

---

# 2A

## Information

### *Educator Preparation Committee*

### **Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation 2022-23**

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents the 2022-23 Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation (COA).

**Recommended Action:** For information only

**Presenters:** Robert Frelly and Katrine Czajkowski, COA Co-Chairs, Cheryl Hickey and Erin Sullivan, Administrators, Professional Services Division

---

---

# Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation 2022-23

---

---

## 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 2022-23 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 2022-23. Section III provides the 2023-24 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 2022-23* was adopted by the COA on October 26, 2023. The report provides an update on all activities undertaken by staff and the COA in 2022-23 to implement the accreditation system.



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

**2022-23**

Dear Commissioners:

On behalf of the Committee on Accreditation, we are pleased to present the 2022-23 Annual Report of the COA to the Commission. This report represents the collective commitment and effort of literally hundreds of California educators who volunteer their time to ensure high quality preparation programs. It is with deep gratitude to all who participate in this system that we present this report.

As members of the Committee on Accreditation, we continue to take pride in California's accreditation system and its continuing improvements. The system holds institutions accountable to the Commission's adopted standards while providing essential support and assistance. The process acknowledges the unique needs of local communities, allowing institutions and programs to adapt implementation of required standards to their local context in an effort to maximize outcomes for educators statewide. The variety of data sources used to better understand the effectiveness of programs – from assessment data to candidate/constituent voices – provides a means for determining standard alignment and serves as an objective basis for constructive feedback. Tracking empirical measures of program effectiveness over time clarifies expectations and allows each program to tell its story of accountability and innovation.

While our state's educational challenges loom large so does our ability to approach them from a foundation of clear, reasonable, and vital expectations, supported by a coherent system for monitoring and enhancing their implementation across our diverse state. As members of the Committee on Accreditation, we look forward to our ongoing role in progressing California's robust accreditation system.

Sincerely,

Robert Frelly  
Co-Chair

Katrine Czajkowski  
Co-Chair

## The Committee on Accreditation 2022-23

**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

**Agustin Cervantes**

Director of Student Services  
California State University, Los  
Angeles

**Allan Hallis**

Administrator, Preliminary Teacher Preparation  
Riverside County Office of Education

**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

<b>Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing ....</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>The Committee on Accreditation 2022-23</i> .....	3
<i>Table of Contents</i> .....	4
<i>Executive Summary</i> .....	5
<i>Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee’s Work Plan in 2022-23</i> .....	10
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession.....	12
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality .....	14
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards .....	20
Purpose 4. Fostering Program Improvement.....	23
<i>Section II: Summary of 2022-23 Accreditation Activities</i> .....	26
Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Educator Preparation Programs.....	26
Accreditation Status for Institutions with Site Visits in 2022-23 (31).....	26
Indigo Cohort Institutions.....	26
Institutions Meeting All Standards.....	27
Institutions Receiving Accreditation with All Common and Program Standards Met, 2022-23 ....	27
Findings on Common Standards <sup>1</sup> 2022-23 Accreditation Site Visits (31 institutions) .....	28
Summary of Findings on Program Standards .....	28
All Program Standards Found to be Met During 2022-23 Site Visit .....	29
Action taken in 2022-23 on Institutions with Stipulations from Prior Year Site Visits .....	32
Provisional Site Visits .....	35
Initial Approval of New Single Subject Content Area .....	35
Initial Approval of New Subject Matter Preparation Programs .....	36
New Subject Matter Programs (1) .....	36
Programs Entering Inactive Status (7).....	36
Withdrawal of an Approved Program.....	37
Institutions No Longer Approved Program Sponsors (4).....	38
Preconditions – Red Cohort Institutions (34).....	39
Preconditions – Green Cohort Institutions (28).....	39
Program Review and Common Standards .....	39
Blue Cohort Program Review 2022-2023.....	40
<i>Section III: Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2023-24</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</i> .....	51

## Executive Summary

This report presents a summary of the vast array of activities that comprised the 2022-23 accreditation year for all Commission approved educator preparation programs. Currently, there are 252 Commission approved program sponsors offering 878 different and active educator preparation programs and many of those are offered through various pathways. The Commission's accreditation system is responsible for ensuring that these programs meet Commission expectations of quality. Below is a summary of some of the major accreditation activities during the 2022-23 year.

### *Ongoing Accreditation Activities*

The thirty-one (31) institutions in the Indigo cohort completed site visits in 2022-23. Out of the 31 site visits:

- 26 institutions (84 percent) received a status of Accreditation.
  - 5 institutions (16 percent) received Accreditation with Stipulations, one of which had Major Stipulations.
  - No institutions received a decision of Probationary Stipulations in 2022-23.
- Additionally, site visits took place at:
    - Three (3) institutions with stipulations from visits in 2021-22 with stipulations that required revisits in 2022-23.
    - Two (2) institutions in provisional status seeking Initial Institutional Approval.
  - Progress was monitored and stipulations removed for twelve (12) institutions reviewed in previous years. In all cases, the COA removed stipulations and full accreditation was granted. These included:
    - Ten (10) institutions with Stipulations.
    - Two (2) institutions with Major Stipulations.
  - Preconditions Review: Staff reviewed preconditions during spring/summer 2023 for 62 institutions (Green and Red cohorts) totaling 2,588 preconditions (444 general preconditions and 2,144 program-specific preconditions).
  - Program Review was completed during fall/winter 2022 for the 32 institutions in the Blue cohort offering 79 programs reviewed by over 200 Board of Institutional (BIR) members.
  - Common Standards review was completed during spring 2023 for the 32 institutions in the Blue cohort.
  - New Credential Program Approvals: Fifteen (15) new educator preparation programs were approved at existing institutions and those that received provisional approval from the Commission. This is a significant decrease from the previous year when 29 new programs were approved.



- New Subject Matter Program Approvals: One (1) new subject matter program was approved (Foundational Level General Science).
  - Changes in status for programs included the following:
    - *Move to Inactive*: 7 programs that went inactive across four (4) institutions and several different credential areas. Four of those programs were due to the impending closure of an institution.
    - *Program Closures through Withdrawal*: 23 programs were withdrawn across 15 institutions.
      - 17% (4) of the withdrawn programs were Education Specialist: Added Authorization Autism Spectrum Disorders.
      - 13% (3) were Preliminary Administrative Services.
      - 9% (2) were Preliminary Multiple Subject
      - 9% (2) were Preliminary Single Subject
      - 9% (2) were Teacher Induction
      - 9% (2) were Education Specialist: Added Authorization Early Childhood Special Education
- The remainder included one each of the following:
- Clear Administrative Services,
  - Education Specialist: Added Authorization Emotional Disturbance,
  - Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education,
  - Education Specialist: Added Authorization Resource Specialist,
  - Education Specialist: Physical and Health Impairments,
  - Preliminary Education Specialist: Language and Academic Development w/ Intern,
  - Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, and
  - Teacher Librarian: Special Class Authorization.
- Four (4) institutions closed and ceased offering any educator preparation programs and therefore ceased to be a Commission-approved program sponsor.
- Five institutions were brought before the Commission in various stages of the Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) process.

*Continued Progress on Other Aspects of Implementation of the Accreditation System*

- Revised and adopted the Accreditation Handbook to ensure that the language of the handbook accurately represents changes that have taken place in recent years in processes and procedures.
- Education Specialist and Pupil Personnel Services credential programs were required to transition to new standards by July 1, 2022. Commission staff continued to work with institutions on ensuring full implementation of the new standards. Institutions and reviewers worked through candidates completing programs under the previous standards and candidates being enrolled under the new standards.

- Continued the Board of Institutional Review (BIR) Site Visit Trainings that resulted in approximately 38 additional individuals trained in 2022-23 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 veteran 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.

*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.

The current system is designed as a seven-year cycle comprised of the following major components or activities:

<b>Year of the Accreditation Cycle</b>	<b>Corresponding Component or Activity</b>
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 peer evaluators who are members of the Commission’s Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) 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 BIR members 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 BIR members that reviewed either an institution's program review or common standards submissions are selected for the site visit of that institution. 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 through 5 of the accreditation cycle.

#### *DECISION BY THE COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION*

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) is entrusted in statute with implementing the Commission's 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 2022-23.

## **Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee’s Work Plan in 2022-23**

The accreditation activities of academic year 2022-23 were focused on continuing to address the lingering impacts of the COVID pandemic on educator preparation and to, as much as possible, return to “normal” operations. Most notably, candidates enrolled in teacher preparation programs during 2022-23 were able to practice their emerging skills as educators under the direction of program personnel and mentor practitioners in California public school classrooms, rather than remotely.

### **Progress to Date Since Implementing the Current Accreditation System**

The Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation Project took place from 2014-2016 and laid out a vision for the Commission’s accreditation system. Since that time, significant progress has been made in developing, implementing, and refining the various aspects of the accreditation system to make that vision come to fruition. 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 completer surveys for Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, Administrative Services, Teacher Induction, Administrator Induction, other services credentials, as well as employer and mentor educator surveys for each of these credential programs.
- Implementation of new processes to strengthen oversight of credential 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 of new Preliminary Education Specialist program standards and teaching performance expectations and transition of all Education Specialist programs to these standards and expectations.
- Adoption of preconditions, program standards, and performance expectations for Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) credential programs and transition of all PPS programs to these standards and performance expectations.
- Adoption of preconditions, program standards, and performance expectations for the Bilingual Authorization programs.
- Development of revised Single Subject Matter Program Standards and the review process for these programs.
- Development of a review process for Single Subject programs to add a new Single Subject content area.
- Development and implementation of a process used to take action with respect to late documents from approved program sponsors.
- 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 PPS School Counseling/Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education 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.
- Adoption of revised COA Procedures Manual
- Review of Refinements to the Initial Institutional Approval Process – Stage V

In 2022-23, some of the major accomplishments included:

- Adopting revisions to the Accreditation Handbook to reflect changes in processes and procedures.
- Providing extensive technical assistance to programs around the sunset of COVID-19 flexibilities.
- Developing and implementing a new Accreditation 201 informational session for programs receiving provisional approval and program approval.
- Monitoring and providing technical assistance around the first year of implementation of the Preliminary Education Specialist program standards and TPEs.
- Monitoring and providing technical assistance to programs around the first year of implementation of the Pupil Personnel Services and performance expectations.
- Providing technical assistance and reviewing transition documents for programs to transition to the Bilingual Authorization Program Standards and Bilingual Teaching Performance Expectations.
- Providing technical assistance to programs planning to offer the PK-3 Early Childhood (ECE) Specialist credential program.
- Developing of all materials and processes needed for programs to apply for approval of a new PK 3-ECE credential program.
- Reviewing and updating a new agreement with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) educator preparation.
- Conducting the first concurrent accreditation visits with the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP) national accrediting body.
- Incorporating performance assessment data into the data dashboards
- Providing information about the new literacy standards and performance expectations to programs in order for them to review and update their curriculum.
- Revising the process for and training reviewers to evaluate new program alignment to the literacy standard; specifically for new program submissions through IPR and IIA processes.
- Development of new literacy standards and teaching performance expectations in accordance with SB 488.

## **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 4, 2022  
October 27, 2022  
January 26, 2023  
March 9, 2023  
May 4-5, 2023  
June 8, 2023

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.

All meetings were held in person with the exception of the August meeting which was held virtually. 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, recordings of all meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation.

[PSD News](#). The PSD 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 tool has continued to be useful during 2022-23 in communicating information to the field as the education community navigated the COVID 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 13 PSAs between July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023:

**Program Sponsor Alerts July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023**

<b>Issue Date</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Title</b>
August 9, 2022	22-08	<a href="#"><u>Reinstatement of Fees for Accreditation Activities</u></a>
September 7, 2022	22-09	<a href="#"><u>Revised Passing Score Standards for the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA)</u></a>
September 30, 2022	22-10	<a href="#"><u>Passing Score Standards for the Education Specialist California Teaching Performance Assessments (CalTPA) for Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN)</u></a>
October 3, 2022	22-11	<a href="#"><u>Revised Preconditions Related to the Subject Matter Competence Requirement</u></a>
October 7, 2022	22-12	<a href="#"><u>California Examinations and Assessments Fee Waivers</u></a>
November 10, 2022	22-13	<a href="#"><u>RICA Requirement for the New Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Authorization</u></a>
November 10, 2022	22-14	<a href="#"><u>Approval of Amendments to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations Pertaining to Teaching Performance Assessment</u></a>
November 30, 2022	22-15	<a href="#"><u>Adoption of Revised Literacy Standards and TPEs for Preliminary MS, SS, Education Specialist (MMSN and ESN), and PK 3 Specialist Instruction Preparation Programs.</u></a>
December 2, 2022	22-16	<a href="#"><u>Updates on Requirements for Teaching Transitional Kindergarten</u></a>
May 11, 2023	23-01	<a href="#"><u>Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) - Child Welfare and Attendance (CWA)</u></a>
June 1, 2023	23-02	<a href="#"><u>Adoption of Revised Literacy Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard-Of-Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Education Preparation Programs, Pursuant to Senate Bill 488</u></a>
June 29, 2023	23-03	<a href="#"><u>Transition Plan for the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA)</u></a>
June 30, 2023	23-04	<a href="#"><u>Approval of Regulations RE: Demonstration of Subject Matter Competence Requirement</u></a>

*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 2021-22 COA annual report to the Commission at the [December 2022](#) 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 2022-23-year, Commissioner Christopher Davis served as the 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 decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of educator preparation programs.

In the 2022-23 academic year, a total of thirty-six institutions had various types of site visits. This included thirty-one accreditation site visits for the Indigo cohort institutions, two provisional site visits, and three revisits.

The results of the thirty-one regular site visits conducted are as follows:

- Twenty-Six institutions Accredited, with no Stipulations, including five with a required follow-up report.
- Four institutions Accredited with Stipulations
- One institution Accredited with Major 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 2022-23, the COA removed the stipulations fully for twelve institutions with stipulations from the previous year.

For institutions receiving major stipulations or probationary stipulations, a revisit is often required. In addition, the COA has frequently required that the institution provide interim reports (quarterly or other), regardless of stipulation level, to ensure that the institution is making adequate and timely progress towards addressing the most pressing issues. This was the case in 2022-23. This approach allows the institutions to regularly check in with Commission staff and the COA to ensure they are moving in the direction that the COA expects. It also may provide some additional leverage with their institutional leadership to ensure the resources or tools to enact change are provided and allow 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 2022-23. 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 News. Additionally, staff made themselves 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 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), 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 reviewer feedback.
- A 2-month 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**

<b>Technical Assistance Activity</b>	<b>Attendees</b>
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 institutional representatives.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date and/or Location</b>
Preparation for Institutions Submitting Common Standards Review	December 15, 2022 - Virtual January 10, 2023 - Virtual January 17, 2023 – Virtual January 24, 2023 – Virtual January 31, 2023 – Virtual February 7, 2023 – Virtual February 14, 2023 – Virtual February 21, 2023 – 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.

<b>Technical Assistance Activity</b>	<b>Date/Location</b>
Accreditation Data System (ADS) Weekly Office Hours (30 mins-1 hour per week)	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 in order to serve as reviewers for all 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 2022-23, 38 individuals completed BIR training and are now contributing to the accreditation system.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Number, Date and/or Location</b>
BIR Site Visit Training	July 26-28, 2022
BIR Team Lead Training and Review	January 10, 2023
Common Standards Reviewer Training and Review	10 Common Standards Training and Review Sessions between March 13 and April 25, 2023 (Virtual)
Program Review Training and Review	14 Program Review Sessions between November 2022 and February 2023 (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 to Accreditation 101 with a team of individuals, including a representative from their partner organization. This past year a new Accreditation 201 session was developed by staff to provide additional support sessions to institutions once they receive provisional approval. Two sessions of Accreditation 101 and one session of Accreditation 201 were held in 2022-23. A total of 15 institutions attended these sessions.

Date	Session	Number of Institutions	Types of Institution	Attendees
October 4, 2022	Accreditation 201	4 institutions	4 LEA/ 0 IHE	11 attendees
October 22, 2022	Accreditation 101	4 institutions	2 LEA/2 IHE	22 attendees
June 21, 2023	Accreditation 101	7 institutions	3 LEA/4 IHE	27 attendees

**Technical Assistance Office Hours for Programs**

Since the beginning of the COVID pandemic, 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 programs. Staff have continued to hold these sessions throughout 2022-23. This includes the following:

Program Area	Day
Early Childhood Education	1 <sup>st</sup> Tuesdays 3 <sup>rd</sup> Tuesdays
Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject	1 <sup>st</sup> Tuesdays
Intern	1 <sup>st</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> Tuesdays
Preliminary Education Specialist	2 <sup>nd</sup> Monday
Induction	1 <sup>st</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> Thursdays
Pupil Personnel Services	2 <sup>nd</sup> Thursdays of the Month
Preconditions for Green and Red Cohorts	2 <sup>nd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> Wednesdays

**Technical Assistance and Guidance for candidates impacted by COVID-19**

The Professional Services Division, in collaboration with the Certification Division, continued to provide updates and guidance about actions taken by the Commission, the Governor, and the legislature to provide flexibilities to programs and candidates during the COVID-19 pandemic. In particular, in 2022-23, many of these flexibilities were no longer available to candidates, however a significant number of candidates who had been impacted were continuing to need assistance and clarification about requirements. The Commission continued to host a webpage with information related to COVID flexibilities, and staff continued to respond to numerous questions from candidates and programs about the changing requirements. Additionally, information related to COVID flexibilities was made available in the PSD 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) that 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](mailto:PSDInfo@ctc.ca.gov))
- Cohort Consultant Email (i.e., [PSDRed@ctc.ca.gov](mailto:PSDRed@ctc.ca.gov))
- Accreditation email ([accreditation@ctc.ca.gov](mailto:accreditation@ctc.ca.gov) - General accreditation emails)
- Program Review Email ([ProgramReview@ctc.ca.gov](mailto:ProgramReview@ctc.ca.gov))
- Accreditation Data System ([ADS@ctc.ca.gov](mailto:ADS@ctc.ca.gov))
- Initial Institutional Approval ([IIA@ctc.ca.gov](mailto:IIA@ctc.ca.gov))
- Initial Program Review ([IPR@ctc.ca.gov](mailto:IPR@ctc.ca.gov))
- Commission Standards Review [CommonStandardsReview@ctc.ca.gov](mailto: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, 2022-June 30, 2023)
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: 1 <sup>st</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> Thurs. 10:00-10:50 am CalAPA: Weekly Thurs. 11:00-noon
EdSp CalTPA Office Hours	EdSp CalTPA: First and Third Fri 10-10:30am
Clear Induction Office Hours, hosted by the PA Team and ES	Admin Induction: Weekly Thurs. 8:00-9:00 am
Digging Deeper: Evidence-based Practices in Performance Assessment (all models)	Quarterly Professional Development held in Fall, Winter and Spring (November, February, April)
Lead Assessor Meetings	CalAPA: Bi-weekly Thursday, 4:30-5:30 EdSp CalTPA- Biweekly- Monday and Thursday 4:00-4:30
Coordinator Meetings (Webinar)	CalAPA: October, January and June EdSp CalTPA: March, June, January

<b>Support Event</b>	<b>Dates (July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)</b>
“Deep Dive” Webinars into Specific PA Cycles	CalAPA: 3 sessions, September 2022
New Assessor Training (two-day, all-day training)	CalAPA: 12 sessions (2/cycle), February and March 2023 EdSp CalTPA- MMSN- 2 sessions March 2023 ESN- 2 sessions March 2023
Returning Assessor Training	CalAPA: 6 general sessions, 3 cycle-specific sessions; October 2022 EdSp CalTPA- 1 general session MMSN- 2 sessions- 1 per Cycle December 2022 ESN- 1 session- Cycle 1 January 2023
Conference Attendance	CCTE: October 2022 (CalTPA, EdSp CalTPA) CCAC: November 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
EdSp CalTPA Operational Webinar	October 5, 2022
ECE CalFTP A Field Test Informational Webinar	November 30, 2022 December 14, 2022
ECE CalFTP A Field Test Submission Scoring & Assessor Training	May 4, 2023 May 5, 2023
ECE CalFTP A Field Test Office Hours	January 4, 2023 February 23, 2023 March 9, 2023 March 23, 2023 (morning and afternoon sessions) April 24, 2023
ECE CalFTP A Field Test Mid-Point Drop-In Support	March 15, 2023
EdSp CalTPA Operational Webinar	October 5, 2022
ECE CalFTP A Field Test Informational Webinar	November 30, 2022 December 14, 2022
ECE CalFTP A Field Test Submission Scoring & Assessor Training	May 4, 2023 May 5, 2023
ECE CalFTP A Field Test Office Hours	January 4, 2023 February 23, 2023 March 9, 2023 March 23, 2023 (morning and afternoon sessions) April 24, 2023
ECE CalFTP A Field Test Mid-Point Drop-In Support	March 15, 2023

Support Event	Dates (July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)
Literacy Design Team Meetings	21 Meetings between March 1-2, 2023 and September 28, 2023.

*Receive Regular Updates on Commission Activities Related to Accreditation and Provide Commission with Advice on Issues Related to Accreditation.* During 2022-23, staff continued to prepare agenda items for the COA on issues related to the Commission’s work to inform the work of the Committee and to provide important context. An example of this is the Commission work around literacy instruction, as institutions will need to be aligned with new standards beginning in 2024.

### **Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards**

*Review and Take Action to Grant Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) 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 2022-23. As previously noted, two Accreditation 101 sessions and one Accreditation 201 session were held in 2022-23 for interested institutions.

In 2022-23, five institutions were brought to the Commission for consideration for approval under one or more of the multi-step IIA process. Three of these were in some stage between II and IV. Two others completed the provisional period and were brought forward for consideration and approval by the Commission after a site visit in 2022-23 at the completion of Stage V. These institutions are listed in Section II of this report.

*Review and Take Action to Grant Initial Program Approval for New Credential Programs.* The COA has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs from Commission-approved institutions. Programs are only granted initial program approval when reviewers have determined that all Commission standards are met and after the COA acts to approve. A total of 15 new programs were approved by the COA in 2022-23. 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. The list of new programs is included in Section II of this report. Finding available reviewers to do this work remains a significant challenge.

*Implementation of COA Review Process for Initial Program Approval.* Since the 2018-19 academic year, the documentation provided to the COA to inform their decision about program approval has changed. The COA now receives all of the program proposal documentation for institutions that have 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 the 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 2022-23 year, institutions in both the Green and Red cohorts were required to submit evidence of meeting all relevant preconditions. These two cohorts represent 62 institutions. For these two particular groups of institutions, this resulted in a staff review of evidence for 444 general preconditions and 2,144 program specific preconditions. While this is a significant undertaking, staff review of precondition submissions helps ensure that programs are complying with state statutes, regulations, and Commission policy, and it 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 continued in 2022-23 with the review of 79 programs from 32 institutions in the Blue cohort this year.

The feedback from reviewers and institutions regarding the revised accreditation system has continued to be positive, reflecting strong support for the current program review process. Institutional personnel express appreciation for having a clear understanding of the exact types of evidence needed for program submissions, indicate that the current process has removed some of the guesswork from knowing what is needed and has limited the temptation to provide significantly more descriptive information than what is required.

*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. This allows institutions to address concerns well in advance of the site visit and to make program improvements much more quickly.



After the program review and common standards review are complete, a subset of those reviewers are asked to serve as site visit team members for the programs and institutions they reviewed. Keeping the same 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 and Accreditation Dashboards.* The development of an accreditation 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 annual 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. The dashboards continue to be refined each year, making them more useful to accreditation review teams and institutions than ever before. In 2022-23, performance data was added to the dashboards for use by accreditation teams and institutions for the purpose of program improvement.

Technical Assistance continues to be provided to institutions on the data 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 News. Staff continuously worked with and provided support to institutions in the use of the ADS. Staff 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 2022-23, surveys continued to play an important role in accreditation. Surveys are available for program completers in Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services, and Teacher Induction programs. More recently, the Commission began implementing the Other Credentials survey that is provided for candidates in Pupil Personnel Services, School Nurse, Teacher Librarian, Speech Language Pathology and Agriculture Specialist, and the Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist credential. Completer Surveys are open each year from approximately September 1 to August 31, with the survey results (Program Reports) available in the Commission's Accreditation Data Dashboard (ADD). Survey results from the prior year are updated in the ADD annually each fall.

In addition, the Commission administers both a Mentor/Cooperating Teacher Survey and an Employer Survey. The Master Teacher Survey is open from approximately September 1 to August

31 annually. Preliminary teacher preparation programs send the link to the survey to all their master teachers and submits 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 completers from that program in the past three years. More information on the surveys can be found on this [webpage](#).

Because the response rate was sufficiently high for the program completer surveys, the results were used by accreditation teams in 2022-23. 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.

*Implement a Team Lead Training.* Staff continue to work closely with accreditation team leads to ensure that they are prepared for their critically important roles. Additionally, staff continues to seek to recruit new team leads as veteran team leads retire or are no longer able to continue to serve. Team lead trainings have continued to take place each year at various times, but in particular prior to the start of accreditation site visits.

#### **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 2022-23 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 2022-23.

*Continued Implementation of the Evaluation System for the Accreditation System.* Staff monitor the accreditation system in different ways. Staff frequently request feedback from reviewers and institutions on the accreditation processes and some changes to the system have been instituted as a result of this feedback. 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 potential new team leads, 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. The number of respondents this year declined significantly, and

therefore a renewed effort is being made to ensure that feedback is provided during 2023-24.

*Continued Partnership with National Accrediting Bodies.* An updated Partnership Agreement between the Commission and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) was signed by both parties in 2022. During 2022-23, 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 2022-23. Over time, a significant number of institutions in California that were CAEP accredited have chosen to no longer pursue that option in the future and as of the date of this report there are only two institutions that are CAEP accredited in California (Chapman University and Loyola Marymount University) and a third pending accreditation (Azusa Pacific University).

Also in 2022-23, the Commission continued discussions with 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 have 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. As of the date of this report, three California institutions are AAQEP accredited (CSU Fresno, CSU Bakersfield and National University).

*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 Preparation Programs - Elementary Subject Matter*

*Preparation 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 2022-23, one new subject matter program was approved by the Commission after review by subject matter experts that determined the program to be in alignment with the subject matter program standards. This is 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 2022-23 Accreditation Activities

This section of the report provides more detailed information about results of the 2022-23 Work Plan with a focus on the outcome of the accreditation activities.

### Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Educator Preparation Programs

In 2022-23, 36 accreditation related site visits took place. Thirty-one of these were institutions in the Indigo cohort that were scheduled for visits in 2022-23. Additionally, three institutions with stipulations from a 2021-22 visit received a revisit in 2022-23. Lastly, two additional institutions in the provisional period of initial institutional approval received a site visit in 2022-23.

Most site visits continued to be completed via technology – a process begun during the COVID-19 pandemic. Three visits were conducted in person or in a hybrid virtual and in person fashion. 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. All [site visit team reports](#) and the respective COA actions are made available on the Commission’s public website.

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

**Accreditation Status for Institutions with Site Visits in 2022-23 (31)  
Indigo Cohort Institutions**

Program Sponsor	Accreditation Decision
Animo Leadership Charter High School (Green Dot Public Schools)	Accreditation
Azusa Pacific University	Accreditation
Brentwood Union School District	Accreditation
California State Polytechnic University, Humboldt	Accreditation with Stipulations
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	Accreditation with Stipulations
*California State University, Bakersfield	Accreditation
California State University, Chico	Accreditation
California State University, Long Beach	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
California State University, San Marcos	Accreditation
Central Unified School District	Accreditation

<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
High Tech High	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
Lancaster School District	Accreditation
Madera Unified School District	Accreditation
Mount Saint Mary's University	Accreditation
Pasadena Unified School District	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District	Accreditation
Sacramento County Office of Education	Accreditation
San Dieguito Union High School District	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
San Jose Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations
San Ramon Valley Unified School District	Accreditation
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District	Accreditation
Stockton Unified School District	Accreditation
Teachers College of San Joaquin	Accreditation
Tracy Joint Unified School District	Accreditation
University of Massachusetts Global	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
University of Redlands	Accreditation with Stipulations
University of San Francisco	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
Ventura County Office of Education	Accreditation
Visalia Unified School District	Accreditation
West Covina Unified School District	Accreditation
Westside Union School District	Accreditation

*\*For this institution, 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 2022-23 which resulted in a determination that all Common Standards and all program standards for all programs offered by the institution were met. Of the 31 site visits, 17 institutions (55 percent with site visits in 2022-23) met all standards applicable for the programs they offer. This was an increase from 48 percent of institutions who were deemed to have met all standards in 2021-22.

### **Institutions Receiving Accreditation with All Common and Program Standards Met, 2022-23**

<b>Program Sponsor (17)</b>	<b>Number of Educator Programs Offered by the Institution</b>
Animo Leadership Charter High School (Green Dot Public Schools)	2
Azusa Pacific University	10
Central Unified School District	1
California State University, Chico	10
California State University, San Marcos	11
High Tech High	4
Lancaster School District	1

Program Sponsor (17)	Number of Educator Programs Offered by the Institution
Madera Unified School District	1
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District	1
Sacramento County Office of Education	6
San Ramon Valley Unified School District	1
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District	1
Stockton Unified School District	1
Teachers College of San Joaquin	12
Ventura County Office of Education	6
Visalia Unified School District	2
West Covina Unified School District	2

### Summary of Institutions with Site Visits in 2022-23 Meeting All Standards

Total Number of Institutions 17

Percentage of Institutions Meeting All Standards 55%

### 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 2022-23 site visits are presented in the following table.

### Findings on Common Standards<sup>1</sup> 2022-23 Accreditation Site Visits (31 institutions)

Common Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	27	3	1
2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	28	3	0
3: Study, Fieldwork, and Clinical Practice	28	2	1
4: Continuous Improvement	28	1	2
5: Program Impact	31	0	0

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

### Summary of Findings on Program Standards

The tables below indicate 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 2022-23 Site Visit**

<b>Programs</b>	<b># of institutions with program</b>	<b># of Institutions All Program Standards Met by Program</b>	<b>% of programs with all Program Standards Met</b>
Added Authorization Autism Spectrum Disorder	2	2	100%
Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education	3	3	100%
Added Authorization: Orthopedic Impairments	1	1	100%
Added Authorization: Mathematics Instruction	1	1	100%
Added Authorization Reading and Literacy	4	4	100%
Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist	1	1	100%
Specialist Teaching: Agriculture Specialist Instruction	2	2	100%
Clear Administrative Services	7	7	100%
Teacher Librarian and Teacher Librarian Special Class Authorization	1	1	100%
Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard-of- Hearing	1	1	100%
Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education, w/Intern	1	1	100%
Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance	2	2	100%
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology w/Intern	5	5	100%
Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work	4	4	100%
School Nurse	1	1	100%
Specialist Teaching: California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)	1	1	100%
Speech-Language Pathology	4	4	100%
Designated Subjects: Adult Education	1	1	100%
Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education	2	2	100%
Designated Subjects: Special Subjects	1	1	100%



### Results of Other Program Standard Findings

Programs	# of institutions with program	# of Institutions All Program Standards Met by Program	% of programs with all Program Standards Met
Preliminary Administrative Services, w/Intern	12	11	92%
Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs with Intern	9	8	89%
Specialist Teaching: Bilingual Authorization	6	5	83%
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling, w/intern	5	4	80%
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, w/intern	13	10	77%
Added Authorization Adapted Physical Education	4	3	75%
Preliminary Single Subject, w/intern	15	11	73%
Preliminary Multiple Subject, w/intern	14	10	71%
Teacher Induction	21	15	71%

#### 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](#).

Preliminary Multiple Subject w/Intern (14 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 1: Program Design and Curriculum	1	0
Standard 3: Clinical Practice	3	0
Standard 4: Monitoring, Supporting, and Assessing Candidate Progress towards Meeting Credential Requirements	1	0
Standard 5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment	1	0

Preliminary Single Subject w/Intern (15 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Standard 1: Program Design and Curriculum	1	0
Standard 3: Clinical Practice	3	0
Standard 4: Monitoring, Supporting, and Assessing Candidate Progress towards Meeting Credential Requirements	1	0
Standard 5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment	1	0

<b>Preliminary Ed Specialist: Extensive Support Needs, w/intern (9 Site Visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Standard 2: Program Collaboration, Communication, and Coordination	1	0
Standard 3: Selection and Training of Coaches	2	0
Standard 4: Professional Learning	3	0

<b>Preliminary Ed Specialist: Mild and Moderate Support Needs, w/intern (13 Site Visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Standard 1: Program Design and Curriculum	1	0
Standard 2: Preparing Candidates to Master the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)	1	0
Standard 3: Clinical Practice	3	0

<b>Bilingual Authorization (6 Site Visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Standard 1: Program Design	1	0
Standard 2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the Bilingual Teaching Performance Expectations	1	0

<b>Preliminary Administrative Services, w/intern (12 Site Visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Standard 4: Equity, Diversity and Access	1	1

<b>Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling, w/intern (5 Site Visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Program Standard 2: Preparing Candidates to Master the School Counselor Performance Expectations (SCPEs)	1	0
Program Standard 4: Clinical Practice	1	0

<b>Teacher Induction (21 Site Visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Standard 3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System	1	1
Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors	3	0
Standard 5: Determining Candidate Competence for the Clear Credential Recommendation	0	1
Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services	1	1

<b>Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization (4 Site Visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Standard 7: Requests for Data	1	0
Standard 8: Faculty Participation	1	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 2022-23, the COA closely monitored eleven institutions that had stipulations placed on them as a result of their accreditation site visit in 2021-22. Additionally, the COA continued to monitor one program sponsor, Las Virgenes Unifies School District, that had one stipulation remaining from their site visit in 2020-21. Many of the stipulations placed on this institution had been addressed in 2021-22 but the institution was granted additional time by the COA to continue making progress in addressing one remaining stipulation and the COA continued to monitor the institution during this time. All twelve of the program sponsors addressed all identified issues such that the COA removed the stipulations in 2022-23 and their status was changed to Accreditation. This information is summarized in the table below.

### **Action taken in 2022-23 on Institutions with Stipulations from Prior Year Site Visits**

<b>Program Sponsors</b>	<b>2020-2021 Decision</b>	<b>2021-2022 Decision</b>	<b>Revisit/Updated Decision 2023</b>
Kern Superintendent of Schools		Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Santa Barbara Unified School District		Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
California State University, Monterey Bay		Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Las Virgenes Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
University of Southern California		Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Palos Verdes Peninsula USD		Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation (revisit)
Claremont Graduate University		Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
La Sierra University		Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation (revisit)
Imperial County Office of Education		Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation

<b>Program Sponsors</b>	<b>2020-2021 Decision</b>	<b>2021-2022 Decision</b>	<b>Revisit/Updated Decision 2023</b>
Hope International University		Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
California State University, Fresno		Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Sacramento City Unified School District		Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation

### **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 five institutions were brought before the Commission for Initial Institutional Approval in 2022-23. 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.

<b>Approval Date</b>	<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>Stage</b>	<b>Approval Status</b>
August 2022	Gateway High School	Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions	Provisional Approval
December 2022	Relay Graduate School of Education	Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions	Provisional Approval
December 2022	Alder Graduate School of Education	Stage V - Full Approval	Full Approval

<b>Approval Date</b>	<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>Stage</b>	<b>Approval Status</b>
February 2023	Northeastern University (Mills College at Northeastern University)	Stage II – Eligibility Requirements	Moved to Stage III
June 2023	Northeastern University (Mills College at Northeastern University)	Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions	Provisional Approval
June 2023	Stella Middle Charter Academy	Stage V - Full Approval	Full Approval

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

Once the Commission grants the institution provisional approval, the institution is allowed to submit a program proposal for approval. 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 the program proposal is aligned to the standards. If the reviewers jointly agree that the program proposal is aligned to all standards, it is so noted. If the review team agrees that the program is not aligned to all standards, 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 two to four 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.

The following provisionally approved institutions submitted documentation for new programs in 2022-23 which were reviewed by experts in the field and received approval from the COA to begin offering the programs during their provisional period.

**New Educator Preparation Programs Sponsored by Provisionally Approved Institutions (2)**

<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>Credential Program</b>
Santa Maria Bonita School District	Teacher Induction
Gateway High School	Teacher Induction

### Provisional Site Visits

In 2022-23, accreditation site visits were conducted at two (2) institutions in the final stage (Stage V) of the Initial Institutional Approval process. 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 date of Commission action.

Institution in Stage	Status of Accreditation	Commission Action
Alder Graduate School of Education	Full Approval	December 2022
Stella Middle Charter	Full Approval	June 2023

### Initial Program Approval for Existing Commission Approved Educator Preparation Programs

The Committee on Accreditation granted approval to the following 13 new preparation programs at institutions that are existing Commission approved program sponsors. The 13 below along with the two above from provisionally approved institutions represent a significant one year decline in new programs, down from 29 in 2021-22.

Program Sponsor	Credential Program
United States University	Preliminary Single Subject Intern
United States University	Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern
Merced County Office of Education	Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern
Los Angeles County Office of Education	Preliminary Administrative Services Program
National University	Bilingual Authorization: Spanish
California State University, Fresno	Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Intern
Fresno Pacific University	Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Intern
Academy of Art University	Preliminary Single Subject Intern: Art
San Francisco State University	Professional School Nurse
Compton Unified School District	Clear Administrative Services
Concordia University Irvine	Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology
Concordia University Irvine	Child Welfare and attendance Authorization
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District	Clear Administrative Services

### Initial Approval of New Single Subject Content Area

The Committee on Accreditation granted approval for the following three Single Subject teacher preparation programs to add new Single Subject content areas. These are at institutions that are existing Commission approved program sponsors. The approval process is led by a Commission staff review and includes a required consultation between Commission staff and the Single Subject program leadership to discuss how the Single Subject program is

differentiated to address the needs of teachers in that particular content area.

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Content Area</b>
San Diego State University	Single Subject - Theatre
California State University, Fresno	Single Subject - Theatre
Concordia University Irvine	Single Subject - Theatre

### **Initial Approval of New Subject Matter Preparation Programs**

Completion of a Commission approved subject matter preparation program meets the subject matter requirement for candidates seeking a preliminary teaching credential. Although subject matter preparation programs are not formally part of the accreditation system, reviewing new subject matter preparation program proposals is a significant part of the Professional Services Division priorities. One subject matter preparation program was approved by the Commission in 2022-23 and is included in the table below.

### **New Subject Matter Programs (1)**

<b>Institutions</b>	<b>Programs</b>
California State University, Northridge	Foundational Level General Science

### **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 teach out the remaining candidates but are not allowed to enroll additional candidates. A program may be declared inactive for a maximum of five years, after which they must be withdrawn if not reactivated. 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 7 programs moved to inactive status in 2022-23.

### **Programs Entering Inactive Status (7)**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Programs</b>
San Jose State University	Education Specialist: Added Authorization Early Childhood Special Education,
Holy Names University	Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs w/ Intern
Holy Names University	Preliminary Multiple Subject w/ Intern
Holy Names University	Preliminary Single Subject w/ Intern
Holy Names University	Specialist Teaching: Bilingual Authorization
University of California, Irvine	Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Added Authorization,
School for Integrated Academics and Technology (SIATech)	Teacher Induction

### **Reactivation of an Inactive Program**

An inactive program may be reactivated only when the institution submits a request to the COA within the 5 year window that an institution is allowed to be inactive, and the COA takes 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 2022-23, no programs previously deemed inactive requested or received reactivation.

### **Transition of Professional Preparation Program to New Standards**

46 institutions have completed the documentation review to transition to recently updated standards for Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling, School Social Work, School Psychologist, and Child Welfare and Attendance, effective July 1, 2022.

### **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 thereafter 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 23 programs at 15 institutions were withdrawn in 2022-23 and are no longer offered at the institution.

### **Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (23)**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
Alliant University	Education Specialist: Added Authorization Autism Spectrum Disorder
Animo Leadership Charter - Green Dot Public School	Preliminary Administrative Services
Antioch University	Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate
Antioch University	Preliminary Multiple Subject/Intern
Antioch University	Teacher Induction
Azusa Pacific University	Teacher Librarian: Special Class Authorization
Bard College	Preliminary Single Subject
California State University, Fresno	Specialist Teaching: Early Childhood Education Specialist
California State University, Fullerton	Education Specialist: Added Authorization Resource Specialist
California State University, Los Angeles	Education Specialist: Physical and Health Impairments
Mills College	Education Specialist: Added Authorization Autism Spectrum Disorder
Mills College	Education Specialist: Added Authorization Emotional Disturbance



<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
Mills College	Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education
Mills College	Preliminary Multiple Subject w/ Intern
Mills College	Preliminary Single Subject w/ Intern
Mills College	Preliminary Administrative Services w/ Intern
Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District	Clear Administrative Services
San Jose State University	Education Specialist: Added Authorization Autism Spectrum Disorder
Tulare County Office of Education	Education Specialist: Added Authorization Autism Spectrum Disorder
Tulare County Office of Education	Education Specialist: Added Authorization Early Childhood Special Education
Tustin Unified School District	Teacher Induction
University of Phoenix	Preliminary Administrative Services
Ventura County Office of Education	Preliminary Education Specialist: Language and Academic Development w/ Intern

#### **Institutions that are No Longer Approved Program Sponsors**

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

#### **Institutions No Longer Approved Program Sponsors (4)**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Effective Date</b>
Bard College	Closed Educator Preparation in October 2022
Mills College	Closed Educator Preparation in January 2023
Tustin USD	Closed Educator Preparation in January 2023
Holy Names University	Closed Educator Preparation in May 2023

#### **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 2022-23, institutions in two cohorts (Red and Green) submitted preconditions for review. For these two cohorts, a total of 62 institutions submitted preconditions, resulting in 444 general precondition responses and 2,144 program specific precondition responses reviewed after the submission date of March 2023. The list below includes the names of institutions that submitted preconditions during this reporting period.

### **Preconditions – Red Cohort Institutions (34)**

Alternatives In Action (Reach)	Oakland Unified School District
Arcadia Unified School District	Orange Unified School District
Burbank Unified School District	Pacific Union College
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo	Pepperdine University
California State University, Dominguez Hills	Placer County Office of Education
California State University, Los Angeles	Pleasanton Unified School District
Campbell Union School District	Point Loma Nazarene University
Chula Vista Elementary School District	Poway Unified School District
Concordia University Irvine	Redwood City School District
Contra Costa County Office of Education	Riverside County Office of Education
Culver City Unified School District	Sonoma State University
Davis Joint Unified School District	Sutter County Superintendent of Schools
Hanford Elementary School District	Tulare City School District
King-Chavez Academy of Excellence	University Of California, Berkeley
Los Angeles Unified School District	University Of California, Los Angeles
Manteca Unified School District	University Of California, Santa Cruz
Marin County Office of Education	University Of San Diego

### **Preconditions – Green Cohort Institutions (28)**

Antioch Unified School District	Merced County Office of Education
Bakersfield City School District	Montebello Unified School District
California Lutheran University	Newark Unified School District
California State University, Channel Islands	Notre Dame De Namur University
California State University, East Bay	San Bernardino City Unified School District
California State University, San Bernardino	San Diego County Office of Education
Evergreen School District	San Juan Unified School District
Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District	San Luis Obispo County Office of Education
Fresno County Superintendent of Schools	San Mateo - Foster City School District
Garden Grove Unified School District	Santa Ana Unified School District
Hacienda La Puente Unified School District	Simpson University
Humphreys University	Tulare County Office of Education
Los Angeles County Office of Education	United States University
Madera County Superintendent of Schools	Westmont College

### **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 2022-23, the 32 institutions of the Blue cohort identified in the table below responded to Common Standards and completed Program Review. As indicated in the table below, these 32 institutions offer a total of 79 programs. To provide some understanding of the scope of this work, each program is reviewed by two individuals.

Additionally, two reviewers and the team lead typically review the Common Standards. As a result, reviewing the Common Standards and all program standards for the institutions in the Blue cohort required the effort of over 250 reviewers matched by expertise and availability.

Alliant International University  
 Bellflower Unified School District  
 California School for the Deaf, Fremont  
 California State University, Fullerton  
 Chaffey Joint Union High School District  
 Chino Valley Unified School District  
 Corona-Norco Unified School District  
 Dominican University of California  
 Elk Grove Unified School District  
 Encinitas Union School District  
 Escondido Union School District  
 Fresno Unified School District  
 Fullerton School District  
 Glendale Unified School District  
 Grossmont Union High School District  
 Kern High School District

Loma Linda University  
 Long Beach Unified School District  
 Monterey County Office of Education  
 Mt. Diablo Unified School District  
 Oak Grove School District  
 Orange County Department of Education  
 Palmdale School District  
 PUC Schools  
 San Mateo County Office of Education  
 Santa Clara County Office of Education  
 Stanford University  
 Tehama County Department of Education  
 Torrance Unified School District  
 University of California, Riverside  
 Vallejo City Unified School District  
 Vanguard University

**Blue Cohort Program Review 2022-2023**

Below are the institutions in the Blue cohort that participated in program review in 2022-23. The cells in the following table indicated by an n/a means that the institution does not offer that type of program.

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Initial Teacher Prep<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Teacher Induction</b>	<b>Other Teacher Prep<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Prelim Admin</b>	<b>Admin Induction</b>	<b>Other Services</b>	<b>Total Programs</b>
Alliant International University	3	n/a	2	1	n/a	2	8
Bellflower Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
California School for the Deaf, Fremont	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
California State University, Fullerton	5	1	4	1	1	2	14
Chaffey Joint Union High School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Initial Teacher Prep<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Teacher Induction</b>	<b>Other Teacher Prep<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Prelim Admin</b>	<b>Admin Induction</b>	<b>Other Services</b>	<b>Total Programs</b>
Chino Valley Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Corona-Norco Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	2
Dominican University of California	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3
Elk Grove Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Encinitas Union School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Escondido Union School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Fresno Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Fullerton School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Glendale Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Grossmont Union High School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Kern High School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Loma Linda University	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	2
Long Beach Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Monterey County Office of Education	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	2
Mt. Diablo Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Oak Grove	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Initial Teacher Prep<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Teacher Induction</b>	<b>Other Teacher Prep<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Prelim Admin</b>	<b>Admin Induction</b>	<b>Other Services</b>	<b>Total Programs</b>
School District							
Orange County Department of Education	n/a	1	1	1	1	n/a	4
Palmdale School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
PUC Schools	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
San Mateo County Office of Education	n/a	1	n/a	1	1	n/a	3
Santa Clara County Office of Education	3	1	n/a	1	1	n/a	6
Stanford University	2	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	3
Tehama County Department of Education	n/a	1	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	2
Torrance Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
University of California, Riverside	4	n/a	4	n/a	n/a	1	8
Vallejo City Unified School District	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1
Vanguard University	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2
<b>Total 32</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>79</b>

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

<sup>2</sup>**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

<sup>3</sup>**Other Services** - Pupil Personnel Services, School Nurse, Speech and Language Pathology

### **Section III: Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2023-24**

The work plan for the Commission and COA for 2023-24 is summarized in this section. The accreditation responsibilities continue with lingering issues and complexities caused by the recent COVID-19 pandemic, albeit fewer than previous years. 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.

Among the major routine accreditation activities for 2023-24 will be:

- Conduct Precondition Review for the Yellow and Violet cohorts.
- Conduct Program Review for the Green cohort
- Conduct Common Standards Review for the Green cohort
- Conduct Accreditation Site Visits for the Blue cohort
- Implement the Annual Data Submission process for all programs
- Review and approval of new educator preparation programs
- Review of new subject matter programs to go to the Commission for approval
- Review institutions for Initial Institutional Approval by the Commission
- Technical Assistance for institutions with site visits in 2023-24 and 2024-2025.
- Board of Institutional Review Training
- Team Lead Training and Refresher Trainings

Among the other accreditation related priorities are:

- Continue to rethink the structure of site visits based on the experience of virtual and in-person visits since the beginning of the COVID pandemic
- Continued assistance to Pupil Personnel Services programs in their second year of transitioning to the new standards
- Continued assistance to Education Specialist programs in their second year of transitioning to new standards and implementation of the teaching performance assessment
- Continued assistance to Bilingual Authorization programs in their first year of transitioning to new standards and performance expectations
- Continued refining of the ADS system and Data Dashboards
- Continued discussion about mining statewide data and how that data should be incorporated into the accreditation system
- Complete the process for promulgating regulations related to accreditation cost recovery fees Continued assistance to programs regarding lingering COVID 19 pandemic issues

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

*PK3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist Credential*

- Continue to implement and refine the Initial Program Review process for PK 3 ECE credential program proposals, including evidence required.
- Continue to provide technical assistance for institutions considering offering a PK 3 ECE credential program
- Recruitment and training of reviewers
- Complete the process to promulgate regulations for the PK 3 credential in order to approve PK 3 ECE credential programs upon approval by the Office of Administrative Law.

*Continued Implementation of SB 488 pertaining to Reading Instruction and Literacy*

- Continue to review new program submissions demonstrating alignment with the new literacy standards and performance expectations
- Continue to work with reviewers to refine and improve the process for submission and review of new program proposals with the new literacy standards and performance expectations.
- Complete development of the Certification process for all programs for 2024, communicate that process for all programs and begin the work of accepting submissions, calibrating reviewers, and beginning the review process.

*Development of a system of mining outcomes data to determine whether some programs/institutions need greater attention, focus, technical assistance, and accountability for candidate outcomes.*

- The Commission continues to try to fill vacancies and build a data unit. As the data unit is built, the Commission has identified the need to look at the comprehensive data that is available and to better utilize those data to identify where the accreditation system should focus its attention.

*Continued development and revision of program standards.* Currently in need of updating are the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) and Reading Leadership Specialist Credential and Speech Language Pathology credential. Additionally, the Child Welfare and Attendance standards need review in light of passage of legislation that allows local education agencies to offer the CWA programs. These efforts are all underway in various phases. Staff is also reviewing legislation that allows Licensed Vocational Nurses to serve under the direction of a School Nurse and whether that requires any changes to standards or credentials.

**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. 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 2023-24, meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

August 10, 2023  
October 26, 2023  
January 25-26, 2024  
March 21-22, 2024  
May 2-3, 2024  
June 6-7, 2024

The Committee's agenda in 2023-24 includes a full schedule of site visits beginning in fall 2023 and continuing well into spring 2024.

Continuing in 2023-24, the PSDNews, Program Sponsor Alerts, and other appropriate and applicable communications platforms will continue to be 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 2023. 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 continues to hold this role. 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 2021-2022 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. Staff will continue in 2023-24 to complete the regulatory process to update the cost recovery fee system.

## **Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality**

### *Professional Accreditation of Institutions and their Credential Preparation Programs*

This is one of the primary ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making the decisions regarding the continuing accreditation of



education institutions and their credential programs. Specifically, these include:

#### *Follow Up– Indigo Cohort*

Five institutions with site visits that took place in 2022-23 received stipulations. Ensuring these institutions address the stipulations will be an important part of the work for 2023-24. Additionally, institutions that received full accreditation but with a required 7<sup>th</sup> year report will also be monitored.

#### *Regularly Scheduled Site Visits –Blue Cohort*

Beginning in fall 2023, the 32 institutions in the Blue cohort will undergo a site visit by a trained team of reviewers. Information from the Program Review and Common Standards review, data in the Accreditation Data System and 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 2023-24, one institution will undergo a site visit during their provisional period of Initial Institutional Approval in preparation for Commission consideration of full initial institutional approval.

#### *Program Review Submission and Review –Green Cohort*

Program Review submissions were required for the Green cohort by October 15, 2023. The Green cohort is comprised of 28 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 2023-24 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 review submission. The vast majority of program review sessions are scheduled from November 2023 through January 2024 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 reviewers 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 32 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 and Review –Yellow and Violet Cohorts*

In March 2024, the institutions in the Yellow and Violet 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 annually. 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 (TPA and APA) will continue to be available for the second year on the Accreditation Data Dashboards. Staff will continue to work to refine the manner in which the performance assessments are included in the dashboards.

### **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 2023-24 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 the newly developed Accreditation 201 to assist programs that have been granted provisional status and are operating programs during the provisional period specified by the Commission. This session was implemented for the first time in 2022. This session will 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. One of these institutions will require a site visit in 2023-24 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 grants 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 2023-24.

*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 competence. 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 2023-24:

- 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
- Mentor Teacher Survey
- Employer Survey

Discussions with the COA, BIR, and site visit team members about the appropriate use of 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 2023-24 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 2023-24 are as follows:

- Continued incorporation of performance assessment data into the data dashboards, in particular, data from non-Commission sponsored performance assessment models (such as EdTPA and FAST).
- 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 2023-24 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 of 2023.

*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 expired on November 1, 2022. In addition, staff will continue to work with institutions seeking AAQEP accreditation and with AAQEP staff in order 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 Bilingual Authorization standards and performance expectations.* 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.

*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 Specialist candidates, 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 2023-24.

#### *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 - AAQEP	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 -	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 (50)

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

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
Concordia University	Red	University of La Verne	Orange
Dominican University of California	Blue	University of Phoenix	Orange
Fresno Pacific University	Yellow	University of Redlands	Indigo
Hebrew Union College	Violet	University of San Diego	Red
High Tech High Graduate School of Education	Violet	University of San Diego	Red
Hope International University	Violet	University of Southern California	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	Westmont College	Green
National University - AAQEP	Violet	Whittier College	Yellow
Notre Dame de Namur University	Green	University of San Francisco	Indigo
Pacific Oaks College	Violet	William Jessup University	Yellow
Pacific Union College	Red		

**Other Program Sponsors (Districts/County Offices/Other) (168)**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
Assoc. of CA School Admin/ASCA	Orange	Milpitas USD	Orange
<i>Alameda County Office of Education</i>	<i>Provisional Approval</i>	Modesto City Schools	Orange
Alhambra USD	Orange	Montebello USD	Green
Anaheim City SD	Yellow	Monterey COE	Blue
Anaheim Union HSD	Orange	Mt. Diablo Unified School District	Blue
Animo Leadership Charter HS	Indigo	Murrieta Valley USD	Violet
Antelope Valley Union HSD	Violet	Alternatives in Action/REACH	Red
Antioch USD	Green	Napa COE	Yellow
Arcadia USD	Red	New Haven USD	Violet
Aspire Berkley Maynard Academy	Orange	<i>Newhall School District</i>	<i>Provisional Approval</i>
Atwater Elementary	Violet	Newark USD	Green
Bakersfield City SD	Green	Oak Grove SD	Blue
Baldwin Park USD	Indigo	Oakland USD	Red
Bellflower USD	Blue	Ontario-Montclair SD	Yellow
Brentwood Union SD	Indigo	Orange County DOE	Blue
Burbank USD	Red	Orange USD	Red

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
Burton School District	Violet	Palmdale SD	Blue
Butte COE	Violet	Palo Alto USD	Violet
California School of the Deaf/Fremont	Blue	Palos Verdes Peninsula USD	Violet
Campbell Union SD	Red	Panama-Buena Vista Union SD	Yellow
Capistrano USD	Yellow	Paramount USD	Orange
Central USD	Indigo	Pasadena USD	Indigo
Ceres USD	Yellow	Placentia-Yorba Linda USD	Indigo
Chaffey Joint Union HSD	Blue	Placer COE	Red
Chino Valley USD	Blue	Pomona USD	Yellow
Chula Vista ESD	Red	Pleasanton USD	Red
Clovis USD	Yellow	Poway USD	Red
Compton USD	Violet	PUC Schools	Blue
Conejo Valley USD	Orange	Redwood City SD	Red
Contra Costa COE	Red	Rialto USD	Orange
Corona –Norco USD	Blue	Riverside COE	Red
Culver City USD	Red	Riverside USD	Yellow
Cupertino Union SD	Violet	Sacramento City USD	Violet
Davis Joint USD	Red	Sacramento COE	Indigo
El Dorado COE	Violet	Saddleback Valley USD	Yellow
El Rancho USD	Orange	<i>San Benito County Office of Education</i>	<i>Provisional Approval</i>
Elk Grove USD	Blue	San Bernardino City USD	Green
Encinitas Union SD	Blue	San Diego COE	Green
Escondido Union SD	Blue	San Dieguito Union HSD	Indigo
Escondido Union HSD	Violet	San Francisco USD	Violet
Etiwanda SD	Yellow	San Gabriel USD	Yellow
Evergreen SD	Green	San Jose USD	Indigo
Fairfield-Suisun USD	Green	San Juan USD	Green
<i>Folsom Cordova Unified School District</i>	<i>Provisional Approval</i>	San Luis Obispo COE	Green
Fontana USD	Orange	San Mateo-Foster City SD	Green
Fortune School	Violet	San Mateo COE	Blue
Fremont UHSD	Yellow	<i>San Mateo Union High School District</i>	<i>Provisional Approval</i>
Fremont USD	Orange	San Ramon Valley USD	Indigo
Fresno COE	Green	Sanger USD	Violet
Fresno USD	Blue	Santa Ana USD	Green
Fullerton SD	Blue	Santa Barbara CEO	Orange
Garden Grove USD	Green	Santa Barbara Unified	Violet
Gateway HS	<i>Provisional Approval</i>	Santa Clara COE	Blue



<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
Glendale USD	Blue	Santa Clara USD	Yellow
Greenfield Union SD	Yellow	Santa Cruz COE	Yellow
Grossmont Union HSD	Blue	<i>Santa Maria-Bonita School District</i>	<i>Provisional Approval</i>
Hacienda La Puente USD	Green	Santa Monica-Malibu USD	Indigo
Hanford ESD	Red	Sequoia Union HSD	Violet
Hayward USD	Orange	School for Integrated Academics and Technology/SIA Tech	Orange
High Tech High	Indigo	Shasta COE	Yellow
<i>Huntington Beach Union High School District</i>	<i>Provisional Approval</i>	Sonoma COE	Yellow
Imperial COE	Violet	South San Francisco USD	Yellow
Irvine USD	Violet	Stanislaus COE	Yellow
Keppel Union SD	Orange	Stella Middle Charter Academy	Indigo
Kern County SOS	Violet	Stockton USD	Indigo
Kern High SD	Blue	Sutter County SOS	Red
King Chavez Academy	Red	Summit Preparatory Charter HS	Yellow
Kings COE	Orange	Sweetwater Union HSD	Orange
<i>Lake County Office of Education</i>	<i>Provisional Approval</i>	Tehama County DOE	Blue
Lancaster SD	Indigo	Torrance USD	Blue
Las Virgenes Unified School District	Violet	Tracy Joint USD	Indigo
<i>Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District</i>	<i>Provisional Approval</i>	Tulare City SD	Red
Lodi USD	Yellow	Tulare COE	Green
Long Beach USD	Blue	Turlock USD	Orange
<i>Los Altos Elementary SD</i>	<i>Provisional Approval</i>	Vallejo City USD	Blue
Los Angeles COE	Green	Ventura COE	Indigo
Los Angeles USD	Red	Visalia USD	Indigo
Los Banos USD	Violet	Walnut Valley USD	Yellow
Madera COE	Green	Washington USD	Violet
Madera USD	Indigo	West Contra Costa USD	Orange
Manteca USD	Red	West Covina USD	Indigo
Marin COE	Red	Westside Union SD	Indigo
Merced COE	Green	Wm S Hart Union HSD	Violet
Merced Union HSD	Orange	<i>Yuba City Unified School District</i>	<i>Provisional Approval</i>