



COMMISSION ON  
TEACHER CREDENTIALING

---

*Ensuring Educator Excellence*

**The Committee on Accreditation's  
Annual Accreditation Report to the  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
2011-2012**

Dear Commissioners:

It is with personal and professional pleasure that, on behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation, we submit to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing the *2011-2012 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 work plan for 2012-2013 as it implements the Commission's accreditation system.

The *Annual Accreditation Report* is organized to address the purposes of the accreditation system: ensure accountability, ensure high quality programs, ensure adherence to standards and foster on-going improvement. Each purpose is addressed as the report notes what was accomplished in 2011-2012 and in the proposed work plan for 2012-2013. We believe that aligning the *Annual Accreditation Report* to these purposes provides evidence of the integrity of the accreditation system.

Although the Commission continues to be challenged by a difficult budget environment, the members of the COA nevertheless remain committed to ensuring that all prospective educators in California are prepared by the highest quality programs. We look forward to working in partnership with the Commission to review processes and procedures over the course of this next year and to continue to improve and refine a strong accountability system for educator preparation programs in California. That said, the members of the COA unanimously and strongly recommend that the Commission resume all accreditation activities as swiftly as possible. This is necessary not only to uphold the mission of ensuring educator excellence but also to maintain California's stature as a national leader in adopting and enforcing high standards.

The Committee stands ready to assist the Commission in achieving the goal of a high quality teacher in every classroom.

Sincerely,



Anne Jones  
Committee Co-Chair



Nancy Watkins  
Committee Co-Chair

# **The Committee on Accreditation**

## **2011-2012**

### **Joyce Abrams**

Substitute Teacher  
Chula Vista Elementary School District

### **Deborah Erickson**

Associate Professor and Assistant Dean  
California Lutheran University

### **Emelina Emaas**

High School Teacher  
BTSA Support Provider  
Sacramento City USD

### **Joseph Jimenez**

Induction Consultant  
Tulare County Office of Education

### **Anne Jones**

Assistant Dean and  
Director, Teacher Education Programs  
University of California, Riverside

### **Gary Kinsey**

Associate Vice President of Academic  
Affairs and Director of the School of  
Education  
California State University, Channel Islands

### **Kiran Kumar**

Substitute Teacher  
National Board Certified Teacher  
Early Adolescence/English Language Arts  
Pomona Unified School District

### **Kenneth Lopour**

Assistant Principal  
Orange Unified School District

### **Reyes Quezada**

Professor of Education  
University of San Diego

### **Iris Riggs**

Professor, Department of Science,  
Mathematics and Technology Education  
CSU, San Bernardino

### **Nancy Watkins**

Teacher, Valencia High School  
Placentia-Yorba Linda School District

### **Pia Wong**

Chair, Department of Teaching Credentials  
College of Education  
California State University, Sacramento

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

Teri Clark, Director, Professional Services Division  
Cheryl Hickey, Administrator of Accreditation, Professional Services Division  
Katie Croy, Consultant, Professional Services Division  
Gay Roby, Consultant, Professional Services Division  
Geri Mohler, Consultant, Professional Services Division  
Teri Ackerman, Analyst, Professional Services Division

# Table of Contents

## Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee’s Work Plan in 2011-12

<b>Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession .....</b>	<b>1</b>
a) <i>Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation. ....</i>	1
b) <i>Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission .....</i>	2
c) <i>Commission Liaison.....</i>	2
<b>Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality .....</b>	<b>3</b>
a) <i>Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs .....</i>	3
b) <i>Revise and maintain the Accreditation Handbook .....</i>	3
c) <i>Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission.....</i>	3
d) <i>Train new members and update current members of the Board of Institutional Review (BIR) .....</i>	3
e) <i>Instituted Improvements to the Initial Institutional Approval process .....</i>	4
f) <i>Strengthened the Commission’s ability to deny accreditation .....</i>	4
<b>Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards .....</b>	<b>5</b>
a) <i>Review and take action to grant initial institutional approval of new credential programs .....</i>	5
b) <i>Conduct and review program assessment activities.....</i>	5
c) <i>Integrate Induction programs into the Commission’s accreditation system .....</i>	5
d) <i>Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation .....</i>	5
e) <i>Disseminate information related to the Commission’s Common Standards .....</i>	5
f) <i>Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment .....</i>	6
g) <i>Continue the discussion of how the Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system.....</i>	6
<b>Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement .....</b>	<b>6</b>
a) <i>Collect, analyze, report on the second year of biennial reports submitted in fall 2010 .....</i>	6
b) <i>Continue development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.....</i>	6
c) <i>Continue partnership with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate.....</i>	6
d) <i>Monitor the agreement detailing how the Commission’s accreditation system can function in alignment with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) .....</i>	7
e) <i>Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state process.....</i>	7
<b>General Operations .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Section II: Summary of Accreditation Activities 2011-12 .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<i>Professional Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Credential Preparation Programs .....</i>	8
<i>Technical Assistance Site Visits .....</i>	13
<i>Initial Approval of New Credential Programs .....</i>	14
<i>Transitioned Programs .....</i>	17
<i>Inactive Status.....</i>	19
<i>Withdrawal of an Approved Program.....</i>	20
<i>Reactivation .....</i>	21

<i>Initial Institutional Approval</i> .....	22
<i>Institutions that are no longer approved program sponsors</i> .....	22
<b>Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee in 2012-2013</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and the Profession</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<i>a) Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation</i> .....	23
<i>b) Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission</i> .....	23
<i>c) Commission Liaison</i> .....	24
<i>d) Examine additional potential revenue sources to support accreditation system</i> .....	24
<b>Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<i>a) Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs</i> .....	24
<i>b) Revise and finalize the Accreditation Handbook</i> .....	24
<i>c) Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission</i> .....	24
<i>d) Develop and Pilot a Program Completer Survey</i> .....	24
<i>e) Discuss which standards provide the most leverage</i> .....	25
<b>Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<i>a) Review and take action to grant initial approval of new credential programs</i> .....	25
<i>b) Conduct and review program assessment activities</i> .....	25
<i>c) Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation</i> .....	26
<i>d) Disseminate information related to the Commission's Common Standards</i> .....	26
<i>e) Integrate induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system</i> .....	26
<i>f) Continue the discussion of how Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system</i> .....	26
<i>g) Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment</i> .....	26
<i>h) Develop a More Streamlined and Targeted Site Visit Model</i> .....	26
<b>Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<i>a) Collect, analyze and report on the biennial reports submitted in fall 2012</i> .....	27
<i>b) Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system</i> .....	27
<i>c) Continue Partnership with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate</i> .....	27
<i>d) Monitor the agreement detailing how the Commission's accreditation system can function in alignment with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)</i> .....	28
<i>e) Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes</i> .....	28
<b>General Operations</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>Section IV: Three Year Summary of Accreditation Activities and Improvements Made by Institutions with Stipulations</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>Appendix A: Accreditation Activities 2011-12</b> .....	<b>40</b>
<b>Appendix B: Accreditation Activities 2012-13</b> .....	<b>43</b>
<b>Appendix C: Institutions by Cohort</b> .....	<b>44</b>
<b>Appendix D: Accreditation Activities for 2012-13 Adopted by Commission in June 2012</b> .....	<b>47</b>

## **Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2011-2012**

On August 3, 2011 the Committee on Accreditation (COA) adopted the work plan for 2011-2012. Co-Chairs Carol Leighty and Gary Kinsey presented this work plan to the Commission at the December 10, 2011 Commission meeting. The items that follow represent the key components of the 2011-2012 work plan for the COA and a summary of each task and its current status.

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

*Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation.* All Committee meetings were held in public with all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. In addition, meetings were transmitted via audio broadcast and video webcast to allow any individual with access to the internet the ability to hear live or recorded broadcasts of all Committee meetings. The Commission's website was utilized fully to provide agenda items, notification of meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation. The COA held meetings as follows:

August 2-3, 2011  
October 27, 2011  
February 1-2, 2012  
March 14-15, 2012  
April 18-19, 2012  
May 30-31, 2012  
June 27-28, 2012

COA meetings were broadcast live over the internet. Except where technical difficulties occurred, agenda items and the video and audio archive of the meetings are housed on the Commission website. Videoconference and Skype have been used frequently in order that those located in various regions of California who are involved in accreditation activities can participate from a videoconferencing center. This resulted in significant cost savings to the Commission.

*PSD-News.* The PSD E-news was developed in 2008 and was distributed on nearly a weekly basis throughout 2011-12. This electronic correspondence notifies nearly 1,300 individuals, including all approved institutions, of on-going activities related to the Professional Services Division. Previously, the number of individuals on the list was 300, indicating that the PSD E-news has experienced significant growth in readership in 2011-12. Information on accreditation-related activities such as standards development and revision work and technical assistance workshops are routinely distributed via this communication tool.

*Program Sponsor Alerts.* Established in 2008, Program Sponsor Alerts provide important and timely information on specific topics of interest to program sponsors. The Commission staff continued to use this resource frequently during the 2011-2012 year. The Program Sponsor Alert format addresses a specific issue, such as institutional responsibilities, implementation of inactive status for programs, or modification to preconditions for multiple and single subject programs.

*Assistance to the Field.* In 2011-2012 a variety of activities took place designed to share information about the current accreditation system and its implementation. All technical assistance meetings were broadcast through the web and the broadcast archived for access by stakeholders: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/webcasts.html>. For site visits that took place in Fall of 2011 or Spring 2012, technical assistance began in 2011. These included the following:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Technical Assistance Activity By Topic</b>
May 5, 2011	2011-12 Accreditation Site Visits Year Out Pre-Visits (Joint NCATE visits)
May 13, 2011	2011-12 Accreditation Site Visits Year Out Pre-Visit Broadcasts (Visits to Very Small [1-2 programs] Institutions)
May 23, 2011	2011-12 Accreditation Site Visits Year Out Pre-Visit (CTC Site Visits)

In addition, workshops were held at the Credential Counselors and Analysts of California annual conference in October 2011. These included specific workshops for those new to accreditation (Accreditation 101) and workshops tailored to the three components of accreditation – program assessment, biennial reports, and site visits.

In addition, the Professional Services Division used the webinar format to update the field on a variety of topics related more generally to accreditation such as for special education programs or reading specialist programs transitioning to new standards.

For those institutions undergoing accreditation visits in 2011-12, all were assigned a Commission consultant to provide them with individual assistance in the months leading up to the accreditation visit.

*Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission.* COA Co-Chairs Gary Kinsey and Carol Leighty, on behalf of the Committee on Accreditation, presented its annual report to the Commission at the December 2011 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-12/2011-12-5D.pdf>).

*Commission Liaison.* The liaison from the Commission is invited to attend each COA meeting. The liaison participates in discussions and brings the perspective of the Commission to the COA. In addition, the liaison then reports back to the Commission on the activities of the Committee. Commission Chair Charles Gahagan served in this role for the Commission but has since appointed Commissioner Louise Stymeist as liaison.

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

*Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs.* This is the principal, ongoing task of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing accreditation of institutions and their educator preparation and credential programs. In the 2011-2012 academic year, accreditation site visits were held at 38 institutions. Visits were held at 15 institutions of higher education, 22 county offices of education and/or school districts, and one school administrators association. Five institutions were revisited in 2011-2012 to ensure sufficient progress in addressing issues identified in previous accreditation visits. A list of the institutions that had a site visit or revisit in 2011-2012 is included in Section II of this report.

*Revise and Maintain the Accreditation Handbook.* As the Committee fine-tunes the accreditation system, the *Accreditation Handbook* has been updated throughout the year. This document explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the Commission's accreditation system and will be continually updated and revised to ensure its accuracy.

*Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide the Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested.* The COA received updates on Commission activities at each meeting. Examples of topics discussed for 2011-12 include updates on the work related to English Learners and potential changes to the Administrative Services credential.

*Train new members of the Board of Institutional Review (BIR) and update current members.* The Commission held three Board of Institutional Review trainings in 2011-2012 – in August 2011 in southern California, in January 2012 in Sacramento, and again in southern California in April of 2012. To limit expenses, the last BIR training was restricted to only those who could commute to and from the training. Typically, BIR trainings have been four days in length, beginning on Sunday afternoons and ending on Wednesday at noon, mirroring accreditation site visits. However, the limitations of the Commission's budget and the challenge that is posed by individuals taking a lengthy absence from their place of employment required that the Commission think differently about BIR training. As a result, the Commission staff developed on line training modules to cover approximately half of the accreditation information. Those registered for the BIR trainings were required to complete the online trainings prior to coming to a shortened in person training. The face to face aspect of the training included a focus on practicing BIR skills such as interpreting standards, interview practice, strategies for developing a well written accreditation report, as well as clarifying topics covered in the online training modules. Feedback from participants at each of the three sessions have helped refine parts of the training and suggest that this model of training where parts are done at the prospective reviewer's convenience while retaining a shortened in person training is effective and that participants appreciate the fact that the shortened face to face training has now allowed some to participate that otherwise would not have been able to with a four day training.

After having used many of the reviewers who were trained using this new hybrid training model for a variety of accreditation activities this past year, Commission staff and the COA believe that it was as effective as the previous four day in person training. As a result, any future training in 2013-14 is expected to be conducted in this manner. Conducting trainings in this manner will result significant cost savings to the Commission while maintaining the quality and effectiveness of the training experience.



The Commission staff also held a refresher training for all team leads in the fall of 2011. A number of team leads attended the one day training in person while others participated remotely. All other accreditation site visit team members were asked to participate in a team member refresher training available on line according to their designated role on the team (Common Standards reviewer or program standards reviewer).

Two topics related to ensuring program quality that were not originally identified in the COA's workplan for the year, nonetheless became important priorities and are noted here. They are described below:

*Instituted improvements in the Initial Institutional Approval process.* In 2011-12, the Commission made numerous changes to the Initial Institutional Approval Process (IIA). These changes were described in detail in an August 2012 Commission agenda item (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-08/2012-08-4H.pdf>). Initial institutional approval is a two-step process. The first step – determining institutional eligibility - involves approval by the Commission and the second step – program approval – is the responsibility of the COA. The changes instituted are intended to prevent institutions from operating a program in advance of being approved. They include changes to the website to clarify the approval process as well as the time necessary to complete the approval process, changes to submission forms that now require institutional leadership to verify that the institution is not currently offering the program and that it has not communicated to students in any manner that the coursework or program will lead to a California credential until such time as the approval process is complete. The changes made serve to 1) clarify expectations for institutions that have not previously operated an educator preparation program in California, and 2) serve as a vehicle to alert staff in a timely manner of any program that may be intentionally or unintentionally misleading candidates into believing the program they are taking is approved by the Commission and will result in a California credential.

*Strengthened the Commission's ability to deny accreditation.* The COA spent considerable time in 2011-12 addressing the issue of Denial of Accreditation. The California Education Code and the *Accreditation Framework* specify three levels of accreditation: Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations, and Denial of Accreditation. The COA has further specified varying levels of stipulations depending on the severity of deficiencies found at an institution. Commission policies and practices have been to reserve the use of Denial of Accreditation until after an institution has been provided with the opportunity to address stipulations. The *Accreditation Handbook* contained language that reserved this option for only after a revisit had occurred. Teams could only consider this option after an institution had hosted an initial accreditation site visit and been given ample opportunity to rectify deficiencies.

The COA took action in June 2012 to change the *Accreditation Handbook* language to allow the accreditation teams the ability to recommend Denial of Accreditation on an initial visit (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2012-06/2012-06-item-16.pdf>). Over the course of several meetings, the COA adopted a revised definition of Denial of Accreditation since the previous definition was based on the assumption that the institution would have been given a year to address stipulations. The Commission retained this language for institutions that had been denied accreditation after a revisit, but adopted language to help guide accreditation teams in understanding when it would be appropriate to recommend Denial of Accreditation on

an initial visit. The COA adopted parameters for when this option should be considered and adopted revised the operational implications for this accreditation decision. This fundamental change in approach provides the COA with a powerful tool for accountability should the situation arise where such a decision is warranted.

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

*Review and take action to grant initial approval of new credential programs.* This is also one of the major ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. 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 approval until the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met. A list of the 74 credential programs approved in the 2011-12 year is included in Section II of this report.

*Conduct and review program assessment activities.* Institutions in the Violet cohort have completed or will soon complete the program assessment process, while those in the Indigo cohort began the process. Those programs that have completed or begun program assessment in 2011-12 are included in Appendix A.

*Integrate Induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system.* 2011-2012 was the third year for inclusion of Induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system, and the second year for site visits. All cohorts have submitted at least one Biennial Report and all but two cohorts (Blue and Green) have participated in program assessment. In 2011-12, 21 of the 38 institutions with accreditation visits were to Local Education Agencies with induction programs. The COA notes that despite the fiscal challenges facing districts and the flexible funding that has posed a challenge for some induction programs, those visited this past year were found to be providing exceptional services to the new teachers and meeting the vast majority of induction standards.

*Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation.* Review teams conducted technical assistance visits to two institutions in preparation for a full accreditation site visit in the future. A list of institutions that hosted a technical assistance site visit in the 2011-12 year is included in Section II.

*Disseminate information related to the Commission's Common Standards.* Ensuring that institutions understand the requirements contained in the Common Standards continued to be an important function during the 2011-12 year. Discussions continued to take place with Commission staff and Cluster Regional Directors, and with the COA on the Common Standards, particularly on Common Standard 2 which is among the more difficult standards to understand. For Common Standard 2, the COA worked to adopt additional guidance to assist institutions, team leads, and consultants in understanding the various components necessary to meet Common Standard 2.

*Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment.* In 2010, the Commission began to use a small group of experts in three approved models of the teaching performance assessment to review institutional responses to all standards applicable to the TPA. This strategy was continued in 2011-12 and was generally successful in ensuring the documentation indicated that the

programs were designed to meet the standards. In addition, each site visit team to a program that was implementing the TPA was comprised of at least one individual who had a good understanding of the requirements for the TPA implementation. Commission staff would like to continue to work on additional strategies to ensure that site visit teams are appropriately trained to understand the various complexities of TPA implementation.

*Continue the discussion of how the Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system.* Subject matter programs continue to be outside the ongoing accreditation cycle. Unless the Commission is able to find additional resources, this particular topic, although important, will not be part of the work plan for the 2012-13 year.

#### **Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement**

*Collect, analyze, and report on biennial reports submitted in fall 2011.* The 2011-2012 academic year was the fifth full year of implementation of the biennial report component of the revised accreditation system. All institutions in three of the seven cohorts (Red, Green, Indigo) were required to submit candidate competence and performance data in their biennial reports in the fall of 2011. A list of all institutions required to submit biennial reports is included in Appendix A. The CTC feedback form was modified for institutions submitting in fall 2011 in order to more clearly indicate beneficial aspects of the biennial report that tied to the data and to program standards. Calibration of reviewers on data submitted in the biennial report will continue to be important in 2012-13.

*Continue development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.* Staff and the COA continued to work to ensure that additional evaluation components are embedded into the system. An on-line evaluation form that team members, team leaders, and institutions complete at the conclusion of a site visit continued to be used successfully. A major focus was providing assistance to institutions as they prepared their biennial reports, both through on-site meetings and webcasts. The evaluation data from site visit teams and institutions will be evaluated and discussed with the COA.

*Continue Partnership with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate.* The Partnership Agreement with NCATE was renewed in 2007 and is effective through 2014. The COA will continue monitoring the agreement to make certain that the implementation of the partnership results in assuring that state issues are appropriately addressed in each joint NCATE-CTC visit and that the process reduces duplication. In 2011-12, the COA approved modifications to the NCATE Partnership. The Partnership Agreement with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) was scheduled to expire in 2012. The Commission has participated fully in the pilot of the NCATE continuous improvement model and the first institution in California was reviewed under the transformational initiative model.

With the unification of NCATE and TEAC into the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), the Commission anticipates developing a new protocol with CAEP. NCATE and TEAC originally requested states to begin the process of developing new protocols with the unified entity and then asked to postpone that process until the new entity had progressed further in its development. In the coming months, the COA will begin discussion of the development of a California CAEP protocol.

*Monitor the agreement detailing how the Commission's accreditation system can function in alignment with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).* The COA took action in January 2010 to adopt the initial agreement with TEAC. The agreement is for two years and one institution, Chapman University, had a joint site visit in February 2011. The COA continued to monitor the agreement both before and after this first review to ensure that the process is efficient and effective. The COA completed the alignment matrix in 2011 which identifies which concepts in the Commission's Common Standards were addressed by the TEAC Quality Principles and Standards of Program Capacity and which concepts were not explicitly addressed. Although the TEAC partnership agreement expires in 2012, the CAEP staff have indicated that new protocols will be negotiated in the near future. As previously mentioned, CTC staff will begin to work with CAEP staff in 2012-13 to develop a new protocol for California.

*Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes.* During 2011-12, the Commission staff worked with the Pupil Personnel Services School Social Work community to develop a standards alignment matrix. Work will continue to vet this draft with stakeholders and to make refinements as appropriate. In the coming months, the COA will determine whether to adopt the alignment matrices with the PPS School Social Work. If adopted by the COA, the Commission will have determined alignment matrices for the American Speech Language Hearing Association (ASHA), the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), and the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP).

### **General Operations**

In addition to the above-mentioned items, the COA engaged in routine matters necessary for general operations of the Committee. This included the election of Co-Chairs, the adoption of a meeting schedule, orientation of new members, and modification of the *Accreditation Handbook*.

## Section II: Summary of 2011-2012 Accreditation Activities

This section of the report provides more detailed information about elements of the 2011-2012 Work Plan with a focus on accreditation activities.

### *Professional Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Credential Preparation Programs*

2011-2012 accreditation decisions were made based upon the written reports of the evidence gathered at the site visit, recommendations made by the team, and the COA interview of program leadership and the team lead. Teams reviewed documentation, interviewed a variety of constituencies (candidates, program completers, faculty, employers, administration, supervisors, etc.), deliberated, and came to consensus on findings for all common standards, program standards, and an accreditation recommendation. Commission consultants, team leads, and institutional representatives attended Committee on Accreditation meetings to present the results of the site visit report and respond to questions. Copies of the site visit team reports are available on the Commission’s website at: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accreditation-reports.html>. The COA made the following accreditation determinations in 2011-12:

<b>COA Accreditation Decisions 2011-2012 Visits</b>	
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
CalStateTEACH	Accreditation
St. Mary’s College	Accreditation
University of California Santa Barbara	Accreditation
California State University Sacramento	Accreditation with Stipulations
Association of California School Administrators	Accreditation
California State University Dominguez Hills	Accreditation with Stipulations
California State University Los Angeles	Accreditation
University of San Diego	Accreditation
Point Loma Nazarene	Accreditation
Burbank USD	Accreditation
Orange USD	Accreditation
Los Angeles USD (414/433)	Accreditation
Manteca USD (311)	Accreditation
Sonoma State University	Accreditation
University of California, Berkeley	Accreditation
Arcadia USD (435)	Accreditation
Pleasanton USD (230)	Accreditation
Riverside COE (612)	Accreditation
Pacific Union College	Accreditation with Stipulations
Davis Joint USD (104)	Accreditation
Campbell USD (203)	Accreditation
Tulare City ESD (318)	Accreditation
Marin COE (110)	Accreditation
Poway USD (521)	Accreditation
Hanford ESD (321)	Accreditation

<b>COA Accreditation Decisions 2011-2012 Visits</b>	
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
Pepperdine University	Accreditation with Stipulations
Concordia University	Accreditation
Placer COE (114)	Accreditation
University of California Santa Cruz	Accreditation
Sutter COE (121)	Accreditation
Redwood City (214)	Accreditation
Oakland USD (212)	Accreditation
Chula Vista ESD (505)	Accreditation
Culver City USD (407)	Accreditation
University of California Los Angeles	Accreditation with Stipulations
Bay Area School for Enterprise/REACH (234)	Accreditation with Stipulations
Contra Costa COE (204)	Accreditation
Temple City USD (425)	Accreditation with Stipulations

In addition, in 2011-12, revisits were conducted for five institutions assigned stipulations as a result of site visits conducted in 2010-11. After these revisits, the COA made the following decisions:

<b>2011-2012 Accreditation Follow-Up</b>		
<b>Revisits</b>		
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>2010-11 Decision</b>	<b>2011-12 Revisit Decision</b>
California State University, Stanislaus	Accreditation (Visit was to address NCATE standard only)	Accreditation
California Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Kings COE	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations	Accreditation
Rialto USD	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation
The Master's College	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
<b>Submission of Documentation Addressing Stipulations</b>		
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>2009-10 Decision</b>	<b>2011-12 Decision</b>
High Tech High	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation with Stipulations Retained two stipulations
San Jose State University	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation

### ***Analysis of Standard Decisions***

As previously noted, a total of 38 visits took place in 2011-12. Of the 38 site visits, 15 were to institutions of higher education, 22 visits were to school districts and county offices of education, and one was to the Association of California School Administrators. 2011-12 was the second year when Induction programs sponsored by local education agencies (school districts

and county offices of education) were fully integrated into the Commission’s accreditation system.

The Commission’s revised Common Standards (2008) and all appropriate credential program standards were utilized in all accreditation site visits in 2011-2012. For institutions that are also NCATE accredited, the NCATE Unit Standards and the four components of the Commission’s Common Standards are used for the site visit.

A review of the year’s site visit results serves as information for the COA and staff in determining needs of institutions for technical assistance meetings and as a guide for institutions as they prepared for site visits. The information regarding findings on the Common Standards from 2011-2012 is presented in the following table.

<b>Findings on the Common Standards 2011-2012 Accreditation Site Visits</b>			
<b>Summary of 38 site visits</b>	<b>Standard Findings</b>		
	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Standard 1: Education Leadership	34	4	0
	89%	11%	0%
Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	29	7	2
	76%	18%	5%
Standard 3: Resources	35	3	0
	92%	8%	0%
Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel	38	0	0
	100%	0%	0%
Standard 5: Admission	38	0	0
	100%	0%	0%
Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	36	2	0
	95%	5%	0%
Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice	37	1	0
	97%	3%	0%
Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors (not applicable to Tier II preparation programs)	12	3	0
	80%	20%	0%
Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence	36	2	0
	95%	5%	0%

The Common Standards that posed the most difficulty in meeting fully were Common Standard 1: Education Leadership and Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation. Common Standard 2 had the highest percentage not fully met (23%). It was also the only standard that received a “not met” finding (2 institutions). For institutions with preliminary preparation programs, Common Standard 8 was less than fully met 20% of the time.

A summary of the information gathered on each type of educator preparation program at the 38 site visits is presented in a series of tables below. Each type of credential program is noted separately. If a standard is not listed, all institutions which offer that program met that standard. As with the information about the Common Standards, this information about standards that were *Not Met* or were *Met with Concerns* guides the COA and staff in determining what additional technical assistance might be helpful to the field.

<b>Preliminary Multiple Subject Standards (16 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Design	1	
7A: Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction	1	
11: Using Technology in the Classroom	1	
14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom	2	
15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork	3	

<b>Preliminary Single Subject Standards (15 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Design	1	
7B: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts	1	
11: Using Technology in the Classroom	1	
14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom	2	
15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork	3	

<b>General Education Induction Standards (23 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Rationale and Design,	3	
2: Communication and Collaboration	1	1
3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers	2	1
6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students	1	

<b>General Education (MS/SS) Clear (5 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Rationale and Design	1	1
2: Communication and Collaboration		1
3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers		1

<b>Preliminary Education Specialist Teaching Credentials and Other Related Services Credential (1-16)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination	1	
2: Assessment and Evaluation of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities	1	
15: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options	4	



<b>Clear Education Specialist Induction Standards (6 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Rationale and Design	1	1
2: Communication and Collaboration		1
3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers		1
7: Education Specialist Induction Program Menu	1	

<b>Reading Certificate (5 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination	1	

<b>Career Technical Education (3 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Design and Rationale		1
6: Determination of CTE Teacher Competence		1
7: Advanced Programs of Preparation		1

<b>Preliminary Administrative Services ( 11 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
9: Assessment of Candidate Competence	1	

<b>Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work (3 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
11: Learning Theory and Educational Psychology	1	

All program standards were found to be met in a number of credential programs. The table below lists program types and the total number of those programs where all standards were met during 2011-12 site visits.

<b>Credential Programs with All Program Standards Met</b>	<b>Number of Site Visits</b>
Adapted Physical Education	1
Bilingual Authorization	3
California Teachers of English learners (CTEL)	3
Career/Technology Education Program	1
Clinical Rehab: Orientation and Mobility	1
Designated Subjects	2
Education Specialist Added Authorization: Adapted Physical Education	2
Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder	4
Education Specialist Added Authorization: Emotionally Disturbed	1
Education Specialist: DHH	1
Education Specialist: ECE	3

<b>Credential Programs with All Program Standards Met</b>	<b>Number of Site Visits</b>
Education Specialist: ECSE Level I and II	1
Education Specialist: ECSE AA	1
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Level I	5
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Level II	2
Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Level I	2
Education Specialist: Moderate Severe Level II	3
Education Specialist: PHI	1
Education Specialist: VI	1
General Education, MS	3
General Education, SS	3
General Education, MS/SS	4
General Education Induction	13
General Education Clear	1
Clear Education Specialist Induction	6
Preliminary Administrative Services	10
Professional Clear Administrative Services	7
Pupil Personnel: School Social Work	2
Pupil Personnel: Child Welfare & Attendance	5
Pupil Personnel: School Counseling	9
Pupil Personnel: School Psychology	5
Reading Certificate (only)	1
Reading Language Arts Specialist	4
School Nurse	1
School Nurse: Special Teacher Authorization	1
Speech and Language Pathology Special Class	1
Speech-Language Pathology	2

***Technical Assistance Site Visits***

Institutions new to the Commission’s accreditation system host a technical assistance site visit approximately two years before the scheduled site visit. During the 2011-12 year, technical assistance visits were held at the following institutions:

- Inner City Educational Foundation (ICEF – Los Angeles Unified School District)
- Animo Leadership Charter High School (Green Dot Public Schools)

After the technical assistance site visit an information item is presented to the COA on the progress of the entity in preparing for its future site visit and generally on its implementation of the standards in its first years of operation.

***Initial Approval of New Credential Programs***

Institutions that would like a program to be considered for Initial Program Approval submit a document that indicates how the program will meet each of the Commission-adopted program standards along with supporting documents that serve as evidence to verify the claims made. In

addition, the institution submits a response to all relevant program specific preconditions that are reviewed by Commission staff as well as a Common Standards document (or a Common Standards addendum if the institution has recently submitted Common Standards). A team of educators who have expertise in the program area and are trained for the review process read the standards documents and consult with one another to determine whether standards are met. If the reviewers jointly agree that standards are met, it is so noted. If the review team agrees that standards are not met, reviewers request specifically what additional information is needed. This feedback is shared with the institution by the CTC staff. When all standards are found to be met and all relevant preconditions are determined to be addressed, Commission staff forwards the item, along with a paragraph about the program written by the institution, to the COA agenda at the next scheduled meeting. Initial program approvals include programs that are new to the credential area. 2011-2012 Initial Program Approval actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation are listed in the tables below.

<b>Preliminary Multiple Subject (4)</b>
Bard College
Humphreys College
Teachers College of San Joaquin
Antioch University

<b>Preliminary Single Subject (2)</b>
Bard College—Social Science, English Language Arts, Science, Mathematics, Music
Teacher College of San Joaquin—Agriculture, Art, Business, English, Health, Home Economics, Industrial and Technology Education, Languages Other than English, Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Science, Social Science

<b>General Education (MS/SS) Clear (3)</b>
Claremont Graduate University
Dominican University of California
Antioch University

<b>General Education (MS/SS) Induction (1)</b>
Teachers College of San Joaquin

<b>Reading Certificate (Added Authorization) (1)</b>
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

<b>Bilingual Authorization (8)</b>
California State University, Sacramento (Spanish and Hmong)
California State University, San Marcos (Spanish)
University of Southern California (Spanish)
University of California, San Diego (American Sign Language)
California State University San Bernardino (Spanish)
Fresno State University (Spanish and Hmong)
University of California Los Angeles (Spanish)

<b>Bilingual Authorization (8)</b>
San Francisco State University (Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese)

<b>Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Disabilities (4)</b>
University of Redlands
University of Southern California
Teachers College of San Joaquin
Antioch University (with internship)

<b>Preliminary Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Disabilities (1)</b>
Teachers College of San Joaquin

<b>Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder (6)</b>
Fresno Unified School District
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
Ontario-Montclair School District
San Diego County Office of Education
Teachers College of San Joaquin
Antioch University

<b>Early Childhood Special Education Credential (1)</b>
Teachers College of San Joaquin

<b>Education Specialist Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education (4)</b>
Ventura County Office of Education
Madera County Office of Education
San Joaquin County Office of Education
Stanislaus County Office of Education

<b>Education Specialist Added Authorization: Orthopedically Impaired (1)</b>
Madera County Office of Education

<b>Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (3)</b>
Sacramento County Office of Education
Mills College
Teachers College of San Joaquin

<b>Professional Administrative Services (5)</b>
Notre Dame de Namur
Placer County Office of Education
REACH Institute for School Leadership
Santa Clara County Office of Education
San Mateo/Santa Cruz County Office of Education

<b>Designated Subjects: Career and Technical Education (3)</b>
California State University, Long Beach
North State Beginning Teacher Program with Tehama County Department of Education
Orange County Department of Education

<b>Clear Education Specialist Induction (22)</b>
San Diego Unified School District
San Luis Obispo County Office of Education
Walnut Valley BTSA Induction Consortium
Monterey County Office of Education
Murrieta Valley Unified School District
Pleasanton Unified School District
Santa Cruz County Office of Education
Riverside Unified School District
Santa Clarita Valley BTSA Consortium
Claremont Graduate University
National Hispanic University
California State University, Los Angeles
Etiwanda School District
Orange County Department of Education
San Dieguito School District
Stockton Unified School District
William S. Hart Union High School District
Bakersfield City School District
San Bernardino City Unified School District
Tracy Unified School District
Campbell Union School District
Hacienda La Puente Unified School District

<b>Designated Subjects: Adult Education (2)</b>
Ventura County Office of Education
University of California, Berkeley

<b>Added Authorization in Adapted Physical Education (1)</b>
Azusa Pacific University

<b>Agriculture Specialist (1)</b>
University of California, Davis

<b>Teacher Librarian Services Credential: Information and Digital Literacy Special Class Authorization (1)</b>
California State University, Long Beach

### ***Transitioned Programs***

In 2011-12 institutions continued to transition their existing programs from prior standards to newly adopted standards. When the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) adopted its updated Unit Standards, NCATE did not require all accredited institutions to submit a new proposal addressing the revised standards. Beginning with the Education Specialist standards revision, the Commission is implementing a standard transition process that parallels the NCATE process, requiring that all accredited institutions meet the revised standards as of a specific date. Either within one year after an institution has transitioned to new standards, or during the next regularly scheduled program assessment if it falls within an acceptable time frame, the institution will be evaluated against the updated standards. Provided below is the list of programs that transitioned in 2011-12.

<b>Preliminary Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate (10)</b>
National Hispanic University
Antioch University, Los Angeles
California State University, East Bay
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
Fresno Pacific University
Los Angeles Unified School District
Mt. Diablo Unified School District/Fortune School of Education
Pacific Oaks University
San Diego State University
University of La Verne

<b>Preliminary Education Specialist, Moderate/Severe (4)</b>
California State University, East Bay
Fresno Pacific University
Los Angeles Unified School District
San Diego State University

<b>Preliminary Education Specialist, Deaf and Hard of Hearing (2)</b>
University of California San Diego
California State University, Fresno

<b>Preliminary Education Specialist, Physical and Other Health Impairments (2)</b>
California State University, Los Angeles
Fresno Pacific University

<b>Orthopedically Impairments (1)</b>
California State University, Los Angeles

<b>Preliminary Education Specialist, Early Childhood Special Education (5)</b>
San Diego State University
Fresno Pacific University
California State University, Dominguez Hills

California State University, Fullerton
National University

<b>Speech-Language Pathology (SLP) Services (8)</b>
California State University, Chico
California State University, Fullerton
San Francisco State University
San Jose State University
California State University, Sacramento
California State University, Los Angeles
California State University, San Marcos
California State University, East Bay

<b>Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder (8)</b>
California State University, Los Angeles
California State University, East Bay
Antioch University, Los Angeles
Los Angeles Unified School District
Santa Clara University
California State University, Stanislaus
University of La Verne
California State University, Monterey Bay

<b>Added Authorization: Adapted Physical Education (8)</b>
California State University, Chico
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
San Francisco State University
California State University, Long Beach
Humboldt State University
California State University, San Bernardino
Sonoma State University
California State University, Northridge

<b>Education Specialist Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education (13)</b>
California State University, Bakersfield
San Jose State University
California State University, Chico
San Diego State University
University of California, Riverside
California State University, Dominguez Hills
California State University, Fullerton
California State University, San Bernardino
Fresno Pacific University
National University

Point Loma Nazarene University
San Joaquin County Office of Education – Project Impact
San Francisco State University

<b>Education Specialist Added Authorization: Resource Specialist (5)</b>
Azusa Pacific University
California State University, Dominguez Hills
California State University, Northridge
Fresno Pacific University
California State University, Fullerton

<b>Speech-Language Pathology Services (3)</b>
San Diego State University
University of Redlands
California State University, East Bay

<b>Education Specialist Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance (1)</b>
Point Loma Nazarene University

<b>Other Related Special Education Services, Orientation and Mobility (1)</b>
San Francisco State University

<b>General Education Clear (1)</b>
Whittier College

<b>Reading Certificate (4)</b>
California State University, East Bay
University of La Verne
San Diego State University
Sonoma State University

<b>Reading and Language Arts Specialist (2)</b>
San Diego State University
Sonoma State University

***Inactive Status***

Institutions may temporarily cease offering an approved program for a variety of reasons such as decreased need in the service area or changes in faculty with expertise in the area. In the past, once a program was approved, it was listed as approved on the Commission website even if the program was not being offered at the institution. At the May 2008 meeting, the COA took action to allow institutions to declare a program to be ***Inactive***. A program may be declared inactive for a maximum of five years. Inactive status does not excuse an institution from accreditation activities. All inactive programs must participate in accreditation activities in a modified manner as determined by the Commission. The following programs noted below were declared to be in an Inactive status in 2011-12.



<b>Professional Preparation Programs Entering Inactive Status in 2011-2012 (23)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
University of San Diego	California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) Program, effective July 5, 2011
	BCLAD (Spanish Program) effective July 15, 2011
Santa Rosa City Schools	General Education (MS/SS) Induction Credential Program, effective August 1, 2011
	Education Specialist Credential Program, effective August 1, 2011
Dos Palos Oro Loma USD	General Education (MS/SS) Induction Credential Program, effective June 2, 2011
California State University, Chico	Reading Language Arts, Effective August 24, 2009 CTEL Certificate Program, effective September 1, 2011
California State University, Sacramento	Single Subject Credential with Internship Option, effective August 19, 2011
	Resource Specialist Credential, effective August 10, 2011
	Added Authorization – Adapted Physical Education, effective September 15, 2011
University of Redlands	Special Class Authorization Program, effective September 7, 2011
Pacific Oaks College	Level II Education Specialist Credential–Mild/Moderate Disabilities, effective September 30, 2011
California State University, San Bernardino	Health Services: School Nurse, effective October 13, 2011
California State University, Dominguez Hills	Education Specialist - Added Authorization – Autism Spectrum Disorder, effective September 1, 2011
Argosy University	Preliminary Multiple Subjects, effective October 27, 2011
	Preliminary Single Subjects (Mathematics, English, General Science, Social Science, Physical Education, Health, Home Economics, Languages Other than English), effective October 27, 2011

### ***Withdrawal of an Approved Program***

For a variety of reasons, institutions may choose to no longer offer an approved program. Institutions are encouraged to formally seek a withdrawal of these programs thus removing the program from the Commission’s accreditation system. The program is then no longer considered a Commission approved program. If an institution decides to offer a program in the future, it is a minimum of two years before a new program proposal will be accepted. The following institutions and programs selected this option in the 2011-2012 year.

<b>Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (26)</b>	
Bethany University	Multiple Subject Credential Program
	Single Subject Credential Program
La Sierra University	Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling

California State University, San Marcos	Education Specialist Credential Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance
	General Education (MS/SS) Clear
California State University, Chico	Other Related Education Specialist Services: Special Class Authorization: Speech Language Pathology Level II Education Specialist Program: Early Childhood Special Education Certificate Program
	Reading Language Arts Specialist
	Reading Certificate Program
	Teacher Librarian Services Credential
University of California, Los Angeles	Designated Subjects – Adult Education Program
	Designated Subjects – Career Technical Education Program
California State University, Los Angeles	Health Services: School Nurse Credential Program
University of California, Santa Barbara	Multiple and Single Subject Programs, BCLAD Emphasis
Sonoma State University	Education Specialist: Resource Specialist
California State University, Bakersfield	Bilingual and Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) Spanish
	Reading/Language Arts Specialist
	School Nurse
California State University, Fullerton	Speech Language Pathology: Special Class Authorization
Occidental College	Preliminary Multiple Subjects Preliminary Single Subjects (English, Languages Other than English, Mathematics, Music, Science, and Social Science)

***Reactivation of Inactive Program***

An inactive program may be re-activated only when the institution submits a request to the COA and the COA has taken action to reactive the program. If the program standards under which the program was approved have been modified, the institution or program sponsor must address the updated standards before the program may be re-activated. During 2011-12, the COA refined its process for reactivating an inactive program. Only three programs previously deemed inactive requested and received reactivation and are once again fully approved programs operating in California.

<b>Reactivation Requests in 2011-2012</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
University of La Verne	Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential
University of Redlands	CTEL Program
California Lutheran University	Multiple and Single Subject Intern Programs

***Initial Institutional Approval***

The Committee on Accreditation does not have authority to approve the eligibility of institutions to offer educator preparation programs in California. Rather, initial institutional approval is within the purview of the Commission. Once the Commission determines that an institution is eligible to offer educator preparation in California, the program proposals by those institutions are brought forward to the COA for its consideration and action. The institutions granted initial institutional approval by the Commission in 2011-12 are listed below:

<b>Institutions Granted Initial Institutional Approval by the Commission 2011-2012</b>	
Antioch University	Bard College
Teachers College of San Joaquin	

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

During 2011-12, four institutions ceased to be Commission-approved program sponsors due to a variety of circumstances. Antioch Los Angeles and Antioch Santa Barbara have been unified under Antioch University. Bethany College closed its doors in fall of 2011. In addition, the withdrawal of all programs previously operated by Occidental College means the institution is no longer an approved program sponsor.

### **Section III:**

## **Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2012-2013**

On June 14, 2012, the Commission approved 14 recommendations related to implementation of the Commission's accreditation system in 2012-13. This discussion was precipitated by the Commission's challenging fiscal situation in which staff has determined that the operational funding is insufficient in 2012-13 to implement the accreditation system as designed. The Commission was faced with the difficult decision of having to postpone all accreditation site visits for one year. <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-06/2012-06-6B.pdf>. A list of the 14 recommendations adopted by the Commission is included as Appendix D.

The COA discussed these adopted recommendations for the 2012-13 year at its August 2012 COA meeting. After the discussion, the 2012-13 work plan was modified to reflect the Commission's actions and direction on accreditation activities. The 14 recommendations, therefore, have been incorporated into the following.

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

*Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation.* All Committee meetings will continue to be held in public and all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. In addition, meetings will be transmitted via audio broadcast to allow any individual with access to the internet the ability to hear live or recorded broadcasts of all Committee meetings. The Commission's website will continue to be utilized fully to provide agenda items, notification of meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation. Meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

August 16, 2012  
October 18, 2012  
February 7, 2013  
June 27, 2013

It is important to note that at full operation of the accreditation activities in 2011-12, the COA met for 6 two-day meetings and 1 one-day meeting. The meeting schedule for 2012-13 has been modified to four one day meetings to reflect the reduced site visit schedule as well as the limitations on the Commission's budget. Small ad hoc working groups of COA members have agreed to help research topics related to the implementation of the accreditation system for 2012-13 via technology between meetings. These are discussions only and no action will be taken.

In 2012-2013, the *PSD ENews*, Program Sponsor Alerts, and press releases will be routinely used to ensure a transparent accreditation process. Additionally, frequent technical assistance workshops on the various aspects of the accreditation process and procedures will also be provided to ensure broad understanding of accreditation requirements and expectations.

*Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission.* The Committee on Accreditation will present its annual report to the Commission in the fall/winter. Additional updates and reports to the Commission will be provided as necessary and appropriate throughout the year.

*Commission liaison.* Maintaining a liaison from the Commission to the COA continues to be a critical aspect of the current process. The Commission's liaison will continue to provide an important perspective to COA discussions and serve as an effective means of communication between the COA and the Commission.

*Examine additional potential revenue sources to support the accreditation system by developing a fee recovery system for certain accreditation activities.* Among the recommendations approved by the Commission in June 2012 were two recommendations that the COA will explore during 2012-13. The COA will assist staff and the Commission develop a fee recovery system for accreditation revisits and other activities that exceed the regularly schedule accreditation activities. In addition, the COA will assist staff and the Commission to develop a fee recovery system where by new programs and new institutions would be assessed a fee to cover the cost for reviewing new programs and new institutional proposals.

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

*Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs.* This is one of the principal ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of institutions and their credential programs. However, the Commission acted in June 2012 to postpone all but one accreditation site visit for 2012-13 due to the significant fiscal situation faced by the Commission. The Commission will use the 2012-13 year to prepare institutions for the resumption of 2013-14 site visits.

The accreditation activities for 2012-13 adopted by the Commission in June 2012 included the recommendation that the Commission continue with any scheduled revisits and special site visits in 2012-13. Two revisits are currently scheduled for 2012-13 and the Commission believes that those can be conducted with small teams and thus the costs involved will be absorbable.

*Review and revise the Accreditation Handbook.* The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. The COA completed a comprehensive review and update of the Accreditation Handbook in 2011-12. These updated chapters will be posted on the website. As the Commission examines the system for refinement and streamlining in 2012, the COA and staff will continue to keep in mind any changes in the system that are made to ensure they are reflected appropriately in the Handbook.

*Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission.* Staff will continue to prepare agenda items for the COA on issues related to the Commission's work as directed by the Commission or as appropriate. The COA will continue to discuss issues referred to it by the Commission and provide guidance as appropriate.

*Develop and Pilot a Program Completer Survey.* The Commission's adopted activities for 2012-13 include the development of a pilot program completer survey to collect data that can be used in the accreditation process. The Commission staff has already begun to collect information about other program completer surveys that are in use and has solicited individuals from the field who are interested in assisting in this effort. The COA will help guide and support this effort throughout the year and, in particular, will be instrumental in determining the role of these survey results in accreditation decisions.

*Discuss which standards provide the most leverage in terms of program analysis and quality improvements based on data.* The Commission's adopted activities for 2012-13 included a recommendation that the COA discuss with the Commission which standards provide the most leverage in terms of program analysis and quality improvements based on data. The COA began this discussion at its August 2012 meeting. It was noted that this recommendation is particularly challenging due to the fact that all of the standards are important to quality programs. The COA will continue to explore this topic in greater depth in 2012-13.

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

*Review and take action to grant initial approval of new credential programs.* This is also one of the major ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. 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 approval until the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met. This review process will continue in 2012-13 despite budget constraints. In order to use the limited resources available and still continue to review new program proposals, reviews will be conducted with a combination of approaches – as many on site reviews as the budget allows, supplemented by remote reviews. While remote reviews tend to result in a lengthier approval process, the Commission staff will continue to monitor the length of time to respond to proposals and work to conduct these reviews as efficiently as possible.

*Conduct and review program assessment activities.* In 2012-13, institutions in the Indigo cohort will be completing the program assessment process. However, the Commission's action to postpone some accreditation activities in 2012-13 impacts program assessment. As a result, the Commission will continue to complete program assessment for the institutions in the Indigo cohort, while those in the Blue cohort that would have been submitting program assessment documents in fall 2012 will not be submitting until fall 2013. (A cohort list and the institutions in each cohort is provided in Appendix C.)

In addition, the Commission's accreditation system has a considerable work load in the Education Specialist area with respect to program assessment. As previously discussed, institutions transitioning to new program standards are provided one year of operation under the new standards prior to submitting a program document, or must submit one during the regular program assessment period should the timelines be acceptable. A significant number of program assessment documents will be reviewed in 2012-13 for alignment with the new Education Specialist program standards as the timeline for transitioning many of these programs has past.

Further, as part of the discussion regarding streamlining the accreditation process, the COA began the discussion in the summer/fall of 2012 of whether to revise the types of documentation necessary for program assessment. This discussion continues.

*Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation.* The COA typically considers the issues identified by technical assistance review teams in their review of institutions new to the accreditation process in California. Review teams provide technical assistance to these institutions in preparation for a full accreditation site visit. However, because the Commission acted to postpone accreditation site visits, no technical assistance visits will take

place in 2012-13. A list of institutions that would have typically been scheduled for a technical assistance site visit in the 2012-13 year, but that will now be scheduled for one in 2013-14, is included in the appendix.

*Disseminate information related to the Commission's Common Standards and Program Standards.* Efforts to assist institutions in understanding the Commission's Common Standards will continue in 2012-13 through a variety of strategies. Common Standard 2 will continue to be a primary focus of these efforts, although additional assistance is likely needed across all Common Standards. An updated webinar focusing on Common Standard 2 is expected to be available in November 2012. Additional topics for technical assistance on Common Standards and program standards will be explored in 2012-13.

*Integrate Induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system.* The COA took action in January 2009 to transition Induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system beginning July 1, 2009. Earlier sections of this report discussed the successes around this integration. Commission staff will continue to work with the Cluster Regional Directors to refine, improve and streamline the processes related to accreditation of Induction programs.

*Continue the discussion of how Subject Matter Programs can be included in the accreditation system.* With the Commission's action in fall 2006 that all programs leading to an authorization to teach or provide services in California's public schools need to be reviewed through the Commission's accreditation system, the subject matter programs are the only programs that have not been integrated into the accreditation system. Due to budget constraints, this work is unlikely to take place in 2012-13.

*Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment.* During 2009-10, the Commission staff, the Committee on Accreditation, and the Teaching Performance Assessment Users Advisory Committee (UAC) began discussing more effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the Teaching Performance Assessment to ensure appropriate implementation. These strategies began being implemented in 2010-11 and continued in 2011-12. Discussions about how well these strategies are working will continue to be part of the streamlining discussion about accreditation in general. Additional strategies are necessary to recruit individuals with expertise in the teaching performance assessment models to assist in related accreditation activities. Further training will be considered to better prepare site visit team members reviewing the implementation of the teaching performance assessment.

*Work with stakeholders and the Committee on Accreditation to develop a more streamlined and targeted site visit model that is cost effective, rigorous, and focused on the essential attributes of high quality educator preparation.* The 2012-13 accreditation activities adopted by the Commission in June 2012 included a focus on reconsidering the current site visit model. Although some of the activities listed in this work plan could result in a more cost effective, streamlined site visit (such as the use of a program completer survey), the COA will continue to discuss this topic in depth throughout 2012-13.

#### **Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement**

*Collect, analyze, and report on the biennial reports submitted in fall 2012.* The 2011-2012 academic year will be the fifth full year of implementation of the biennial report component of the revised accreditation system. All institutions in the Violet, Yellow and Blue cohorts are required to submit candidate competence and performance data in fall 2012. The recommendations adopted by the Commission in June 2012 included the recommendation to continue with the biennial report submission, review, and feedback for all institutions as currently scheduled for 2012-13.

A major focus of the effort will be to provide assistance to institutions as they prepare their biennial report and to analyze information from institutions to ensure appropriate responses to the requirements of the biennial report. (A cohort list, and the institutions in each cohort, is provided in Appendix C.)

Also included among the 14 recommendations adopted by the Commission in June 2012 was a recommendation to increase the consistency and comprehensiveness of the data collected, analyzed and reported on for each type of educator preparation program. The recommendation noted that the initial focus for technical assistance efforts in this area would be on the development, analysis, and use of teaching performance assessment data within the biennial reports followed by data provided for the site visit. COA anticipates spending considerable time in 2012-13 on this topic assisting staff and experts in each of the credential areas in identifying and employing strategies to assist the field in this regards across all credential areas.

The COA will also assist the Commission staff during 2012-13 in the development of a pilot where program directors/leaders come together to review biennial reports, with an initial focus on one type of credential preparation program. The purpose, as described in the June 2012 Commission agenda item is to develop a process for building capacity within the preparation programs to think deeply about candidate assessment data, the analysis of the data, and using data to drive program improvement.

*Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.* Although site visits have been deferred for a year, it is expected that the Commission and the COA will use this time period to make improvements and refinements in its accreditation processes. The evaluation data available on the accreditation system will be critical to ensuring that any changes are appropriate and strengthen the accreditation system. Examining the data from the previous year's site visits will be discussed with the COA members at the October 2012 meeting. Additional work will be undertaken to improve the information the Commission has about the efficacy of program assessment and biennial reporting.

*Continue partnership with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate.* The Partnership Agreement with NCATE was renewed in 2007 and is effective through 2014. The COA will continue monitoring the agreement to make certain that the implementation of the partnership results in assuring that state issues are appropriately addressed in each joint NCATE-CTC visit and that the process reduces duplication. In June 2011, the COA had begun discussions about a revised protocol in light of the unification of NCATE and TEAC into the new organization, Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). However, subsequent direction from NCATE suggested they temporarily halted the development of all



new protocols until after the unification details have been worked out. The COA will continue discussing a new protocol in 2012-13 since the unification of TEAC and NCATE is progressing.

*Monitor the agreement detailing how the Commission's accreditation system can function in alignment with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).* In 2009-10, the COA took action to adopt the initial agreement with TEAC. Chapman University was the first institution in California that earned TEAC accreditation. Because of the unification of TEAC and NCATE, and because no other entity in California has indicated a desire to move toward TEAC accreditation, Commission activities in this area in 2011-12 were limited. However, the formal TEAC Partnership Agreement will expire in 2012. As previously mentioned, CTC staff will begin to work with CAEP staff in 2012-13 to develop a new protocol for California.

*Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes.* In 2011, the Commission staff participated in meetings with the representatives of the School Social Work community. Preliminary work was done to identify the areas of alignment between the Commission PPS: School Social Work standards and the Council on Social Work Education Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (CSWE-EPAS) 2008. In 2012-13, it is anticipated that work could continue to collect stakeholder feedback on the draft alignment matrix and to make refinements. The final document is expected to be presented for consideration and possible adoption in 2012-13. Should the Commission receive requests for analysis of the alignment of other national and professional organization standards with those of the Commission, the COA will review the analysis, consistent with its responsibilities set forth in the Education Code, and determine issues of comparability.

### **General Operations**

In addition to the above mentioned items, the COA will engage in routine matters necessary for general operations of the Committee. This includes the election of Co-Chairs, the adoption of a meeting schedule, and orientation of new members.

## **Section IV: Three Year Summary of Accreditation Activities and Improvements Made in 2011-12 by Institutions with Stipulations**

For the first time since the accreditation system was reinstated in 2007, the COA, together with Commission staff, compiled the findings from accreditation site visits from 2009-2012 to determine if there was important information that could be gleaned about the quality of institutions and programs in California and the overall impact of the revised accreditation system.

The following tables include only data from the revised system. Data for 2007-08 and 2008-09 were also tabulated but not included in this report. In previous reports to the Commission, staff had noted that data from these two years immediately after the hiatus suggested there had been significant “drift” in alignment to standards. For example, during the 2008-09 accreditation year, under the previous system, 10 out of 15 institutions, or 67%, received Accreditation with Stipulations as compared to an average of 22 out of 82 (27%) in the three years of site visits that occurred during 2009-2012.

The data from the three years of the new system, beginning in 2009, are significant because they represent the first three years in which all aspects of the accreditation system were in operation – that is, institutions that hosted an accreditation visit in 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12 had submitted a program assessment document in advance of a site visit as well as a biennial report.

The first table in this section depicts the number of accreditation activities (program assessment, biennial reports and site visits) that were conducted as well as a breakdown of issues found at site visits with Common and Programs Standards. The second table tallies the number of new and transitioned programs Commission staff and volunteers have dealt with during these three years, as well as other issues regarding programs and institutions. The third table provides a closer look at the number and types of stipulations and 7<sup>th</sup> Year Reports that were the result of the 82 site visits. In many cases, these data are broken down by whether the institutions were large (10+ programs), medium (2-9 programs) or small (only 1 program). (Please note that the definition of large, medium and small for purposes of this report refers only to the number of programs and not the number of candidates.) Some of the trends noted are:

- The number of institutions that had less than full accreditation has decreased significantly during the initial 3 years—from 54% to 18%
- In 2011-12 there were no accreditation decisions with Major or Probationary Stipulations
- Issues related to Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation were the highest with 28%, compared to Standard 5: Admission which had only 1% of the identified issues
- Over half (55%) of the programs reviewed met all program standards.

The COA and staff will use these data to help guide and inform the type of technical assistance that should be offered institutions in the future. The data may also be helpful as the Commission considers streamlining and efficiency efforts for accreditation over the course of the next year.

## ACCREDITATION ACTIVITIES: 2009-2012

(Institution Size by # of Programs: Small: 1 | Medium: 2-9 | Large: 10+Programs)

TOPIC	ITEM	2009-10			2010-11			2011-12			Totals		
Accreditation Activities	<b>Institutions Completing Program Assessment</b> (374 programs)	42			40			38			120		
	<b>Biennial Reports</b>	52			102			117			271		
	<b>Site Visits</b>	13			31			38			82		
	# Small   Medium   Large	<u>S</u> 4	<u>M</u> 4	<u>L</u> 5	<u>S</u> 22	<u>M</u> 5	<u>L</u> 4	<u>S</u> 14	<u>M</u> 18	<u>L</u> 6	<u>S</u> 40	<u>M</u> 27	<u>L</u> 15
	% Small   Medium   Large	31%	31%	38%	71%	16%	13%	37%	47%	16%	49%	33%	18%
	<b>Less than Full Accreditation</b>	7			8			7			22		
	% of total visits/year	54%			26%			18%			27%		
	# Small   Medium   Large	<u>S</u> 3	<u>M</u> 2	<u>L</u> 2	<u>S</u> 4	<u>M</u> 2	<u>L</u> 1	<u>S</u> 1	<u>M</u> 2	<u>L</u> 3	<u>S</u> 8	<u>M</u> 7	<u>L</u> 6
	% Small   Medium   Large	23%	23%	15%	13%	6%	3%	3%	5%	8%	10%	9%	7%
	Stipulations	3			5			7			15		
	Major	4			1			0			5		
	Probationary	0			2			0			2		
	<b>Common Standards Issues (MWC/NM) (Total)</b>	28			30			24			82		
	Standard 1: Educational Leadership	3			7			4			14		
	Standard 2: Assessment System	8			5			9			23		
	Standard 3: Resources	5			1			3			9		
	Standard 4: Faculty	2			7			0			9		
	Standard 5: Admission	0			1			0			1		
	Standard 6: Advisement	3			3			2			8		
	Standard 7: Field Experience	3			2			1			6		
Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors	2			2			3			7			
Standard 9: Candidate Competence	2			2			2			6			
<b># of Programs Reviewed at Site Visits</b>	96			72			206			374			
Programs w/ All Standards Met	62			26			118			206			
# of Program Standards MWC or NM	42			49			42			133			
<b>Institutions -- Required 7<sup>th</sup> Year Reports Only</b>	2			4			4			10			
<b>Revisits Required/Year</b>	4			6			1			11			
# of Institutions not cleared a year later	0			0			3			3			

## Program-Specific Information

(Institution Size by # of Programs: Small: 1 | Medium: 2-9 | Large: 10+Programs)

Type	PROGRAM	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	Totals
<b>New Programs</b>	Preliminary Multiple/Single Subject	2	2	7	11
	General Education (MS/SS) Induction	2	5	1	8
	General Education (MS/SS) Clear	2	0	3	5
	Bilingual Authorization	5	15	8	28
	California Teachers of English Learners	1	0	0	1
	Ed Sp Level I: Mild/Moderate	0	0	4	4
	Ed Sp Level I: Moderate/Severe	1	0	1	2
	Ed Sp Level I: Early Childhood Sp Ed	0	0	1	1
	Clear Education Specialist Induction	4	34	22	60
	Ed Sp: Autism Spectrum Disorder AA	4	8	6	18
	Ed Sp: Early Childhood Sp Ed AA	0	0	4	4
	Ed Sp: Orthopedic Impairments AA	0	0	1	1
	Ed Sp: Traumatic Brain Injury AA	0	0	1	1
	Career and Technical Education	5	6	3	14
	Adult Education	0	0	2	2
	Reading Certificate	0	0	0	0
	Reading Language Arts Specialist	0	0	0	0
	Agriculture Specialist	1	0	1	2
	Adapted Physical Education AA	0	0	1	1
	Preliminary Administrative Services	3	3	3	9
	Professional Administrative Services	0	0	5	5
	PPS: School Psychology	0	0	0	0
	PPS: School Counseling	0	2	0	2
	PPS: Child Welfare and Attendance	0	0	0	0
	Speech Language Pathology	0	1	0	1
	Teacher Librarian: Special Class Authorization	0	0	1	1
<b>Totals</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>181</b>
<b>Transitioned Programs</b>	Preliminary Ed Sp: Mild/Moderate	0	21	10	31
	Preliminary Ed Sp: Moderate/Severe	0	16	4	20
	Preliminary Ed Sp: Early Childhood Sp Ed	0	5	5	10
	Preliminary Ed Sp: Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing	0	2	2	4
	Preliminary Ed Sp: Visual Impairments	0	2	0	2
	Preliminary Ed Sp: Physical and HI	0	1	2	3
	Ed Sp: Other Health Impaired AA	0	0	2	2
	Ed Sp: Early Childhood Special Education AA	0	0	13	13
	Ed Sp: Orthopedic Impairments AA	0	0	1	1
	Ed Sp: Emotional Disturbance AA	1	0	1	2
	Ed Sp: Autism Spectrum Disorder AA	9	12	8	29
	Adapted Physical Education AA	0	0	8	8
	Reading Certificate	0	0	4	4
	Reading and Language Arts Specialist	0	0	2	2
	Other Related Services: O&M	0	0	1	1
	Speech-Language Pathology	0	5	11	16
	Health Services School Nurse	0	1	0	1
	<b>Totals</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Misc.</b>	<b>Inactive Programs</b>	18	40	22	80
	<b>Withdrawn Programs</b>	9	20	21	50
	<b>Program Reactivation Requests</b>	0	3	3	6
<b>Other</b>	<b>New Institutions</b>	11	3	5	19
	<b># Institutions No Longer Program Sponsors</b>	0	1	2	3
	<b>Technical Assistance Site Visits</b>	5	2	2	9

### Program-Specific Information

(Institution Size by # of Programs: Small: 1 | Medium: 2-9 | Large: 10+Programs)

<b>Details on Stipulations and 7<sup>th</sup> Year Reports</b>						
(Institution Size by # of Programs: <u>Small</u> : 1   <u>Medium</u> : 2-9   <u>Large</u> : 10+Programs)						
Small (12) Medium (11) Large (9)	Year	Stipulations	Standards (75) & Programs (23)	7 <sup>th</sup> Year Reports (10)	Quarterly Reports (4)	Revisits (11)
M	09-10	----	2,9 (EdSpec)	x		
S	09-10	----	3 (MS/SS)	x		
L	09-10	Stipulations	2			
L	09-10	Stipulations	1,2			
S	09-10	Stipulations	2			
M	09-10	Major	2,3,4,7,8 (MS/SS, EdSpec)			X
M	09-10	Major	1,2			X
S	09-10	Major	1,2,4,7,8,9 (MS/SS)			X
S	09-10	Major	2,3,7 (MS)			X
L	10-11	----	1,4	x		
M	10-11	----	2,3 (EdSpec, Admin)	x		
S	10-11	----	1,4	x		
S	10-11	----	1 (Induction)	x		
L	10-11	Stipulations	2, (MS/SS)			
L	10-11	Stipulations	1,2,4			X
M	10-11	Stipulations	2		X	X
M	10-11	Stipulations	1,4,8 (MS/SS)			
S	10-11	Stipulations	2,4 (MS/SS)			X
S	10-11	Major	1,2,3,4		X	X
S	10-11	Probationary	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,9 (Induction)		X	X
S	10-11	Probationary	1,2,4,5,6,7,9 (MS/SS)		X	X
L	11-12	----	6	x		
M	11-12	----	2	x (BR)		
M	11-12	----	1,8,9 (MS/SS, CTE)	x		
S	11-12	----	3 (Induction)	x		
L	11-12	Stipulations	2, 3			
L	11-12	Stipulations	1,2 (MS/SS)			
L	11-12	Stipulations	1 (MS/SS)			X
M	11-12	Stipulations	3			
M	11-12	Stipulations	2 (MS/SS)			
M	11-12	Stipulations	7,8 (MS/SS, Induction)			
S	11-12	Stipulations	4 (Induction)			

<b>Follow-Up On Common Standards Resulting In Stipulations and 7<sup>th</sup> Year Reports (75 Total)</b>				
<b>Standard 1: Educational Leadership—(14)</b>		<b>Standard 5: Admission—(2)</b>		
<b>Standard 2: Assessment and Evaluation—(20)</b>		<b>Standard 6: Advice and Assistance—(3)</b>		
<b>Standard 3: Resources—(9)</b>		<b>Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice—(6)</b>		
<b>Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel—(11)</b>		<b>Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors—(5)</b>		
<b>Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence—(5)</b>				
<b>Programs with Stipulations and Required Reports (23 Total)</b>				
<b>MS/SS (13)</b>	<b>ED SPEC (3)</b>	<b>DS: Adult ED, CTE (1)</b>	<b>Induction (5)</b>	<b>Preliminary Admin (1)</b>

## **Improvements Made in 2011-12 by Institutions with Stipulations**

This section documents some of the modifications that were made by institutions as a result of stipulations placed upon the institution after the accreditation visit in 2010-11. Institutions with stipulations have one year to satisfactorily address all stipulations. Institution may be provided with additional time if COA believes the institution has made sufficient progress in addressing the stipulations and if the nature of the changes necessary warrant additional time. Below is a brief summary of some of the deficiencies identified by the site visit review teams and the actions taken to address the stipulations. Each institution's accreditation report contains a greater level of detail and may be accessed at: [https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/accreditation/accreditation\\_reports.html](https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/accreditation/accreditation_reports.html).

### ***Institutions with Probationary Stipulations***

Two institutions that were visited by accreditation teams in 2010-11 were granted *Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations* by the Committee on Accreditation – Occidental College and Kings County Office of Education. For reference, below is the definition contained in the *Accreditation Handbook for Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations*.

*The recommendation of Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations indicates that an accreditation team identified serious and pervasive deficiencies in the institution's implementation of the Common Standards and program standards applicable to the institution, or that the team found areas of concern (such as matters of curriculum, field experience, or candidate competence) that substantially impact the preparation of credential program candidates. The team identified issues that prevent the institution from delivering high quality, effective programs. The review team may have found that some of the institution's credential programs are effective in preparing educators and/or that its general operations are adequate, but the team determined that these areas of quality clearly do not outweigh the identified areas of concern.*

### **Occidental College**

Occidental College offered the Multiple and Single Subject credential programs. The accreditation site visit team found in spring 2011 that only 1 of the Common Standards was met, 2 were met with concerns and 6 were not met. Eight of the 19 Multiple and Single Subject standards were found to be not met. The COA placed Occidental on probationary status; prohibited the institution from accepting additional candidates; required an action plan within a few weeks after the COA action, follow up reports every 60 days from the institution, and a follow up visit to the institution in the fall of 2011 to ensure that those remaining candidates were receiving a quality program that met state requirements. The institutional leadership subsequently made the decision to withdraw all teacher education programs as a result of the findings of the review team, to teach out those candidates that remained in various stages in the program, and to take time to reevaluate the institutions' role in teacher education.

The Commission assigned a consultant to work with the institution over the course of the 2011-12 academic year to ensure that each of these candidates was able to complete the program, was provided a quality program, completed the teaching performance assessment, and was able to be recommended for a credential, and that the institution followed through with all of the reporting requirements issued by the COA. The COA reviewed the institution's action plan at the August 2011 meeting, reviewed the revisit report at the October 2011 meeting, and received follow up reports at each of the February 2012, April, 2012, and June 2012 meetings. By the August 2012

COA meeting, all current candidates had either completed the program and all state requirements or had declined to complete for various individual reasons.

The institution will be eligible to reapply for initial institutional approval in June of 2013. The Commission staff has committed to work with the institution should it decide to move forward with teacher education in the future.

### **Kings County Office of Education**

Kings County Office of Education (COE), which offers a General Education Induction Program, was recommended by the accreditation site visit review team for Major Stipulations. After the review of the report and discussion with the institution and team lead, the COA determined that the institution be awarded Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations. The review team had determined that of the 8 Common Standards, four were met with concerns and 2 were not met, in addition of the 6 Induction Program standards, 5 were met with concern and 1 was not met.

In making a stronger determination than recommended by the review team, the COA acknowledged one overarching issue identified by the review team. As described in the accreditation report by the team, the team found that the program was largely a compliance, paperwork driven process, rather than a true induction program that encourages and assists new candidates to reflect on effective practice. The report summarized the major finding:

*There is no consistent body of evidence to suggest that that the educational unit understands that the goal of Induction is to develop the habits of mind demonstrated by teachers who know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. As a result, neither support providers nor participating teachers have that understanding as well. Available evidence and data collected through stakeholder interviews defined program requirements as form-driven rather than behavior-driven.*

The COA required quarterly reports from Kings COE on the progress it was making in addressing each of the stipulations and required a revisit in spring of 2012. A Commission consultant was assigned to work closely with Kings COE to ensure that progress was being made.

The changes that the review team was able to confirm one year later in May of 2012 were described in the site visit report as follows:

*Formative assessment is now at the heart of the Kings COE Induction program. The participating teachers, support providers, site administrators, and advisory board members interviewed were able to articulate the purposes of formative assessment and universally agree that the Kings COE Induction program is supporting all participating teachers to develop and demonstrate the skills defined in the CSTP.*

*Reflective conversation has become a focus of the Kings COE Induction program in 2011-12 and site administrators, support providers and participating teachers expressed not only their understanding and importance of this focus but the impact and growth this has had on teacher outcomes and student learning. Participating teachers articulated how the formative assessment system and the*

*reflective conversations have supported each participant as they grow and develop expertise as a teacher.*

***Institutions with Stipulations***

Other institutions received accreditation decisions of Accreditation with Stipulations or Accreditation with Major Stipulations. Below is a summary of the remainder of the site visits and the changes that were made:

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
<b>Rialto Unified School District</b>	<b>Major Stipulations, January 2011 Stipulations Removed, March 2012</b>
<p><i>Summary of Major Improvements:</i></p> <p>Rialto Unified School District offers the General Education Induction Program. The accreditation review team found that RUSD did not meet one of the nine common standards and had 3 other Common Standards met with concern. The COA issued 7 Stipulations including requiring quarterly reports and prohibiting the institution from not admitting new candidates to the program. The COA required that the institution provide evidence that the leadership supports a clear vision for teacher preparation and fosters cohesive management including clear communication and lines of authority and responsibility; 2) implement a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, completers and stakeholders and demonstrate potential for assuring continuous program improvement; 3) that the program receive sufficient resources to enable the program to operate effectively, particularly in terms of coordination and program development; 4) that the institution provide evidence that all faculty and instructional personnel are provided with opportunities for professional development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new research based vision was developed and infused throughout the program.</li> <li>• Redefined and clarified induction program roles and responsibilities or program leadership and personnel such that the program has created a cohesive management team that is responsive to the needs of its candidates, frequently shares information about the program and its goals with institutional leadership, responds quickly to suggestions for program improvement.</li> <li>• Developed new tools and survey instruments to evaluate various components of the program. Program and Institutional leadership now review the data from these instruments and document program modifications and improvements to the program that results.</li> <li>• A budget revision process was developed and a commitment was made by the district to allocate additional resources to support additional support providers should participant levels exceed 25.</li> <li>• District required and optional professional development opportunities are widely shared by the district personnel. All Rialto induction faculty have taken advantage of the training opportunities.</li> </ul>	



<b>Institution</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
<b>Antioch University, Santa Barbara</b>	<b>Stipulations, Spring 2011</b> <b>Stipulations Removed, Spring 2012</b>
<p><i>Summary of Major Improvements:</i></p> <p>The accreditation review team found that Antioch Santa Barbara lacked a unit assessment system (Common Standard 2). Past practices at AUSB included informal assessments and relied heavily on anecdotal evidence of individual candidates. No system was in place to ensure that data was being collected analyzed and utilized at the unit level. Among the ways AUSB addressed the stipulation over the course of the next year were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hired a designated program coordinator who had the responsibility to oversee the collection, analysis and utilization of data to identify trends and inform decisions.</li> <li>• Implemented a process for systematic analysis of data being collected such as end of quarter student evaluations of faculty and coursework.</li> <li>• Provided evidence that it was now collecting and analyzing additional program effectiveness information such as program completer and employer survey data.</li> <li>• Implemented new tracking processes to ensure success from admission to completion in all programs.</li> <li>• Implemented additional guidance for candidates that were identified through the data of in need of additional assistance to complete credential requirements.</li> </ul>	
<b>California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo</b>	<b>Stipulations, April 2011</b> <b>Stipulations Removed, March 2012</b>
<p><i>Summary of Major Improvements:</i></p> <p>The COA issued stipulations on Cal Poly SLO that included: 1) the implementation of a unit wide assessment system; 2) a clear description of the structures and procedures employed to ensure that unit leadership has the authority and responsibility for effectively overseeing all unit operations and representing the needs of all programs within the institution; 3) implement a process for the systematic recruitment and retention of diverse faculty. Among the improvements that the institution made were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hired a fulltime assessment coordinator to oversee assessment for the School of education, including management of the PACT. The review team determined that a broad range of data are being reviewed and analyzed across programs and at the unit level. They were able to confirm that data plays a central role in discussions and are helping build unit wide understanding and collaboration.</li> <li>• The Dean’s role and authority have been made explicit and clear. The proper leadership of the School of Education have been vested in a Dean and collaborative work groups representing all constituents have been collaborating. The review team found that these groups have proved very effective in bringing understanding, transparency, trust, and focus to the work of the school of education over a very short period of time. These changes have promoted fundamental changes in how faculty and staff collaborate within and across programs and have fostered significant improvements in program and unit operations.</li> <li>• Created a diversity committee, developed a diversity plan, and put in place strategies to support new faculty.</li> <li>• Within the single subject credential there is now a coordinator who arranges the appropriate practicum placement for all candidates meeting state requirements.</li> </ul>	

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
<b>San Jose State University</b>	<b>Stipulations, March 2011</b>
<p><i>Summary of Major Improvements:</i>  By all accounts as confirmed by the site visit team, SJSU operated a variety of high quality programs in diverse settings and serves a large number of candidates across the spectrum of credential programs. The institution is one of the oldest in state history and its contributions to educator preparation in California are notable. However, the accreditation team found issues relating to whether the candidates in several pathways for the multiple subject program, notably the pathways with full year placements and in the middle school emphasis program, were not receiving the breadth of experiences required by the Commission standards. Additionally, the team was concerned that those in the upper elementary and middle school placements were not receiving extensive opportunities to work with beginning readers. Improvements that the institution made to the program included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all candidates, regardless of pathway or placement, are provided opportunities to work with beginning readers.</li> <li>• Augmenting the year long placements with opportunities for all candidates to gain opportunities to teach students in multiple settings and the full range of subjects required of multiple subjects credential.</li> </ul> <p>Because of the variety of possible placements and pathways, the institution agreed to provide the Commission with individual student level data demonstrating that it was following through on ensuring that all candidates were getting opportunities to observe and practice the variety of subjects and levels required.</p>	
<b>The Master’s College</b>	<b>Stipulations, March 2011</b> <b>Stipulations Removed, February 2012</b>
<p><i>Summary of Major Improvements:</i>  The Master’s College (TMC) accreditation decision of Accreditation with Stipulations was a result of the site visit team’s findings on Common Standards 2 and 4, as well as several program standards for the Multiple/Single Subject credential.</p> <p>TMC did not have a research-based vision, required in Common Standard 1, to provide direction for programs, courses, and teaching. The institution worked with its Community Advisory Committee to develop a conceptual framework, The Four Pillars, which provides guidance for all aspects of their program and, in particular, connects current educational research to revisions in program courses to focus more intentionally on diversity and culture. TMC also had several issues in relation to culture and diversity: a non-diverse faculty; opportunities for candidates to learn about and experience cultural, ethnic and gender differences; and limited knowledge on the part of faculty members regarding historical and cultural traditions of the cultural and ethnic groups in California. TMC created an Intercultural Education Advisory Council—a diverse group of faculty, pastors, educators, and community leaders—which provides direction, feedback and resources to broaden the TMC community’s understanding and appreciation of diversity. This council worked with faculty to devise strategies to recruit new faculty members from diverse backgrounds, assisted in creating intentional networking opportunities with minority churches, and provided guidance in faculty professional development in the area of culture and diversity.</p>	

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
<b>University of Phoenix</b>	<b>Stipulations Spring 2011 Stipulations Removed Spring 2012</b>
<p data-bbox="186 260 630 291"><i>Summary of Major Improvements:</i></p> <p data-bbox="186 296 1382 474">The 2011 accreditation site visit team determined that five of the nine Common Standards were met and three were met with concerns. Additionally, all program standards were met with the exception of one Multiple/Single Subject program standard – Standard 16: Learning, Applying, and Reflecting on the Teaching Performance Expectations which was met with concerns.</p> <p data-bbox="186 516 1369 764">The concerns of the site visit team did not center around a common theme, but rather were four somewhat disparate issues – lack of articulation of a research-based vision of the education unit, the lack of evidence around the recruitment of diverse faculty that are reflective of a diverse society, consistency in training of district employed supervisors, and clarity in the oversight of supervision of candidate competence with regard to subject matter competence and pedagogy by qualified individuals. Examples of improvements that the institution made were as follows:</p> <ul data-bbox="237 772 1390 1440" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarified and infused the education unit’s vision throughout the program documents, within materials for candidates, and linked the themes of the conceptual framework to assignments, activities, and coursework for candidates.</li> <li>• Developed new hiring plans and reexamined the campus faculty recruitment plan. Demonstrated efforts to ensure that all sites were making deliberate efforts to recruit qualified and diverse faculty and instructional personnel.</li> <li>• Required all faculty supervisors to attend training that prepares them to serve in the role of cooperating teacher prior to placement of the candidate in the teachers classroom.</li> <li>• Develop a standardized statewide orientation and training for cooperating teachers to ensure consistency.</li> <li>• Required attendance at a face to face training prior to the student teaching process.</li> <li>• Enhanced the documentation of the faculty supervisor qualifications to candidate field placement according to content experience and licensure.</li> <li>• Documented support and ensured appropriate alignment of student teacher and faculty supervisor.</li> <li>• Clarified the process used by university supervisor and district employed supervisor to evaluate the candidate.</li> </ul>	

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
<b>National Hispanic University</b>	<b>Major Stipulations, Spring 2010</b> <b>Removed all but 1 Stipulation, Spring 2011</b> <b>Removal of final Stipulation, February 2012</b>
<p><i>Summary of Major Improvements:</i></p> <p>No one theme resonated throughout the programs at NHU. The COA placed the following stipulations on NHU in 2010: 1) that every intern must be supervised by a university supervisor during the entire internship; 2) major stakeholders must be involved in the organization, coordination and governance of the programs; 3) that a unit assessment plan must be created; 4) that there be the development of a uniform system of professional development of field supervisors and master teachers with regular and systemic evaluation. The spring 2011 accreditation revisit team concluded that all of the stipulations had been addressed with the exception of #1 above. The COA acted to remove all but #1 in spring 2011. The revisit team found that the institution had addressed the issue of providing support to the interns throughout the duration of the program had been addressed for the multiple and single subject programs but had not yet been addressed for candidates in the Education Specialist program.</p>	
<b>High Tech High</b>	<b>Stipulations, Spring 2009</b> <b>3 stipulations removed, some stipulations</b> <b>Continued, August 2010</b> <b>Two of the three remaining stipulations removed</b> <b>in October 2011</b> <b>Removed last remaining stipulation in August</b> <b>2012</b>
<p><i>Summary of Major Improvements:</i></p> <p>The issues identified by the 2009 site visit team centered on a general theme that the program was somewhat insulated from the larger educational community. The site visit team determined that four of the nine Common Standards were met with concern and that 5 were met. The COA listed six stipulations in June 2009, removed three of the six in 2010, removed two additional stipulations in 2011, and removed the final stipulation in August 2012. Among the changes that the institution made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developed and implemented strategies to expand the diversity of the instructional personnel to work with High Tech High Interns.</li> <li>• Developed and implemented efforts to encourage and support applicants from diverse populations.</li> <li>• Instituted new requirements to the program that ensured that all candidates had opportunities to observe and reflect on a range of educational settings outside of High Tech High.</li> <li>• Provided additional opportunities and evidence that candidates use assessments for individualized content based reading instruction.</li> <li>• Instituted new requirements that interns were provided with additional opportunities to observe and participate in classrooms in hard to staff and/or underperforming schools.</li> </ul>	

**Appendix A: Accreditation Activities 2011-12  
Biennial Reports Submitted in Fall 2011**

<b>RED COHORT</b>	<b>GREEN COHORT</b>	<b>INDIGO COHORT</b>
<b>California State University</b>	<b>California State University</b>	<b>California State University</b>
Dominguez Hills	Channel Islands	Bakersfield
Los Angeles	East Bay	Cal Poly Pomona
Monterey Bay	San Bernardino	Chico
Sonoma State		Humboldt
	<b>Private/Independents</b>	Long Beach
<b>University of California</b>	California Lutheran University	San Marcos
Berkeley	Mills College	
Los Angeles	Notre Dame de Namur	<b>Private/Independents</b>
Santa Cruz	Patten University	Azusa Pacific University
	Simpson University	Brandman University
<b>Private/Independents</b>	Western Governors University	Fielding Graduate University
Concordia University	Westmont College	Mt. St. Mary's College
Pacific Union College		University of Redlands
Pepperdine University	<b>Local Education Agencies</b>	University of San Francisco
Pt. Loma Nazarene University	Antioch USD	University of Southern California
University of San Diego	Bakersfield City SD	
	Castaic Union SD	<b>Local Education Agencies</b>
<b>Local Education Agencies</b>	Evergreen SD	Animo Leadership (Green Dot)
Arcadia USD	Fairfield-Suisun USD	Baldwin Park USD
Davis Jt. USD	Fresno COE	Brentwood Union SD
Marin COE	Garden Grove USD	Central USD
Placer COE	Hacienda LaPuente USD	Fullerton SD
Sutter County SOS	La Mesa-Spring Valley SD	High Tech High
Campbell Union SD	Los Angeles COE	Lancaster SD
Contra Costa COE	Madera COE	Madera USD
Oakland USD	Merced COE	Metropolitan Education District
Pleasanton USD	Montebello USD	Monterey COE
Redwood City SD	Newark USD	Oceanview SD
BASE/REACH	Oceanside USD	Orange County DOE
Manteca USD	San Bernardino City USD	Pasadena USD
Tulare City SD	San Diego COE	Placentia-Yorba Linda USD
Hanford ESD	San Juan USD	Sacramento COE
Dos Palos Oro Lomo JUSD	San Mateo – Foster City SD	San Diego USD
Burbank USD	Santa Ana USD	San Dieguito Union HSD
Culver City USD	Saugus Union SD	San Joaquin COE
Los Angeles USD		San Jose USD
Temple City USD		San Ramon Valley USD
Chula Vista ESD		Santa Clara COE
Cajon Valley Union SD		Santa Monica-Malibu USD
Orange USD		Stockton USD
Poway USD		Tracy USD
Riverside COE		Ventura COE
		Visalia USD
		Vista USD
		West Covina USD
		Westside Union SD

### Biennial Reports Due Fall 2012

<b>VIOLET COHORT</b>	<b>YELLOW COHORT</b>	<b>BLUE COHORT</b>
<b>California State University</b>	<b>California State University</b>	<b>California State University</b>
Fresno	Northridge	Fullerton
San Francisco	San Diego	
Monterey Bay	Stanislaus	<b>University of California</b>
		Riverside
<b>University of California</b>	<b>Private/Independents</b>	
Davis	Biola University	<b>Private/Independents</b>
Irvine	Fresno Pacific University	Alliant International University
San Diego	Loyola Marymount University	Argosy University
	National Hispanic University	Dominican University of California
Other Sponsors	San Diego Christian College	Drexel University
Boston Reed College	Santa Clara University	Holy Names University
	Touro University	Loma Linda University
<b>Private/Independents</b>	Whittier College	Phillips Graduate Institute
Antioch University Los Angeles	William Jessup University	Stanford University
Claremont Graduate University		United State University
Hebrew Union College	<b>Local Education Agencies</b>	Vanguard University
Hope International University	Anaheim City SD	
La Sierra University	Capistrano USD	<b>Local Education Agencies</b>
National University	Chino Valley USD	Bellflower USD
Pacific Oaks College	Clovis USD	California School for the Deaf/Fremont
	Etiwanda SD	Corona-Norco USD
<b>Local Education Agencies</b>	Lodi USD	Elk Grove USD
Antelope Valley UHSD	Napa COE	Encinitas Union SD
Compton USD	Ontario-Montclair SD	Escondido Union SD
Cupertino Union SD	Panama-Buena Vista USD	Fresno USD
El Dorado COE	Pomona USD	Glendale USD
Envision Schools	Riverside USD	Greenfield Union SD
Escondido Union HSD	Rowland USD	Grossmont Union HSD
ICEF Public Schools/LAUSD	Saddleback Valley USD	Kern High SD
Imperial COE	San Gabriel USD	Lawndale ESD
Irvine USD	Santa Clara USD	Long Beach USD
Keppel Union SD	Santa Cruz COE	Magnolia Public Schools – Pacific Technology School – Orange County
Kern County SOS	Sonoma COE	Mt. Diablo USD/Fortune School of Education
Los Banos USD	Stanislaus COE	Oakgrove SD
Murrieta Valley USD	Sweetwater Union HSD	Palmdale SD
New Haven USD	Walnut Valley USD	PUC Schools
Norwalk La Mirada		San Luis Obispo COE
Palo Alto USD		San Mateo COE
Palos Verdes Peninsula USD		Tehama County DOE
San Francisco USD		Torrance USD
Sacramento City USD		Tulare COE

Selma USD		Tustin USD
Sanger USD		Vallejo City USD
Sequoia Union HSD		Wiseburn SD
Washington USD		
William S. Hart Union HSD		

**Program Assessment**

Institutions completing Program Assessment in 2012-13  
 Program Assessment Document Resumed in 2013-14

Indigo  
 Blue

**2011-12 Site Visits (Red Cohort)**

Association of California School Administrators	Orange USD
Arcadia USD (435)	Pacific Union
Bay Area School of Enterprise/REACH	Pepperdine University
Burbank USD	Placer COE (114)
Cajon Valley USD (506)	Pleasanton USD (230)
Campbell USD (203)	Poway USD (521)
Chula Vista ESD (204)	Pt. Loma Nazarene
Concordia University	Redwood City (214)
Contra Costa COE (204)	Riverside COE (612)
CSU Dominguez Hills	Sonoma State University
CSU Los Angeles	St. Mary's College
CSU Sacramento	Sutter COE (121)
Culver City USD (407)	Temple City USD (425)
Davis Joint USD (104)	Tulare City ESD (318)
Hanford ESD (321)	University of San Diego
Los Angeles USD (414/433)	University of California, Berkeley
Manteca USD (311)	University of California, Santa Barbara
Marin COE (110)	University of California, Santa Cruz
Oakland USD (212)	University of California, Los Angeles

**Institutions with a Revisit 2011-12**

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo	Rialto USD	Occidental College
Kings County Office of Education	California State University, Stanislaus	The Master's College

**Institutions with a Technical Assistance Site Visits 2011-2012**

ICEF Public Schools/LAUSD      Animo Leadership Charter HS (Green Dot)

**Appendix B**  
**2012-2013 Accreditation Activities**

*For a list of all institutions in each cohort, please see Appendix C*

<b>Biennial Reports</b>			
<b>Due Fall 2012</b>	Violet cohort	Yellow Cohort	Blue Cohort

  

<b>Program Assessment</b>	
Institution Completing Program Assessment Process in 2012-2013	Indigo cohort
Program Assessment is on hiatus during 2012-2013	---

  

<b>Institutions with a Site Visits</b>
Site Visits are on hiatus during 2012-2013 with the exception of Bard College

  

<b>Institutions with a Revisit</b>
University of California, Los Angeles Cal Poly San Luis Obispo



### Appendix C: Cohort Membership by Institution

Cohort	RED	ORANGE	YELLOW
2012-2013	<b>Year 7 7<sup>th</sup> Year Follow-Up</b>	<b>Year 1 --</b>	<b>Year 2 Biennial Report</b>
	<b>CSU</b>	<b>CSU</b>	<b>CSU</b>
	Dominguez Hills Los Angeles Sonoma State	Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo CalState TEACH Sacramento San Jose State	Northridge San Diego State Stanislaus
	<b>UC</b>	<b>UC</b>	<b>UC</b>
	Berkeley Los Angeles Santa Cruz	Santa Barbara	--
	<b>LEA</b>	<b>LEA</b>	<b>LEA</b>
	Arcadia USD Bay Area School of Enterprise/REACH Burbank USD Cajon Valley Union SD Campbell Union SD Chula Vista ESD Contra Costa COE Culver City USD Davis Joint USD Dos Palos Oro Lomo JUSD Hanford ESD Los Angeles USD Manteca USD Marin COE Oakland USD Orange USD Placer COE Pleasanton USD Poway USD Redwood City SD Riverside COE Sutter County SOS Temple City USD Tulare City SD	Alhambra USD Anaheim Union HSD Aspire Public Schools Azusa USD Butte COE Conejo Valley USD El Rancho USD Fontana USD Fremont USD Hayward USD Kings COE Merced Union HSD Milpitas USD Modesto City Schools Paramount USD Rialto USD San Marcos USD Santa Barbara CEO Santa Rosa City Schools School for Integrated Science and Technology/SIA Tech West Contra Costa USD	Anaheim City SD Capistrano USD Chino Valley USD Clovis USD Etiwanda SD Lodi USD Napa COE Ontario-Montclair SD Panama-Buena Vista Union SD Pomona USD Riverside USD Rowland USD Saddleback Valley USD San Gabriel USD Santa Clara USD Santa Cruz COE Sonoma COE Stanislaus COE Sweetwater Union HSD Walnut Valley USD
	<b>Private/Independent</b>	<b>Private/Independent</b>	<b>Private/Independent</b>
	Concordia University Pacific Union College Pepperdine University Point Loma Nazarene University of San Diego	California Baptist University Chapman University St. Mary's College of Calif. The Master's College University of La Verne University of Phoenix University of the Pacific	Biola University Fresno Pacific University Loyola Marymount University National Hispanic University San Diego Christian College Santa Clara University Touro University Whittier College William Jessup University
	<b>Other Sponsors</b>	<b>Other Sponsors</b>	<b>Other Sponsors</b>
		ACSA	
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Site Visit</b>	<b>2019-2020</b>	<b>2018-2019</b>	<b>2017-2018</b>

Cohort	<b>GREEN</b>	<b>BLUE</b>	<b>INDIGO</b>	<b>VIOLET</b>
2012-2013	<b>Year 3 Biennial Report</b>	<b>Year 4 --</b>	<b>Year 5 Biennial Report</b>	<b>Year 6 --</b>
	<b>CSU</b>	<b>CSU</b>	<b>CSU</b>	<b>CSU</b>
	Channel Islands East Bay San Bernardino	Fullerton	Bakersfield Cal Poly, Pomona Chico Humboldt Long Beach San Marcos	Fresno San Francisco State Monterey Bay
	<b>UC</b>	<b>UC</b>	<b>UC</b>	<b>UC</b>
	--	Riverside	--	Davis Irvine San Diego
	<b>LEA</b>	<b>LEA</b>	<b>LEA</b>	<b>LEA</b>
	Antioch USD Bakersfield City SD Castaic Union SD Evergreen SD Fairfield-Suisun City SD Fresno COE Garden Grove USD Hacienda La Puente USD La Mesa-Spring Valley SD Los Angeles COE Madera COE Merced COE Montebello USD Newark USD Oceanside USD San Bernardino City Schools San Diego COE San Juan USD San Mateo-Foster Santa Ana USD Saugus Union SD	Bellflower USD CA School for the Deaf Chaffey Joint Union HSD Corona-Norco USD Elk Grove USD Encinitas Union SD Escondido Union SD Fresno USD Glendale USD Greenfield Union SD Grossmont Union HSD Kern High SD Lawndale ESD Long Beach USD Magnolia Schools: Pacific Technology Mt. Diablo USD/Fortune School Oak Grove SD Palmdale SD PUC Schools San Luis Obispo COE San Mateo COE Tehama County DOE Torrance USD Tulare COE Tustin USD Vallejo City USD Wiseburn SD	Animo Leadership Charter HS: Green Dot Baldwin Park USD Brentwood Union SD Central USD Fullerton SD High Tech High Lancaster SD Madera USD Metropolitan Education District Monterey COE Ocean View SD Orange County DOE Pasadena USD Placentia-Yorba Linda USD Sacramento COE San Diego USD San Dieguito Union HSD San Joaquin COE San Jose USD San Ramon Valley USD Santa Clara COE Santa Monica-Malibu USD Stockton USD Tracy USD Ventura COE Visalia USD West Covina USD Vista USD West Covina USD Westside Union SD	Antelope Valley Union HSD Compton USD Cupertino Union SD El Dorado COE Envision Schools Escondido Union HSD ICEF Public Schools (LAUSD) Imperial COE Irvine USD Keppel Union SD Kern County SOS Los Banos USD Murrieta Valley USD New Haven USD Newport-Mesa USD Norwalk-La Mirada USD Palo Alto USD Palos Verdes Peninsula USD Sacramento City USD San Francisco USD Sanger USD Selma USD Sequoia Union HSD Washington USD Wm. S. Hart Union HSD

	<b>Private/Independent</b>	<b>Private/Independent</b>	<b>Private/Independent</b>	<b>Private/Independent</b>
	Cal Lutheran Univ. Humphreys College Mills College Notre Dame de Namur Univ. Patten University Simpson University Western Governors Univ. Westmont College	Alliant International University Bard College Dominican University Drexel University Holy Names University Loma Linda University Phillips Graduate University Stanford University United States University Vanguard University	Azusa Pacific University Brandman University Fielding Graduate University Mount St. Mary's College Teachers College of San Joaquin University of Redlands University of San Francisco	Antioch University Argosy University Claremont Graduate University Hebrew Union College Hope International Univ. La Sierra University National University Pacific Oaks College University of Southern California
	<b>Other Sponsors</b>	<b>Other Sponsors</b>	<b>Other Sponsors</b>	<b>Other Sponsors</b>
	--	--	--	Boston Reed
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Site Visit</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>

**Appendix D**  
**Recommendations Adopted by the Commission**  
**Related to Implementing the Commission's Accreditation System in 2012-13**

1. **Continue with the Biennial Report submission, review and feedback for all approved institutions as currently scheduled for 2012-13.** Submission dates have been selected by the institutions, with the first round of submissions currently arriving at CTC.
2. **Develop and implement a pilot where program directors/leaders come to the CTC (or another central location) to review Biennial Reports, with an initial focus on one type of educator preparation program to facilitate the pilot activities.** The purpose of the pilot would be to develop a process for building capacity within the preparation program to think deeply about candidate assessment data, the analysis of the data, and using data to drive program improvement.
3. **Increase the consistency and comprehensiveness of the data collected, analyzed, and reported on for each type of educator preparation program.** An efficient process would be to work with program sponsors to help them work with and incorporate data in future reports, possibly through a webinar. The initial focus for technical assistance efforts would be on the development, analysis, and use of teaching performance assessment data within the biennial reports, and the subsequent focus would be on the use of performance assessment data within the site visit process to help focus the visit on candidate outcomes and program quality issues.
4. **Continue with the Program Assessment process for all institutions in the Violet and Indigo cohorts.** This will allow the programs sponsored by the institutions in the Violet and Indigo cohorts to complete the review, and redesign if necessary, of each approved program. In addition, program assessment for Education Specialist programs that have transitioned will also be important. *2012-13 Accreditation Item 12 Implementation 2*
5. **Postpone the beginning of Program Assessment for institutions in the other five cohorts by one year.** The Blue cohort would submit in Fall 2013 rather than Fall 2012 and each of the other cohorts would be deferred by one year as well.
6. **Discuss with the Commission which standards provide the most leverage in terms of program analysis and quality improvements based on data.** A list of key essential standards would serve to focus programs on a smaller number of higher impact, essential standards than is presently the case.
7. **Provide technical assistance for program-specific groups to discuss and build understanding of the Commission's Common and program standards and clarify the essential attributes in the adopted standards.** Webinars could be a part of these activities and the webinar would be archived for later reference.
8. **Postpone all initial site visits scheduled for 2012-13 until 2013-14, and postpone subsequent visits by one year.** Use the 2012-13 year to provide technical assistance for institutions in preparation for the site visit (i.e., developing Preconditions reports, support for developing Common Standards narratives and electronic exhibits that are streamlined but allow an institution the ability to demonstrate ways it addresses the Commission's standards. Work to

help all institutions scheduled for visits in 13-14 to be efficiently prepared for the site visit programs.

9. **Conduct the scheduled accreditation revisits and special site visit scheduled for 2012-13.** When prudent, decrease the size of the team and/or the length of the visit to complete the visits in an economical yet rigorous manner.
10. **Develop and pilot a program completer survey to collect data that can be used in the accreditation process.** The survey would provide information relative to both the Common and program standards and could focus the site visit beginning with the visits in 2013-14.
11. **Work with stakeholders and the Committee on Accreditation to develop a more streamlined and targeted site visit model that is cost effective, rigorous, and focuses on the essential attributes of high quality educator preparation.** Discussions could take place with the COA over the course of 2012-13 and if it is determined that a revision to the site visit model, a pilot could occur in 2013-14.
12. **Develop a fee recovery system for accreditation revisits and other activities that exceed the regularly scheduled accreditation activities.** Use the 2012-13 year to explore whether a fee recovery system is appropriate for any part of accreditation.
13. **Continue to review program proposals in 12-13 through a distance reading process.** CTC staff would monitor and mediate the work between readers and between readers and the program.
14. **Develop a fee recovery system whereby new programs and new institutions would be assessed a fee to cover the cost for reviewing the new program or institutional proposal.** Use the 2012-13 year to explore whether a fee recovery system is appropriate for any part of accreditation.