tulare COE	Green
King Chavez Academy	Red	Tustin USD	Blue
Kings COE	Orange	Turlock USD	Orange
Lancaster SD	Indigo	Vallejo City USD	Blue
Las Virgenes Unified School District	Violet	Ventura COE	Indigo
Lodi USD	Yellow	Visalia USD	Indigo
Long Beach USD	Blue	Walnut Valley USD	Yellow
Los Angeles COE	Green	Washington USD	Violet
Los Angeles USD	Red	West Contra Costa USD	Orange
Los Banos USD	Violet	West Covina USD	Indigo
Madera COE	Green	Westside Union SD	Indigo
Madera USD	Indigo	Wm S Hart Union HSD	Violet
Manteca USD	Red		
Marin COE	Red		
Merced COE	Green		
Merced Union HSD	Orange		
Milpitas USD	Orange		
Modesto City Schools	Orange		
Montebello USD	Green		
Monterey COE	Blue		