



CODED CORRESPONDENCE

DATE: December 7, 2018	NUMBER: 18-07
TO: All Individuals and Groups Interested in the Activities of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing	FROM: Mary Vixie Sandy Executive Director Commission on Teacher Credentialing
SUBJECT: Proposed Amendments to Title 5 Regulations Pertaining to Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities	

Notice of Public Hearing is Hereby Given

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) proposes to take the regulatory action described below after considering all comments, objections, and recommendations regarding the proposed action. A copy of the proposed regulations is attached with the added text underlined and the deleted text lined out.

A public hearing on the proposed actions will be held:

February 8, 2019
8:30 a.m.
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95811

Written Comment Period

Any interested person, or his or her authorized representative, may submit written comments by fax, through the mail, or by email relevant to the proposed action. The written comment period closes at 5:00 p.m. on January 21, 2019. Comments must be received by that time or may be submitted at the public hearing. You may fax your response to (916) 327-3165; write to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, attn. Kathryn Polster, 1900 Capitol Avenue,

Sacramento, California 95811; or submit an email to kpolster@ctc.ca.gov, or Michelle Bernardo at mbernardo@ctc.ca.gov.

Any written comments received by the closing of the public comment period will be reproduced by the Commission's staff for each member of the Commission as a courtesy to the person submitting the comments and will be included in the written agenda item prepared for and presented to the full Commission at the hearing.

Authority and Reference

Education Code (EC) section 44225 authorizes the Commission to adopt the proposed regulation amendments. The proposed regulations implement, interpret, and make specific changes to EC section 44374.5 pertaining to fees related to extraordinary accreditation activities.

Information Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Summary of Existing Laws and Regulations

This rulemaking action proposes amendments to sections 80691 and 80692 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) related to cost recovery fees for extraordinary accreditation activities. The purpose of the fee schedule is to recover the costs of extraordinary staff time and work that is created as a result of a current or prospective educator preparation program requiring consultation or additional specialized attention outside of regularly scheduled accreditation activities. As a result of the addition of EC section 44374.5 which authorized the Commission to develop and implement a cost recovery plan for extraordinary accreditation activities the initial cost recovery fee regulations went into effect October 30, 2013 after Commission approval on September 27, 2013.

The Budget Act of 2015 (Assembly Bill 93, Chap. 10, Stats. 2015) provided a one-time General Fund appropriation of \$3.467 million for the Streamline and Strengthen the Accreditation Process (SSAP) which included funds to support a comprehensive review and revision of educator preparation including the development and implementation of significant improvements to streamline and strengthen the Commission's accreditation system. Significant changes to the accreditation system's processes and terminology have resulted in the need to amend sections 80691 and 80692 of Title 5 of the CCR related to cost recovery fees for extraordinary accreditation activities so that the regulations are up to date and aligned with the Commission's processes and the governing statutes.

At the December 2016 Commission meeting staff proposed amendments to the fee schedule and the Commission directed staff to begin the regular rulemaking process. A Coded Correspondence and a notice of proposed amendments were published on the Commission webpage on April 14, 2017. Additionally, the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) published the notice on their website. The proposed amendments included two fee changes and general clean-up to align terms with the Commission's restructured accreditation system.

As part of the regulatory process, staff engaged in several discussions with OAL and responded to their questions about the proposed regulations. During these discussions it became apparent to Commission staff that the regulatory process for the proposed cost recovery regulations was extraordinarily complicated. This was due in part to the extensive changes implemented in processes and procedures that stem from the strengthening and streamlining accreditation project. In addition, the current regulations incorporated by reference specific Accreditation Handbook chapters requiring interested parties to have to consult both sources. After discussions with OAL and upon reflection, staff realized the need to identify a new approach that would be more transparent and less burdensome to readers.

Additionally, in summer 2017, while the staff was preparing the regulations package for submission to OAL, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) changed their fee structure which resulted in an additional \$2,500 fee for the Commission for each joint review conducted with educator preparation programs in California. National accreditation is voluntary in California. The activity is in addition to the regularly scheduled activities and is defined as an extraordinary fee. In response, at the September 2017 Commission meeting, the Commission took action to include a new \$2,500 fee for joint CAEP site visits and directed staff to include this fee in this regulations packet.

As a result of these factors, the 2017 rulemaking packet was withdrawn. After withdrawing the previously amended Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities regulations from review by the OAL, Commission staff attended additional training with OAL staff and received clarification on the best methods for updating regulations in light of the significant overhaul to the accreditation system.

The amendments in this proposal have been updated and rewritten for clarity and to reflect the changes to the accreditation system, including a fee for joint accreditation visits with other accrediting entities.

General Provisions

The proposed regulations have been updated and rewritten for clarity and to align terminology and fee structure with the new changes to the accreditation system, including a fee for joint accreditation visits with other accrediting entities, removal of the in-kind process, removing obsolete fees, and general language cleanup.

Articles Incorporated By Reference

Currently, regulations have several chapters of the Commission's Accreditation Handbook incorporated by reference and interested parties have to consult both the regulations and the incorporated handbook chapters. The updates to the Accreditation System have necessitated updates to the Accreditation Handbook. In order to align terminology between the new system and proposed regulations all of the article incorporated by reference in the current regulations have been removed. The Commission believes this approach is more transparent and less burdensome on the readers. Rather than amending the current cost recovery sections with articles incorporated by reference, the Commission is proposing to amend the current

accreditation fee regulations by providing greater detail and terminology alignment in the definitions section of the text and removing the articles incorporated by reference.

Definitions Amendments

The definitions section of the regulations has been updated to reflect the new accreditation system and eliminate language that no longer applies to the current system, as well as to clearly define the various types of accreditation team site visits and types of documentation that must be submitted throughout the accreditation cycle.

Fee Structure Amendments for Initial Program Review (IPR)

Amendments to the regulations are being proposed due to the changes in the accreditation system and efforts to update and revise program standards. Currently, the cost recovery fee structure is based on the number of standards required for the submission of a new program. Since program standards have been streamlined and strengthened, the number of standards in a program is no longer indicative of the complexity of elements within the program standards or the efforts needed to review the program. Proposed amendments include categorizing standards based on the type of authorization that results from them (preliminary credential, clear credential, or added authorization) which provides the flexibility needed to continually improve standards without having to amend the fee structure or regulations.

Fee Structure Amendments for Initial Institutional Approval (IIA)

The previous flat fee of \$2,000 for IIA covered the review of preconditions and Common Standards as well as time consulting with prospective institutions and reviewing their documentation. In the previous IIA process, there was a single Commission decision point. However, the current IIA process is now much more rigorous and includes multiple stages for which documentation is submitted for review and action by the Commission. This new more rigorous review format requires a significant amount of additional staff time. Specifying the fees for specific IIA activities not only recovers the cost of staff time and reviewer's travel for these extraordinary accreditation activities, but it is more reflective of the various stages of the new system. Instead of a flat \$2,000 fee the new fee structure more appropriately reflects the work involved in providing assistance to institutions before during and after Accreditation 101, reviewing and approving the eligibility requirements, the Initial Program Review process. Finally, the proposed regulations allow for a \$1,000 per site visit team member for initial focused site visits for provisionally approved institutions. The Commission has historically charged \$1,000 per site visit team member for focused site visits, however the regulations did not explicitly explain the difference between an accreditation focused site visit for an institution already approved by the Commission and an initial focused site visit for a provisionally approved institution.

Fee Structure Amendments for Joint Site Visits

At the September 2017 Commission meeting the Commission approved adding a new fee for joint site visits with CAEP as a result of changes that CAPE made to their annual dues formula. CAEP's restructuring of their fees requires the Commission to pay dues which have increased \$2,500 per institution requesting a joint visit. Since joint visits are not a requirement of the

accreditation system for the state of California the Commission approved adding the \$2,500 dues to the cost recovery regulations for institutions choosing to have a joint visit.

Deleted Fees

The program assessment process has been replaced by program review and streamlined to have only one review session. For this reason, fees associated with more than three reviews are no longer necessary and are proposed to be deleted from the fee structure.

When the fee structure was initially created an in-kind payment process was allowed as a way to ease the financial burden of IPR. Approved institutions seeking a new program approval could pay in-kind by sending two Board of Institutional Review (BIR) trained members to the Commission to review two documents each. The in-kind payment option has not been utilized by very many institutions and staff are proposing eliminating the in-kind payment structure entirely.

Summary of Amendments

The proposed amendments are presented in three ways. Table 1 shows the current fee and the proposed change, if any. Table 2 provides proposed changes with a detailed rationale for the change. Table 3 provides the program category listing for the Initial Program Review fees. Additionally, Table 4 provides the calculations utilized for determining the structure of the fees.

Table 1: Current Cost Recovery Fees and Proposed Changes

Beyond Standard Accreditation Cycle Activities Education Code §44374.5	Comment/Brief Explanation	Current Cost Recovery Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery Fee
<p>Current: Initial Institutional Approval Proposed: Initial Institutional Approval Review of IIA Eligibility Requirements Review of IIA Common Standards Review of IIA Preconditions Initial Focused Site Visit</p>	<p>Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) is the process used by the Commission to determine whether an institution that has not previously been approved to offer educator preparation leading to a license or certificate in California should be authorized to do so by the Commission. Previously, this process comprised of a review of program and Common Standards and one decision point by the Commission. At the request of the Commission, this process has been recently revised to be a multi-stage review process with several decision points by the Commission.</p>	<p>\$2,000</p>	<p>Eligibility Requirements: \$1,000 Common Standards: \$1,000 Preconditions: \$1,000 Focused Site Visit: \$1,000 per team member</p>
<p>Current: Initial Program Review: Programs responding to 12 or more standards Proposed: Initial Program Review: Category I Preliminary/Initial Preparation programs</p>	<p>Initial Program Review (IPR) is the process of determining whether to approve a new educator preparation program leading to a license, certificate, or authorization. IPR is restricted to Commission approved institutions, that is, those that have previously been approved through IIA. IPR is considered and acted upon by the Committee on Accreditation (COA). Previously, the fees for IPR was based on the number of standards of a credential area. As program standards were streamlined and strengthened, the number of standards in a program is no longer indicative of the complexity of the effort needed to review the program. Rather than base the fee structure on the number of standards for a credential area, it is proposed that it be based on the type of credential program. Credential programs have been arranged into three categories for programs with similar characteristics.</p>	<p>\$2,000</p>	<p>No changes</p>
<p>Current: Initial Program Review: Programs responding to 6-11 standards Proposed: Initial Program Review: Category II Second Tier Preparation programs</p>	<p>See IPR above.</p>	<p>\$1,500</p>	<p>No changes</p>

Beyond Standard Accreditation Cycle Activities Education Code §44374.5	Comment/Brief Explanation	Current Cost Recovery Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery Fee
Current: Initial Program Review: Programs responding to fewer than 6 standards Proposed: Initial Program Review: Category III Added Authorization programs	See IPR above.	<i>\$1,000</i>	<i>No changes</i>
Current: In-kind payment for Initial Program Review Proposed: Eliminate in-kind payment option	Currently, in-kind is accepted in lieu of payment by an institution if an institution provides two Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) members to review two program documents. The proposed regulations would eliminate this option.	<i>In-kind payment</i>	<i>Eliminate</i>
Current: Focused Site Visit Proposed: Focused Site Visit		<i>\$1,000 per team member</i>	<i>\$1,000 per team member</i>
Current: Late Document Reviews Proposed: Review of Late Submission of Accreditation Documentation	The Accreditation System requires that various documentation be submitted at various times during the seven-year cycle at specified due dates, the Commission incurs additional staff time and expense in tracking down the late submissions and in coordinating additional reviews.	<i>\$500 per program</i>	<i>\$500 per document</i>
Current: Program Assessment Requiring More than 3 Reviews Proposed: Eliminate	No longer part of the accreditation system	<i>\$1,000</i>	<i>Eliminate Fee</i>
Current: Full Program Review during Site Visit as a result of not completing program assessment process Proposed: Modified fee for full program review for not	Full Program Review is required when the documentation was not submitted in time for a review prior to the site visit (in the past it was Program Assessment and in the new system it is Program Review) or that the documentation that was submitted raised significant questions about whether the program was aligned to the standards. In either case, it is determined that an additional review team member is needed to be entirely dedicated to conducting an in-depth review of the program.	<i>\$3,000 per program</i>	<i>\$1,000 per team member</i>

Beyond Standard Accreditation Cycle Activities Education Code §44374.5	Comment/Brief Explanation	Current Cost Recovery Fee	Proposed Cost Recovery Fee
completing required activities of the accreditation cycle			
Current: Not in regulations Proposed: Joint visitation fee with regional or national accrediting bodies	The Commission, in partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), conducts joint accreditation visits with CAEP institutions seeking both state and national accreditation. Joint visits are site visits where review teams are comprised of reviewers appointed by both CAEP and by the Commission, some portions of the processes are merged while still meeting the individual needs of each accrediting body, and the process allows for both accrediting bodies to make accreditation findings. Joint visits allow for efficiencies in both the work of the Commission’s accreditation visits and for the institution seeking accreditation.	<i>no fee</i>	<i>\$2,500</i>
Current: Site revisit fee Proposed: Site revisit fee		<i>\$1,000 per team member</i>	<i>No changes</i>
Current: Review of 7 th year report with no site revisit Proposed: Review of 7 th year report with no site revisit	Seventh Year reports with no site revisit are reports required to be submitted by institutions as a result of action taken by the COA that address specific findings of issues or concerns of the accreditation site visit team. Seventh year reports are required for institutions with stipulations, but can also be required for institutions without stipulations based on the COA’s discretion.	<i>\$500</i>	<i>No changes</i>
Current: Review of 7 th year report associated with a site revisit Proposed: Review of 7 th year report associated with a site revisit	Seventh year reports associated with a site revisit are reports required to be submitted by institutions as a result of action taken by the COA that address specific findings or issues or concerns of the accreditation site visit team. A seventh year report associated with a site revisit is used to provide the site revisit team with information about the actions taken by the institution to address the stipulations and as a basis for the revisit.	<i>\$1,000</i>	<i>No changes</i>

Table 2: Current Regulations with Proposed Amendments and Rationale

Regulation	Proposed Amendment	Rationale
§80691		
§80691(a)	<p><i>Insert new definition: “Accreditation Documentation”</i></p> <hr/> <p>Definition for “Board of Institutional Review member” <i>updated and relocated to §80691(d).</i></p>	<p>The former accreditation system and fee structure included specific types of documentation (biennial reports, program assessment, and 7th year reports). Some of these types of documentation are no longer included in the new accreditation system which now require four types of Accreditation Documentation that must be submitted throughout the seven-year cycle. Definitions for the types of documentation have been added under §80691(a)(1)-(4).</p> <p>In the former system, different types of documents were reviewed differently and had different costs for non- or late submission. The new streamlined accreditation system has removed the need for most documentation to be reviewed multiple times and the fee structure needs to be aligned with the new system. Adding this definition makes the fee structure of the proposed regulations more clear.</p> <p>It is important to note that Accreditation Documentation is also required for Initial Institutional Approval (IIA). This cost recovery fee information is described in section 80692(a).</p>
§80691(a)(1)	<p><i>Insert new definition: “Annual data submissions”</i></p>	<p>The definition for annual data submissions has been added to clarify the different types of Accreditation Documentation in the current system. Adding this definition makes the fee structure of the proposed regulations more clear. Fees related to annual data submissions can be found in §80692(b)(2).</p>
§80691(a)(2)	<p><i>Insert new definition: “Common Standards responses”</i></p>	<p>The definition for Common Standards responses has been added to clarify the different types of Accreditation Documentation in the current system. Adding this definition makes the fee structure of the proposed regulations more clear.</p>

Regulation	Proposed Amendment	Rationale
		Fees related to Common Standards responses can be found in §80692(a)(2)(A) for IIA and in §80692(b)(2) for currently approved programs.
§80691(a)(3)	<i>Insert new definition:</i> “Preconditions responses”	The definition for preconditions responses has been added to clarify the different types of Accreditation Documentation in the current system. Adding this definition makes the fee structure of the proposed regulations more clear. Fees related to preconditions responses can be found in §80692(a)(2)(B) for IIA and in §80692(b)(2) for currently approved programs.
§80691(a)(4)	<i>Insert new definition:</i> “Program Review Submission”	The definition for Program Review Submission has been added to clarify the different types of Accreditation Documentation in the current system. Adding this definition makes the fee structure of the proposed regulations more clear. Fees related to program documents can be found in §80692(b)(2).
§80691(b)	<i>Definition removed:</i> “Focused site visit”	This definition was deleted and replaced by the term “Focused accreditation site visit” located in §80691(c)(2). The new accreditation system has five types of site visits and the term and definition needed to be amended and updated to bring the regulatory language up to date.
	<i>Insert new definition:</i> “Accreditation System”	This definition is being added, as “accreditation system” is a common term within this section.
§80691(c)	<i>Definition updated and relocated to §80691(g) for “Initial Institutional Approval”</i>	Relocated to maintain alphabetical order of definitions.
	<i>Insert new definition:</i> “Accreditation team site visit”	To improve clarity, and at the recommendation of the Office of Administrative Law (OAL), the Commission is removing all of the Committee on Accreditation (COA) Accreditation Handbook chapters from the regulations as “articles incorporated by reference” and instead this definition has been inserted. This approach

Regulation	Proposed Amendment	Rationale
		<p>provides clear definitions without requiring the regulated public to review a secondary document.</p> <p>Education Code §44374(b) requires that the accreditation system include “well-trained accreditation teams.” This definition explains what an accreditation team site visit is, the purpose of it, and how the teams are composed.</p> <p>The Commission has five different types of accreditation team site visits as described in §80691(c)(1)-(5).</p>
§80691(c)(1)	<p><i>Insert new definition:</i> “Standard accreditation site visits”</p>	<p>Definition added to clarify between the different types of site visits. The cost recovery fees associated with each type of site visit varies and the definitions are necessary to make the fees in §80692 clear. There are currently no fees associated with a standard accreditation site visit, provided that the institution has complied with the requirements of the accreditation system.</p>
§80691(c)(2)	<p><i>Insert new definition:</i> “Focused accreditation site visits”</p>	<p>Definition added to clarify between the different types of site visits. The cost recovery fees associated with each type of site visit varies and the definitions are necessary to make the fees in §80692 clear. Fees associated with focused accreditation site visits are in §80692(b)(1).</p>
§80691(c)(3)	<p><i>Insert new definition:</i> “Initial focused accreditation site visits”</p>	<p>Definition added to clarify between the different types of site visits. The cost recovery fees associated with each type of site visit vary and the definitions are necessary to make the fees in §80692 clear. Initial focused site visits are a new component of the revised accreditation system’s IIA process and occur for provisionally approved institutions. Fees associated with Initial focused accreditation site visits are in §80692(a)(2)(D).</p>
§80691(c)(4)	<p><i>Insert new definition:</i> “Accreditation site revisits”</p>	<p>Definition added to clarify between the different types of site visits. The cost recovery fees associated with each type of site visit varies and</p>

Regulation	Proposed Amendment	Rationale
		the definitions are necessary to make the fees in §80692 clear. Fees associated with accreditation site revisits are in §80692(b)(4)(A).
§80691(c)(5)	<i>Insert new definition: “Joint accreditation site visits”</i>	Definition added to clarify the difference between the different types of site visits. The cost recovery fees associated with each type of site visit varies and the definitions are necessary to make the fees in §80692 clear. Fees associated with joint accreditation site visits are in §80692(b)(3).
§80691(d)	<i>Definition updated and relocated to §80691(h) for “Initial Program Review”</i>	Relocated to maintain alphabetical order of definitions.
	<i>Updated and relocated: Definition for “Board of Institutional Review member”</i>	To improve clarity the Commission is removing all of the COA Accreditation Handbook chapters from the regulations as “articles incorporated by reference” and instead, this definition has been updated to provide a clear definition without requiring the regulated public to review a secondary document.
§80691(e)	<i>Definition relocated to §80691(i) for “Institution”</i>	Relocated to maintain alphabetical order of definitions.
	<i>Insert new definition: “Educator preparation program”</i>	The IIA and Initial Program Review processes both require that documents related to how institutions will operate their educator preparation programs be submitted to the Commission. Fees for review of these documents are based upon the category of educator preparation program. This definition makes clear what an educator preparation program is so that the fee structure for the review of documents is clear.
§80691(e)(1)	<i>Insert new definition: “Category I: Preliminary/Initial Preparation”</i>	This definition makes clear what qualifies as a Category I educator preparation program is so that the fee structure for the review of documents is clear.

Regulation	Proposed Amendment	Rationale
§80691(e)(2)	<i>Insert new definition:</i> “Category II: Second Tier Preparation”	This definition makes clear what qualifies as a Category II educator preparation program is so that the fee structure for the review of documents is clear.
§80691(e)(3)	<i>Insert new definition:</i> “Category III: Added Authorizations”	This definition makes clear what qualifies as a Category III educator preparation program is so that the fee structure for the review of documents is clear.
§80691(f)	<i>Definition removed:</i> “Late Review” (Topic of review of late submission is addressed in 80692(b)(2)).	This definition is being removed from this section due to the fact that it references components of the former accreditation system that no longer exist under the current system. The proposed regulations have been simplified to charge one fee for review of late submission of any required Accreditation Documentation (see §80691(a) and §80692(b)(2)).
	<i>Insert new definition:</i> “Eligibility Criteria”	The Commission’s updated IIA process now requires that prospective institutions submit a response to Eligibility Criteria. This definition makes clear what Eligibility Criteria are. Fees associated with Eligibility Criteria are located in §806912(a)(1).
§80691(g)	<i>Definition removed:</i> “Program Assessment”	This definition is being removed as the Commission’s updated accreditation system no longer includes a program assessment component which included an iterative process requiring the review of multiple versions of an institution or program responses. The regulations have been simplified to charge one fee for late submission of required Accreditation Documentation (see §80691(a) and §80692(b)(2)).
	<i>Updated and relocated from §80691(c):</i> Definition for “Initial Institutional Approval”	To improve clarity the Commission is removing all of the COA Accreditation Handbook chapters from the regulations as “articles incorporated by reference” and this definition has been updated to provide a clear definition without requiring the regulated public to review a secondary document. Additionally, the definition has been updated to

Regulation	Proposed Amendment	Rationale
		include the fact that the IIA process is now a multi-stage and multi-year process.
§80691(h)	<i>Definition removed: “Professional preparation program”</i>	This definition is being removed, as “educator preparation program” in §80691(e) is a more accurate term. The word “professional” is used in different ways by different individuals and often refers to teachers and administrators with second tier or “cleared” credentials.
	<i>Updated and relocated from §80691(d): Definition for “Initial Program Review”</i>	To improve clarity, and at the recommendation of the OAL, the Commission is removing all of the COA Accreditation Handbook chapters from the regulations as “articles incorporated by reference” and this definition has been updated to provide a clear definition without requiring the regulated public to review a secondary document.
§80691(i) §80691(i)(1) §80691(i)(2) §80691(i)(3) §80691(i)(4) §80691(i)(5)	<i>Definition updated and relocated to §80691(c)(4) for “site revisit”</i>	<p>The term was updated to accreditation site revisit and relocated to §80691(c)(4).</p> <p>To improve clarity, and at the recommendation of the OAL, the Commission is removing all of the COA Accreditation Handbook chapters from these regulations as “articles incorporated by reference” and this definition has been updated to provide a clear definition without requiring the regulated public to review a secondary document.</p>
	<i>Definition added for 80691 (c) 1, 2, 3, and 5</i>	To improve clarity, and at the recommendation of the OAL, the Commission is removing all of the COA Accreditation Handbook chapters from these regulations as “articles incorporated by reference” and this definition has been updated to provide a clear definition without requiring the regulated public to review a secondary document. The definitions have been added for standard accreditation site visit, focused accreditation site visits, initial focused accreditation site visit and joint accreditation site visits.

Regulation	Proposed Amendment	Rationale
	<i>Relocated from §80691(e) and Updated: Update to subsection reference.</i>	Definitions reordered to maintain alphabetical order. Reference to another section updated as a result of reordering of definitions.
§80691(j)	<i>Definition removed: "Site Visit"</i>	To improve clarity the Commission is removing all of the COA Accreditation Handbook chapters from the regulations as "articles incorporated by reference" and this definition has been updated to provide a clear definition without requiring the regulated public to review a secondary document. Additionally, §80691(c) amendments propose the new and more robust definition of "Accreditation team site visits" to provide more clear information to the public.
	<i>Insert new definition: "Seventh year report"</i>	The definition for seventh year report has been added to clarify that it is a specific report that is not a regularly scheduled accreditation activity and that the report has fees associated with it. Adding this definition makes the fee structure of the proposed regulations more clear. Fees related to seventh year reports can be found in §80692(b)(4).
§80691(k)	<i>Definition removed: Standard Accreditation Cycle</i>	Revisions to §80691(b), "Accreditation system," replaced the need for "Standard Accreditation Cycle" to be defined. The revised definition includes information about the accreditation cycle therefore §80691(k) is no longer relevant to the purpose of these regulations.
§80691(l)	<i>Definition removed: Stipulations</i>	The previous definition for "Stipulations" was no different than that in the dictionary and does not make specific or clarify any part of the governing statute for these regulations.

Table 3: Program Category Listing

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

Table 4: Calculations for Determination of Fees

Beyond Standard Accreditation Cycle Activities Education Code §44374.5	Proposed Cost Recovery Fee	Calculation of Fee <i>Cost to the agency is approximately</i>
Initial Institutional Approval		
Review of IIA Eligibility Requirements - Attend Accreditation 101 (Administrator, Consultant x2, AGPA 1 day each=\$1,441 for the day; 4-8 institutions attend the event)	\$1,000	(\$ 180-\$ 360) + 989 = \$1,169 - \$1,349

Beyond Standard Accreditation Cycle Activities Education Code §44374.5	Proposed Cost Recovery Fee	Calculation of Fee Cost to the agency is approximately
- Review Eligibility requirements (Consultant 1 day, Analyst 1 day, Administrator 2 hours=\$ 989)		
Review of IIA Common Standards	\$1,000	2 reviewers, \$600 in travel for each \$1,200
Review of IIA Preconditions <i>Consultant review and work with prospective sponsor—2-3 days @ 492.12 per day</i>	\$1,000	\$ 984 - \$ 1,476
Extraordinary Fees		
Initial Focused Site Visit: 2-3 days	<i>\$1,000 per team member</i>	\$1,000 in travel expenses per individual
Initial Program Review: Category I - 2 BIR Members review - Consultant work prior to submission ~ 1 day - Consultant and Analyst work prior and post review .5 day each	\$2,000	\$ 600 x 2 readers + \$ 492 consultant + \$ 246 consultant and \$ 193 analyst = \$1,951
Initial Program Review: Category II Second Tier - BIR Members review - Consultant work prior to submission ~ .75 day - Consultant and Analyst work prior and post review .4 day each	\$1,500	\$ 450 x 2 readers + \$ 369 consultant + \$ 196 consultant and \$ 154 analyst= \$ 1,479
Initial Program Review: Category III - BIR Members review - Consultant work prior to submission ~ .50 day - Consultant and Analyst work prior and post review .3 day each	\$1,000	\$ 300 x 2 readers + \$ 246 consultant + \$ 148 consultant and \$ 115 analyst = \$ 1109
Focused Site Visit -Usually a 2-3 day event	<i>\$1,000 per team member.</i>	\$1,000 in travel expenses per team member
Late Submission of Accreditation Documentation Analyst follow up with institution: 2 hours-2 days Consultant schedule and facilitate late review	<i>\$500 per document</i>	~ \$385 analyst + ~ \$ 492 consultant = \$ 877
Modified the fee for not completing required activities of the accreditation cycle	<i>\$1,000 per team member</i>	\$1,000 in travel expenses per team member
Joint visitation fee with regional or national accrediting bodies.	\$2,500	Amount CAEP charges the Commission
Site revisit fee with minimum added.	<i>\$1,000 per member</i>	\$1,000 in travel expenses per team member
Review of 7 th year report with no site visit	\$500	~ \$ 984 - \$ 2,952

Beyond Standard Accreditation Cycle Activities Education Code §44374.5	Proposed Cost Recovery Fee	Calculation of Fee <i>Cost to the agency is approximately</i>
Consultant follow up through Year 7—2-6 days through Year 7 @ \$492/day		
Review of 7 th year report associated with a site revisit Consultant follow up through Year 7: 3-7 days through Year 7 @ \$492/day	\$1,000	~ \$ 1,476 - \$ 3,444
Hourly Staff Costs (Position and Mid-Step Hourly Wage with Benefits)		
Administrator		\$70.53
Consultant		\$61.59
Associate Governmental Program Analyst		\$48.14
Staff Services Analyst		\$35.36

Round-trip travel expenses are to be covered at \$600 for a 1-day meeting and \$800 for a 2-day meeting, or \$1000 for a 3-day event for volunteers to review documents.

- Category I programs take a full day and possibly a bit more for the two members to complete the review of a program
- Category II programs take about 2/3-3/4 of a day for the two members to complete the review of a program
- Category III programs take about ½ to 2/3 of a day for the two members to complete the review of a program

Documents Relied Upon in Preparing Regulations:

Commission Agenda Items

June 2014 Commission Agenda Item 2E:

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

October 2014 Commission Agenda Item 3A:

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

February 2015 Commission Agenda Item 4D:

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

April 2015 Commission Agenda Item 4B:

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

June 2015 Commission Agenda Item 5B:

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

August 2015 Commission Agenda Item 3C:

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

August 2015 Commission Agenda Item 3D:

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

October 2015 Commission Agenda Item 2D:

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

February 2016 Commission Agenda Item 3B:

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

February 2016 Commission Agenda Item 3C:

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

December 2016 Commission Agenda Item 3C:

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

February 2017 Commission Agenda Item 2C:

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

September 2017 Commission Agenda Item 4G:

https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/agendas/2017-09/2017-09-4g.pdf?sfvrsn=4c3f54b1_2

Committee on Accreditation (COA) Agenda Items

January 2016 COA Agenda Item 15:

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

January 2016 COA Agenda Item 17:

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

January 2016 COA Agenda Item 18:

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

January 2016 COA Agenda Item 19:

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

March 2016 COA Agenda Item 9:

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

March 2016 COA Agenda Item 12:

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

March 2016 COA Agenda Item 16:

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

April 2016 COA Agenda Item 17:

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

April 2016 COA Agenda Item 18:

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

April 2016 COA Agenda Item 19:

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

April 2016 COA Agenda Item 21:

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

February 2017 COA Agenda Item 14:

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

March 2017 COA Agenda Item 9:

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

Disclosures Regarding the Proposed Actions

The Commission has made the following initial determinations:

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

Costs to any local agency or school districts requiring reimbursement pursuant to Government Code section 17500 et seq.: School districts, county offices of education and charter schools that are not currently approved to offer educator preparation programs (i.e. that elect to offer a program(s)) will be required to submit fees to cover the cost of IIA and Initial Program Review (IPR). Currently approved institutions pursuing additional Commission-approved programs will also be subject to IPR fees. Institutions may avoid all Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities (IPR, review of late submissions, etc.) provided new programs are not proposed and accreditation activity requirements are followed in a timely manner.

Cost or savings to any state agency: None.

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

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

Significant effect on housing costs: None.

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

Cost impacts on a representative private person or business: Cost impacts to a representative business would be minimal. Non-Commission approved private/independent education entities that elect to offer a program(s) will be required to submit fees to cover the cost of IIA and IPR. Currently approved institutions pursuing additional Commission-approved programs will also be subject to IPR fees. Institutions may avoid all Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities (IPR, review of late submissions etc.) provided new programs are not proposed and accreditation activity requirements are followed in a timely manner. The Commission is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

Statement of the Results of the Economic Impact Assessment/Analysis: The Commission concludes that it is:

- 1) Unlikely that the proposal will create any jobs within the State of California, as there are already 146 institutions operating teacher preparation programs within the state. As new programs and institutions are approved new jobs may be created, however the Commission is unable to determine whether or not jobs will be created and believes that the number of jobs created would be minimal.
- 2) Unlikely that the proposal will eliminate any jobs within the State of California as there is currently a teacher shortage and teacher preparation programs are busy preparing teachers to help with the shortage. Approved programs can avoid cost recovery fees entirely and the fees for new programs and institutions is not large enough to impact the number of jobs an institution has available.

- 3) Unlikely that the proposal will create any new businesses within the State of California as the regulations apply to currently approved institutions or to institutions seeking approval which must already have regional accreditation and are only expanding their business into teacher preparation.
- 4) Unlikely that the proposal will eliminate any existing businesses within the State of California as there is currently a teacher shortage and teacher preparation programs are busy preparing teachers to help with the shortage. Approved programs can avoid cost recovery fees entirely and the fees for new programs and institutions is not large enough to impact the ability of an institution to remain open.
- 5) Possible the proposal would cause the expansion of businesses currently doing business within the State of California. The current and proposed amendments to regulations apply to currently approved institutions or to institutions seeking approval which must already have regional accreditation and are only expanding their business into teacher preparation in California. The Commission is unable to determine whether or not any significant number of businesses would expand into California.
- 6) The Commission anticipates that the proposed amendments will benefit the health and welfare of California residents, as summarized in the Objectives and Anticipated Benefits of the proposed regulations below, by providing resources to perform the Commission's statutorily-mandated accreditation duties, thereby ensuring high quality educator preparation for the instruction of California K-12 public school students. The proposed regulations will promote fairness and prevent discrimination by specifying that the cost recovery fees apply to all institutions offering or proposing to offer Commission-approved programs, regardless of agency type. The proposed regulations will also increase openness and transparency by clarifying the cost recovery fees associated with IIA, new program review and accreditation activities in excess of the regularly scheduled data reports, document reviews, and accreditation site visits. The Commission does not anticipate that the proposed regulations will result in the protection of worker safety, or the environment, the prevention of social inequity or an increase in openness and transparency in business.

Objectives and Anticipated Benefits of the Proposed Regulations

The objective of the proposal is to amend the regulations that permit the Commission to continue to recover costs incurred for extraordinary accreditation activities, while bringing the regulations up to date and in alignment with the new accreditation process and improving the clarity of the regulatory language.

The Commission anticipates that the proposed amendments will benefit students attending public schools in the State of California by providing resources to perform the Commission's statutorily-mandated accreditation duties, thereby ensuring high quality educator preparation for the instruction of California K-12 public school students. Amendments will also provide a way for prospective institutions to pay their IIA fees as they move along, paying for services rendered rather than having to pay all IIA fees at the start of the approval process with the possibility of not completing the process successfully. Finally, interested parties will benefit by having a clearer set of regulations to refer to which aligns the terminology and process of the

updated Accreditation System and no longer requires referencing secondary sources (articles incorporated by reference).

The proposed regulations will promote fairness and prevent discrimination by specifying that the cost recovery fees apply to all institutions offering or proposing to offer Commission-approved programs, regardless of agency type. The proposed regulations will also increase openness and transparency by clarifying the cost recovery fees associated with IIA, new program review and accreditation activities in excess of the regularly scheduled data reports, document reviews, and accreditation site visits.

The Commission does not anticipate that the proposed regulations will result in the protection of public health and safety, worker safety, or the environment, the prevention of social inequity or an increase in openness and transparency in business.

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

Consideration of Alternatives

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative it considered or that has otherwise been identified and brought to its attention would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private person than the proposed action, or would be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law. The Commission invites interested persons to present statements or arguments with respect to alternatives to the proposed regulations during the written comment period or at the public hearing.

Contact Person/Further Information

General or substantive inquiries concerning the proposed action may be directed to Kathryn Polster by telephone at (916) 445-0229, by mail at Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95811, or by email to Kathryn Polster kpolster@ctc.ca.gov or Michelle Bernardo mbernardo@ctc.ca.gov. General question inquiries may also be directed to the addresses mentioned above. Upon request, a copy of the express terms of the proposed action and a copy of the Initial Statement of Reasons will be made available. This information is also available on the Commission's website at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/notices/rulemaking.html>. In addition, all the information on which this proposal is based is available for inspection and copying.

Availability of Statement of Reasons and Text of Proposed Regulations

The entire rulemaking file is available for inspection and copying throughout the rulemaking process at the Commission office at the above address. As of the date this notice is published in the Notice of Register, the rulemaking file consists of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, the proposed text of regulations, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and an economic impact assessment/analysis contained in the Initial Statement of Reasons. Copies may be obtained by

contacting Kathryn Polster or Michelle Bernardo at the address or telephone number provided above.

Modification of Proposed Action

If the Commission proposes to modify the actions hereby proposed, the modifications (other than non-substantial or solely grammatical modifications) will be made available for public comment for at least 15 days before they are adopted.

Availability of Final Statement of Reasons

The Final Statement of Reasons is submitted to the Office of Administrative Law as part of the final rulemaking package, following the conclusion of the public hearing. Upon its completion, copies of the Final Statement of Reasons may be obtained by contacting Kathryn Polster at (916) 445-0229.

Availability of Documents on the Internet

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

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

Subarticle 3. Cost Recovery Fees for Program Approval and Accreditation

§80691. Definitions.

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

- ~~(a) "Board of Institutional Review member" is an individual who has successfully completed the Commission provided training detailed in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Eleven, Board of Institutional Review Member Skills and Competencies (rev. 2012), available on the Commission's website and hereby incorporated by reference.~~
- (a) "Accreditation Documentation" are formal submissions of documentation required for the Commission to assess the quality of the educator preparation program. These include:
 - (1) "Annual data submission" which is information about educator preparation programs as well as data on candidates and completers submitted through the Commission's Accreditation Data System.
 - (2) "Common Standards response" is a written description and documentation demonstrating how the educator preparation program meets the Common Standards. This response is submitted in year five of the accreditation cycle and during Initial Institutional Approval.

- (3) “Preconditions response” is a written description and documentation demonstrating how the institution and the educator preparation programs it sponsors meet the preconditions. The response is submitted in years one and four of the accreditation cycle, during Initial Institutional Approval, and during Initial Program Review
- (4) “Program Review Submission” is a written description and documentation on how a program meets the specific program standards. The response is submitted in year 5 of the accreditation cycle for each of the programs sponsored by the institution
- ~~(b) “Focused site visit” is a site visit requested by the Committee on Accreditation when it is determined that the professional preparation program is not complying with the accreditation system activities specified in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Four, *The Accreditation Cycle* (rev. 2012), available on the Commission’s website and hereby incorporated by reference.~~
- (b) “Accreditation system” is the system established by the Commission and implemented by the Committee on Accreditation for accrediting educator preparation programs in California as set forth in Education Code sections 44370 through 44374.5. The system has a standard seven year cycle and requires active participation from institutions with educator preparation programs through various Accreditation Documentation submissions and accreditation team site visits.
- ~~(c) “Initial institutional approval” is granted by the Committee on Accreditation when an institution that has not previously prepared educators for certification in California has been deemed to meet the accreditation requirements as explained in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Three, *Institutional and Program Approval* (rev. 2012), available on the Commission’s website and hereby incorporated by reference.~~
- (c) “Accreditation team site visit” is an onsite or technologically facilitated review of an approved or provisionally approved institution and its educator preparation programs for the purpose of observing and ensuring the institution’s compliance with all relevant state statutes, regulations and standards of quality established by the State of California for preparing educators to serve in public schools. The Commission’s Administrator of Accreditation determines the composition of the team which, includes volunteer Board of Institutional Review members and volunteer education experts. The team is accompanied and facilitated by a Commission staff member.
- (1) “Standard accreditation site visits” take place in year six of the accreditation cycle when an institution has turned in required accreditation documents throughout the accreditation cycle. A site visit team reviews how the institution is implementing the program and common standards. These visits result in an accreditation decision by the Committee on Accreditation.

- (2) “Focused accreditation site visits” are accreditation team site visits authorized by the Committee on Accreditation when the educator preparation program is not demonstrating compliance with the accreditation system requirements. The Administrator of Accreditation for the Commission determines the number of accreditation team members needed for the focused site visit.
- (3) “Initial focused accreditation site visits” are accreditation team site visits authorized by the Commission that occur after the first set of candidates complete the approved program(s) at the provisionally approved institution, in order to determine if the institution has complied with the accreditation system requirements for earning full Commission approval. The Commission’s action at the time of provisional approval will determine when the initial focused site visit will take place. The Administrator of Accreditation for the Commission determines the number of accreditation team members needed for the initial focused site visit.
- (4) “Accreditation site revisits” are accreditation visits conducted in the year after the site visit in order to determine whether the institution has taken corrective action to address the stipulations placed upon it by the Committee on Accreditation.
- (5) “Joint accreditation site visits” are standard or focused accreditation team site visits, as defined in subdivision (c)(1) and (c)(2), that take place with national accreditation bodies and their team members in addition to the Commission’s accreditation team.
- ~~(d) “Initial program review” is the review of a professional preparation program’s formal response to the program standards associated with a specific program type as explained in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Three, Institutional and Program Approval (rev. 2012). Initial program review occurs when a professional preparation program intends to offer a new professional preparation program type or when the Commission revises program standards to such a significant degree that a professional preparation program must rewrite the program document.~~
- (d) “Board of Institutional Review member” is an individual who has successfully completed the Commission’s Board of Institutional Review training and who possesses the knowledge, skills, and abilities to participate in the accreditation system as a volunteer reviewer of Accreditation Documentation and as a volunteer member of accreditation site visit teams.
- ~~(e) “Institution” means any of the following categories of agencies which are authorized to seek initial institutional approval as defined in subsection (c) in order to submit a professional preparation program for approval and accreditation as defined in subsection (h):~~
- ~~(1) A California county superintendent of schools office;~~
 - ~~(2) A California school district;~~
 - ~~(3) A charter school as established in Education Code Section 47605;~~

- ~~(4) A regionally accredited college or university;~~
- ~~(5) A non-governmental or community-based organization.~~
- (e) “Educator preparation program” refers to a planned course of study including fieldwork and clinical practice that has been approved by the Commission and accredited by the Committee on Accreditation which leads to the issuance of teaching credentials, services credentials, specialist credentials, added authorizations, or certificates. For the purposes of cost recovery fees, categories of educator preparation programs include:
- (1) “Category I: Preliminary/Initial Preparation,” defined as educator preparation programs that lead to a preliminary or initial credential and may require credential holders to obtain the necessary category II credential.
- (2) “Category II: Second Tier Preparation,” defined as educator preparation programs that require candidates to hold a category I credential or related state issued license as a prerequisite.
- (3) “Category III: Added Authorizations,” defined as educator preparation programs leading to authorizations that can be added to an existing credential.
- ~~(f) “Late review” refers to the submission of a Biennial Report, as defined in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Five, Biennial Reports (rev. 2012), available on the Commission’s website and hereby incorporated by reference, and/or a Program Assessment, as defined in Chapter Six, Program Assessment (rev. 2012), available on the Commission’s website and hereby incorporated by reference, after the deadline established pursuant to the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Four, The Accreditation Cycle (rev. 2012).~~
- (f) “Eligibility criteria” are Commission-adopted criteria that must be responded to by an institutions seeking Initial Institutional Approval and reviewed by Commission staff prior to Commission consideration for Initial Institutional Approval.
- ~~(g) “Program Assessment” is a process that occurs in year four of the seven year accreditation cycle and requires professional preparation programs to submit to the Commission a clear description of how a program is operating as explained in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Six, Program Assessment (rev. 2012).~~
- (g) “Initial Institutional Approval” is a multi-stage approval process used by the Commission when an institution is not currently approved to prepare educators for certification in California. If granted approval, the institution becomes part of the ongoing accreditation cycle.
- ~~(h) “Professional preparation program” refers to an institution that has been approved by the Commission and accredited by the Committee on Accreditation to offer a program which leads to the issuance of teaching credentials, services credentials, specialist credentials, added authorizations, or certificates.~~

- (h) “Initial Program Review” is the review of an institution’s formal response to the program standards associated with the specific type of educator preparation program for which the institution is pursuing approval. Initial Program Review occurs when an institution intends to offer a new educator preparation program type or when the Commission significantly revises program standards. Initial Program Review is conducted by two or more volunteer Board of Institutional Reviewers members or other volunteer education expert who determine whether the proposed program meets all relevant requirements for that credential program. Once the Board of Institutional Review members makes that determination, the Committee on Accreditation consider the program proposal for approval.
- ~~(i) “Site revisit” is an accreditation visit that is conducted as a result of an action taken by the Committee on Accreditation to place stipulations on the accreditation of a professional preparation program as detailed in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Fifteen, The Accreditation Revisit (rev. 2012), available on the Commission’s website and hereby incorporated by reference.~~
- (i) “Institution” means any of the following categories of agencies that are authorized to seek Initial Institutional Approval as defined in subsection (g) in order to submit an educator preparation program for approval and accreditation:
- (1) A California county superintendent of schools office;
 - (2) A California school district;
 - (3) A charter school as established in Education Code section 47605;
 - (4) A regionally-accredited college or university;
 - (5) A non-governmental or community-based organization as established in Education Code section 44227.2.
- ~~(j) “Site visit” is an accreditation visit conducted in the seventh year of the accreditation cycle as specified in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Four, The Accreditation Cycle (rev. 2012).~~
- (j) “Seventh year report” is a report required by the Committee on Accreditation following the year six accreditation team site visit. Seventh year reports detail how the institution is addressing issues identified during the site visit and are prepared by the institution and submitted to the Committee on Accreditation for review. Seventh year reports are required of all institutions with stipulations and may be required for institutions without stipulations for which the Committee on Accreditation has specifically taken action to require a 7th year report.
- ~~(k) “Standard accreditation cycle” refers to the seven year accreditation cycle specified in the *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter Four, The Accreditation Cycle (rev. 2012).~~

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

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

§80692. Program Approval and Accreditation Fees

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

- ~~(a) Fees for document review beyond the Standard Accreditation Cycle shall be submitted with the professional preparation program's formal response to the applicable standards as follows:~~ Initial Institutional Approval and Initial Program Approval Fees:
- ~~(1) Initial institutional approval: \$2,000 flat fee. Review of eligibility criteria: \$1,000~~
 - ~~(2) Initial program review: Review of Initial Institutional Approval documents:~~
 - ~~(A) Professional preparation program that addresses twelve or more standards: \$2,000 flat fee. Common standards response document: \$1,000 flat fee.~~
 - ~~(B) Professional preparation program that addresses six to eleven standards: \$1,500 flat fee. Initial, general and program specific preconditions: \$1,000 flat fee.~~
 - ~~(3) Professional preparation program that addresses fewer than six standards: \$1,000 flat fee. Initial Program Review:~~
 - ~~(A) Category I: Preliminary/Initial Preparation program review: \$2,000 flat fee.~~
 - ~~(B) Category II: Second Tier Preparation program review: \$1,500 flat fee.~~
 - ~~(C) Category III: Added Authorization program review: \$1,000 flat fee.~~
 - ~~(4) A professional preparation program that provides a number of Board of Institutional Review members that is equal to or greater than two times the number of their program documents submitted for initial program review annually and that assume all travel costs related to the review of the program documents submitted for initial review shall be exempt from payment of the fees associated with this subsection. Initial focused site visit: \$1,000 per individual attending the site visit.~~

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

- (1) Focused site visit: \$1,000 for each individual attending the focused site visit.
- (2) ~~Late reviews: \$500 per document.~~ Review of late submission of accreditation documentation required throughout accreditation cycle: \$500 per document.
- (3) ~~Program assessments: Joint visitation with national accreditation bodies: \$2,500 flat fee.~~
 - (A) ~~No fee shall be charged for the first three reviews of a program assessment submitted by a professional preparation program. The fee for review of a program assessment beyond the first three reviews: \$1,000 flat fee.~~
 - (B) ~~A professional preparation program that does not complete the program assessment process at least six months prior to a scheduled site visit: \$3,000 flat fee for two additional Board of Institutional Review members to review the program during the site visit.~~
- (4) ~~Stipulations: Seventh Year Activities:~~
 - (A) ~~Site revisit: \$1,000 per individual attending the site revisit; Accreditation site revisit: \$1,000 per individual attending the site visit in the seventh year.~~
 - (B) ~~Review of a report due to stipulations that does not require a site revisit as detailed in the Accreditation Handbook Chapter Nine, Activities during the Seventh Year of the Accreditation Cycle (rev. 2012), available on the Commission's website and hereby incorporated by reference: \$500 flat fee; Review of seventh year report on how stipulations have been addressed when no site revisit is required by the Committee on Accreditation: \$500 flat fee.~~
 - (C) ~~Review of a report associated with a site revisit as detailed in the Accreditation Handbook Chapter Nine, Activities during the Seventh Year of the Accreditation Cycle (rev. 2012): \$1,000 flat fee. Review of report associated with an accreditation site revisit: \$1,000 flat fee.~~

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



Commission on Teacher Credentialing

1900 Capitol Avenue Sacramento, CA 95811-4213 (916) 445-0229 Fax (916) 327-3165 www.ctc.ca.gov

Attn: Kathryn Polster, Professional Services Division

Title: Proposed Amendments to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations Pertaining to Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities

Section: Amend 5 CCR §§80691 and 80692

Response to the Attached Title 5 Regulations

To allow the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to more clearly estimate the general field response to the attached regulations, please return this response form to the Commission office, attention Kathryn Polster, at the above address or fax to their attention at (916) 327-3165. The response must arrive at the Commission by 5:00 pm January 21, 2019 for the material to be presented at the February 8, 2019 public hearing.

1. **Yes**, I agree with the proposed Title 5 Regulations. Please count me in favor of these regulations.
2. **No**, I do not agree with the proposed regulations for the following reasons:
PLEASE LIST THE SPECIFIC SECTION. If additional space is needed use the reverse of this sheet, an additional page, or the body of your email.

3. Personal opinion of the undersigned and/or
 Organizational opinion representing: (Circle One) School District, County Schools, College/University, Professional Organization, Other _____
4. I shall be at the public hearing. Place my name on the list for making a presentation to the Commission.
 No, I will not make a presentation to the Commission at the public hearing.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: _____

Title: _____ Phone: _____

Employer/Organization: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Route to kp