

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT

to the

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

by the

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION



AUGUST, 1996

**First Annual Report to the
California Commission on
Teacher Credentialing**

**By the Committee
on Accreditation**

**Assisted by the
Professional Services Division
Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

**Sacramento, California
August 1996**

First Annual Report to the Commission by the Committee on Accreditation

Table of Contents

The Committee on Accreditation (1995-96)		4
Letter of Transmittal to the Commission		5
Section I: Organizational Activities of the Committee		6
I-A	Election of Committee Officers	6
I-B	Schedule of Committee Meetings	6
I-C	Committee Membership Changes	7
I-D	Minor Modifications to the Framework	7
I-E	Public Presentations by the Committee on Accreditation	7
Section II: COA Transition Plan and Internal Workplan		8
II-A	Plan for Transition to Professional Accreditation	8
II-B	Internal Workplan of the Committee on Accreditation	13
II-C	Status of Each Workplan Task by the Committee	14
	Task 1 <i>Accreditation Handbook</i>	14
	Task 2 New NCATE Partnership Agreement	14
	Task 3 Comparability of Standards	14
	Task 4 Team Selection, Training and Evaluation	16
	Task 5 COA Legal and Ethical Issues	17
	Task 6 Policies for Election of Committee Officers	17
	Task 7 Policies for Communication of Public Information	17
	Task 8 Evaluation Plan for the <i>Accreditation Framework</i>	18
II-D	Analysis and Evaluation of the Committee's First Year	18
Section III: Workplan for 1996-97 and Policy Issues		19
III-A	Overview of Workplan for 1996-97	19
III-B	Description of Workplan for 1996-97	20
III-C	Schedule of Committee Meetings in 1996-97	22
III-D	Policy Issues for Consideration by the Commission	23
Section IV: Meeting Agendas of the COA (1995-96)		24
Section V: Presentation Materials Developed by the COA		38

THE COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION 1995-97

Anita "Chris" Chavez Co-Chair (1995-96)	Assistant Superintendent ABC Unified School District
Irving Hendrick Co-Chair (1995-96)	Dean, School of Education University of California, Riverside
Anthony Avina	Superintendent Pajaro Valley Unified School District
Carol Barnes	Professor, Elementary Education California State University, Fullerton
Margaret Bonanno	Director, Davis Learning Community Oak Grove School District
Joya Chatterjee	Middle School Principal Palo Alto Unified School District
Dolores Escobar	Dean, College of Education San Jose State University
Fay Haisley	Dean, School of Education University of the Pacific
Robert Hathaway	Teacher of Mathematics Anaheim Union High School District
Olivia M. Palacio	Associate Superintendent Fresno County Office of Education
Fannie Preston	Dean, School of Education Saint Mary's College of California
Arthurlene G. Towner	Dean, School of Education and Allied Studies California State University, Hayward
Committee Staff:	Dennis S. Tierney, Lead Consultant Lawrence W. Birch, Consultant Philip A. Fitch, Consultant Carol Roberts, Secretary

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

1812 Ninth Street
Sacramento, California 95814-7000

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

July 31, 1996

Dear Commissioners:

It is with both pleasure and pride that, on behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation, we submit to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing the first *Annual Report* of the Committee on Accreditation as required by the *Accreditation Framework*. This report presents not only an overview of the activities and accomplishments of the Committee on Accreditation since its inception, but also provides some suggestions for improving the work of the Committee in the future. This inaugural report differs somewhat from the reports that this Committee will make in the coming years in that this report focuses on the preparatory work of the Committee rather than the ongoing work of professional accreditation. As such, this report contains a detailed portrait of the Committee's activities and a proposed workplan for 1996-97.

The initial fifteen months of Committee's formal existence have been busy and productive. The Committee set an ambitious workplan for itself and has accomplished virtually all of its eight original objectives. Accordingly, the Committee is well positioned to assume responsibility for the accreditation function in the 1997-98 academic year. The Committee and the staff have provided sufficient lead time and support to institutions that are scheduled for accreditation visits in that year. In addition, through the cooperation of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the staff of the Professional Services Division, considerable experimentation regarding the adoption of a professional accreditation process has taken place during the Committee's inaugural year, which has informed the work of the Committee.

The Committee looks forward eagerly to its future annual reports and believes it has made significant strides this year toward full implementation of the *Accreditation Framework*. We hope you will find this report instructive and helpful.

Sincerely,

Anita "Chris" Chavez
Committee Co-Chair

Irving G. Hendrick
Committee Co-Chair

First Annual Report to the Commission by the Committee on Accreditation

Section I: Organizational Activities of the Committee on Accreditation

Section I describes efforts by the Committee on Accreditation to organize its members and its activities for maximum productivity during 1995-96.

I-A Election of Committee Officers

The Committee on Accreditation elected a Chair and Vice-Chair *pro tempore* at its inaugural meeting on April 21-22, 1995. The Committee elected Dr. Irving Hendrick as the Chair *pro tempore*, and Dr. Anita "Chris" Chavez as the Vice-Chair, *pro tempore*. Committee members decided to hold regular elections of officers in August each year. The Committee also decided that one Co-Chair will be elected each year from the postsecondary education members, and the other Co-Chair will be elected from the elementary and secondary education members. Co-Chairs will be elected for one year terms and may serve only two consecutive terms. In August, 1995, Chris Chavez and Irving Hendrick were unanimously elected as Co-Chairs to serve until September of 1996. The Committee also developed procedures to follow when a Co-Chair is not re-elected to the Committee by the Commission.

I-B Schedule of Committee Meetings

The inaugural meeting of the Committee on Accreditation was held on April 21 and 22, 1995, in Burlingame, California. At that meeting, the Committee decided to meet monthly for one-day-and-a-half during the last week of each month unless there was insufficient business to warrant a meeting of that length. With the exception of the June, 1995, meeting which was canceled due to scheduling conflicts, the Committee has met at the dates and locations shown below.

May 25-26, 1995	Burlingame	
July 27-28, 1995	Burlingame	
August 24-25, 1995	Burlingame	
September 28-29, 1995	Burlingame	
October 26-27, 1995	San Diego	(With CCET Conference)
November 30, 1995	Long Beach	(With CSBA Conference)
January 25, 1996	Burlingame	
February 29, March 1, 1996	Burlingame	
April 25-26, 1996	Burlingame	
May 30-31, 1996	Irvine	
June 27, 1996	Burlingame	
July 25, 1996	Sacramento	

I-C Committee Membership Changes

On November 3, 1994, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing elected twelve members and four alternates to the Committee on Accreditation. By lot, six members and two alternates were appointed to two-year terms and the remaining members and alternates were appointed to three-year terms. These staggered terms were designed to maintain the institutional memory of the Committee when the membership changed due to future elections or resignations. Although unexpected, the Committee did have three resignations in its first year. Member Ann Chlebicki resigned in January due to work pressures, Member Shirley Rosenkranz resigned in April due to family illnesses, and Member Barbara Burch resigned in May due to a new position as Vice-President for Academic Affairs at Western Kentucky University. These three members of the Committee received certificates of appreciation for their dedication and hard work.

Pursuant to the authority granted under the *Accreditation Framework*, the Executive Director of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing filled the three vacant positions on the Committee from the list of elected alternates. In May, 1996, Dr. Swofford selected Dr. Anthony Avina, Superintendent, Pajaro Valley Unified School District, Ms. Margaret Bonanno, Director, Davis Learning Center, Oak Grove School District, and Dr. Fannie Preston, Dean, School of Education, Saint Mary's College of California, to serve as members of the Committee of Accreditation. Dr. Preston and Ms. Bonanno were able to attend the May meeting of the Committee on Accreditation, and Dr. Avina joined the Committee at its June meeting.

I-D Minor Modifications of the *Framework*

Section 8 of the *Accreditation Framework* permits the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to make "refinements and clarifications" of the Framework as needed. Significant modifications of the *Framework* must await the completion of the external evaluation required under Section 8, unless there is compelling evidence that such a modification is needed. At the August, 1995, meeting of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, the Professional Services Division presented a request from the Committee to alter the members' terms of appointment.

The request noted that Section 2.C.4 of the *Accreditation Framework* sets the length of terms of Committee on Accreditation (COA) members. The *Framework* is silent about the actual calendar dates when members' terms commence. The initial members of the COA were selected at the November, 1994, meeting of the Commission, and received their letters of appointment in December of 1994. This notification letter set the calendar date of appointment to the COA as January 1, 1995. Due to a variety of reasons, the COA did not hold its initial meeting until April 21, 1995.

Having developed its first workplan, the Committee realized that its work year will, in the future, closely parallel the nine-month academic calendar. Thus, the major work of the COA will take place between October and June each year. If January remained the formal starting month for new COA members, it could mean, depending on the outcome of the selection process, that half of the COA would begin service in the middle of a work year. The COA requested that the Commission declare July 1 to be the start date for terms of appointment. Thus the six members now holding two year terms would end their service (if not re-elected) on June 30, 1997 and the members now holding three year terms would end their service (if not re-elected) on June 30, 1998. The COA believed that this clarification of service dates would make the COA more effective in implementing the *Accreditation Framework*. The Commission voted to accept this refinement in the terms of office for members of the Committee on Accreditation.

The second clarification of the *Framework* involved developing a clear procedure for selecting new members of the Nominations Panel for the Committee on Accreditation. The *Accreditation Framework* calls for a Nominations Panel to select candidates for membership on the Committee, but is silent on the means by which the Nominations Panel itself is selected. At the March, 1995, meeting of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, the Commission adopted a procedure for selecting new members of the six-member Nominations Panel.

I-E Public Presentations by the Committee on Accreditation

The Committee on Accreditation made two formal presentations in its first fifteen months. In February, 1996, the Committee was featured at the Annual Conference of the Credential Counselors and Analysts of California. Co-Chairs Chavez and Hendrick provided the delegates with a general overview of the Committee on Accreditation and a status

report on the work of the Committee to date. In October, 1996, the Co-Chairs made a similar presentation to the Fall Conference of the California Council on the Education of Teachers (CCET). The Committee held its October meeting in conjunction with the CCET Fall Conference when members of the Committee attended several sessions of the CCET Conference and enjoyed opportunities to meet with teacher educators from around the state. In addition to these formal presentations, articles about the Committee on Accreditation appeared in two editions of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing *Newsletter* which is mailed to approximately 1100 educators in the state.

For 1996-97, the Committee plans to meet in conjunction with the Association of California School Administrators, and to meet again with the California Council on the Education of Teachers.

Section II: Accreditation Transition Plan and Internal Workplan by the Committee on Accreditation

II-A Plan for Transition to Professional Accreditation

At the initial meeting of the Committee on Accreditation in April, 1995, members decided that the Committee would defer implementation of the full professional accreditation system until such time as the Committee had developed and adopted a detailed set of accreditation procedures, as required by the *Accreditation Framework*. The Committee also wanted to provide sufficient lead time to colleges and universities to prepare for the new system. To that end, the Committee prepared a letter to the educator preparation community detailing a two year transition plan for full implementation of the *Accreditation Framework*. This transition plan was adopted by the Committee on Accreditation in May, 1995. The letter from Co-Chairs Chavez and Hendrick to the field is displayed on the following two pages. Attached to the letter were printed pages about the Transition Plan and Transition Options for 1995-97 which are displayed after the letter.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

1812 Ninth Street
Sacramento, California 95814-7000

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

May 12, 1995

Dear Colleagues:

I write to let you know that the Committee on Accreditation has held its inaugural meeting and begun the process of giving full substance to the *Accreditation Framework*. As you may remember, the Committee on Accreditation was created by the Legislature under SB 148 (Bergeson) and SB 655 (Bergeson). Its principal functions are to make decisions about the initial and continuing accreditation of educator preparation institutions and programs, determine the comparability of standards used to accredit institutions and programs, develop guidelines and procedures for conducting accreditation reviews, and generally monitor the performance of the accreditation system.

The Committee consists of twelve members elected by the Commission. Six members are employed in postsecondary education and six are certificated professionals in public schools, school districts or county offices of education. At the inaugural meeting of the Committee, held on April 21 and 22, 1995, the Committee decided to elect a Chair and Vice-Chair, pro-tempore, to serve until August, 1995 at which time the Committee will elect more permanent officers. I was elected Chair pro-tempore and Dr. Chris Chavez, Associate Superintendent for Human Resources, Chula Vista Elementary School District, was elected Vice-Chair pro-tempore.

As its first important action, the Committee decided to let those institutions scheduled for Commission on Teacher Credentialing reviews in the next two years know what they should expect regarding the transition from CTC program reviews to COA accreditation reviews. To that end, I want you to know that the Committee unanimously agreed that all institutions scheduled for review in the 1995-96 academic year will follow existing policies and procedures regarding program review. Institutions scheduled for reviews in the 1996-97 academic year will be afforded the opportunity to choose the new system of accreditation or the present system of program review. The Committee currently expects that the new system of accreditation will be required with the 1997-98 academic year. We also directed the CTC staff to encourage institutions to volunteer for experimental type visits using all or parts of the *Accreditation Framework* during this transitional period. Thus, in a word, our plan is to provide colleges and universities with the security they need to plan effectively, but to encourage experimentation. If you are uncertain about your institution's next scheduled review, please contact the Commission directly.

I also want you to know that the Committee has set an ambitious schedule of meetings to permit it to develop the necessary procedures and materials as quickly as possible. A second attachment shows the meeting dates and locations we have approved to date. Later meeting locations can be obtained by contacting our assigned staff person, Dr. Dennis Tierney. He can be reached at 916-327-2968 or on e-mail at dtierney@ctc.ca.gov. Many of you know Dennis from his work in teacher education at The Claremont Graduate School, California State University, Fullerton, and San Jose State University. He is also a former President of the California Council on the Education of Teachers. I consider our Committee particularly fortunate to have Dennis as our lead staff person.

Our meetings are, of course, public, and the Committee welcomes advice from all interested parties. As we develop our own internal procedures, we will be disseminating information about our agendas, minutes, and other activities. We hope to make full use of all forms of dissemination and welcome any suggestions you might have to make our work better known. I can be reached at 909-787-5228 or on e-mail at Irving.Hendrick@ucr.edu. Dr. Chavez can be reached at 619-425-9600 x 431.

I look forward to the work of this important Committee and hope that you will provide us with your concerns and ideas as we build upon the work of the Accreditation Advisory Council and construct high quality accreditation procedures for California educator preparation.

Sincerely,

Irving G. Hendrick, Chair pro-tempore
Committee on Accreditation

Enclosures

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

TRANSITION PLAN FOR 1995-1997

1995-96 *Thirteen institutions of postsecondary education and one local education agency will be reviewed. One of the IHE visits is a joint NCATE visit.*

These institutions may use the current program evaluation and approval process. The COA/CTC staff encourages institutions to host pilot studies of key elements of the *Accreditation Framework*, for the purpose of providing helpful information to the Committee while the *Accreditation Handbook* is under development. The COA expects to complete a new NCATE partnership for California in this year.

1996-97 *Eleven institutions of postsecondary education and two local education agencies will be reviewed. Five NCATE Joint visits are scheduled for this year.*

Institutions on the current schedule will be given a choice between (a) the CTC program evaluation and approval process or (b) the new professional accreditation process insofar as the new process or parts of the new process have been developed and disseminated to the field. All institutions will be encouraged to host additional pilot studies of accreditation elements during this transition year.

1997-98 *Eleven institutions of postsecondary education and two local education agencies will be reviewed. Three NCATE Joint visits are scheduled for this year.*

Institutions on the schedule will be required to implement the new professional accreditation process as defined by the Committee in the *Accreditation Handbook*, which the Committee plans to complete by September 1996.

TRANSITION OPTIONS FOR 1995 - 1997

1. One Integrated Team Organized in Clusters

The visit is conducted by a single team composed of a team leader, a group focused on common institutional standards, and various clusters focused on credential program standards.

2. Host Events

To assist the institution and the team in developing trust and positive working arrangements, a social event on the evening prior to the start of interviews is made part of the arrangements for the visit.

3. Institutional Document Preparation

Institutions may prepare one concise institutional document regarding common standards and several brief program documents focused on the relevant program standards. In this model, the program-level cluster groups would focus on curriculum and field experience standards while the common standards group would look at governance, resources, faculty, student support, and other institutional-level issues and standards. Institutions involved in NCATE visits should consider combining document preparation and visit structure to provide for maximum efficiency. Consideration of non-print documentation such as videos, student portfolios, and other electronic records are encouraged as part of the COA's experimentation during this transition.

4. Use of National or Alternative Standards

Credential programs at several IHE's have indicated a strong interest in using national standards (School Psychology programs in particular). Interested institutions should write to the national standards and include in their documentation the institutional response to any California standards not specifically mentioned in the national standards. In this manner, experiments may continue without compromising existing standards or creating unequal circumstances among California credential programs.

5. Modifications in Site Visit Schedules

The COA is interested in learning more about possible modifications in the interview schedule, the use of time during site visits, and alternative forms of data collection prior to and during the actual visit. Use of teleconferences, non-print documentation of standards, satellite interview settings, and other alternate methodology is strongly encouraged.

6. Other Ideas from the Field

The COA has directed the CTC/COA consultants to work actively with institutions by fostering an atmosphere of collegial support and experimentation with all aspects of the *Accreditation Framework*. This transition period will work most effectively if all parties approach it in a spirit of professional cooperation and inquiry.

II-B Internal Workplan of the Committee on Accreditation

At the second meeting of the Committee on Accreditation, the members conducted an in-depth analysis of the *Accreditation Framework* with particular attention to work tasks that are embedded in the *Framework*. The Committee identified all possible work tasks necessary to implement the *Framework* fully. Then the Committee engaged in a priority-setting exercise and created a list of eight work tasks that needed to be completed in the first year of operation, which are shown in the following workplan.

Committee on Accreditation Workplan for 1995-96

Task No.	Description of Each Task	Start Date	Target Date
Task 1	Initiate and Complete an <i>Accreditation Handbook</i>	July 1995	May 1996
Task 2	Initiate and Complete a New NCATE Partnership Agreement	July 1995	Nov. 1995
Task 3	Develop a Process for Comparing Standards	Sept. 1995	Feb. 1996
Task 4	Develop Team Selection, Training, and Evaluation Procedures	Sept. 1995	June 1996
Task 5	Resolve COA Legal and Ethical Issues	Oct. 1995	Nov. 1995
Task 6	Develop Policies for Election of Committee Officers and Plans for Committee Organization	Oct. 1995	Dec. 1995
Task 7	Create Policies for the Communication and Dissemination of Accreditation Information	Dec. 1995	Sept 1996
Task 8	Create an Evaluation Plan for the <i>Accreditation Framework</i>	Sept. 1996	June 1997

A discussion of each work task and the current status of each is presented in the following pages of this report.

II-C Status of Each Workplan Task by the Committee

Task 1: Initiate and Complete an Accreditation Handbook

During the fifteen-month period of this report, the Committee on Accreditation made decisions at each of its meetings about particular procedures to be followed in the new accreditation system. During the concluding months of 1995-96, these procedures were gradually assembled as an *Accreditation Handbook*, as is called for in the *Accreditation Framework*. The *Handbook* is designed to provide specific information about the new professional accreditation process for (1) institutions of postsecondary education that are preparing for accreditation reviews, and (2) team members who are responsible for conducting those reviews. The Committee examined a complete draft of the *Accreditation Handbook* on June 27, and directed the staff to make particular changes in it. The Executive Committee of the Commission analyzed a revised draft of the document on July 17, and identified several additional changes. The Committee reviewed and unanimously adopted another revision of the *Handbook* on July 27. The Committee anticipates disseminating the *Handbook* in September, 1996, and revising the *Handbook* during 1996-97, after it has had some use by the field.

Task 2: Initiate and Complete a New NCATE Partnership Agreement

In January, 1996, the Committee on Accreditation completed its work on a new General Partnership Agreement with the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), as called for in the *Accreditation Framework*. This new partnership benefits primarily the fourteen institutions of postsecondary education that are voluntary members of NCATE. As a result of the partnership, these 14 institutions can eliminate much duplication that occurs in multiple reviews of the same programs. The new partnership will be unique in that no other state has a body comparable to the Committee on Accreditation. The Committee is currently awaiting the review of its pro-posal by NCATE's State Partnership Board, which will meet in October of 1996. The General Partnership Agreement appears on the COA Workplan for 1996-97 because adjustments may be needed in the draft Agreement based on the reaction of the NCATE State Partnership Board. The new partnership agreement will be valid for four years and is renewable.

Task 3: Develop a Process for Comparing Standards

In August, 1995, the Committee on Accreditation developed a process for determining comparability between (1) standards for credential programs that have been adopted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and (2) the standards of national accrediting bodies or learned societies. Staff was directed to conduct a study to determine which national or professional standards were most likely to be used as alternatives in California, and to establish qualified review panels of practitioners and scholars to make professional judgments as to the comparability of the alternative standards. Beginning in April, 1996, the staff brought to the Committee a series of action reports regarding the comparability of national standards to CCTC standards in the credential areas that are charted on the following page.

	California Credentials	Sources of National Standards for Review	Results of Comparisons with California Standards
(1)	Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential	International Reading Association	Determined to be Comparable with Some Stipulations (April 1996)
(2)	Library Media Teacher Credential	American Library Association and American Assn. of School Librarians	Determined to be Comparable with Some Stipulations (April 1996)
(3)	Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Credential	National Association of School Psychologists	Determined to be Comparable with Some Stipulations (May, 1996)
(4)	Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Credential	American Psychological Association	Determined to be Comparable with Some Stipulations (May, 1996)
(5)	Multiple Subject Credential with Early Childhood Emphasis	National Association for the Education of Young Children	Determined to be Not Comparable with California Standards
(6)	Early Childhood Specialist Credential	National Association for the Education of Young Children	Determined to be Not Comparable with California Standards
(7)	Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential in Language, Speech and Audiology	American Speech-Language-Hearing Association	Determined to be Comparable with Some Stipulations (June, 1996)

As a result of the comparability studies by expert review panels and the above determinations of comparability by the Committee on Accreditation, institutions in California will be invited to prepare and propose credential preparation programs on the basis of national standards as alternatives to the Commission's standards. This option is consistent with the terms of state laws and the *Accreditation Framework*, and it reflects the Commission's continuing commitment to the provision of responsible alternatives to institutions as well as individual candidates for California credentials.

Additional comparison studies to be completed include the credentials charted on the following page.

	California Credentials	Sources of National Standards for Review	Results of Comparisons with California Standards
(8)	Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Credential	Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs	To be Determined
(9)	Education Specialist in Special Education Credential	Council for Exceptional Children	To be Determined
(10)	School Nurse Services Credential	National League of Nursing	To be Determined

Task 4: Develop Team Selection-Training-Evaluation Procedures

The *Accreditation Framework* calls for establishment of a pool of reviewers to participate in accreditation reviews. The Committee decided to call this group of educators the *Board of Institutional Reviewers* (BIR). In the first part of this work task, the Committee decided on the criteria by which members of the *Board of Institutional Reviewers* would be selected. Based on its careful analysis of the *Accreditation Framework*, the Committee identified (1) a set of criteria required by the *Framework* and (2) a set of additional criteria the Committee believes are critical for the success of the accreditation process. Both sets of criteria are shown below.

Selection Criteria Required by the *Accreditation Framework*

- (A) Diversity in race, ethnicity, and gender
- (B) Geographic distribution of members
- (C) Balanced numbers of members from K-12 and postsecondary education employment

Additional Selection Criteria Determined by the Committee on Accreditation

- (D) At least three years of related professional experience in education (e.g., teaching, administration, counseling)
- (E) Experience with qualitative evaluations (e.g., PQR, WASC NCATE, CTC or other form of complex evaluations of organizations -- no preference given for type of experience)
- (F) Experience with forms of data collection (e.g., interviewing skills, proposal reviews, document analysis, simple statistics)
- (G) Experience with collaborative problem-solving (particularly ones that involve writing)
- (H) Experience with other levels of education than one's own (e.g., K-12 people who have worked with colleges or universities and the reverse)
- (I) Judgment of general work ability by supervisors or colleagues (as suggested by letters of recommendation)
- (J) Language skills, including self-assessment of oral and written fluency in languages other than English
- (K) Familiarity with common computer word processing programs

Once these criteria were established, the application materials were designed to provide information relative to the criteria. To ensure that the selection process would be equitable, scoring rubrics for judging the applicants' qualifications were developed and approved by the Committee. All applicants were informed of the criteria and the scoring rubrics so there would be no misunderstandings regarding the selection process. The procedures were adopted in late Fall, 1995, and the application process was opened in the Winter of 1995-96. The first round of applications did not produce sufficient applicants in all of the needed areas of expertise. The Committee authorized a second, focused, round of applications intended to fill the areas of shortage that occurred in the first round of recruitment. In July, 1996, the Commission staff evaluated all applications using the approved scoring rubrics. Final notification of the initial members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers is occurring in August, 1996.

The planning of team training was delayed until the *Accreditation Handbook* was completed, in order that the training would reflect the procedures developed for the *Handbook*. The actual training curriculum will be developed as a part of the 1996-97 workplan. The formal training of the 200 members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers will take place in the 1996-97 academic year, with final training occurring the Summer of 1997.

Task 5: Resolve COA Legal and Ethical Issues

This matter proved to be a smaller and less critical issue once the Committee began its work on Task 6 (below). Since the Committee on Accreditation is a public body, it must conduct its business in accordance with state policy. This means all discussions of accreditation team reports and all deliberations of the Committee about the final accreditation status of an institution must be public discussions. Moreover, as a standing committee of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, the Committee has access to legal counsel in the event that it needs assistance of that type.

Task 6: Develop Policies for the Election of Committee Officers and Plans for the Committee's Organization

Over a series of meetings in the Summer and Fall of 1995, the Committee approved a set of procedures beginning with the annual election of Co-chairs to the adoption of attendance policies and other technical aspects of its internal operations. The Committee's initial *Procedures Manual* was adopted at the November meeting of the Committee.

Task 7: Create Policies for the Communication and Dissemination of Accreditation Information

For its formal presentations to professional organizations, the Committee on Accreditation adopted a set of materials that reflected the philosophy of the *Accreditation Framework*, and that addressed the Committee's organization, its principal duties, and its transition plan. These materials were used in presentations and publications by the Committee during the first fifteen months of its existence. These and other materials will be posted on the Commission's *Homepage* and the Committee will have a frequent column in the *CTC Newsletter*. In addition, the Committee will seek other opportunities and venues to disseminate its activities to the broader educator preparation community.

Task 8: Create an Evaluation Plan for the Accreditation Framework

In accordance with the *Accreditation Framework*, a Request for Proposals must be prepared and an independent evaluation contractor hired by the Commission and the Committee before the Committee actually begins its work on the continuing accreditation of institutions. It was not necessary or possible to develop an evaluation plan or an RFP during 1995-96. Instead, the Committee will work with the Commission in the development and release an evaluation RFP no later than April of 1997. An independent evaluator should be selected by the Commission and the Committee during the summer of 1997.

II-D Analysis and Evaluation of the Committee's First Year

The Committee on Accreditation set an ambitious workplan for its first year of existence. The eight principal tasks involved substantial work efforts for members of the Committee and the staff. Based on its careful analysis of the *Accreditation Framework*, these tasks included the development of procedures for the internal operations of the Committee, the development of an *Accreditation Handbook* for team members and institutions preparing for accreditation visits, and the development of procedures to identify and select members of accreditation teams. In addition to these tasks, the Committee was charged with the responsibility of drafting a new Partnership Agreement with the national organization for voluntary accreditation of teacher education, and of determining the comparability of eight sets of national standards with the standards of the California Commission. The Committee is pleased to report the completion of each of these significant work tasks.

In order to keep the education profession informed of its progress, the Committee has produced memoranda and articles for dissemination to the field, and made formal presentations at two major state conferences. The Committee believes that it has established a firm base for its operations, communicated accurately and fairly with the educator preparation community in the state, developed an operational set of procedures for handling the initial accreditation of credential programs and the continuing accreditation of colleges and universities. With the publication and dissemination of its *Accreditation Handbook*, the Committee will operationally launch California's new accreditation system. Postsecondary education institutions will then be able to prepare for accreditation visits in keeping with the *Accreditation Framework*. The only significant task remaining from the 1995-96 workplan is the development and delivery of team training and the development of a Request for Proposals for an independent evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework*. In summation, the Committee believes that it has discharged its assigned responsibilities promptly and effectively.

**Section III:
Analysis of Workplan for 1996-97 and
Identification of Policy Issues**

III-A Overview of the Draft Workplan for 1996-97

On July 25, 1996, the Committee on Accreditation again reviewed its progress in relation to its original workplan for 1995-96. The results of this review have been included in Section II of this *Annual Report*. At the same meeting, the Committee also adopted a Draft Workplan for 1996-97, which is shown below.

**Draft Workplan for the
Committee on Accreditation in 1996-97**

Task	Description of Each Task	Start Date	Target Date	Completion Date
(1)	Printing and Distribution of the Draft <i>Accreditation Handbook</i>	July 1996	Sept. 1996	
(2)	Completion of a Training Curriculum for the Board of Institutional Reviewers	July 1996	Oct. 1996	
(3)	Scheduling and Delivery of Board of Institutional Reviewer Training	July 1996	Sept. 1997	
(4)	Negotiation of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National and Professional Organizations	July 1996	Dec. 1996	
(5)	Dissemination of the <i>Handbook</i> on the World Wide Web and Other Presentations	July 1996	Dec. 1996	
(6)	Planning and Scheduling of Regional Workshops on Accreditation	July 1996	May 1997	
(7)	Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs Including Educational Administration and Special Education	July 1996	Ongoing	
(8)	Review of All Program Evaluation Reports Completed in 1996-97	July 1996	Ongoing	
(9)	Final Adoption of the Partnership Agreement with NCATE	July 1996	Jan. 1997	
(10)	Election of Co-Chairs	July 1996	Oct. 1997	
(11)	Development of RFP and Award of a Contract for External Evaluation of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i>	July 1996	July 1997	

III-B. Description of the Draft Workplan for 1996-97

The proposed workplan for 1996-97 focuses on eleven tasks. Several of these tasks are ongoing Committee activities that were initiated in 1995-96. The remainder of the workplan tasks are still part of the start-up process for implementing the *Accreditation Framework*. Descriptive information about each task is provided below.

(1) Printing and Distribution of the *Accreditation Handbook*

This task involves the development of a print-ready draft of the the *Accreditation Handbook* and its subsequent distribution to the field. Care must be taken to avoid unnecessary printing while still ensuring that the participants in the accreditation system are properly notified and that sufficient copies are made available. Task 3 will assist in the completion of this task. Projected completion date is October, 1996.

(2) Completion of a Training Curriculum for the Board of Institutional Reviewers

This task involves developing instructional activities and materials suitable for the planned training of all Board of Institutional Reviewer members. Based on the *Accreditation Framework* and the *Accreditation Handbook*, this training will include specialized training for Cluster Leaders and Team Leaders. Completion date is scheduled for October, 1996.

(3) Scheduling and Delivery of Board of Institutional Reviewer Training

Once the curriculum has been approved, pilot training will be scheduled and delivered in the Fall, 1996. Following an evaluation of the pilot training, additional training sessions will be scheduled and presented in the Spring and Summer, 1997. All BIR members will be trained by September, 1997. Completion date is September, 1997.

(4) Negotiation of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National and Professional Organizations

The final step in determining the comparability of standards requires the Committee on Accreditation to negotiate and sign agreements with those national and professional organizations whose standards have been determined to be comparable to CTC Credential Standards. This will entail ensuring that the national or professional organization will conduct site visits in accordance with the *Accreditation Framework*. Once the agreements have been reached, institutions will be permitted to substitute national accreditation of specific credential programs for state review and accreditation of the same programs, pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*. This task will be completed by December, 1996.

The staff will need to monitor these agreements to ensure that national and professional organizations do, in fact, live up to their agreements and that the comparability of standards remains accurate and up-to-date. If other national or professional organizations develop standards for educator preparation, the Committee will need to engage in a similar process to ensure that postsecondary education institutions can take full advantage of this accreditation option.

(5) **Dissemination of *Handbook* on World Wide Web and Other Presentations**

As part of the overall plan for disseminating the work of the Committee, the *Handbook*, if possible, will be put on the World Wide Web through the Commission's "Homepage." If sufficient funds are available, the *Handbook* will be made available on disk and the COA will prepare *Information Bulletins* for general distribution. In addition, the Committee expects to make presentations during the year to several professional organizations, including ACSA, CCET, and other groups that may wish to know more about the Committee. This task will be completed by December, 1996.

(6) **Development and Scheduling of General Workshops on Accreditation**

In preparation for the formal initiation of the professional accreditation process in September, 1997, the Committee will schedule a series of workshops for colleges and universities about the new process and the *Accreditation Handbook*. This will require the development of presentation materials and the creation of a user-friendly schedule that will permit the maximum participation by faculty and administration from the 76 institutions with approved credential programs. Task completed by May, 1997.

(7) **Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs Including Educational Administration and Special Education**

This task represents one of the ongoing activities of the Committee. Starting in the Fall, 1996, the Committee will review credential program proposals for Educational Administration and Special Education Credentials. Since these credentials have new standards, all institutions must submit new program proposals that respond to the new standards. The Committee will conduct the formal review process for the initial accreditation of these new programs, including programs at institutions for the first time. This task is ongoing beyond 1996-97.

(8) **Review and Consideration of Program Evaluation Reports Completed in 1996-97**

This task represents the final practice year for the Committee before it assumes responsibility for the continuing accreditation of institutions with approved credential programs. During the coming year, the Committee will review and analyze continuing program evaluation reports in relation to the *Accreditation Framework* requirements. This should provide beneficial practice for the Committee and enable it to "fine-tune" its operating procedures before assuming decision-making authority and responsibility in the Fall, 1997.

(9) **Final Adoption of a Partnership Agreement with NCATE**

The Committee completed its draft of a General Partnership Agreement with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in January, 1996. However, the State Partnership Board of NCATE will not meet until October, 1996. Some additional revisions may be required as a result of the deliberations of the State Partnership Board. This task will complete the development and adoption of a new General Partnership with NCATE that is consistent with the *Accreditation Framework*. This task will be completed by January, 1997.

(10) Election of Co-Chairs

Pursuant to the *Procedures Manual* that the Committee adopted during the past year, the Committee will conduct an election of Co-Chairs at its October meeting. Normally, officers will be elected during September, but this year the Committee decided, in the interests of cost-effectiveness, to cancel its meeting in September, 1996. This task will be completed in October, 1997.

(11) Development of RFP and Award of Contract for an External Evaluation of the Accreditation Framework

The Accreditation Framework requires an external evaluation of the accreditation process, beginning with the first accreditation activities. Thus, the development of the Request for Proposals and the award of a contract to an independent contractor must occur before September, 1997 when the COA officially assumes responsibility for accreditation decisions. This task must be completed by July, 1997.

III-C Schedule of Committee Meetings in 1996-97

In June, 1996, the Committee on Accreditation adopted a meeting schedule for 1996-97, as follows.

DATES	LOCATIONS	
July 25, 1996	Sacramento Hilton	
October 24-25, 1996	San Francisco	(With ACSA Conference)
November 21, 1996	Sacramento Hilton	(If Needed)
January 30-31, 1997	Burlingame Holiday Inn	
March 13, 1997	Sacramento Hilton	(If Needed)
April 17-18, 1997	San Jose Hyatt Hotel	(With CCET Conference)
May 29-30, 1997	Sacramento Hilton	
June 26-27, 1997	Burlingame Holiday Inn	

The Committee believes that this meeting schedule will provide the most cost-effective and efficient means of completing its workplan for 1996-97.

III-D Policy Issues for Commission Consideration

In its deliberations during its first fifteen months, the Committee noted a few issues pertaining to implementation of the *Accreditation Framework*, which the Commission may wish to consider prior to a formal evaluation of the *Framework*. Some of the issues grew out of the Committee's efforts to complete its adopted workplan.

(1) Review the Standards for Early Childhood Credentials

The Committee received a report by an expert panel that reviewed the Commission's Standards for the Multiple Subject Credential with Early Childhood Emphasis and the Early Childhood Specialist Credential in comparison with the Guidelines of the National Association for the Education of Young Children. This panel noted that the California Standards are more than ten years old and could benefit from a review and revision process. Much research on child development and education has been completed since the current standards were developed. The expert panel urged the Committee on Accreditation to suggest that such a review and revision take place. The Committee agreed to transmit that request to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing in its *Annual Report*. The Committee hereby so advises the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

(2) Develop Innovative Ways of Obtaining Graduates' Opinions

The Committee believes that additional work is needed to identify and support innovative ways of obtaining valid, reliable data about the perspectives of graduates of credential programs in California. Such information is difficult to obtain during accreditation visits. However, such data would provide powerful indications of the quality and effectiveness of educator preparation at an institution. The Committee would like to work with the Commission in exploring alternative, innovative, cost-effective ways of obtaining such data in the future.

(3) Coordinate with the SB 1422 Advisory Panel Recommendations

The report of the SB 1422 Advisory Panel may have significant implications for the work of the Committee on Accreditation. Those implications may be apparent prior to completion of the required independent evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework*. The Committee on Accreditation wishes to bring this prospect to the attention of the Commission so that any changes related to the accreditation of educator preparation that are included in the recommendations of the SB 1422 Advisory Panel will be reviewed in the context of the *Accreditation Framework*.

(4) Provide Training for National Reviewers

The *Accreditation Framework* permits the use of national accreditation of an education unit or a credential program *in lieu* of state accreditation if certain conditions are met. Implicit in those conditions is some form of training for reviewers from the national organizations who will conduct California accreditation reviews on behalf of the Committee on Accreditation. In particular, such training must impart a clear understanding of California laws and Commission Standards. This training will be the responsibility of the Committee on Accreditation, and will have fiscal implications for the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. As the Commission builds its future budgets, the costs inherent in making the *Accreditation Framework* fully operational should be considered.

(5) Seek Legislation Regarding the Accreditation of District Intern Programs

Currently, district intern programs operate only under the broad authority of state laws, and are not subject to any *Standards of Program Quality or Effectiveness*. Because of these circumstances, the credentials that are issued to graduates of district intern programs carry fewer quality assurances than any other professional credentials in California education. The Committee on Accreditation believes that sensible public policy calls for all credential programs to be accredited by the same basic process. In this way, the public would be assured that (1) credentials are issued to individuals who meet existing standards and (2) this assurance has been determined by the same process regardless of the nature of the program.

**Section IV:
Collected Agendas of the COA
April, 1995 to July, 1996**

The following pages present the agendas of the Committee on Accreditation as approved by the members of the Committee at their regularly scheduled meetings. The agendas are attached to the *Annual Report* to give a sense of the kinds of issues and activities that have engaged the Committee during its first fifteen months of existence.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

1812 Ninth Street
Sacramento, California 95814-7000

PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

AGENDA

INAUGURAL MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

Hyatt Regency Hotel
Burlingame, CA
April 21 and 22, 1995

FRIDAY APRIL 21, 1995

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Facilitator</u>
1:00 p.m.	Welcome and Introductions	Phil Fitch
	Dennis Tierney	
1:30 p.m.	Charge to the Committee	David Wright
2:00 p.m.	Overview of Accreditation	
	Framework	David Wright
3:00 p.m.	Break	
3:15 p.m.	Selection of Chair Pro-tempore	Dennis Tierney
3:30 p.m.	Establish Meeting Schedule	
	for 1995 and 1996	Chair Pro-tem
4:00 p.m.	Establish election date and	
	procedures for officers	Chair Pro-tem
4:30 p.m.	Establish priorities for 1995	Chair Pro-tem
5:00 p.m.	Adjourn	

SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 1995

7:30 a.m.	Continental Breakfast	
8:00 a.m.	Priority work continued	Chair Pro-tem
9:00 a.m.	Discuss Committee	
	internal organization	Chair Pro-tem
10:00 a.m.	Break	
10:15 a.m.	Discuss Handbook	Chair Pro-tem
11:00 a.m.	Discuss Team Training	Chair Pro-tem
11:45 a.m.	Discuss agenda for next	
	meeting	Chair Pro-tem
12:00	Adjourn	

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

1812 Ninth Street
Sacramento, California 95814-7000

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

A G E N D A

May 25 and May 26, 1995

Holiday Inn Crowne Plaza
Burlingame, CA 94010
415-340-8500 FAX 415-340-0599

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Facilitator</u>
10:00 am	Call to Order	Irv Hendrick
10:05 am	Approval of Agenda	Irv Hendrick
10:10 am	Approval of Minutes of April COA meeting	Irv Hendrick
10:20 am	Chair's Report	Irv Hendrick
	Facilitated Discussion of <i>Accreditation Framework</i>	
10:30 am	Review of Process	Dennis Tierney
11:00 am	Section 1 Discussion <i>Authority & Responsibility</i>	Dennis Tierney
12:00	LUNCH	
1:00 pm	Section 2 Discussion <i>Establishment of Committee on Accreditation</i>	Dennis Tierney
2:00 pm	Section 3 Discussion <i>Accreditation Standards</i>	
3:15 pm	Section 4 Discussion <i>Initial Accreditation</i>	Dennis Tierney
4:15 pm	Section 5 Discussion <i>Continuing Accreditation:</i>	Dennis Tierney
5:30 pm	Review of Progress & Goal Setting for Friday	Irv Hendrick
6:00 pm	Adjourn	
1:00 pm	Section 8 <i>Evaluation and Modification of Framework</i>	Dennis Tierney
2:00 pm	Summary and Review of Framework: Next Steps	Irv Hendrick
2:50 pm	Items for Future Agendas	
3:00 pm	Adjourn May Meeting	

Committee on Accreditation

Proposed Agenda

July 27-28, 1995

Holiday Inn Crowne Plaza
Burlingame, California

July 27, 1995

10:00 a.m.	Item 1	Call to Order	
	Item 2	Roll Call	
	Item 3	Approval of Agenda	Tab 5
	Item 4	Approval of Minutes of Prior Meeting	Tab 6
	Item 5	Chair's Report	
10:30 a.m.	Item 6	Review of Proposed COA Workplan	Tab 7
	Item 7	Transition Options Plan	Tab 8
12:00		Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	Item 8	Report on CSU, San Bernardino Visit	Tab 9
3:00 p.m.		Break	
3:15 p.m.	Item 9	Initial Discussion of Handbook Organization	Tab 10

July 28, 1995

8:00 a.m.	Item 10	Roll Call	
		Resumption of Tab 6: Handbook	
10:00 a.m.		Break	
10:15 a.m.	Item 11	Initial Discussion of Team Selection, Training, and Evaluation	Tab 11
12:00		Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	Item 12	NCATE Partnership Update and Discussion	Tab 12
2:30 p.m.	Item 13	August Election of Chair and Vice-Chair	Tab 13
3:00 p.m.	Item 14	Adjournment	

Committee on Accreditation

Proposed Agenda

August 24, 1995

Holiday Inn Crowne Plaza
Burlingame, California

AUGUST 24, 1995

8:30 a.m.	Item 1	Call to Order	
8:35 a.m.	Item 2	Roll Call	
8:40 a.m.	Item 3	Approval of Agenda (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 1
8:50 a.m.	Item 4	Approval of Minutes of Prior Meeting (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 2
9:00 a.m.	Item 5	Co-Chairs' Reports (<i>Information Item</i>)	
9:15 a.m.	Item 6	Adoption of Revised Minutes, Agenda Procedures (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 3
10:00 a.m.		Break	
10:15 a.m.	Item 7	Presentation at Fall Conference of CCET (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 4
11:00 a.m.	Item 8	Experimental Use of Framework, Section 7, C at California State University, Fullerton (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 5
12:00		Lunch (in conference room)	
1:00 p.m.	Item 9	NCATE Partnership Agreement (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 6
2:30 p.m.	Item 10	Plan for Standards Comparability Study (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 7
3:00 p.m.		Break	
3:15 p.m.	Item 11	Draft of Team Selection Process (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 8
4:00 p.m.	Item 12	COA Procedures Manual Proposal (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 9
4:30 p.m.		Adjournment	

Committee on Accreditation

Proposed Agenda

September 28, 1995

Holiday Inn Crowne Plaza
Burlingame, California

SEPTEMBER 28 , 1995

8:00 a.m.	Item 1	Call to Order		
8:05 a.m.	Item 2	Roll Call		
8:10 a.m.	Item 3	Approval of Agenda (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 1	
8:20 a.m.	Item 4	Approval of Minutes of Prior Meeting (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 2	
8:30 a.m.	Item 5	Co-Chairs' Reports (<i>Information Item</i>)		
8:40 a.m.	Item 6	Special Education Standards: COA Implications (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 3	
9:45 a.m.		Break		
10:00 a.m.	Item 7	Accreditation Handbook Update	Tab 4	
11:00 a.m.	Item 8	Team Selection Process - Rubrics (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 5	
12:00		Lunch		
1:00 p.m.	Item 9	NCATE Proposed Protocol (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 6	
2:00 p.m.	Item 10	CCET Presentation Update (<i>Information Item</i>)		Tab 7
3:00 p.m.	Item 11	COA Internal Procedures Manual (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 8	
4:00 p.m.	Item 12	Comparability of Standards Process (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 9	

Committee on Accreditation

Proposed Agenda

October 26, 27 1995

Kona Kai Plaza Hotel
Shelter Island, San Diego

OCTOBER 26, 1995

- | | | | |
|------------|---------|--|-------|
| 8:30 a.m. | Item 1 | Call to Order | |
| 8:35 a.m. | Item 2 | Roll Call | |
| 8:40 a.m. | Item 3 | Approval of Agenda (<i>Action Item</i>) | Tab 1 |
| 8:50 a.m. | Item 4 | Approval of Minutes of Prior Meeting
(<i>Action Item</i>) | Tab 2 |
| 9:00 a.m. | Item 5 | Co-Chairs' Reports (<i>Information Item</i>) | |
| 9:10 a.m. | Item 6 | Team Selection Process - Criteria and
Rubrics (<i>Action Item</i>) | Tab 3 |
| 10:00 a.m. | | Break | |
| 10:15 a.m. | Item 7 | Team Training Overview (<i>Information Item</i>) | Tab 4 |
| 12:00 | | Lunch | |
| 1:00 p.m. | Item 8 | Revision of Term of Appointment for
Inaugural COA members (<i>Information Item</i>) | Tab 5 |
| 1:30 p.m. | Item 9 | Participation in CCET Fall Conference
(<i>Information Item</i>) | Tab 6 |
| 1:45 p.m. | Item 10 | Adjournment to CCET Conference | |

Committee on Accreditation

Proposed Agenda

October 26, 27 1995

Kona Kai Plaza Hotel
Shelter Island, San Diego

OCTOBER 27, 1995

8:00 a.m.	Item 11 Call to Order	
8:05 a.m.	Item 12 Roll Call	
8:10 a.m.	Item 13 NCATE Proposed Protocol	Tab 7
10:00 a.m.	Break	
10:15 a.m.	Item 11 COA Internal Procedures Manual (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 8
10:45 a.m.	Item 12 Comparability of Standards Process (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 9
11:30 a.m.	Adjournment	

Committee on Accreditation Agenda

Courtyard by Marriott Hotel Long Beach, California

November 30, 1995

- | | | | |
|------------|---------|--|-------------------|
| 8:30 a.m. | Item 1 | Call to Order | |
| 8:35 a.m. | Item 2 | Roll Call | |
| 8:40 a.m. | Item 3 | Approval of Agenda (<i>Action Item</i>) | Tab 1 |
| 8:50 a.m. | Item 4 | Approval of Minutes of Prior Meeting
(<i>Action Item</i>) | Tab 2 |
| 9:00 a.m. | Item 5 | Co-Chairs' Reports (<i>Information Item</i>) | |
| 9:10 a.m. | Item 6 | Team Selection Process -Application Form
Information Packet (<i>Information Item</i>) | and
Tab 3 |
| 9:30 a.m. | Item 7 | Accreditation Handbook - Standards Display
for Multiple and Single Subject
Teaching Credential (<i>Information Item</i>) | Tab 4 |
| 10:30 a.m. | | Break | |
| 10:45 a.m. | Item 8 | NCATE Protocol - Final Draft (<i>Action Item</i>) | Tab 5 |
| 12:00 | | Lunch | |
| 1:00 p.m. | Item 9 | Oral Team Training Update and Simulation
(<i>Information Item</i>) | Exercise
Tab 6 |
| 3:00 p.m. | | Break | |
| 3:15 p.m. | Item 10 | Procedures Manual - Chapters 7 - 12
(<i>Action Item</i>) | Tab 7 |
| 4:00 p.m. | Item 11 | Adjournment | |

Committee on Accreditation Agenda

**Holiday Inn Crowne Plaza
Burlingame, California**

January 25, 1996

8:30 a.m.	Item 1	Call to Order	
8:35 a.m.	Item 2	Roll Call	
8:40 a.m.	Item 3	Approval of Agenda (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 1
8:50 a.m.	Item 4	Approval of Minutes of Prior Meeting (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 2
9:00 a.m.	Item 5	Co-Chairs' Reports (<i>Information Item</i>)	
9:10 a.m.	Item 6	Revision of COA Meeting Schedule (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 3
9:40 a.m.	Item 7	Reviewer Selection Process Update (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 4
10:00 a.m.	Item 8	NCATE Partnership Update (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 5
10:30 a.m.		Break	
10:45 a.m.		Continue NCATE Update	
11:00 a.m.	Item 9	Accreditation Handbook - Standards Display for Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 6
12:00		Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	Item 10	Team Training Simulation Exercise (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 7
2:45 p.m.		Break	
3:00 p.m.	Item 11	Decision Rules for Accreditation Teams (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 8
4:30 p.m.	Item 12	Adjournment	

Committee on Accreditation Agenda

Burlingame, California

February 29, 1996

8:30 a.m.	Item 1	Call to Order	
8:35 a.m.	Item 2	Roll Call	
8:40 a.m.	Item 3	Approval of Agenda (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 1
8:50 a.m.	Item 4	Approval of Minutes of Prior Meeting (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 2
9:00 a.m.	Item 5	Co-Chairs' Reports (<i>Information Item</i>)	
9:10 a.m.	Item 6	Members Reports (<i>Information Item</i>)	
9:40 a.m.	Item 7	Reviewer Selection Process Update (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 3
10:00 a.m.	Item 8	NCATE Partnership Update (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 5
10:30 a.m.		Break	
10:45 a.m.	Item 9	National Professional Organization Standards Comparability Study (<i>Action and Information Item</i>)	Tab 6
11:15 a.m.	Item 10	Accreditation Handbook - Standards Display for Administrative Services Credentials (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 7
12:00		Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	Item 11	Draft Questions for Common and General Program Standards (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 8
2:00 p.m.		Proposal for Nominations Panel Member Replacement (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 9
3:00 p.m.	Item 12	Revised Decision Guidelines for Accreditation Teams (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 10
4:30 p.m.	Item 13	Adjournment	

March 1, 1996

8:00 a.m.	Item 14	Call to Order	
8:10 a.m.	Item 15	Roll Call	
8:15 a.m.	Item 16	Consideration of Declaration of Vacancy on Committee (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 11
8:30 a.m.	Item 17	Revised Timeline and Review Structure for Accreditation Handbook (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 12
9:30 a.m.	Item 18	Break	
9:45 a.m.	Item 19	Team Training Simulation: Assembling Lines of Evidence (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 13
11:45 a.m.	Item 20	Adjournment	

Committee on Accreditation Agenda

Holiday Inn Crowne Plaza Burlingame, California

April 25, 1996

8:30 a.m.	Item 1	Call to Order	
8:35 a.m.	Item 2	Roll Call	
8:40 a.m.	Item 3	Approval of Agenda (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 1
8:50 a.m.	Item 4	Approval of Minutes of Prior Meeting (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 2
9:00 a.m.	Item 5	Co-Chairs' Reports (<i>Information Item</i>)	
9:10 a.m.	Item 6	Members Reports (<i>Information Item</i>)	
9:40 a.m.	Item 7	Reviewer Selection Process Update (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 3
10:00 a.m.	Item 8	Break	
10:15 a.m.	Item 9	Revised Decision Guidelines (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 4
11:00 a.m.	Item 10	Transition Plan Letter to NCATE IHE's (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 5
11:30 a.m.	Item 11	Adoption of Meeting Dates for Rest of '96 (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 6
1:00 p.m.	Item 12	COA Agenda Format Proposal (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 7
1:30 p.m.	Item 13	Accreditation Handbook Review (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 8
3:00 p.m.	Item 16	Special Education Standards Update (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 9
4:30 p.m.	Item 17	Adjournment	

April 26, 1996

8:00 a.m.	Item 18	Call to Order	
8:10 a.m.	Item 19	Roll Call	
8:15 a.m.	Item 20	Team Training Elements/Simulation (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 11
9:00 a.m.	Item 21	Comparability of Standards Study (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 12
10:00 a.m.	Item 22	Initial Accreditation of Programs Process (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 13
10:45 a.m.		Initial Accreditation of Programs Cont'nd	
11:15 a.m.	Item 24	Revised Transition Proposal	Tab 14
11:45 a.m.	Item 20	Adjournment	

Committee on Accreditation Agenda

Irvine, CA 92714

May 30, 1996

8:30 a.m.	Item 1	Call to Order	
8:35 a.m.	Item 2	Roll Call	
8:40 a.m.	Item 3	Approval of Agenda (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 1
8:45 a.m.	Item 4	Approval of Minutes of Prior Meeting (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 2
8:50 a.m.	Item 5	Co-Chairs' Reports (<i>Information Item</i>)	
8:55 a.m.	Item 6	Members Reports (<i>Information Item</i>)	
9:00 a.m.	Item 7	Workplan Update (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 3
9:15 a.m.	Item 8	Report on NCATE State Partnership Meeting (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 4
9:30 a.m.	Item 9	Reviewer Pool Update (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 5
10:00 a.m.	Item 10	Break	
10:15 a.m.	Item 11	Report of COA-type Visit to UC Riverside (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 6
11:30 a.m.	Item 12	Team Report Format (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 7
12:00		Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	Item 13	Adoption of Meeting Locales for Rest of '96 (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 8
1:30 p.m.	Item 14	Revised Decision Guidelines (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 9
3:00 p.m.	Item 15	Break	
3:15 p.m.	Item 16	Use of Questions in Accreditation Handbook (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 10
4:00 p.m.	Item 17	Adjournment	

May 31 1996

8:00 a.m.	Item 18	Call to Order	
8:10 a.m.	Item 19	Roll Call	
8:15 a.m.	Item 20	Initial Accreditation of Programs Process (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 11
9:00 a.m.	Item 21	Comparability of Standards Study (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 12
10:45 a.m.	Item 23	Accreditation Handbook Update (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 13
11:30 a.m.	Item 24	District Intern Issues (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 14
11:45 a.m.	Item 25	Adjournment	

Committee on Accreditation Agenda

**Holiday Inn Crowne Plaza
Burlingame, California**

June 27, 1996

9:00 a.m.	Item 1	Call to Order		
9:05 a.m.	Item 2	Roll Call		
9:10 a.m.	Item 3	Approval of Agenda (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 1	
9:15 a.m.	Item 4	Approval of Minutes of Prior Meeting (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 2	
9:20 a.m.	Item 5	Co-Chairs' Reports (<i>Information Item</i>)		
9:30 a.m.	Item 6	Members Reports (<i>Information Item</i>)		
9:45 a.m.	Item 7	Workplan Update (<i>Information Item</i>)		Tab 3
10:00 a.m.	Item 8	Reviewer Selection Process Update (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 4	
10:15 a.m.	Item 9	Break		
10:30 a.m.	Item 10	Nomination Panel Update (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 5	
10:45 a.m.	Item 11	Comparability Study Reports (<i>Action Item</i>)		Tab 6
12:00		Lunch		
1:00 p.m.	Item 12	Annual Report Plan & Format (<i>Information Item</i>)		Tab 7
1:30 p.m.	Item 13	Revised Meeting Location, '96-'97 <i>Item</i>	Tab 8	(<i>Action</i>)
1:45 p.m.	Item 14	Appeal Procedures (<i>Action Item</i>)	Tab 9	
2:00 p.m.	Item 15	Accreditation Handbook Review (<i>Information Item</i>)	Tab 10	
2:45 p.m.		Break		
3:00 p.m.		Accreditation Handbook Review Cont'd		
4:30 p.m.	Item 16	Adjournment		

Section V: Presentation Materials and Newsletter Articles about the Committee on Accreditation

The following pages contain materials that were developed by the Committee on Accreditation as a part of its dissemination and outreach activities. The materials range from press releases to presentations at state conferences. Some of these materials have been published in the Commission on Teacher Credentialing's *Newsletter*.

Committee on Accreditation Selected by Commission (Commission Newsletter Article)

At the November Commission meeting, the initial twelve members of the Committee on Accreditation were chosen thus bringing to fruition the efforts of many individuals in the teacher education community in California. The creation of the Committee on Accreditation was the product of a series of reform in program evaluation efforts in California beginning with the passage of SB 148 (Bergeson, 1988) and culminating in the passage of SB 655 (Bergeson, 1994). The essential features of this new approach to assuring excellence in educator preparation are as follows:

- Orientation to Quality
- Professional Character of Accreditation
- Breadth and Flexibility
- Intensity in Accreditation
- Integration with the Certification System
- Contributions of Accreditation to Improved Preparation
Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness

The Committee on Accreditation has been charged with several important tasks that were previously performed by the Commission itself. The key tasks of the Committee on Accreditation are:

- 1) Conduct studies to compare existing or proposed national or professional program standards with current California program standards to ensure that such standards are comparable and, therefore, approvable for California credential programs.
- 2) Review and approve proposals for new credential programs submitted by previously approved institutions.
- 3) Review and approve the recommendations of peer educator teams regarding continuing accreditation of approved programs.
- 4) Develop accreditation procedures to accompany the *Framework* including team training activities, institutional handbooks, forms, and internal policies and procedures for the Committee. report
- 5) Monitor the performance of the accreditation teams and oversee the general operation of the accreditation system. the
- 6) Present annual reports to the Commission and advise the Commission about policy changes deemed necessary.
- 7) Jointly sponsor an external evaluation of the entire process within the first four years of operation. This process to be conducted by a qualified outside evaluator chosen by competitive bid process.
- 8) Conduct all business in public session in accordance with state law.

The membership of the Committee consists of twelve individuals, six chosen from a pool of individuals professionally affiliated with institutions of higher education and six individuals chosen from a pool of certificated individuals professionally affiliated with public schools, school districts, or county offices of education. These individuals were selected from a pool of 132 individuals nominated by a wide array of organizations and individuals in California. This group of 132 was reviewed by an exceptionally distinguished panel of six California educators jointly selected by the Commission and the Accreditation Advisory Council. The panel included a current President of a California State University campus, a past president of the American Education Research Association, the superintendent of a major school district, and a former teacher of the year. They picked twenty-four highly accomplished individuals for the second level of selection.

The second level of selection included the submission of a resume, written response to a prepared question, and a formal interview with members of the Commission. The formal interview consisted of four questions asked of all finalists and the responses were evaluated using criteria adopted by the Commission. All Commissioners received these materials prior to the November meeting. The enabling law required that members of the Committee fit certain specified categories and the Commission was bound to follow those. Beyond such restrictions, the Commission selected the twelve individuals on the basis of the following criteria:

- evidence of achievement in the education profession
- recognized professional or scholarly contributions
- recognition of excellence by peers
- experience with and sensitivity to issues of human diversity
- distinguished teaching record
- leadership experiences in educational reform and restructuring
- knowledge of issues related to educator preparation and licensing
- knowledge of accreditation issues and processes
- possession of appropriate professional credentials

Following a complex and careful voting process that emphasized a concern for addressing all the balancing factors noted in the law and those that typically govern the identification of advisory panels, the Commission picked the following individuals for the inaugural Committee on Accreditation. As is required for all public bodies, the Commission conducted this election in public and each Commissioner was required to announce her or his choice at each round of voting. The institutional affiliation of the selected persons follows their names which are listed in alphabetical order within each major group.

Members from Institutions of Higher Education

Carol Barnes, Professor of Education, CSU, Fullerton
Barbara Burch, Dean of Education, CSU, Fresno
Dolores Escobar, Dean of Education, San Jose State University
Fay Haisley, Dean of Education, University of the Pacific
Irving Hendrick, Dean of Education, UC Riverside
Arthurlene Towner, Dean of Education, CSU, Hayward

Members from Public Schools, School Districts, and County Office of Education

Joya Chatterjee, Principal, Westwood School, Santa Clara Unified School District	
Anita "Chris" Chavez, Assistant Superintendent Personnel, Chula Elementary School District	Vista
Ann Chlebicki, Superintendent, Palos Verdes Unified School District	
Robert Hathaway, Mathematics Teacher, Walker Junior High School, Union High School District	Anaheim
Olivia Palacio, Assistant Superintendent, Instruction, Fresno County Education	Office of
Shirley Rosenkranz, English Teacher, Temple City High School, Temple City Unified School District	

These individuals will be meeting early in 1995 to begin the work of the Committee on Accreditation. They have significant duties to complete and will require much assistance and input from all who are interested in the preparation of future educators.

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION ANNOUNCES ITS SELECTION PROCESS FOR ACCREDITATION REVIEW TEAMS (Commission Newsletter Article)

At its October meeting, held in conjunction with the joint Fall Conference of the California Council on the Education of Teachers, California Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, and the State of California Association of Teacher Educators, the Committee on Accreditation approved procedures for the recruitment and selection of individuals to be trained in the new accreditation process. These procedures are designed to identify and select, through a formal public process, a group of approximately 200 highly qualified educators, who will be trained through an intensive summer workshop in the *Accreditation Framework*. It will be these qualified, trained individuals who will conduct the actual accreditation site reviews to California colleges and universities with approved credential programs on behalf of the Committee on Accreditation and make recommendations about those programs to the Committee.

The formal process will begin with a mailing to over 3,000 education organizations and individuals, inviting them to submit applications for membership in the reviewer pool. The Committee on Accreditation seeks a balance in its pool of elementary and secondary classroom teachers and other certificated personnel, local school board members, and college and university faculty and administrators. The Committee will also seek a pool that is geographically and culturally diverse and that represents gender equity. The application form is designed to provide interested candidates with an opportunity to demonstrate they possess the criteria selected by the Committee on Accreditation as critical for membership in the pool.

The COA has selected nine criteria for its selection process. They are:

1. At least three years of related professional experience in education (e.g., teaching, administration, counseling, school board membership).
2. Experience with qualitative evaluations (e.g., PQR, WASC NCATE, CTC or other form of complex evaluations of organizations -- no preference will be given for type of experience).
3. Experience with forms of data collection (e.g., interviewing skills, proposal reviews, document analysis, simple statistics).
4. Experience with collaborative problem solving (particularly those that involve writing).
5. Experience with other levels of education than one's own (e.g., K-12 people who have worked with colleges or universities and the reverse).
6. Judgment of general work ability by supervisors or colleagues (as suggested by the letter of recommendation).
7. Language skills, including self-assessment of oral and written fluency, in diverse languages.
8. Knowledge of and experience with multicultural education, including language acquisition and diversity issues.
9. Familiarity with a common computer word processing program

The application materials will be mailed to the field in late November - early December. Because of the holiday season, adequate time will be allowed for interested individuals to complete and return the application form. Upon receipt of all applications, the COA staff will prepare summary information regarding the balancing factors called for by the *Accreditation Framework* (e.g., geographical, cultural, and employment diversity plus gender equity) and evaluate the applications on the basis of scoring rubrics approved by the Committee on Accreditation at its October meeting. Once all the applications have been scored, the actual selection of the pool of 200 reviewers will be made in accordance with the need for a balanced pool. The Committee on Accreditation is also mindful that the pool of reviewers must have sufficient expertise to conduct accreditation reviews in all credential areas and programs. The Committee has directed staff to increase the size of the pool if necessary to ensure sufficient numbers of experts.

Once selected and publicly announced, the pool of reviewers will be expected to conduct at least one review per year. All members of the pool will be trained through an intensive summer workshop. These are planned for the summer of 1996 and will involve several days of training in the new Accreditation Framework, principles of qualitative evaluation, interview techniques, collaborative decision-making, and other related skills needed by team members. The training will emphasize simulations and "hands-on" training based on actual accreditation materials.

Anyone interested in serving as a member of the accreditation review pool should write or call Mrs. Carol Roberts, secretary to the Committee on Accreditation. She can be reached at 916-324-8002. Her address is, Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1812 Ninth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814. She can also be reached via E-mail at carolrctc@aol.com. Application materials will be sent to the interested party.

The Committee believes that this selection process is critical to the success of the *Accreditation Framework*. The assistance of all educators in making the application process known widely and in encouraging many colleagues to apply will ensure that the future accreditation of educator preparation will be conducted by the best professionals in the state. Our colleagues who prepare educators deserve the best evaluators. More importantly, the children who will be taught by the graduates of these programs deserve only the best and a rigorous, high quality accreditation process can ensure that they get the best. The Committee on Accreditation asks the help of all concerned educators in making this a reality in California.

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

(Conference Presentation Materials)

ESSENTIAL ATTRIBUTES OF ACCREDITATION

- **ORIENTATION TO EDUCATIONAL QUALITY**

This new system of accreditation focuses primarily on the educational quality of educator preparation in our colleges and universities. The use of standards in defining educational quality is intended to avoid purely technical or operational aspects of educator preparation and emphasize the decisions of trained reviewers as to the level of quality demonstrated by a particular institution or program.

- **PROFESSIONAL CHARACTER OF ACCREDITATION**

The expertise and experience of those who create accreditation standards, conduct accreditation reviews, and make accreditation decisions must be credible to the general public and the education profession. Professional educators must be involved in every phase of the accreditation process and must hold themselves and their peers accountable for the quality of professional education. In each step of the accreditation process, decisions should emerge from consultation and consensus among professional participants.

- **BREADTH AND FLEXIBILITY**

In a society as diverse as California, universities and colleges must be creative and responsive to meet changing educational and social needs. High quality accreditation processes must celebrate such differences and foster multiple means to agreed-upon ends. Broad domains of educator preparation describing levels of quality can clarify meaning without making standards restrictive. The training of those who conduct such accreditation reviews emphasizes this orientation toward breadth and flexibility.

- **INTENSITY IN ACCREDITATION**

The accreditation process must provide trained reviewers with sufficient breadth and depth of information to make reliable decisions about quality. The focus of the process must be on the key elements of educational quality and the standards used must encompass the critical dimensions of educator preparation. Sufficient essential information must be available to those who conduct accreditation reviews so that their decisions are based on verifiable data.

ESSENTIAL ATTRIBUTES OF ACCREDITATION

- **INTEGRATION WITH THE CERTIFICATION SYSTEM**

Accreditation processes must be linked to the state certification system by acknowledging state licensure requirements and state-mandated professional roles and responsibilities. Attention to specialized preparation for particular credentials is a critical aspect of high quality accreditation.

- **CONTRIBUTIONS OF ACCREDITATION TO IMPROVED PREPARATION**

Accreditation standards, reviews, and decisions must also contribute to improvements in the preparation of educators. For that to occur, accreditation reviews must note weaknesses as well as strengths and provide institutions with clear understandings of accreditation standards. The real value in accreditation lies in the opportunity to engage in professional and institutional growth through consultation and analysis from respected professional peers.

- **EFFICIENCY AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS**

Review processes, decision procedures, and reporting mechanisms must be streamlined and economical. The effort to contain costs must neither come at the expense of fairness and rigor nor should it impose undue burdens on the institutions being reviewed.

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

KEY ELEMENTS OF THE FRAMEWORK

A. FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

1. Determine Comparability of Standards

The Committee on Accreditation is charged with the task of determining whether National, Professional Program, or Alternative Program Standards are comparable, when taken as a whole, to the standards adopted by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing for a particular credential. If the Committee so determines, the proposed standards may be used in lieu of California Standards in the review and accreditation process for that credential program(s).

2. Initial Accreditation of Programs

The Committee reviews proposals for the initial accreditation of professional preparation programs submitted by institutions deemed eligible by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Eligible institutions may propose programs under four options. If the Committee determines that the program meets all eligible standards, the Committee grants initial accreditation to the program.

3. Continuing Accreditation Decisions

Upon review of the recommendation of an accreditation team and the responses (if any) of the institution visited, the Committee makes one of three possible decisions about the continuing accreditation of the institution -- Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations, Denial of Accreditation.

4. Accreditation Procedures

The Committee is charged with the responsibility of developing the procedures for conducting accreditation visits, including materials to be developed, guidelines for self-study reports, accreditation team reports, and other information related to the accreditation process. An *Accreditation Handbook* will be published with these procedures outlined.

5. Monitor the Accreditation System

The Committee will monitor the performance of the accreditation teams and oversee other activities associated with the system.

6. Annual Report, Recommendations, and Responses

The Committee will make an annual report on the dimensions and results of the accreditation process to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The Committee also advises the Commission about policy changes to improve the quality and integrity of the process.

7. Meet in Public Sessions

The Committee will conduct its business and make its decisions in meetings open to the public, except as provided by statute.

8. Jointly Sponsor an External Evaluation of Accreditation Policies and Practices

The Committee shares the responsibility with the Commission on Teacher Credentialing for the design and implementation of a comprehensive evaluation of accreditation policies and the selection of an external evaluator to conduct this evaluation.

KEY ELEMENTS OF THE FRAMEWORK

B. PROGRAM ACCREDITATION STANDARDS OPTIONS

1. CALIFORNIA PROGRAM STANDARDS

The Commission has developed program standards for each credential area. Institutions may elect to use these standards for their accreditation visits.

2. NATIONAL OR PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM STANDARDS

Institutions may elect to have one or more programs judged by standards developed by national or professional associations. The Committee on Accreditation must make the determination that these standards, taken as a whole, are comparable to the respective California program standards.

3. GENERAL PROGRAM STANDARDS

Institutions may elect to have one or more programs judged by general program standards developed by the Accreditation Advisory Council and approved by the Commission. These general standards may be used for continuing accreditation visits.

4. EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM STANDARDS

For initial accreditation, an institution may present a program that meets the experimental standards adopted by the Commission. For continuing accreditation of experimental programs, the institution is required to file reports to the Commission for dissemination to the field.

5. ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM STANDARDS

Institutions may develop alternative standards for initial or continuing accreditation of a credential program. The Committee on Accreditation must determine that the standards proposed, taken as a whole, are comparable to the respective California standards before the program is visited. Such alternative standards may legally depart from several statutory requirements that govern teacher education programs.

C. ACCREDITATION OPTIONS IN THE FRAMEWORK

1. NATIONAL ACCREDITATION OF AN EDUCATION UNIT

The Framework authorizes the Committee to substitute the accreditation of the education unit (school, college, or department of education) by a national accrediting body for the Common Standards portion of the state accreditation process provided that the national accrediting body agrees to the following conditions:

- (a) They agree to use the Common Standards adopted by the Commission.
- (b) Their process includes on-site reviews.
- (c) Their teams represent ethnic and gender diversity and include elementary and secondary practitioners. One of their team members must be from California.
- (d) Their team is equivalent in size to our team.
- (e) Their period of accreditation is compatible with ours.

2. MERGED STATE-NATIONAL ACCREDITATION TEAMS

Assuming the issues in number 1 have been met, a merged visit is composed of one team serving state and national accrediting bodies. The team will have co-chairs and the group examining the Common Standards will be jointly chosen by the COA/CTC consultant and the co-chairs. Members of the team examining the Program Standards will follow the Accreditation Handbook.

3. NATIONAL ACCREDITATION OF A CREDENTIAL PROGRAM

The accreditation of a credential program by a national accrediting body can substitute for state accreditation of the program provided that the Committee certifies to the Commission that the national accrediting body satisfies the following conditions.

- (a) The national body agrees to use California Standards or the Committee has previously judged national standards to be comparable.
- (b) The national process includes on-site review.
- (c) Their accreditation team represents ethnic and gender diversity.
- (d) Their team includes postsecondary and elementary and secondary school practitioners; one person must be from California.
- (e) Their accreditation cycle is compatible with California's.