



**SEVENTH ANNUAL  
ACCREDITATION REPORT**

To the  
**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON  
TEACHER CREDENTIALING**

By the  
**COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION**

**Seventh Annual Accreditation Report to  
the  
California Commission on  
Teacher Credentialing**

**By the Committee  
on Accreditation**

**Assisted by the  
Professional Services Division**

**Sacramento, California  
August 2002**

# Seventh Annual Accreditation Report to the Commission by the Committee on Accreditation

## Table of Contents

Letter of Transmittal to the Commission	iii
The Committee on Accreditation (September, 2002)	iv
<b>Section I: Major Activities of the Committee on Accreditation</b>	<b>1</b>
(1) Election of Co-Chairs for 2001-2002	1
(2) Schedule of Committee Meetings for 2001-2002	1
(3) Major Accomplishments of the Committee on Accreditation	1
(4) Schedule of Committee Meetings for 2002-2003	2
<b>Section II: Accomplishment of the Committee's Workplan in 2001-2002</b>	<b>3</b>
Task 1 Monitor the Evaluation of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i>	3
Task 2 Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National Organizations (including NCATE)	3
Task 3 Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs	5
Task 4 Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and their Credential Preparation Programs	5
Task 5 Revise the <i>Accreditation Handbook</i> and Team Training Curriculum	7
Task 6 Maintain Public Access to the Committee on Accreditation	7
Task 7 Receive Regular Updates on SB 2042 Advisory Panel and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation	7
Task 8 Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission	8
Task 9 Other Required Elements of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> - Election of Co-Chairs, Adopt Meeting Schedule, Orient New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.	8
<b>Section III: Proposed Workplan for the Committee in 2002-2003</b>	<b>9</b>
Task 1 Monitor the Evaluation of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i>	9
Task 2 Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National Organizations (including NCATE)	9
Task 3 Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs	9

Task 4	Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and their Credential Preparation Programs	10
Task 5	Revise the <i>Accreditation Handbook</i> and Team Training Curriculum	10
Task 6	Maintain Public Access to the Committee on Accreditation	11
Task 7	Receive Regular Updates on the Implementation of SB 2042 and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation	11
Task 8	Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission	11
Task 9	Other Required Elements of the <i>Accreditation Framework</i> - Election of Co-Chairs, Adopt Meeting Schedule, Orient New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.	11
<b>Appendix A:</b>	<b>Continuing Accreditation Decisions Made by the Committee on Accreditation Based Upon Institutional Site Visits Conducted - 2001-2002</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendix B:</b>	<b>Initial Program Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation - 2001-2002</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Appendix C:</b>	<b>Additional Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation – 2001-2002</b>	<b>83</b>

**COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**

1900 Capitol Avenue  
Sacramento, California 95814-4213  
(916) 323-4508 fax



COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION  
(916) 327-2967

June 30, 2002

Dear Commissioners:

It is with personal and professional pleasure that, on behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation, we submit to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing the *Seventh Annual Accreditation Report* by the Committee on Accreditation in accordance with the provisions of the *Accreditation Framework*. This report presents an overview of the activities and accomplishments of the Committee in the past year and its proposed workplan for 2002-2003 as it implements the Commission's accreditation system.

2001-2002 was the fifth year that the Committee fully exercised its responsibilities under the *Accreditation Framework*. Through the continued receiving of accreditation team reports and the accreditation decision-making activity, the Committee has gained a more comprehensive understanding of its work and has taken steps to enhance its procedures.

The Committee now looks forward to its sixth full year with operational responsibilities in 2002-2003. We have had a successful year and are confident that we have maintained the high standards set by the Commission. This report provides evidence of our preparation and our confidence.

Sincerely,

Sue Teele  
Committee Co-Chair

David Madrigal  
Committee Co-Chair

# The Committee on Accreditation

## June 2002

### California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Sacramento, California

- **Fred Baker**, Professor  
School of Educ. & Integrative Studies  
Polytechnic State Univ., Pomona
- **Diane Doe**, Teacher  
Peer Assistance and Review  
San Francisco Unified School District
- **Lynne Cook**, Professor  
College of Education  
California State University,  
Northridge
- **Irma Guzman-Wagner**, Dean  
College of Education  
California State University, Stanislaus
- **Dennis Jory**, Teacher  
BTSA/PAR Consultant  
Desert Sands Unified School District
- **Edward Kujawa**, Dean  
School of Education  
Dominican University
- **David Madrigal**, COA Co-Chair  
Principal, John Muir Elementary  
School  
Antioch Unified School District
- **Karen O'Connor**, Teacher  
Sunset Hills Elementary School  
Poway Unified School District
- **Ruth Sandlin**, Chair, Ed. Psych & Couns  
College of Education  
Calif. State University, San Bernardino
- **Sue Teele**, COA Co-Chair  
Director, Education Extension  
University of California, Riverside
- **Donna Uyemoto**  
Asst. Superintendent, Personnel Service  
New Haven Unified School District
- **Michael Watenpaugh**  
Assistant Superintendent  
Novato Unified School District

#### Committee Support Staff (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing)

- **Mary Vixie Sandy**, Director, Professional Services Division
- **Lawrence Birch**, Administrator for Accreditation, Professional Services Division
- **Philip A. Fitch**, Consultant, Professional Services Division
- **Teri Ackerman**, Analyst, Professional Services Division
- **Marla Miles**, Secretary, Professional Services Division

## **Section I. Major Activities of the Committee on Accreditation**

This section of the Annual Report provides specific information about the principal activities of the Committee on Accreditation during the past year, including the organization of the Committee, list of meetings for 2001-2002, a summary of major accomplishments for the year and the adopted schedule of meetings for 2002-2003..

### **(1) Election of Co-Chairs for 2001-2002**

In developing its procedures, the Committee agreed that Co-Chairs (one from postsecondary education and one from K-12 education) would be elected annually. In August of 2001, the Committee elected Sue Teele and David Madrigal to serve as Co-Chairs during the 2001-2002 accreditation cycle.

### **(2) Schedule of Committee Meetings for 2001-2002**

In accordance with the duties assigned to the Committee on Accreditation and its adopted workplan for 2001-2002, the Committee on Accreditation held the following meetings. The Committee held either one-day or two-day meetings, depending on the amount of business before the body.

August 21, 2001	Commission Offices, Sacramento (Orientation of new COA members)
August 22, 2001	Commission Offices, Sacramento
October 24-25 2001*	Shelter Pointe Hotel, San Diego
January 24-25, 2002	Commission Offices, Sacramento
April 25-26, 2002	Commission Offices, Sacramento
May 23-24, 2002	Commission Offices, Sacramento
June 27-28, 2002	Commission Offices, Sacramento

\* This meeting was held in conjunction with the Fall Conference of the California Council on the Education of Teachers.

### **(3) Major Accomplishments of the Committee on Accreditation**

The Committee on Accreditation has now completed its fifth year of full accreditation decision-making responsibility. In addition to its major activity, hearing and acting upon twelve accreditation team reports and six accreditation re-visits, the COA made initial accreditation decisions for 101 professional preparation programs, mostly in special education and blended programs of subject matter preparation and professional preparation. During the year, the first programs of professional preparation under SB 2042 were granted initial accreditation, and a number of institutions on the Spring 2002 accreditation schedule were early adopters of the new standards and used them in the accreditation process.

Each year, the Committee has made improvements in the accreditation procedures or in its own procedures. The COA scheduled regular discussions at a number of its meetings about ways to improve the accreditation process and procedures. The Committee continued a practice initiated during its first year of scheduling a debriefing discussion about the accreditation decision-making process, at every meeting in which an accreditation decision had been made. The discussions have continued to be very helpful to the Committee in “fine tuning” the accreditation procedures. As a result, the COA has incorporated a number of refinements in the accreditation decision-making process.

The Committee was responsible for conducting a training session for new members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers. Another major accomplishment of the year was the successful renewal of the partnership with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). In summary, the Committee on Accreditation has completed its workplan, and looks forward to continuing to exercise its responsibility to implement the Commission’s accreditation system.

#### **(4) Schedule of Committee Meetings for 2002-2003**

In order to fulfill its responsibilities and accomplish its workplan, the Committee on Accreditation has adopted a schedule for meetings for the 2002-2003 accreditation cycle.

August 19, 2002	Commission Offices, Sacramento
October 16, 2002	Commission Offices, Sacramento
January 23-24, 2003	Commission Offices, Sacramento
March 27-28, 2003	Commission Offices, Sacramento
April 24-25, 2003	Commission Offices, Sacramento
May 22-23, 2003	Commission Offices, Sacramento
June 26-27, 2003	Commission Offices, Sacramento



## **Section II. Accomplishment of the Committee's Workplan in 2001-2002**

On August 21, 2001, the Committee on Accreditation adopted its workplan for 2001-2002. The Committee's elected Co-Chairs presented this workplan to the Commission at the November 2001 Commission meeting. The nine items that follow represent the key elements of the 2001-2002 workplan for the Committee on Accreditation. They include a detailed explanation of each task and its current status.

### **Task 1            Monitor the Evaluation of the Accreditation Framework**

The *Accreditation Framework* calls for an outside evaluator to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the *Framework* over a four-year period beginning with the first official accreditation visits under the oversight of the Committee on Accreditation. The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation developed a plan for the evaluation and a Request for Proposals was approved by the Commission. The contractor was selected in December 1999 and the contract was subsequently approved by the Commission. The COA and Commission staff are assisting in the gathering of data and monitoring the progress of the evaluation. A progress report was presented to Commission staff in November 2001. During the 2001-2002 accreditation cycle, the contractor was fully involved in gathering data, attending Committee on Accreditation meetings and Commission meetings and observing accreditation visits, interviewing accreditation team members, institutional personnel and other participants in the accreditation process. The final report is due by December 2002.

### **Task 2            Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National Organizations (including NCATE)**

A Partnership Agreement is in effect with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) that is monitored and periodically renewed. The required initial steps for the review and modification of the partnership with NCATE were undertaken. The Committee on Accreditation approved the procedures developed by staff to develop the partnership application.

As a part of the preparation for the partnership renewal, the COA was involved in a number of activities. The COA reviewed the Protocol for the Partnership Agreement and agreed to seek some modifications, primarily related to team configuration and options for accreditation team reporting. The NCATE 2000 unit standards were reviewed in order to determine their comparability with the California Common Standards adopted by the Commission. The COA determined

that the two sets of standards are comparable with the addition of specific information not required by the NCATE 2000 unit standards. (The NCATE 2000 unit standards also require some specific information in addition to that required under the California Common Standards.) The COA approved the voluntary use of NCATE 2000 unit standards for institutions with NCATE visits, with the addition of the specific information rrelated to the California Common Standards not required under the NCATE 2000 standards. Institutions are still required to respond to a set of approved program standards for each program area as outlined in the *Accreditation Framework*.

At the conclusion of the preparatory activities, the application for the partnership renewal was completed and submitted to NCATE in September 2001. The partnership was renewed by the NCATE State Partnership Board in October 2002.

During the 2001-2002 accreditation cycle the COA monitored the four NCATE merged state/national accreditation visits, especially in light of the feature of the revised partnership that allows institutions to use the NCATE unit standards in place of the California Common Standards. The COA also agreed to allow the state team report to be prepared using the NCATE standards in lieu of the Common Standards and then to merge that report with the state program report. The COA carefully studied the implementation and is satisfied that this new feature is useful in reducing duplication between the state and the national accreditation process and helps to streamline the report preparation.

California was also invited to participate in a pilot study of NCATE procedures that would streamline the process for recognition of state programs by the Specialized Professional Associations of NCATE. This activity was beyond the minimum that was required for the renewal of the partnership but the COA and staff agreed that it would be in the best interest of California institutions to participate. For that process, the state was required to prepare documents showing how the requirements of the various California Program Standards match the standards for each of the NCATE Specialized Professional Associations and submit an application that shows how the California state program accreditation/approval process meets the NCATE guidelines. The California accreditation process was found to be equivalent to the Specialized Professional Association process and thus, California will be able to grant national recognition, on behalf of the Specialized Professional Associations, for all areas in which state program standards are determined to be equivalent to those of the various Specialized Professional Associations. There are currently four state content areas that have been approved by the NCATE Specialized Professional Associations for purposes of national recognition. They are Association for Childhood Education International, International Reading Association (Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential only), National Council of Teachers of English, and National Middle School Association. The review process is underway to have other program areas recognized.

As part of the further implementation of the *Accreditation Framework*, the Committee negotiates formal memoranda of understanding with national professional education organizations. These memoranda govern the portion of the *Accreditation Framework* that permits national accreditation of credential programs to substitute for state accreditation. The Committee is required to monitor the ongoing implementation of these agreements and evaluate their effectiveness. The COA also evaluates the comparability of national standards that may be used in place of California Program standards in an accreditation site visit. Activities related to this part of the COA responsibility were deferred in favor of the NCATE Partnership Renewal activities.

### **Task 3          Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs**

This is one of the principal ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The Committee has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Some of the decisions are made on the basis of expert review panel recommendations and some are made on the basis of staff recommendations. In all cases, programs are not given initial accreditation until the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission’s program standards are met.

During the 2001-2002 year, the following number of programs were given initial accreditation:

Administrative Services Credential Programs	4
Pupil Personnel Services Credential Programs	9
Education Specialist Credential and Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential Programs	15
Health Services (School Nurse) Credential Programs	1
Reading Certificate Programs	16
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Programs	8
Multiple and Single Subject CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Credential Programs and Internship Programs	11
Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs under the SB2042 Standards	11
Blended Programs of Subject Matter Preparation and Professional Preparation for Multiple and Single Subject Credentials	10
Adapted Physical Education Credential Programs	2
Approved Responses to Standard 20.5 – Use of Computer Based Technology in the Classroom for Multiple and Single Subject Credential	13
Approved Responses to Standard 13 Pursuant to AB1059 (Ducheny)	1

A detailed listing of the programs granted initial accreditation is included in Appendix B.

**Task 4      Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and Their Credential Preparation Programs**

This is the principal ongoing task of the Committee on Accreditation. Effective September 1, 1997, the Committee on Accreditation assumed full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of postsecondary education institutions and their credential programs. This task continues to make up the major portion of the March through June agendas of the Committee on Accreditation. During the 2001-2002 year, there were twelve

accreditation visits to colleges and universities. A total of 184 accreditation team members participated in the visits. Following is the list of institutions and the accreditation decision of the Committee on Accreditation.

### 2001-2002 Accreditation Visits

Institution	Accreditation Decision
Bethany College	Accreditation with Technical Stipulations
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations
California State University, Hayward	Accreditation
California State University, San Bernardino	Accreditation
California State University, Stanislaus	Accreditation with Technical Stipulations
Humboldt State University	Accreditation
Mount St. Mary's College	Accreditation
National University	Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations
Stanford University	Accreditation
University of Redlands	Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations
University of San Diego	Accreditation with Technical Stipulations
University of San Francisco	Accreditation

A more detailed report of each accreditation visit is included in Appendix A. For each visit, the accreditation team report information is provided, followed by the COA accreditation decision, the list of all credential programs authorized for the

institution or district, any stipulations given by the Committee on Accreditation, and the date of the next accreditation visit.

In addition to the above accreditation visits, the Committee on Accreditation received follow-up information from the five institutions and one district intern program which received stipulations in the 2000-2001 accreditation cycle. This included five focused accreditation re-visits. There were four site visits to the Accreditation Pilot Project institutions and accreditation teams provided a formative evaluation for each of the program sponsors in the Accreditation Pilot Project. Additional accreditation actions were taken to remove stipulations, approve the withdrawal of programs and to change the accreditation status of institutions, based upon the removal of stipulations. A summary of these accreditation actions is included in Appendix C.

#### **Task 5        Revise the *Accreditation Handbook* and Team Training Curriculum**

The Committee on Accreditation is committed to continuous improvement in the accreditation process. Each year, the Committee reviews the *Accreditation Handbook* and its training curriculum to ensure that it provides accurate and useful information to its clients. Minor modifications of the accreditation procedures are incorporated into the accreditation process and the training curriculum as they occur. A major part of the team training curriculum was revised during the past year to prepare team members to work with the SB 2042 accreditation standards adopted by the Commission. In addition, revised decision procedures were implemented for use with the new standards.

#### **Task 6        Maintain Public Access to the Committee on Accreditation**

The Committee made a formal presentation at the annual conference of the California Credential Analysts and scheduled its October meeting in conjunction with the Fall conference of the California Council on the Education of Teachers. The Committee has continued to seek opportunities to make presentations to professional organizations. Written materials/publications were developed when possible to carry this task forward. Individual committee members were available to assist in the process. Regular information about the Committee and its deliberations is posted on the COA webpage at the Commission's website.

#### **Task 7        Receive Regular Updates on the Implementation of SB 2042 and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation**

The implementation of the SB 2042 reforms has significant implications for accreditation. During the year, the Committee received reports of the new teacher preparation standards, the induction standards, the reading standard study, the

revised preconditions and the review procedures for initial accreditation of programs. This enabled the COA to make appropriate adjustments in accreditation procedures. The Committee also received a report on the new Pupil Personnel Services Credential standards and the plan for implementation. Finally, the COA received three progress reports on the Accreditation Pilot Project (AB 2730 – Mazzoni) bringing information about the participants in the pilot, the preparations for site visits and the accomplishment of the site visits.

#### **Task 8           Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission**

The Committee on Accreditation adopted its Sixth Annual Accreditation Report in August 2001 and presented it to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing at its November 2001 meeting. The presentation of the Seventh Annual Accreditation Report is scheduled the November 2002 Commission meeting.

#### **Task 9           Other Required Elements of the *Accreditation Framework* - Election of Co-Chairs, Adopt Meeting Schedule, Orient New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.**

Each year, the Committee elects Co-Chairs, adopts a meeting schedule, orients new members, and modifies its own procedures manual. In August 2002, the Co-Chairs were elected and the 2001-2002 workplan was adopted. An orientation for new COA members was held on August 2002 and was continued at the October COA meeting. The 2002-2003 schedule of meetings was adopted in May 2002.

As a part of its ongoing review of accreditation process and procedures, the COA annually schedules meetings with team leaders and Commission consultants to evaluate the accreditation visits of the previous year and consider modifications in procedures that might be appropriate. The Committee also reviews the results of the evaluations of team members and the evaluations of the accreditation process completed by team members and institutions. At any COA meeting in which an institutional accreditation decision is made, the COA schedules a debriefing discussion at the end of the meeting about the accreditation decision-making process. At the end of each accreditation cycle, the COA schedules a discussion reflecting on the entire accreditation process. All of these activities together contribute to continuous improvement in the implementation of the Commission's accreditation system. Some modifications are made to be effective in the next accreditation cycle, and others are implemented immediately. As an example of the latter, in January, the COA adopted revised procedures to be used in the site visits in Spring 2002 for institutions that were early adopters of the SB 2042 standards.





### **Section III. Proposed Workplan for the Committee in 2002-2003**

The items that follow represent the key elements of the 2002-2003 workplan for the Committee on Accreditation. Because the Committee is fully involved in the implementation phase of the accreditation system, ongoing accreditation decision-making tasks make up a major part of the work and the oversight of the COA.

#### **Task 1 Monitor the Evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework***

The *Accreditation Framework* calls for an outside evaluator to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the *Framework* over a four-year period beginning with the first official accreditation visits. The contractor was selected in December 1999 and the contract was subsequently approved by the Commission. The contractor has been fully involved in gathering data, attending COA meetings, observing accreditation visits, and interviewing participants in the accreditation process. The final report due by December 2002. The Committee on Accreditation stands ready to assist the Commission in considering the results of the evaluation, making changes in the accreditation system and modifying accreditation procedures.

#### **Task 2 Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National Organizations (including NCATE)**

The Partnership Agreement in effect with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) was renewed in October 2001. The COA will continue monitoring the new agreement in the same manner as during the past year to make certain that the implementation of the partnership results in assuring that state issues are appropriately addressed in each visit and that the process reduces duplication. The COA will continue with the process of having state standards reviewed by the Specialized Professional Associations of NCATE in order to assist California institutions in gaining national recognition in specialized areas.

As part of the implementation of the *Accreditation Framework*, the Committee has negotiated formal memoranda of understanding with some national professional education organizations. These memoranda govern the portion of the *Accreditation Framework* that permits national accreditation of credential programs to substitute for state accreditation. The Committee is required to monitor the ongoing implementation of these agreements and evaluate their effectiveness. The COA will develop a plan to determine which of the agreements need to be updated and which standards need review for use with this part of the *Framework* and then develop a timeline for the review.

### **Task 3      Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs**

This is one of the principal ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The Committee has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Some of the decisions are made on the basis of expert review panel recommendations and some are made on the basis of staff recommendations. In all cases, programs will not be given initial accreditation until the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's program standards are met.

### **Task 4      Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and Their Credential Preparation Programs**

This is the principal ongoing task of the Committee on Accreditation. Effective September 1, 1997, the Committee on Accreditation assumed full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of postsecondary education institutions and their credential programs. This task continues to make up the major portion of the March through June agendas of the Committee on Accreditation. During the 2002-2003 year, there will be twelve accreditation visits to colleges and universities and two accreditation visits to district internship programs. The following is a list of institutions to be visited.

#### **Institutional Reviews**

California State University, Chico  
California State University, Northridge\*  
Dominican University  
Holy Names College  
Loma Linda University  
Loyola-Marymount University\*  
Phillips Graduate Institute  
San Diego State University\*  
San Jose State University\*  
University of California, Riverside  
University of Southern California  
Vanguard University  
\* Merged COA/NCATE Visit

#### **District Intern Programs**

San Diego Unified School District  
San Joaquin County Office of Education

In addition to the above accreditation visits, the Committee on Accreditation will continue to receive follow-up information from the six institutions that received stipulations in the 2001-2002 accreditation cycle, three of which require re-visits. Actions will be taken to remove stipulations, approve the withdrawal of programs

and to change the accreditation status of institutions, based upon the removal of stipulations

**Task 5        Revise the *Accreditation Handbook* and Team Training Curriculum**

The Committee on Accreditation is committed to continuous improvement in the accreditation process. Each year, the Committee reviews the *Accreditation Handbook* and its training curriculum to ensure that it provides accurate and useful information to its clients. Minor modifications of accreditation procedures are incorporated into the accreditation process and the training curriculum as they occur. The accreditation team training curriculum will continue to be reviewed and revised in the light of the changes in accreditation procedures necessitated by the implementation of the SB 2042 reforms.

**Task 6        Maintain Public Access to the Committee on Accreditation**

The Committee will be available to make presentations to professional organizations. Written materials will be developed when necessary to carry this task forward. Individual committee members will be available to assist in the process. Regular information about the Committee and its deliberations is posted on the COA webpage at the Commission's website.

**Task 7        Receive Regular Updates on the Implementation of SB 2042 and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation**

The Committee believes that the implementation of the SB 2042 reforms will continue to have significant implications for its work in accreditation. Thus, regular reports on the topic will be presented. For example, the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) will be an important new part of accreditation considerations. The Committee will also be receiving information about other Commission activities related to accreditation issues.

**Task 8        Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission**

Each year the Committee on Accreditation presents its annual report to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing in the fall. Interim reports to the Commission will be made as needed.

**Task 9        Other Required Elements of the Accreditation Framework - Election of Co-Chairs, Adopt Meeting Schedule, Orient New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.**

Each year, the Committee elects Co-Chairs, adopts a meeting schedule, orients new members, and modifies its own procedures manual. Through numerous planned

activities and in the process of the ongoing accreditation reports and discussions, the Committee conducts an on-going review of the accreditation process. As a result of those discussions, the Committee considers and adopts modifications in accreditation procedures, as needed.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Continuing Accreditation Decisions Made by the Committee on Accreditation Based Upon Institutional Site Visits Conducted 2001-2002**

# APPENDIX A

## Continuing Accreditation Decisions Made by the Committee on Accreditation Based Upon Institutional Site Visits Conducted 2001-2002

### Introduction

Following is a summary of the continuing accreditation decisions made by the Committee on Accreditation during the 2001-2002 academic year, based upon team site visits. Accreditation visits were conducted for twelve institutions. The accreditation information is presented in two parts as follows:

- Accreditation team report information, including the accreditation team recommendation and the rationale for the recommendation, the team membership, and a summary of the documents reviewed and the interviews conducted.
- Committee on Accreditation action, including the Committee's accreditation decision, a list of credentials for which an institution or district internship program is authorized to recommend its candidates, any stipulations given by the Committee on Accreditation, and the date of the next accreditation visit. (In some cases, the COA action may differ from the team recommendation, as the COA carries out its statutory responsibility.)

### BETHANY COLLEGE March 3-6, 2002

#### A. Accreditation Team Report Information

##### Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Technical Stipulations

##### **Rationale**

The team recommendation is based on a thorough review of the self study document and information gathered during the visit from exhibits, extensive interviews with campus and field personnel, and additional information requested from administrators during the visit. The team agreed it obtained sufficient and consistent information to enable them to make overall and programmatic judgments about the Department of Education. There were consistent reports from employers that the graduates were well-prepared, competent and effective teachers. Although the team identified some areas of concern in this report, it concluded that overall the credential program was of high quality. Therefore the team reached the decision that the evidence gathered clearly supported the above accreditation recommendation.

1. COMMON STANDARDS: The team found that all Common Standards were met. However, Standard 2 was met minimally with Qualitative Concerns.
2. PROGRAM STANDARDS: The team determined that all program standards were met, with the exception of the Single Subject Clad Emphasis Program, which was minimally met with qualitative concerns.
3. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION: The Accreditation Team decision to recommend Accreditation with Technical Stipulations is based upon information received by reading the Institutional Self-Study Report, program documents, advisement materials, the college catalog and interviewing candidates, graduates, full- and part-time faculty, college staff, coordinators, institutional administrators, K-12 site supervisors, teachers and administrators, and additional documentation requested from institutional administrators while on site.

### **Team Membership**

#### **Team Leader:**

**Barbara Morton**  
Concordia University

#### **Team Members:**

**Peter Cheoros**  
Lynwood High School

**Geraldine Morey**  
Valencia Valley School (Retired)

**Carol Adams**  
La Honda Elementary School

## Data Sources

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
18	Program Faculty	X	Catalog and Addendum
14	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
53	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
19	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
7	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook
23	Supervising Practitioners	X	Budgetary Information
11	Advisors		Needs Analysis Results
6	School Administrators	X	Information Booklet
3	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
7	Advisory Committee	X	Schedule of Classes
		X	Advisement Documents
		X	Faculty Vitae
		X	Textbooks
		X	Candidate Credential Files
		X	Student Teacher Portfolios
		X	Reading Study

**Total Interviews 161**

### B. Committee on Accreditation Action

- The decision for Bethany College is **ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS.**

Following are the recommended stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence of sufficient resources in the areas of library, technology, and teacher preparation textbooks and related materials.
- That the institution provide evidence of substantive, research based instruction in reading that effectively prepares candidates for the Single Subject Teaching Credential.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Multiple Subject CLAD Emphasis
  - Single Subject CLAD Emphasis
2. Bethany College is to provide evidence to the Committee on Accreditation that appropriate actions have been taken to clear each of these stipulations within one year from the date of this action through a written report to the Team Leader and Commission Consultant.
  3. In addition:
    - Bethany College is permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
    - Bethany College is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2007 - 2008 academic year.



**CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA**  
May 5-8, 2002

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations**

**Rationale**

The unanimous recommendation of Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

1. COMMON STANDARDS: The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by-one and then voted upon by the entire team. Only two standards, Standard 2 Resources and Standard 3 Faculty, were judged to have been fully met. Three standards, Standard 4 Evaluation, Standard 5 Admission, and Standard 7 School Collaboration, were judged to have been met minimally with qualitative concerns. Two standards, Standard 1 Educational Leadership and Standard 8 District Field Supervisors, were judged to have been met minimally with quantitative concerns. One standard, Standard 6 Advice and Assistance, was judged to have been not met. These judgments were based on the fact that candidates are completely frustrated in their attempts to understand the requirements of the programs, including the criteria for admission, and receive advice and assistance. In addition there is a significant void in leadership: clear and unified vision for the preparation of teachers is missing; management is fragmented and does not resolve problems in an effective and timely way; and lines of authority and responsibility are unclear. No system is in place to ensure that master teachers and district support providers are carefully selected, trained, and oriented. Although candidates are well supported in seeking field placements for student teaching, there is little collaboration with students or local schools in selecting placements for earlier field experiences. Numerous evaluative tools are in place; however, there is neither evidence that the information gained is used to improve the program nor that a systematic and comprehensive program is in place to include all stakeholders in program design and evaluation activities.
2. PROGRAM STANDARDS: Findings about program standards were presented to the team by the cluster leaders, with additional clarification as needed from the cluster members. Following the initial presentation, the team discussed each program area and particularly each standard that was less than fully met.

Generally the candidates who complete the professional programs are judged by professionals in the field to be well prepared to teach.

The Multiple Subject Programs, including Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD and Multiple Subject Internship, were judged to have all standards fully met with the exception of Standards 1 and 16, which were met with concerns, and Standards 2, 7A, and 18, which were not met. The design and sequence of the program do not adequately account for the needs and schedules of intern teachers. Collaboration with local school personnel, particularly with respect to the design of the program and field placements, is not evidenced. There is not programmatic, systematic assurance that the criteria for the selection of field placements, student teaching placements, and master teachers are used and enforced; this includes settings where comprehensive, systematic beginning reading instruction is taught.

The Single Subject Programs, including Single Subject CLAD and Single Subject Internship, were judged to have all standards fully met with the exception of 1, 2, 7B, and 16, which were met with concerns. The concerns were similar to those evidenced in the Multiple Subject Programs; however, the significant and important collaboration of the content area faculty and their connection in local schools, lessened the degree of concern.

The Educational Specialist Level I program standards are fully met, with the exception of standards 9 and 23, which were met minimally. The design curriculum of the Integrated Program, particularly in light of the changes proposed in the Multiple Subject Program in response to the 2042 standards, appear to provide inadequate opportunity for candidates to acquire the specialized knowledge necessary.

All standards for the Educational Specialist Level II Program are fully met.

All standards for the Adaptive PE Program are fully met.

All standards for Agricultural Specialist are fully met.

The Designated Subjects Credential Program has been withdrawn. All remaining candidates will have written plans for completion, at the latest by the end of Fall Quarter, 2002.

3. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations was based in part on team consensus that only two Common Standards were fully met. Significant deficiencies were noted, and the issues identified impinge on the ability to deliver effective programs. Despite these numerous and significant impediments, the core programs and teaching and learning interactions were generally found to be of good quality and effectiveness; consistent reports from employers indicated that graduates

were well prepared, competent, and effective. Therefore, the team reached the decision that the overall evidence clearly supported the recommendation Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations.

**Team Membership**

**Team Leader:**

**Judith Greig**  
Notre Dame de Namur University

**Common Standards Cluster:**

**Stacie Curry**, Cluster Leader  
Riverdale Unified School District

**Carl Brown**  
Calif. Poly St. Univ., San Luis Obispo

**Elementary and Education  
Specialist Cluster:**

**Reyes Quezada**, Cluster Leader  
University of San Diego

**Candace Kaye**  
California State University, Long Beach

**Lucy Vezutto**  
Orange County Department of Education

**Margaret Parker**  
California State University, Dominguez Hills

**Mary Male**  
San Jose State University

**Carol Adams**  
Lompoc Unified School District

**Secondary and Other  
Program Cluster:**

**Chris Hopper**, Cluster Leader  
Humboldt State University

**Carolyn Csongradi**  
Palo Alto Unified School District

**Bill Kellogg**  
Calif. Poly St. Univ., San Luis Obispo

**Marilyn Cothran**  
Simi Valley Unified School District



## Data Sources

### DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog Course Syllabi Fieldwork Handbooks Needs Analysis Results Field Experience Notebooks Advisement Documents College Annual Report	Institutional Self Study Candidate Files Follow-up Survey Results Information Booklets Schedule of Classes Faculty Vitae College Budget Plan
--	--

### INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Commor Stand	Elem. & Educ. Spec.	Second. & Other Programs	TOTAL
Program Faculty	5	10	34	37	<b>86</b>
Institutional Administration	10	2		4	<b>16</b>
Candidates	26	15	180	71	<b>292</b>
Graduates		5	47	16	<b>68</b>
Employers of Graduates			6	4	<b>10</b>
Supervising Practitioners	1		20	7	<b>28</b>
Advisors			3	8	<b>11</b>
School Administrators		7	8	11	<b>26</b>
Credential Analysts and Staff		1	5	4	<b>10</b>
Advisory Committee		3	2	14	<b>19</b>

**Total 566**

## **B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for California State Polytechnic University is ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS.

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence that leadership supports a clear vision for teacher preparation and fosters cohesive management, including clear communication and lines of authority and responsibility.
- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement and must be applied to all credential program areas.
- That the institution provide evidence that candidates are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and that consistent advice and assistance is readily available to candidates.
- That the institution provide evidence that it collaborates effectively with local school personnel in selecting school sites all along the planned fieldwork sequence and that district field supervisors are carefully selected, trained, and oriented.
- That the institution provide evidence that all remaining candidates for the Designated Subjects credential have completed requirements and that the program no longer exists.
- That the institution provide evidence of actions taken to meet all program standards less than fully met.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Adapted Physical Education Credential
- Agricultural Specialist Credential
- Designated Subjects Credential (only until withdrawal date)
- Education Specialist Credentials

Preliminary Level I  
Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe Disabilities  
Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship  
Professional Level II  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Moderate/Severe

- Multiple Subject Credential
    - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish, Korean)
    - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish, Korean) Internship
  - Single Subject Credential
    - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
    - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish) Internship
2. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona is required to provide evidence about actions taken to remove all of the stipulations noted above within one year of the date of this action, to be verified with a revisit by Commission staff, the Accreditation Team Leader and two additional team members.
3. In addition:
- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
  - California State Polytechnic University, Pomona be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
  - California State Polytechnic University, Pomona not be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits until after the Committee on Accreditation acts upon the results of the re-visit.



**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD**  
**April 27 – May 1, 2002**  
**(COA/NCATE Merged Accreditation Visit)**

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation**

**Rationale**

The recommendation pertaining to the accreditation status of California State University, Hayward and all of its credential programs was determined according to the following:

1. NCATE's SIX STANDARDS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: The university elected to use the NCATE format and to write to NCATE's unit standards to meet the COA Common Standards requirement. There was extensive cross-referencing to the COA Common Standards. Also, the corresponding part of this team report utilizes the NCATE standards and format. The total team, NCATE and COA, reviewed each element of the six NCATE Standards, added appropriate areas of the Common Standards, and voted as to whether the standard was met, not met, or met with areas of improvement.
2. PROGRAM STANDARDS: Team clusters for (1) Basic credential programs, (2) Specialist credentials, and (3) Services credentials reviewed all data regarding those credential programs. Appropriate input was provided by other team members to each of the clusters. Following discussion of each program the total team, NCATE and COA, considered whether the program standards were either met, met minimally, or not met.
3. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that the six (6) NCATE Standards were met, with one identified area for improvement for purposes of the NCATE report, that Standard 6 was met with one identified area of concern for purposes of the COA report, that all elements of the CCTC Common Standards were addressed and met within the context of the NCATE report, and that all Program Standards were met for all program areas. The following report further explains these findings.

## Team Membership

### Team Leader:

**Kathleen Cohn** (Team Co-Chair)  
California State University, Long Beach

### Common Standards Cluster:

**Jan McCarthy**, Cluster Leader, NCATE Chair  
(Team Co-Chair)  
University of South Florida

**Clifton Edwards** (NCATE Member)  
Pennsylvania State Department of Education

**James Ehmen** (NCATE Member)  
Janesville Consolidated School (Iowa)

**Mary Tanner** (NCATE Member)  
University of Tennessee, Chattanooga

**Mark Fulmer** (CCTC/COA Member)  
Visalia Unified School District

**Arlinda Eaton** (CCTC/COA Member)  
California State University, Northridge

### Basic Credential Cluster:

**Joel Colbert**, Cluster Leader  
California State University, Dominguez Hills

**Sharon Brockman**  
California State University, Stanislaus

**Felecia Bessent**  
Elk Grove Unified School District

**Katy Anderson**  
California State University, Chico

**Karen Hayashi**  
Elk Grove Unified School District

**Specialist Credential Cluster:**

**Judy Mantle**, Cluster Leader  
University of San Diego

**Sandy Gilbert**  
Desert Sands Unified School District

**Joanne Abrassart**  
Murietta Valley Unified School District

**Services Credential Cluster:**

**Marcia Weill**, Cluster Leader  
Folsom-Cordova Unified School District

**Carol Purcell**  
California Department of Education (Retired)

**Lori Kim**  
California State University, Los Angeles

**Beverly Neu**  
University of Southern California

## Data Sources

### DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog	Field Experience Notebooks
Schedule of Classes	Electronic Portfolios
Advisement Documents	Institutional Self Study
Faculty Vitae	Course Syllabi
Portfolios	Candidate Files
Textbooks	Fieldwork Handbooks
Assessment Measures	Follow-up Survey Results
Descriptions of Field Sites	Information Booklets
Written Agreements w/District	

### INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Stands. Cluster	Basic Credential Cluster	Services Credential Cluster	Specialist Credential Cluster	<b>TOTAL</b>
Program Faculty	4	63	39	19	20	<b>145</b>
Institutional Administration	6	31	12	3	1	<b>53</b>
Candidates	4	80	148	75	51	<b>358</b>
Graduates	2	56	49	43	23	<b>173</b>
Employers of Graduates		24	20	9	8	<b>61</b>
Supervising Practitioners		23	34	9	18	<b>84</b>
Advisors		25	11		5	<b>41</b>
School Administrators		29	23	4	8	<b>64</b>
Credential Analyst		1	3	1	1	<b>6</b>
Advisory Committee	2	25		24	18	<b>69</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1054</b>					

## B. Committee on Accreditation Action

1. The decision for California State University, Hayward, and all its credential programs is **ACCREDITATION**

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Multiple Subject Credential
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish /English)
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish/English) Internship
- Single Subject Credential
  - CLAD Emphasis
  - CLAD Emphasis Internship
- Education Specialist Credentials – Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
- Administrative Services Credential
  - Preliminary Administrative
  - Preliminary Administrative Internship
  - Professional Administrative
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
  - School Psychology
  - School Psychology Internship
- Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential
  - Reading Certificate
  - Reading/Language Arts Specialist
- Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential
  - Language, Speech and Hearing

2. In Addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- California State University, Hayward is permitted to prepare new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation

- California State University, Hayward is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006 – 2007 academic year.

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO**  
**May 5 – 8, 2002**  
**(COA/NCATE Merged Accreditation Visit)**

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation**

**Rationale**

The recommendation pertaining to the accreditation status of California State University, San Bernardino and all of its credential programs was determined according to the following:

1. NCATE's SIX STANDARDS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: The COA approved a request by the institution to use the NCATE Standards and Conceptual Framework, and the NCATE team report format to meet the requirements of the CCTC's Common Standards. There was extensive cross-referencing of the NCATE Unit Standards with the CTC Common Standards. Also, the institutional report (Self Study Report) provided supplemental language, incorporating areas of the CCTC Common Standards not directly referenced in the NCATE Standards. Therefore, the corresponding part of this team report utilizes the NCATE standards report format. The total merged team, NCATE and COA, reviewed each standard and all standard elements including the NCATE Conceptual Framework and the supplemented areas of the Common Standards. The total merged team voted as to whether the standard was met, not met, or met with areas for improvement.
2. PROGRAM STANDARDS: Team clusters for (1) Basic (multiple and single subjects and designated subjects) credential programs, (2) Special Education credential programs, and (3) Services (administration, pupil personnel, and school nurse) credential programs reviewed extensive data regarding all credential programs. Appropriate information and findings were provided by other team members to each of the various credential areas. Following discussion of each credential program area the total merged team decided whether the program standards were either met, met minimally, or not met.
3. ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend accreditation was based on consensus of the entire merged team including the NCATE team members and COA members. All elements of the eight COA Common Standards were reviewed by the entire merged team as they discussed the team findings on the Six NCATE Standards, and findings on their NCATE Conceptual Framework. One difference in the findings for the NCATE Report, and the COA report, were the team's findings regarding Standard 1. In the NCATE Report Standard 1 was met for all Advanced

Programs, but was not met for Initial Programs. The COA team, and two state members of the NCATE/Common Standards Cluster were unanimous in the belief that Standard 1 was fully met for all Advanced Programs and for all Initial Programs. The issue for Standard 1 for two members of the NCATE team was that the institution did not adequately address subject matter verification for the multiple subject and single subject programs. The COA consultant and the COA co-chair for the visit, as well as other state team members, explained on a number of occasions during the visit that subject matter verification for all initial programs is handled through a separate process from the team visit. This process is one of the key elements of the NCATE Partnership Agreement. As part of the NCATE procedures, the institution may rejoin this element of the NCATE Report to the Unit Accreditation Board of NCATE.

The total merged team did find that NCATE Standards 1, 2, and 6 were met with identified “Areas For Improvement”, which are listed in the COA Report as concerns. There was total agreement of the merged team on the areas of concern listed in the COA Report. The merged team determined that all Program Standards were met with the exception of Education Specialist Program-Level II Standards 10 and 11. Standard 10 was found to be minimally met with qualitative concerns. Standard 11 was not met as there were no clearly defined provisions and procedures for non-IHE activities. The following team report further explains these findings.

## **Team Membership**

### **Co-Chairs**

**Robert Monke**  
COA Chair  
California State University, Fresno

**Dennis Koutouzos**  
NCATE Chair  
Roosevelt University  
Chicago, Illinois

### **Common Standards/NCATE Standards Cluster:**

**Nicholas Michelli** (NCATE BOE)  
Dean of Teacher Education  
University of New York

**Qiuping Cao** (NCATE BOE)  
Ohio University, Lancaster  
Lancaster, Ohio



**Roberta Margo (NCATE BOE)**  
Media Specialist  
Virginia, Minnesota

**Shane Martin (CCTC BIR)**  
Associate Dean  
Loyola Marymount University

**J. L. Fortson (CCTC BIR)**  
Director of Student Teaching  
Pepperdine University

**Basic Credential Cluster:**

**Barbara Price**  
**Cluster Leader/Designated Subjects**  
Educational Specialist  
Newport Beach, California

**Bettie Spatafora**  
Teacher, Seneca School  
Moreno Valley Unified School District

**Michael Jordan**  
Multiple Subject Coordinator  
CSU Fresno

**Cathy Buell**  
Adaptive Physical Education  
Chair, Secondary Education  
San Jose State University

**Deborah Schurr**  
Science Division Chair  
Chaffey Union High School District

**Carolyn Cogan**  
Reading Program Specialist  
University of California, Santa Barbara

**Education Specialist Cluster:**

**Sue Craig, Cluster Leader**  
Education Specialist  
Redding, California

**Linda Smetana**  
Special Education Professor  
CSU, Hayward

**School Administration Cluster:**

**Marcia McVey, Cluster Leader**  
School Administrator Professor  
Azusa Pacific University

**Robert Hoffman**  
Administrator  
Mission Viejo, California

**School Nurse Cluster:**

**Patricia Ghiglieri**  
Public School Nurse  
Folsom-Cordova Unified School Dist.

**Pupil Personnel Services Cluster:**

**M. Clifford Cole, Cluster Leader**  
Guidance Counselor  
Roseville, California

**LaVerne Aguirre**  
School Social Worker  
San Jose, California

**Staff and Observers:**

**Philip A. Fitch**  
CCTC Lead Consultant

**Helen Hawley**  
CCTC Consultant

**Kathleen Taira, NEA Observer**  
CalStateTeach  
Regional Director

## Data Sources

<b>Interviews Conducted</b>		<b>Documents Reviewed</b>	
Program Faculty	271	Catalog	
Institutional Administration	77	Institutional Self Study	
Candidates	573	Course Syllabi	
Graduates	232	Candidate Files	
Employers of Graduates	68	Fieldwork Handbook	
Supervising Practitioners	151	Follow-up Survey Results	
Advisors	83	Needs Analysis Results	
School Administrators	67	Information Booklet	
Credential Analyst	34	Field Experience Notebook	
Advisory Committee	102	Schedule of Classes	
Admission/Credential Analyst	12	Advisement Documents	
Part-time Faculty	113	Faculty Vitae	
Parents	26	Adjunct Faculty Files	
BTSA Support Providers	13	University Annual Report	
		Faculty Retreat Agenda/Minutes	
		Budgets	
		Budget Report	
		Faculty Handbook	
		Adjunct Faculty Handbook	
		Student Handbook	
		Schedule of Classes	
		Cal STAT Grant	
		Program Advising Minutes	
		Student Evaluation of Faculty	
		Student Placement Files	
		Full and Part-Time Faculty Ethnicity	
		Final Program Exams	
		Final Course Exams	
		Faculty Evaluations (Institutional)	

**Total 1822**

## **B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for California State University, San Bernardino, and all its credential programs is **ACCREDITATION**.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Multiple Subject Credential
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
  - CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Internship
- Single Subject Credential
  - CLAD Emphasis
  - CLAD Emphasis Internship
- Education Specialist Credentials – Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II
  - Preliminary Level I
  - Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe Disabilities Including Internship
  - Professional Level II
  - Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe Disabilities
- Administrative Services Credential
  - Preliminary
  - Preliminary Internship
  - Professional Internship
- Designated Subjects Credential
  - Adult Education
  - Vocational Education
  - Supervision and Coordination
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
  - School Counseling
  - School Psychology
  - School Psychology Internship
  - School Social Work
- Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential
  - Reading Certificate
  - Reading/Language Arts Specialist
- Health Services (School Nurse) Credential
- Adapted Physical Education



2. In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- California State University, San Bernardino is permitted to prepare new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, San Bernardino is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006-2007 academic year.

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS**  
**November 3-7, 2002**  
**(COA/NCATE Merged Accreditation Visit)**

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Technical Stipulations**

**Rationale**

The recommendation pertaining to the accreditation status of California State University, Stanislaus and all of its credential programs was determined according to the following:

1. NCATE's SIX STANDARDS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: The university elected to use the NCATE format and to write to NCATE's unit standards to meet the COA Common Standards requirement. There was extensive cross-referencing to the COA Common Standards. Also, the corresponding part of this team report utilizes the NCATE standards and format. The total team, NCATE and COA, reviewed each element of the six NCATE Standards, added appropriate areas of the Common Standards, and voted as to whether the standard was met, not met, or met with weaknesses.
2. PROGRAM STANDARDS: Team clusters for (1) Basic credential programs, (2) Special Education credentials, and (3) Services credentials reviewed all data regarding those credential programs. Appropriate input was provided by other team members to each of the clusters. Following discussion of each program the total team, NCATE and COA, considered whether the program standards were either met, met minimally, or not met.
3. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend Accreditation with Technical Stipulations was based on team consensus that although the six (6) NCATE Standards were met for purposes of the NCATE report, the team determined that Standard 2 was Met Minimally for purposes of the COA report. The team determined that all Program Standards were met for all program areas. The following report further explains these findings.

**Team Membership** \_\_

**Co-Chairs:**

**Lamar Mayer**  
COA Chair  
CSU Los Angeles

**Kenneth Moore**  
NCATE Chair  
Eastern New Mexico University



**Common Standards/NCATE  
Standards Cluster**

**Beverly Kitzmiller**  
Secondary English Teacher  
Bristol, Wisconsin

**Dennis W. Koutouzos**  
Assistant Dean  
Roosevelt University  
Chicago, Illinois

**Mattie E. Moss**  
Associate Dean  
North Carolina Central University  
Durham, North Carolina

**Phyllis Fernlund,**  
Dean, School of Education  
Sonoma State University

**Jim Reidt**  
Administrator  
San Juan Unified School District

**Basic Credential Cluster:**

**Charles Zartman, Cluster Leader**  
**Director of Teacher Education**  
CSU Chico

**Shane Martin**  
Single Subject Coordinator  
Loyola Marymount University

**Paula Bowers**  
Middle School Department Chair  
Lake Elsinore Unified School District

**Philip Romig**  
Science and Technology Resource Teacher  
Elk Grove Unified School District

**Carol Sue Adams**  
Reading Specialist  
Lompoc Unified Public Schools

**Special Education:**

**Chistine Givner**  
Division Chair of Special Education  
CSU Los Angeles

**Melinda Medina-Levin**  
Special Education Resource Teacher  
San Diego Unified School District

**School Administration:**

**Mary McCullough**  
Coordinator  
Loyola Marymount University

**Doug Smith**  
High School Principal  
Grossmont Union High School District

**Pupil Personnel Services:**

**Steve Riley**  
School Counselor  
Galt Joint Union School District

**Dale Matson**  
Director, Pupil Personnel Services  
Fresno Pacific University

**Observers:**

**Dounell Jordon**  
Secondary Teacher. CTA  
Indio, California

**Susie Chow**  
Elementary Teacher, CFT  
Los Angeles, California

### Data Sources

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED
Program Faculty	142	Catalog
Institutional Administration	46	Institutional Self Study
Candidates	320	Course Syllabi
Graduates	113	Candidate Files
Employers of Graduates	57	Fieldwork Handbook
Supervising Practitioners	41	Follow-up Survey Results
Advisors	4	Needs Analysis Results
School Administrators	59	Information Booklet
Credential Analyst	4	Field Experience Notebook
Advisory Committee	48	Schedule of Classes
Teacher Recruitment	1	Advisement Documents
Librarian	2	Faculty Vitae
Subject Matter Faculty	7	Adjunct Faculty Files
Parents	10	University Annual Report
		Faculty Retreat Agenda/Minutes
		Budgets
		Budget Report
		Faculty Handbook
		Adjunct Faculty Handbook
		Student Handbook
		Schedule of Classes
		Cal STAT Grant
		Program Advising Minutes
		Student Evaluation of Faculty
		Student Placement Files
		Full and Part-Time Faculty Ethnicity
		Final Program Exams
		Final Course Exams
		Faculty Evaluations (Institutional)

**Total Interviews    854**

## **B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

### **1. The decision for California State University, Stanislaus is ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS**

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution collect appropriate data regarding current students and develop follow-up data collection instruments and procedures to evaluate candidate competence in each of the credential programs.
- That the institution collect, summarize and review data on current students and follow-up data from program graduates and employers and provide evidence of how that data is utilized to determine any program modifications or additions that may be indicated.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Multiple Subject Credential
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish and Southeast Asian Languages, Hmong Cambodian, and Lao)
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish) Internship
- Single Subject Credential
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
  - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish) Internship
- Education Specialist Credentials – Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
- Administrative Services Credential
  - Preliminary
  - Preliminary Internship
  - Professional
- Pupil Personnel Services
  - School Counseling
- Reading and Language Arts Specialist
  - Reading Certificate
  - Reading and Language Arts Specialist

2. California State University, Stanislaus is required to provide evidence about actions taken to respond to all of the stipulations noted above within one year of the date of the above action, to be verified with a written report to Commission Staff and the Accreditation Team Leader.
3. In addition:
  - The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
  - California State University, Stanislaus is permitted to prepare new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
  - California State University, Stanislaus is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006-2007 academic year.

**HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY**  
April 14-17, 2002

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation**

**Rationale**

The team recommendation for Accreditation was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Report, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, graduates, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the institution. The decision was based upon the following:

1. COMMON STANDARDS: The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by one and then voted upon by the entire team. All were judged to have been met, however, one (Common Standard 4) was met minimally with qualitative concerns.
2. PROGRAM STANDARDS: Findings about program standards were presented to the team by the Cluster Leaders, assisted by the Cluster members (for additional clarification). Following their presentation, the team discussed each program area and determined that all Program Standards were met in all program areas.
3. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that all Common Standards and Program Standards were met. Although Common Standard 4 was found to be met minimally, the team felt that the overall strength demonstrated by the programs in meeting the other standards justified a recommendation of Accreditation. An examination of the evidence, including interviews with university administration, faculty, students, and local educators, revealed numerous areas of strength across education programs at Humboldt State University. The institution has been responsive to interests within the university and from the Chancellor of the California State University System to develop a strong program of teacher preparation. This has been done with significant, ongoing collaboration with local districts and has built on strengths of HSU faculty and local practitioners. The team concluded that all credential programs were effective and of overall high quality. Therefore, the team reached the decision that evidence supported the above accreditation recommendation.

**Team Membership**

**Team Leader:**

**Mark Cary**  
Davis Joint Unified School District

**Common Standards Cluster:**

**Marsha Savage**, Cluster Leader  
Santa Clara University

**Jim Reidt**  
San Juan Unified School District

**Stephen Davis**  
University of the Pacific

**Program Cluster I:**

**Carol McAllister**, Cluster Leader  
Los Alamitos Unified School District

**Rita Mulholland**  
California State University, Chico

**Bert Goldhammer**  
Placer Hills Union School District

**Shelly Ramey**  
Center Unified School District

**Program Cluster II:**

**Mel Lopez**, Cluster Leader  
Chapman University

**Lawrence Pleet**  
Los Angeles Unified School District

**Shane Jimerson**  
University of California, Santa Barbara

**Barbara Gottesman**  
San Jose State University

## Data Sources

### DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog  
 Institutional Self Study  
 Course Syllabi  
 Candidate Files  
 Fieldwork Handbooks  
 Follow-up Survey Results

Information Booklets  
 Field Experience Notebooks  
 Schedule of Classes  
 Advisement Documents  
 Faculty Vitae  
 Strategic Plan  
 Portfolios

### INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Stands. Cluster	Program Cluster I	Program Cluster II	TOTAL
Program Faculty	2	20	28	48	98
Institutional Administration	4	5	2	9	20
Candidates	6	48	45	91	190
Graduates		24	25	54	103
Employers of Graduates	2	6	1	12	21
Supervising Practitioners	2	15	22	59	98
Advisors		4	10	15	29
School Administrators		5	1	15	21
Credential Analyst		1		1	2
Advisory Committee		7	18	36	61

**Total 643**



**B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for Humboldt State University is **ACCREDITATION**.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Adapted Physical Education
- Administrative Services Credential
  - Preliminary
  - Professional
- Education Specialist Credentials, Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
  - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
- Multiple Subject Credential
  - CLAD Emphasis
- Pupil Personnel Services
  - School Psychology
  - School Psychology Internship
- Reading Certificate
- Single Subject Credential
  - CLAD Emphasis

2. In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- Humboldt State University is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Humboldt State University is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2007-2008 academic year.

# MOUNT ST. MARY'S COLLEGE

March 24-27, 2002

## A. Accreditation Team Report Information

### Team Recommendation: Accreditation

#### **Rationale**

The team recommendation for Accreditation was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Report, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the unit. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the unit was based upon the following:

1. COMMON STANDARDS: The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by-one and then voted upon by the entire team. Each Common Standard was a unanimous vote indicating that the standard was met.
2. PROGRAM STANDARDS: Findings about program standards were presented to the team by the Cluster Leaders, assisted by the Cluster members (for additional clarification). The accreditation team findings on standards for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs were based upon the SB 2042 Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs adopted by the Commission in September 2001 using the Decisions Options for findings on the standards approved by the Committee on Accreditation in January 2002. Findings on standards for the Education Specialist and Administrative Services credential programs were based on current professional preparation program standards. Following their presentation, the team discussed each program area and determined that all program standards were met in all program areas.
3. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that all Common Standards were met and all Program Standards were met. There were consistent reports from employers that graduates are well prepared, competent, and effective in their classrooms and schools. Mount St. Mary's College is especially committed to schools in the inner city and to meeting the needs of diverse students from many cultural backgrounds. This is reflected in all of the college's programs. The team concluded that all credential programs were strong, effective and of high quality. An often voiced sentiment from multiple perspectives was the commitment of faculty to personalized attention for each candidate. The team unanimously decided that the evidence clearly supported the accreditation recommendation

**Team Membership** .

**Team Leader:**

**Athena Waite**  
University of California, Riverside

**Common Standards Cluster:**

**Jo Birdsell**, Cluster Leader  
Point Loma Nazarene University

**Basic Credential Cluster:**

**Marilyn Vaughn**, Cluster Leader  
Bethany College

**Charles Weber**  
Acton Aqua Dulce Unified School District

**Joyce Abrams**  
Chula Vista Elementary School District

**Lucy Levine**  
Los Angeles Unified School District

**Advanced Credential Cluster :**

**Gary Hoban**, Cluster Leader  
National University

**Nancy Tatum**  
California Department of Education

Data Sources

**DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

University Catalog Candidate Files Institutional Self Study Fieldwork Handbooks Course Syllabi Follow-up Survey Results Needs Analysis Results	Information Booklets Field Experience Notebooks Schedule of Classes Advisement Documents Faculty Vitae On-line Instructional Material
--	--

**INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED**

	Team Leader	Commons Cluster	Basic Cluster	Ed Specialist Level I and II M/M	Prelim Admin Services	TOTALS
Program Faculty	4	7	16	8	5	40
Institutional Administration	7	4				11
Candidates	9	1	105	21	15	151
Graduates		6	40	4	10	60
Employers of Graduates			2	2	7	11
Supervising Practitioners	2		26	4	10	42
Advisors	3		1	3	2	9
School Administrators	2		4	6	9	21
Credential Analyst		1	5	2	1	9
Advisory Committee				2	5	7
Chair/ Program Coordinators	4		1			5
Chief Financial Officer	1					1
Graduate Recruiter		1				1

Teacher Center Liaison			1			1
Curator/Cultural Fluency Center	1					1

**Total 370**

**B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for Mount St. Mary's College is **ACCREDITATION**.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Preliminary Multiple Subject Credential
- Preliminary Single Subject Credential
- Education Specialist Credential - Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II Mild/Moderate
- Administrative Services Credential  
Preliminary

2. In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- Mount St. Mary's College is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Mount St. Mary's College is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2007-2008 academic year.

**NATIONAL UNIVERSITY**  
**May 19-23, 2002**

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations**

**Rationale**

The programs at National University exhibit quality and effectiveness; however, the Team recommendation for accreditation with substantive stipulations is based on findings that reveal important deficiencies in the Common Standards and the Basic Teaching Credential. The findings were identified, first, by reviewing program documents, advisement materials, the university catalog, and other school of education documents. The findings were further identified through interviews with candidates; graduates; full- and part-time faculty; university administrators and staff; and, K-12 site administrators, supervisors, and teachers.

The accreditation team decision was based on the lack of adequate faculty and fiscal resources allocated: to provide for comprehensive program evaluation that involves core constituent groups and is used for program modifications; to provide for the lack of an admissions process that is either fully informative to candidates or that employs the use of multiple measures; to provide for the absence of well articulated processes for advice and assistance to candidates that involves staff and faculty, as appropriate; and, for unmet needs in the Basic Teaching Credentials in the areas of preparation of teachers in subject specific pedagogy in the single subject program and demonstrated competency in working with identified student populations in both credential programs.

Students who complete professional programs in Education are judged by school-site professionals to be well prepared to be teachers, counselors and administrators. However, there are some inconsistencies in the quality of preparation that relate to the Common Standards and the Basic Teaching Credential. National University does not provide sufficient attention to the allocation of resources in a manner that supports effective use of program evaluation data, supports an informative and effective admissions process, and supports articulated involvement of staff and faculty in early stages of advisement. Furthermore, National University has not developed and implemented programmatic means to respond to preparing single subject candidates in subject specific pedagogy and in working with identified student populations.

The team recommends that National University provide evidence to the CCTC staff, including a focused revisit by the Consultant and Team Leader, that appropriate actions have been taken to address each of the stipulations within one year from date of action by the Committee on Accreditation.

**Team Membership**

**Team Leader:**

**Randall Lindsay**  
Pepperdine University

**Common Standards Cluster:**

**Nancy Brownell, Cluster Leader**  
The California State University

**Cheryl Getz**  
University of San Diego

**Linda Hoff**  
Fresno Pacific University

**Kathleen Taira**  
CalStateTeach

**Juan Flores**  
California State University, Stanislaus

**Patricia Sako-Briglio**  
Bassett Elementary School District

**Basic Credential Cluster:**

**Robert Curley, Cluster Leader**  
University of San Francisco

**Wanda Baral**  
Ocean View School District

**Barbara Black**  
San Juan Unified School District

**Michele Britton-Bass**  
Antioch University

**Clara Chapala**  
California Department of Education

**Stanley Dillon**  
Exeter School District



**Steven Gelb**  
University of San Diego

**Karen McVey**  
Twenty Nine Palms High School District

**Gloria Guzman**  
California State University, Pomona

**Mike Kotar**  
California State University, Chico

**Sylvia Maxson**  
California State University, Long Beach

**Melinda Medina-Levin**  
San Diego Unified School District

**Sheryl Santos**  
California State University, Bakersfield

**Carol Adams (Reading)**  
Lompoc School District

**Education Specialist Cluster:**

**Mary Falvey, Cluster Leader**  
California State University, Los Angeles

**Diana Berliner**  
Humboldt State University

**Jeanne Davis**  
California State University, Pomona

**Education Administration  
Cluster:**

**Yvonne Lux, Cluster Leader**  
California Lutheran University

**Kathleen Henderson**  
Sonoma Valley School District

**Gary Kinsey**  
California Polytechnic University, Pomona

**Ken Engstrom**  
Fresno Pacific University

**Pupil Personnel Services  
Cluster:**

**Dale Matson, Cluster Leader**  
Fresno Pacific University

**Bud Watson**  
Sacramento (Retired)

**Loretta Whitson**  
Monrovia School District

**Barbara Sorenson**  
Azusa Pacific University

**Xiaolu Hu**  
San Jose State University

**Commission Staff:**

**Margaret Olebe, Lead Consultant**  
CCTC

**Betsy Kean, Consultant**  
CCTC

**Helen Hawley, Consultant**  
CCTC

## Data Sources

### DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Catalog and Addendum	Course Syllabi
Institutional Self Study	Candidate Files
Fieldwork Handbook	Budgetary Information
Information Booklet	Field Experience Notebook
Schedule of Classes	Advisement Documents
Faculty Vitae	Textbooks
Candidate Credential Files	Student Teacher Portfolios
Website	On-line courses including
Reading Study	Threaded discussions

### INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Standards	Basic Credentials	Education Specialist	Educ. Admin	PPS	TOTAL
Program Faculty		45	121	37	48	34	<b>285</b>
Institutional Administration	8	42	40	7	13	11	<b>121</b>
Candidates		165	341	172	86	265	<b>1029</b>
Graduates		50	116	27	40	36	<b>269</b>
Employers of Graduates		13	28	11	23	9	<b>84</b>
Supervising Practitioners		17	57	11	13	26	<b>124</b>
Advisors		16	46	8	8	10	<b>88</b>
School Administrators		22	34	11	7	5	<b>79</b>
Credential Analysts/Staff		16	22	7	8	9	<b>62</b>
Advisory Committee		14	30	18	16	10	<b>88</b>
Librarian		1	5				<b>6</b>
Text Coordinator			2				<b>2</b>

Writing Center Staff		1					1
Technician		1					1

**Total 2239**

**B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for National University is **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS.**

Following are the stipulations:

Common Standards

- That the institution provide evidence that a plan has been devised and implemented for allocating faculty and fiscal resources that support specified changes in program evaluation, admissions, and advice and assistance as stated below.
- That the institution provide evidence that the plan for and implementation of program evaluation be further developed to insure the inclusion of all constituent groups and the resulting data be used for documented program improvement.
- That the institution provide evidence that admissions policies and practices have been revised and implemented to insure full and complete information is provided to candidates and that multiple measures are used for each admissions pathway.
- That the institution provide evidence that a plan for candidate advice and assistance that includes clearly defined roles for both staff and faculty in credential and academic advising has been devised and implemented.

Basic Teaching Credential

- That the institution provide evidence that the Single Subjects Program include pedagogical preparation through coursework and fieldwork for subject-specific instruction in each single-subject content area offered (Standard 8b).

- That the institution demonstrate that it has implemented adequate faculty development as well as syllabi content and fieldwork activities that ensure that the elements of the Standard 8b are met.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
  - Preliminary
  - Professional
- Education Specialist Credential
  - Preliminary Level I
    - Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe Disabilities including Internships
  - Professional Level II
    - Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe Disabilities
- Multiple Subject Credential
  - CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish)Emphasis
  - CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis Internship
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
  - School Counseling
  - School Psychology
- Single Subject Credential
  - CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis
  - CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis Internship

2. National University is required to provide evidence about actions taken to remove all of the stipulations noted above within one year of the date of this action, to be verified with a revisit by Commission staff, the Accreditation Team Leader and two additional team members, one from the Basic credential cluster and one from the Pupil Personnel Services credential cluster.

3. In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- National University is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- National University will not be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits until after the Committee on Accreditation acts upon the results of the revisit.



**STANFORD UNIVERSITY**  
**May 11-15, 2002**  
**(COA/NCATE Merged Accreditation Visit)**

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Rationale**

The recommendation pertaining to the accreditation status of Stanford University and both of its credential programs was determined according to the following:

1. NCATE's SIX STANDARDS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: The university elected to use the NCATE format and to write to NCATE's unit standards to meet the COA Common Standards requirement. There was extensive cross-referencing to the COA Common Standards. Also, the corresponding part of this team report utilizes the NCATE standards and format. The total team, NCATE and COA, reviewed each element of the six NCATE Standards, added appropriate areas of the Common Standards, and voted as to whether the standard was met, not met, or met with weaknesses.
2. PROGRAM STANDARDS: Team clusters for the Single Subject Teaching Credential program and Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program reviewed all data regarding those credential programs. Appropriate input was provided by other team members to each of the clusters. Following discussion of each program the total team, NCATE and COA, considered whether the program standards were either met, met minimally, or not met.
3. ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that although the six(6) NCATE Standards were met for purposes of the NCATE report and for the purposes of the COA report. The team determined that all Program Standards were met for the Single Subject Teaching Credential. For the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, the team determined that all standards were met except Standard 3, which was Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns and Standard 7, which was Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns. The following report further explains these findings.

## **Team Membership**

### **Co-Chairs:**

**Randall Souviney**  
COA Chair  
University of California, San Diego

**Mary Harris**  
NCATE Chair  
University of North Texas

### **Common Standards/NCATE Standards Cluster:**

**Terrence Cannings**  
Associate Dean  
Pepperdine University

**Carlos F. Diaz**  
Professor  
Florida Atlantic University

**Carol Vukelich**  
Professor  
University of Delaware

**Julie A. Jagusch**  
Teacher  
Northdale Middle School  
Coon Rapids, Minnesota

**Peter Murrell**  
Professor  
Northeastern University

### **Basic Credential Cluster:**

**Dianne Kingsland**  
Teacher  
Santiago Middle School  
Orange, California

**Mary Poplin**  
Director of Teacher Education  
Claremont Graduate University

**Robin Scarcella**  
Reading Study Specialist  
University of California, Irvine





**Preliminary Administrative Services:**

**Terrence Cannings**  
Associate Dean  
Pepperdine University

**Observer :**

**Tom Gerin**  
NEA Observer

**Data Sources**

<u>INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED</u>		<u>DOCUMENTS REVIEWED</u>
Program Faculty	67	Catalog
Institutional Administration	18	Institutional Self Study
Candidates	81	Course Syllabi
Graduates	62	Candidate Files
Employers of Graduates	27	Fieldwork Handbook
Supervising Practitioners	19	Follow-up Survey Results
Advisors	11	Needs Analysis Results
School Administrators	29	Information Booklet
Credential Analyst	5	Field Experience Notebook
Advisory Committee	4	Schedule of Classes
Teacher Recruitment	3	Advisement Documents
Librarian	1	Faculty Vitae
Subject Matter Faculty	1	Adjunct Faculty Files
University Supervisors	40	STEP/PPP Website (Docushare)
Program Staff	3	Faculty Evaluations (Institutional)
		Budget Reports
		Faculty Handbook
		Adjunct Faculty Handbook
		Student Handbook
		Schedule of Classes
		Cabinet meeting minutes
		PPP Program Advising Minutes
		Student Evaluation of Faculty
		Student Placement Files
		Full and Part-Time Faculty Ethnicity
		Portfolio portfolios and evaluation rubric

**Total Interviews 371**

## **B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for Stanford University is **ACCREDITATION**.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Single Subject Credential
  - CLAD Emphasis
  - CLAD Emphasis Internship
- Administrative Services Credential
  - Preliminary

2. In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted;
- Stanford University is permitted to prepare new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation
- Stanford University is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006 - 2007 academic year.

**UNIVERSITY OF REDLANDS**  
April 21–24,2002

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations**

**Rationale**

The recommendation of the accreditation team for Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations was based on a thorough review of the self study documentation presented to the team, additional information in the form of exhibits, extensive interviews with campus and field-based personnel, and additional information requested from administrators during the visit. The team felt it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the institution's operation of its professional preparation programs. Although there are some program standards met minimally and there are concerns expressed by the team, the overall quality of the programs is good. The recommendation of the team was based on the following:

1. Common Standards: Four common standards were judged to have been met, three were judged to have been minimally met and one was judged to have been not met. Data from the students, graduates and employers indicated that, overall, students recommended for credentials were prepared to function appropriately in classrooms, service and administrative positions. Many students and graduates were complimentary about the supportive, personal interest evidenced by the faculty, administration and staff of the School of Education. However the team identified some specific areas of concern related to some of the standards. Standards two, five, seven and eight were judged to have been met. Standards one, three and six were judged to have been partially met and standard four was judged to be not met.
2. Program Standards. While many of the Program Standards were met, ten standards were met with concerns and two were not met in Multiple Subject, and one standard in Single Subjects was not met. The areas of concern are detailed below.

Multiple Subject: For Program Standard 2, the institution has very good informal partnerships. While not currently operational, formal partnerships are in the process of being established. In Program Standard 7A, elements (c) independent reading, (d) spelling instruction, and (j) a plan to implement collaborative relationships are not yet in place. Elements (a) and (b) of Program Standard 8 were met with concern due to a lack of evidence in the instructional portion of the syllabus. For elements (c), (d), (e), and (f) of Program Standard 8, no evidence was found to indicate that candidates would be instructed in the content or instructional strategies for history-social

science, visual and performing arts, physical education, and health. Program Standard 9, using technology in the classroom, was not met because no evidence was found that the candidates: (b) analyze best practices and research; (f) use established criteria to evaluate materials; (g) choose appropriate software; or (h) adequately assess electronic resources. For Program Standard 14, evidence was not found to indicate that candidates: (b) learn relevant state and federal laws pertaining to education of exceptional populations, or (d) learn to select assistive technologies or to develop teaching strategies for multiple and diverse special populations. Referring to Program Standard 16, early field work experiences need to be well defined so that roles, responsibilities, and expectations can be communicated to stakeholders. With regard to Program Standard 18, no evidence was found that candidates in the Multiple Subject program are instructed in subject-specific pedagogical skills in the Teacher Performance Expectations 1A for history-social science, visual and performing arts, physical education, and health.

Single Subject: For Program Standard 2, informal partnerships are substantial. While not currently operational, formal partnerships will be established. In Program Standard 7B, elements (c) (i) no evidence of instruction on making inferences was found and (g) a plan to implement collaborative relationships are not yet in place. Program Standard 9, using technology in the classroom, was not met because no evidence was found that the candidates: (b) analyze best practices and research; (f) use established criteria to evaluate materials; (g) choose appropriate software; or (h) adequately assess electronic resources. For Program Standard 14, evidence was not found to indicate that candidates: (b) learn relevant state and federal laws pertaining to education of exceptional populations, or (d) learn to select assistive technologies or to develop teaching strategies for multiple and diverse special populations. Referring to Program Standard 16, early field work experiences need to be well defined so that roles, responsibilities, and expectations can be communicated to stakeholders.

Clinical Rehabilitative Services: The team determined that for the Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential Program, all ASHA and supplementary CTC standards and preconditions were met, although ASHA standard 5.2 was met minimally. All standards and preconditions for the Special Class Authorization are met.

All standards were met for the preliminary, professional and preliminary internship credentials and for the Pupil Personnel Services, School Counseling Credential Programs.

2. Overall Recommendation: The accreditation team unanimously supports the above accreditation recommendation based on a careful analysis of all available data presented in the institution's self study reports, documentation available at the time of the visit, and interviews with a wide variety of constituents.

## Team Membership

### Team Leader:

**John Yoder**  
Fresno Pacific University

### Common Standards Cluster:

**Louise Adler**, Cluster Leader  
California State University, Fullerton

**J. Alex Pulido**  
California State University, Los Angeles

### Basic Credential Program Cluster:

**Virginia Glenn**, Cluster Leader  
Lake Tahoe Unified School District

**Christine G. Renne**  
California State University, Fullerton

**Katherine Liu**  
Jefferson Union High School District

### Services Credential Program Cluster:

**Gene Gallegos**, Cluster Leader  
California State University, Bakersfield

**Cynthia DeClercq**  
Poway Unified School District

**Louis H. Shaup**  
Pasadena Unified School District

**Terry Saenz**  
California State University, Fullerton

**Albert Valencia**  
California State University, Fresno

## Data Sources

### DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog  
 Course Syllabi  
 Fieldwork Handbooks  
 Needs Analysis Results  
 Notebooks  
 Schedule of Classes  
 Faculty Vitae

Institutional Self Study  
 Candidate Files  
 Follow-up Survey Results  
 Field Experience  
 Information Booklets  
 Advisement Documents

### INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Common Stands. Cluster	Basic Cred. Cluster	Services Cred. Cluster	<b>TOTAL</b>
Program Faculty	14	18	31	<b>63</b>
Institutional Administration	8	1	3	<b>12</b>
Candidates	25	39	70	<b>134</b>
Graduates	0	9	24	<b>33</b>
Employers of Graduates	2	3	17	<b>22</b>
Supervising Practitioners	1	10	17	<b>28</b>
Advisors	0	18	10	<b>28</b>
School Administrators	5	2	13	<b>20</b>
Credential Analyst	1	1	1	<b>3</b>
Advisory Committee	0	0	1	<b>1</b>

**Total 344**

## **B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

### **1. The decision for the University of Redlands and all of its credential programs: ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS**

Following are the stipulations:

- The institution must provide a well defined written plan for hiring and retaining faculty that reflect cultural, ethnic and gender diversity. The plan must indicate how the various levels (President, Academic Vice President, School of Education Dean, etc.) of the university will be involved.
- The institution must provide evidence that it has developed and implemented a systematic, comprehensive and formalized plan for evaluating the quality of its courses and field experiences. The plan must involve diverse community members (e.g., program participants, graduates, local practitioners, participating schools and school districts) in the collection of evaluative information and data and indicate how the information is being used for program design, development and improvement.
- The institution must provide evidence that it develops and implements an individual plan for the mentoring support and professional development of each intern in the Basic Credential program in consultation with the intern and the employing school district.
- The institution must provide evidence that the Multiple Subject coursework begins to prepare each candidate to plan and deliver content-specific instruction in mathematics, science, history-social science, the visual and performing arts, physical education, and health. The coursework as described in the proposed syllabi must include instruction and class experiences addressing specific pedagogical content knowledge.
- The institution must provide evidence that Multiple and Single Subject candidates learn to evaluate current educational technologies and materials, to appropriately select software, to effectively assess electronic research tools including web sites, and to analyze best practices and research findings on the use of technology.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential  
Preliminary  
Preliminary Internship



## Professional

- Multiple Subject Credential
    - CLAD Emphasis
    - CLAD Emphasis Internship
  - Single Subject Credential
    - CLAD Emphasis
    - CLAD Emphasis Internship
  - Pupil Personnel Services Credential
    - School Counseling
  - Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential:
    - Language Speech and Hearing
    - Special Class Authorization
2. University of Redlands is required to provide written evidence to the Commission staff that appropriate actions have been taken to remove each of these stipulations and address all standards that are less than fully met and that the team leader and a team member revisit the university to verify the appropriate action in relation to all stipulations and standards less than fully met within one year from the date of this action.
3. In addition:
- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
  - The University of Redlands is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
  - The University of Redlands is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2007-2008 academic year.

**UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO**  
**April 14-17, 2002**

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Technical Stipulations**

**Rationale**

The recommendation of the accreditation team for Accreditation with Technical Stipulations was based on a thorough review of the self study documentation presented to the team, additional information in the form of exhibits, extensive interviews with campus and field-based personnel, and additional information requested from administrators during the visit. The team felt it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the institution's operation of its professional preparation programs. All common standards were met. Six program standards were met minimally with qualitative concerns in three programs, and there were concerns expressed by the team. The overall quality of the programs is good. The recommendation of the team was based on the following:

1. COMMON STANDARDS: All eight common standards were met. Data, especially from students, graduates, and employers were very complimentary about the manner in which the University of San Diego organized its programs, the qualifications of faculty delivering program content, and the students' perceived learning, by students themselves and their employers. As a result of coursework and field experience, those recommended for credentials were prepared to function appropriately in classrooms, service positions, and specialist positions. However, the team did identify some specific concerns, mostly related to the assurance of consistent excellence across program areas and across the variety of sites where programs are offered.
2. PROGRAM STANDARDS: In general most of the standards for the range of Programs offered by the University of San Diego were met. However, there are a few standards in program areas that were met minimally with qualitative concerns. These areas of concern are detailed below:

**Multiple Subject**: All program standards were met with the exception of Standard 7-A which was met with concerns. Referring to element (a), the team found that the EDUC 183/283 reading methods course content is only partially aligned with the State-adopted academic content standards in the California Reading/Language Arts Frameworks (across K-6 grade levels) and does not include exposure to instructional programs adopted by the State Board of Education for use in California public schools. The California

Reading/Language Arts Framework is only cited during one of the thirteen sessions rather than throughout the course.

Administrative Services: All standards were fully met except for Standards one and three, which were minimally met with qualitative concerns. The institution does not have over-arching language in program descriptions, integrating all the paths to the credential. The institution does not address the program content delivery regarding curriculum design options.

Health Services Credential-School Nurse Program: All standards are met, except for Standards 13, 17 and 20, which were minimally met with qualitative concerns. The program does not provide evidence of proposed changes in their curriculum, ensure practicum in school settings, and ensure continuation of an assistant program coordinator.

3. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION: The team made its recommendation for accreditation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Framework*. In its deliberations, the team decided that although six program standards were less than fully met, the overall quality of the programs was good. The team did list some concerns, but did not feel that the concerns were of sufficient magnitude such that any additional standards were less than fully met. The team then considered the appropriate accreditation decision for the institution. The options were: "Accreditation," "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations," "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations," Probationary Accreditation, or "Denial of Accreditation." After thorough discussion, the entire team voted to recommend the status of "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations." The recommendation was based on the unanimous agreement of the team.

### Team Membership -

**Team Leader:**

**Marilyn Draheim**  
University of the Pacific

**Common Standards Cluster:**

**Curtis L. Guaglianone**, Cluster Leader  
California State University, Fresno

**Herbert D. Bonds**  
Kern Community College District

**Basic Credential Program Cluster:**

**Beth Bythrow**, Cluster Leader  
Los Angeles Unified School District

**Jeffrey S. Hittenberger**  
Vanguard University

**Patricia Barrett**  
Grant Joint Union School District

**Karl Skindrud**  
Calif. State University, Dominguez Hills

**Specialist Credential Program Cluster:**

**Christine Givner**, Cluster Leader  
California State University, Los Angeles

**Brigid Richards**  
San Rafael High School District

**Services Credential Program Cluster:**

**Daniel C. Elliott**, Cluster Leader  
Azusa Pacific University

**Marcel Soriano**  
California State University, Los Angeles

**Cathy S. Turney**  
West Covina Unified School District

**Janet Needman**  
San Jose City College

Data Sources

**DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

University Catalog	Institutional Self Study
Candidate Files	Course Syllabi
Fieldwork Handbooks	Follow-up Survey Results
Needs Analysis Results	Information Booklets
Field Experience Notebooks	Schedule of Classes
Advisement Documents	Faculty Vitae

**INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED**

	Team Leader	Common Stands. Cluster	Basic Cred. Cluster	Specialist Cred. Cluster	Services Cred. Cluster	<b>TOTAL</b>
Program Faculty	1	5	22	14	16	<b>58</b>
Institutional Administration	4	16	5	3	8	<b>36</b>
Candidates		42	18	20	51	<b>131</b>
Graduates	2	4	38	8	21	<b>73</b>
Employers of Graduates		1	7	3	9	<b>20</b>
Supervising Practitioners		5	15	6	9	<b>35</b>
Advisors		2	2	7	8	<b>19</b>
School Administrators		6	4	4	6	<b>20</b>
Credential Analyst		1	2	1	3	<b>7</b>
Advisory Committee		1	8	14	4	<b>27</b>

**Total 426**

## **B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

### **1. The decision for the University of San Diego is ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS**

Following are the stipulations:

- The institution must provide evidence of implementation of revised reading course content to ensure that each candidate participates in reading methods training that enables him/her to provide a comprehensive program of reading instruction aligned with the California Reading/Language Arts Framework. The institution must also provide evidence of implementation of methods course content that includes exposure to instructional programs adopted by the State Board of Education for use in California Public Schools.
- The institution must provide evidence of a revised over-arching program description with a “cohesive design” and a “cogent rationale” that will ensure that all preliminary administrative credential candidates, regardless of their cohort or special emphasis, are prepared to serve generally as a p-12 administrator anywhere in California, and allow for all possible alternative cohorts or paths.
- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of the full range of the school nursing proposed curriculum.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
  - Preliminary
  - Preliminary Internship
- Multiple Subject Credential
  - CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis
- Single Subject Credential
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
  - School Counseling
- Education Specialist Credentials:
  - Preliminary Level I
  - Early Childhood Special Education
  - Early Childhood Special Education Internship
  - Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship  
Professional Level II  
Early Childhood Special Education  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities  
Early Childhood Special Education Certificate

- Health Services (School Nurse) Credential
2. The University of San Diego is required to provide written evidence to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing staff that appropriate actions have been taken to meet each of these stipulations within one year from the date of this action.
  3. In addition:
    - The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted
    - The University of San Diego is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation
    - The University of San Diego is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2007-2008 academic year.



**UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO**  
**April 21-24, 2002**

**A. Accreditation Team Report Information**

**Team Recommendation: Accreditation**

**Rationale**

The team recommendation for Accreditation was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Reports, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the unit. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the unit was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards: The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by-one and then voted upon by the entire team. The team voted unanimously on each Common Standard and determined that seven Common Standards were judged to be fully met. One Common Standard, Common Standard 8, was met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns.
2. Program Standards: Findings about program standards were presented to the team by the Cluster Leaders, assisted by the Cluster members (for additional clarification). The accreditation team findings on standards for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Programs were based upon the SB 2042 Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs. The team discussed each program standard at the element level and found that Multiple Subject Program Standard 16 was Met with Concerns and Single Subject Program Standards 8B, 15, and 16 were Met With Concerns.

Findings on standards for the Education Specialist Credential Program: Mild/Moderate, including Internship, Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program: School Counseling, including Internship, and the Administrative Services Credential Program, Preliminary and Professional Clear, were based on current professional preparation program standards. The team discussed each program area and determined that the program standards for these credential programs were fully met.

3. Overall Recommendation: The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that all Common Standards were Met although one Common Standard was Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns. When judging the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Programs the team found that all standards were met with one Multiple Subject Program Standard Met with Concerns and three Single Subject Program Standards Met with Concerns. Program standards for the Education Specialist, Pupil Personnel Services and

Administrative Services Credential Programs were all fully met. The team noted the concerns about the one Common Standard and four program standards that were less than fully met but concluded that these concerns did not affect the overall quality of the graduates. The team further concluded that a stipulation should not be placed on the institution because of compensating strengths. Those strengths include university leadership, the priority placed on teacher education, high-quality programs that effectively integrate theory and practice, and the attention provided to all professional preparation program candidates resulting in caring, competent and effective educators. The team unanimously decided that the evidence clearly supported the accreditation recommendation.

### **Team Membership**

#### **Team Leader:**

**Jeanie Milliken**  
Point Loma Nazarene University

#### **Common Standards Cluster:**

**William Watkins**, Cluster Leader  
National University (Retired)

**Marian Reimann**  
Los Angeles Unified School District

#### **Basic Credential Cluster:**

**Jody Daughtry**, Cluster Leader  
California State University, Fresno

**Patricia Carrillo-Hurtado**  
Fresno Unified School District

**Priscilla Walton**  
University of California, Santa Cruz

**Roxanne Higgins**  
Sacramento County Office of Education

#### **Advanced Credential Cluster :**

**Mary Williams**, Cluster Leader  
University of San Diego

**Barbara Wilson**

Education Research Consultant (Retired)

Data Sources

**DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

University Catalog Instructional Self Study Course Syllabi Candidate Files Fieldwork Handbooks Follow-up Survey Results Information Booklets Field Experience Notebooks	Schedule of Classes Advisement Document Faculty Vitae Program/Faculty Evaluations On-line Instructional Materials Student Portfolio Student Projects Curriculum Resource Center
--	--

**INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED**

	Commons Cluster	Basic Cluster	Ed Specialist Level I and II M/M	Pupil Personnel Services	Admin Services Prelim and Professional	TOTALS
Program Faculty	16	43	12	9	14	94
Institutional Administration	13	20		2	4	39
Candidates	18	157	40	15	9	239
Graduates	13	27	19	13	11	83
Employers of Graduates	20	4	9	3	4	40
Supervising Practitioners	24	11	12	7	4	58
Advisors	34	10	4	1	6	55
School Administrators	39	7	6	3	24	79
Credential Analyst	120		1	1	2	124
Advisory Committee	11	2	5	3	6	27
Chair/ Program Coordinators	30					30
Budget Officer	1				1	2
Graduate Recruiter	1					1

Regional Center Coordinator	1	1				2
Administrative Assistant	2					2

**Total 875**

**B. Committee on Accreditation Action**

1. The decision for the University of San Francisco is **ACCREDITATION**.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Multiple Subject Credential  
CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish/Filipino) Emphasis
- Subject Credential  
CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish/Filipino) Emphasis
- Education Specialist Credential - Preliminary Level I  
Preliminary Level I  
Mild/Moderate  
Mild Moderate Internship  
Professional Level II  
Mild/Moderate
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential  
School Counseling  
School Counseling Internship
- Administrative Services Credential  
Preliminary  
Professional Clear

2. In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- The University of San Francisco is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- The University of San Francisco is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2007-2008 academic year.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Initial Program Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation 2001-2002**

# APPENDIX B

## Initial Program Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation – 2001-2002

### Introduction

Following is a summary of the initial program accreditation actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation during the 2001-2002 academic year. For each program area, the institutions are listed in alphabetical order. For each of the institutions, the specific programs accredited are named in each listing.

### Initial Accreditation Based Upon Panel Review

The Committee on Accreditation granted initial accreditation to the following preparation programs, based upon the recommendations of the appropriate review panels. Each of the institutions listed responded fully and appropriately to the adopted standards and preconditions by preparing a program proposal that described how each standard and precondition was met and that included appropriate supporting evidence. The program proposals were read by the appropriate review panels following the procedures adopted by the Committee on Accreditation. The programs were judged to meet all standards and preconditions.

#### A. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Education Specialist Credential

Azusa Pacific University

Preliminary Level I

Mild/Moderate Internship – Option 1

Dominican University of California

Preliminary Level I

Mild/Moderate Disabilities with Internship

California State University, Monterey Bay

Preliminary Level I

Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Chapman University

Preliminary Level I

Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship

Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship

National University  
Preliminary Level I  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship with Option I  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship with Option I

Notre Dame de Namur University  
Preliminary Level I  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities  
Moderate /Severe Disabilities with Internship

San Jose State University  
Preliminary Level I  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship with Option I  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship with Option I  
Professional Level II  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities  
Early Childhood Special Education  
Deaf and Hard of Hearing

University of California, Santa Barbara  
Preliminary Level I  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities

**B. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Adapted Physical Education Credential**

San Jose State University  
Sonoma State University

**C. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential**

Reading Certificate  
California Baptist University  
California Lutheran University  
California State University, Chico  
California State University, Fresno  
California State University, Fullerton  
California State University, Hayward  
California State University, Northridge  
California State University, San Bernardino  
Concordia University  
Point Loma Nazarene University  
San Francisco State University  
San Jose State University  
Sonoma State University



University of California, Berkeley  
University of La Verne  
University of San Francisco

Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

California State University, Chico  
California State University, Fresno  
California State University, Hayward  
California State University, Northridge  
California State University, San Bernardino  
San Francisco State University  
Sonoma State University  
University of California, Berkeley

**D. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential (New Standards)**

University of La Verne  
School Counseling

**E. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Multiple and Single Subject Credentials Under SB 2042**

California State University, Hayward  
Single Subject (Integrated Pathway)

California State University, San Marcos  
Multiple Subject  
Single Subject

Santa Clara University  
Multiple Subject  
Single Subject

University of California, San Diego  
Multiple Subject  
Single Subject

University of La Verne  
Multiple Subject  
Single Subject

Vanguard University  
Multiple Subject  
Single Subject

**F. Blended Programs of Subject Matter Preparation and Professional Preparation for Multiple and Single Subject Credentials and Education Specialist Credentials**

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona  
Multiple Subject/BCLAD

California State University, Fresno  
Multiple Subject/Education Specialist  
Preliminary Level I  
Mild/Moderate  
Moderate/Severe

California State University, Los Angeles  
Single Subject - Science

California State University, Sacramento  
Single Subject - Physical Education

California State University, San Marcos  
Multiple Subject

Dominican University of California  
Multiple Subject

Humboldt State University  
Multiple Subject, CLAD Emphasis

St. Mary's College of California  
Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis

Sonoma State University  
Multiple Subject

University of California, Riverside  
Multiple Subject

**G. Approved Responses to Standard 20.5 – Use of Computer Based Technology in the Classroom for the Multiple and Single Subject Credential**

California State University  
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo  
Humboldt State University (Single Subject)  
San Jose State University

### University of California

University of California, Berkeley  
University of California, Davis  
University of California, Los Angeles  
University of California, Riverside (Education Extension)

### Independent Colleges and Universities

Biola University  
Fresno Pacific University  
The Master's College  
Stanford University (Single Subject Only)  
University of San Francisco  
University of San Diego

### District Internships

San Joaquin County Office of Education (Multiple Subject Only)

## **H. Professional Preparation Program Responses to Standard 13 Pursuant to AB 1059 (Ducheny)**

California State University, Long Beach  
Multiple Subject Credential

## **I. Programs of Professional Preparation in the Accreditation Pilot Project Pursuant to Assembly Bill 2730 (Mazzoni)**

Argosy University  
Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis  
Single Subject CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis

## **Initial Accreditation Based Upon Staff Review**

The Committee on Accreditation granted initial accreditation to the following preparation programs, based upon the recommendations of the Commission consultants. Each of the institutions listed responded fully and appropriately to the adopted standards and preconditions by preparing a program proposal that described how each standard and precondition was met and that included appropriate supporting evidence. The program proposals were read by the appropriate consultant following the procedures adopted by the Committee on Accreditation. The programs were judged to meet all standards and preconditions.

## **A. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Multiple and Single Subject Credentials**

California State University, Monterey Bay

Single Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish)  
Single Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Internship

Chapman University  
Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Internship

Loyola Marymount University  
Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis Internship  
Single Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis Internship

Point Loma Nazarene University  
Multiple Subject CLAD Internship  
Single Subject CLAD Internship

San Diego City Unified School District  
Single Subject Internship

Whittier College  
Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Internship

**B. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Health Services (School Nurse) Credential**

Azusa Pacific University

**C. Programs of Preparation for the Administrative Services Credential**

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona  
Preliminary  
Preliminary Internship

California State University, Bakersfield  
Preliminary Internship

University of San Diego  
Preliminary Internship

**D. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential**

California Lutheran University  
School Counseling  
School Counseling Internship  
Child Welfare and Attendance

California State University, Chico  
School Counseling, Internship  
School Psychology, Internship

California State University, Dominguez Hills  
School Counseling, Internship  
School Psychology, Internship

Humboldt State University  
School Psychology Internship

# **APPENDIX C**

## **Additional Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation 2001-2002**

## APPENDIX C

### Additional Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation – 2001-2002

#### Introduction

Following is a summary of other accreditation actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation during the 2001-2002 academic year. Actions include the withdrawal of programs, removal of accreditation stipulations and changing of accreditation status.

#### A. Withdrawal of Professional Preparation Programs

In August 2001, the Committee approved the voluntary withdrawal of the Pupil Personnel Services, School Counseling Program at **Humboldt State University**, effective June, 2002.

In October 2001, the Committee approved the voluntary withdrawal of the Multiple Subject Program and the Multiple Subject Program with CLAD Emphasis Credentials at **City University**.

In January 2002, the Committee approved the voluntary withdrawal of the Program of Professional Preparation for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counselor Credential at the **University of the Pacific**, effective December 30, 2003.

In April, 2002, the Committee approved the voluntary withdrawal of the following credential programs at **Pacific Oaks College**: Multiple Subject BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis Credential, effective August, 2002; Education Specialist Credential – Early Childhood Special Education, effective January, 2003; Education Specialist Credential – Moderate/Severe, effective August, 2003.

In April, 2002, the Committee approved the voluntary withdrawal of the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and the Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology Credential Programs at the **University of Southern California**, both effective Spring, 2004.

In April 2002, the Committee also approved staff recommendation to withdraw the Designated Subjects Adult Education Credential Program and the Designated Subjects Vocational Education Program, both effective, Fall 2002, from **California State Polytechnic University, Pomona**.

All of these programs no longer accept candidates and the programs are not included in any continuing accreditation visits. A withdrawn program may be re-accredited only when the institution submits a new proposal for initial accreditation according to the policies of the Committee on Accreditation. The institution must wait at least two years from the date in which candidates were no longer admitted to the program before requesting re-accreditation of the program.

## **B. Removal of Accreditation Stipulations and Change of Institutional Accreditation Status**

In October 2001, The Committee voted to remove the technical stipulations placed on **California State University, San Marcos** on the basis of information submitted by the institution and to change the accreditation status from "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations" to "Accreditation".

In October 2001, the Committee voted to remove the technical stipulations placed on **Azusa Pacific University** based on the Accreditation Re-Visit Team Report, team recommendations and staff recommendations. The Committee voted to change the accreditation status from "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations" to "Accreditation."

In April 2002, the Committee voted to remove the stipulations placed on **California State University, Bakersfield**, based upon the Accreditation Re-Visit Team Report, team recommendations and staff recommendations. The Committee voted to change the accreditation status of California State University, Bakersfield from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Accreditation".

In May, 2002, the Committee voted to remove the stipulations placed on **Pacific Oaks College** based upon the Accreditation Re-Visit Team Report, team recommendations and staff recommendations. The Committee voted to change the accreditation status of Pacific Oaks College from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Accreditation".

In June, 2002, the Committee voted to remove the substantive stipulations placed on **Hope International University** based upon the Accreditation Re-Visit Team Report, team recommendations and staff recommendations. The Committee voted to change the accreditation status of Hope International University from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Accreditation".

In June, 2002, the Committee voted to remove the stipulations placed on the **Compton Unified School District** based upon the Accreditation Re-Visit Team Report, team recommendations and staff recommendations. The Committee voted to change the accreditation status of the Compton Unified School District from "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations" to "Accreditation".

In June, 2002, the Committee voted to remove the stipulations placed on **New College of California** based upon the Accreditation Re-Visit Team Report, team recommendations and staff recommendations. The Committee voted to change the accreditation status of New College of California from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Accreditation".