



**The Committee on Accreditation's  
Annual Accreditation Report to the  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
2013-2014**

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 *2013-2014 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 2014-15 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 2013-14 and in the proposed work plan for 2014-15. We believe that aligning the *Annual Accreditation Report* to these purposes provides evidence of the integrity of the accreditation system.

The COA shares with the Commission the goal of having a strong accountability system that encourages excellence and holds educator preparation programs to high standards. The membership of COA is encouraged by the recent discussions of the Commission to strengthen and streamline the accreditation process and welcome the opportunity to further examine the accreditation system over the next year. We stand ready to assist the Commission in this important effort to make the accreditation system leaner, more focused on essential aspects, and outcomes based.

Ensuring a well prepared workforce to educate our state's students is of paramount importance. We look forward to working in partnership with the Commission to achieve the important objectives of ensuring a high quality educator in every classroom.

Sincerely,

Reyes Quezada  
Committee Co-Chair

Kenneth Lopour  
Committee Co-Chair

# The Committee on Accreditation

## 2013-2014

**Joyce Abrams**

Substitute Teacher  
Chula Vista Elementary School District

**Anna W. Moore**

Director/COO  
Bay View Academy Charter School

**Deborah Erickson**

Professor and Dean  
Point Loma Nazarene University

**Reyes Quezada**

Professor of Education  
University of San Diego

**Anne Jones**

Associate Dean  
Director, Teacher Education Programs  
University Extension  
University of California, Riverside Extension

**Iris Riggs**

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

**Gary Kinsey**

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

**Jose Rivas**

Teacher  
Lennox Mathematics, Science and  
Technology Academy

**Kiran Kumar**

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

**Nancy Watkins**

Assistant Principal  
Valencia High School  
Placentia-Yorba Linda School District

**Kenneth Lopour**

Assistant Principal  
Orange Unified School District

**Pia Wong**

Chair, Department of Teaching Credentials  
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  
Lynette Roby, Consultant, Professional Services Division  
Geri Mohler, Consultant, Professional Services Division  
Catherine Kearney, Consultant, Professional Services Division  
Teri Ackerman, Analyst, Professional Services Division

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee’s Work Plan in 2013-2014</b> .....	<b>7</b>
Purpose 1: Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession .....	8
Purpose 2: Ensure Program Quality.....	10
Accreditation.....	10
Accreditation: Accreditation with Stipulations.....	10
Accreditation with Major Stipulations.....	10
Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations .....	10
Denial of Accreditation .....	11
Purpose 3: Ensure Adherence to Standards .....	12
Purpose 4: Foster Program Improvement .....	14
General Operations.....	15
<b>Section II: Summary of 2013-14 Accreditation Activities</b> .....	<b>16</b>
Professional Accreditation of Program Sponsors & Credential Preparation Programs .....	16
Analysis of Standard Decisions .....	17
Common Standards .....	17
Program Standards .....	18
Technical Assistance Site Visits.....	22
Initial Approval of New Credential Programs .....	22
Transitioned Programs.....	23
Inactive Status.....	24
Withdrawal of an Approved Program.....	26
Reactivation of Inactive Programs .....	27
Initial Institutional Approval .....	28
Institutions that are no longer Approved Program Sponsors.....	28
<b>Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2014-15</b> .....	<b>28</b>
Purpose 1: Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession .....	29
Purpose 2: Ensure Program Quality.....	30
Purpose 3: Ensure Adherence to Standards .....	31
Purpose 4: Foster Program Improvement .....	33
General Operations.....	34
Appendix A: Accreditation Activities by Cohort.....	35
Appendix B: Institutions by Cohort.....	36

## **Introduction**

The Commission's current *Accreditation Framework* was adopted by the Commission in 2006. The accreditation system is the primary means by which the Commission ensures quality in educator preparation in California. The system is designed as a 7 year cycle comprised of three major components or activities: 1) biennial reports, 2) program assessment, and 3) site visits. Each of the over 260 Commission approved institutions have been assigned a color cohort which identifies which component or activity is expected of those institutions in any given year. Biennial reports are submitted for those cohorts in Year 1, 3, and 5; program assessment is conducted in year 4; site visits in year 6; and finally, follow up is required in Year 7. Below is a summary description of each of the three components.

- *BIENNIAL REPORTS*: Educator preparation programs collect data on candidate competence and report the results electronically every other year of the cycle. Reports are reviewed by Commission staff and reported to the Committee on Accreditation.
- *PROGRAM ASSESSMENT*: The program sponsor reports on indicators of candidate competence such as performance on assessments and feedback from employers. The report also includes program updates and provides a data-based rationale for any program changes. Reports are reviewed by trained educators with expertise in the credential area, are summarized by staff, and then reported to the Committee on Accreditation.
- *SITE VISITS*: All data are provided to a trained team of evaluators. Team members provide expertise in credential areas. Site visits also include in-depth interviews of graduates, candidates, employers, and program faculty and administrators. Accreditation recommendations are made by the team for final action by the Committee on Accreditation.

The Commission is assisted in the work of the accreditation system by the Committee on Accreditation. This body is comprised of twelve members of the education community – 6 from postsecondary education and 6 K-12 practitioners. While the Commission sets policy for accreditation, the COA implements the accreditation system and makes accreditation decisions for institutions offering educator preparation in California.

This report presents information about the accreditation system, the COA decisions, and the three major components for the academic year 2013-14.

### **Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2013-2014**

Accreditation site visits and all accreditation activities resumed in 2013-14, however, the Commission's fiscal challenges continued. The Commission remained committed to continuing accreditation activities in the most cost effective manner possible, including seeking possible long term remedies to ensuring the Commission can carry out its mandate in future years.

The items that follow represent the key components of the 2013-2014 accreditation activities 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.* The COA resumed its regular schedule to accommodate the return to a full schedule of accreditation site visits. It held open public meetings on the following dates:

August 7, 2013  
October 10-11, 2013  
February 6-7, 2014  
April 24-25, 2014  
June 26-27, 2014

All Committee meetings were held in public and all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. In addition, meetings were 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 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.

As a continuing cost saving measure, videoconference, Skype, Google Hangout, and phone conferencing were used, where possible and appropriate, in order that those located in various regions of California who are involved in accreditation activities could participate without travel.

*PSD News.* The PSD E-news, developed in 2008, continued to be distributed weekly. This electronic notification reaches 1728 individuals (up from 1500 last year) , including all approved institutions, to inform them of accreditation-related activities such as information regarding standards development and revision, technical assistance opportunities, and notification of requests for stakeholder input.

*Program Sponsor Alerts.* Program Sponsor Alerts (PSA) continued to be used to provide important and timely information on specific topics of interest to program sponsors. The Commission staff used this resource frequently in the 2013-2014 year, issuing eight PSAs. The PSA is used to address a specific issue such as requirements for transition to new standards and has served the Commission and the field well. Program Sponsor Alerts will continue to be used to provide information to the field. A list of Program Sponsor Alerts for 2013 may be found on the Commission's website at: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PS-alerts.html>

*Technical Assistance to the Field.* In 2013-14 a variety of activities took place designed to share information about the accreditation system and its implementation. Meetings were held both in person and via the web. All webinars were broadcast live and also archived for access by stakeholders at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/meetings.html>. Technical Assistance included the following:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Technical Assistance Activity</b>
Throughout Fall	Archived Webinar trainings for Accreditation site visit team members (NCATE and non-NCATE versions)
12/18/2013	Common Core State Standards Webinar - How Does Educator Preparation Need to Change with CCSS?
1/16/2014	Administrator Examinations: Examinations Development Stakeholder Discussion
1/22/14	Site Visit Team Lead Training
3/21/2014	Induction Stakeholder Webcast
4/15/2014	Stakeholder Conversation- Assignment Monitoring and Compliance Activities
5/08/2014	Accountability and Accreditation Stakeholder Discussion
5/16/2014	TPA Stakeholder Meeting
5/30/2014	Joint CAEP and CTC Accreditation Discussion with Institutional Leaders
10/3/2014	Intern Webinar
10/16-18/2014	Credential Counselors and Analysts of California Conference
May-Sept	Intern Program Modification: EL, Support and Supervision Requirements (5 sessions) Informational Meetings
Jan-Aug	Administrative Services Credential Think Tanks (15 sessions)

*Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission.* COA Co-Chair Anne Jones presented its annual report to the Commission at the December 2013 Commission Meeting <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-12/2013-12-agenda.html>.

*Commission Liaison.* The Commission's liaison position was vacant during 2013-2014. The Commission's liaison provides an important perspective to COA discussions and serves as an effective means of communication between the COA and the Commission. This role will be filled in 2014-15 by Commissioner Haydee Rodriguez.

*Implementation of a fee recovery system for certain accreditation activities.* The Commission adopted a cost recovery plan, and associated regulations (effective October 2013), for the review of new programs and for accreditation activities outside the typical accreditation cycle. A system was established to track reviewer assignments and credit institutions for in-kind, and that ensures a fiscal process which invoices institutions accurately reflecting any earned in-kind credit. Approximately \$65,000 was garnered through Cost Recovery fees during 2013-2014.

## ***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.

The COA has five options when making an accreditation decision for an institution. Chapter Eight of the Accreditation Handbook describes them as follows:

### **Accreditation**

The recommendation of *Accreditation* means that the accreditation team verified that the institution and its programs, when judged as a whole, met or exceeded the CTC's adopted Common Standards and program standards applicable to the institution. The institution (including its credential programs) is judged to be effective in preparing educators and is demonstrating overall quality in its programs and general operations. The status of *Accreditation* can be achieved even if one or two common standards were identified as "met with concerns" or one or more areas of concern were identified within its credential programs.

### **Accreditation: Accreditation with Stipulations**

The recommendation of *Accreditation with Stipulations* means that the accreditation team, at the site visit, verified that the institution and some of its programs have "not met" or "met with concerns" some common standards and/or program standards, applicable to the institution, and that action is required to address these deficiencies. The institution is judged to be generally effective in preparing educators and in its general operations apart from the identified areas of concern. The concerns or problems identified are confined to specific issues that minimally impact the quality of the program received by candidates or completers.

### **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**

The recommendation of *Accreditation with Major Stipulations* means that the accreditation team concluded that the institution and some of its programs have "not met" or "met with concerns" multiple standards in the common standards, and/or 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 impact, or are likely to impact, the preparation of credential program candidates. The team identified issues that impinge on the ability of the institution to deliver high quality, effective programs. The review team may have found that some of the institution's credential programs are of high quality and are effective in preparing educators or that the general operations of the institution are adequate, but the team concluded that these areas of quality do not outweigh the identified areas of concern.

### **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.

**Denial of Accreditation**

The COA can deny accreditation upon either an initial visit or a revisit to an institution. Although a recommendation of Denial of Accreditation typically comes after a finding of probationary status at an initial visit and after the institution has been provided with an opportunity to institute improvements a review team can recommend Denial of Accreditation at any time if the situation warrants the finding in accordance with this section of the Handbook.

Accreditation site visits resumed in 2013-14. Thirty-three institutions were reviewed resulting in the following decisions:

<b>COA Accreditation Decision</b>	<b>Number of Institutions</b>
Accreditation	24
Accreditation with Stipulations	5
Accreditation with Major Stipulations	2
Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations	1
Denial of Accreditation	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>33</b>

Two institutions that received Accreditation with Stipulations in 2012-13 addressed the COA’s concerns sufficiently such that the COA acted to remove the stipulations and change their status to Accreditation in 2013-14. There was also a revisit to Bard College which resulted in a decision of Accreditation. A list of the institutions that had a site visit or revisit in 2013-2014 is included in Section II of this report.

Attention was paid to ensuring cost effectiveness in reviews. In particular, the number of team members was reduced to the minimum number of reviewers required to complete the task. In addition, all site visits with one or two similar programs (such as General Education Induction and Clear Education Specialist Induction) were reduced by one day for a total of three days, two nights, instead of four days and three nights. However, the expectations for site visit team members have shifted significantly in that much more is done prior to arriving on site. These actions reduced the cost involved in the review while continuing to ensure a sufficient length of time for a thorough review.

*Review and revise the Accreditation Handbook.* The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. Chapter 3 was updated to include information to institutions regarding the reactivation of a program that

was on Accredited Inactive status. An additional chapter addressing Technical Assistance visits was also added to the Accreditation Handbook. This information can be found in Chapter 16.

*Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission.* The COA received updates on Commission activities at each meeting. Examples of topics discussed for 2013-14 included updates on the work related to the Commission's consideration of recommendations regarding Administrative Service Credential Standards, efforts to strengthen and streamline the accountability system, and the transition from NCATE/TEAC to CAEP.

*Continue Efforts to Develop Surveys for Use in Accreditation.* The Commission's adopted activities for 2012-13 included the development of a pilot program completer survey to collect data that could be used in the accreditation process. In the spring of 2013, the Commission staff worked with stakeholders to develop and pilot the first of these surveys for Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist program completers. Additional effort was made during the 2013-14 year to examine the use of the data collected during the pilot, determine how it might be brought to scale, and used for accreditation purposes in the future. The second phase of the Completer Survey pilot is underway with an eye towards increasing participation. The survey is being sent to all individuals that earned a preliminary credential between January 1 and August 30, 2014. Completers were asked to submit the survey by September 15, 2014.

Programs were asked to encourage their graduates to participate. The first statewide and program reports generated from these surveys were provided to institutions in October 2014.

The Commission is also in the process of developing additional surveys to be completed by candidates completing induction programs, Pupil Personnel Services programs, master and mentor teacher surveys, and employers. Administrative Services Credential program survey questions were developed for testing in 2014 and implementation with program completers in 2015.

### ***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. Forty-three (43) programs were granted initial approval during 2013-2014.

*Conduct and review program assessment activities.* In 2013-14, institutions in the Blue cohort were working to complete the program assessment process and submitted documents at the end of 2013. The review of indigo and blue program assessment documents was slow due to the lack of budget to bring readers together as well as lack of reader sign ups when budget was available for travel. Staff facilitated eight program assessment sessions during the 2013-2014 year throughout the state bringing nearly seventy readers together to review documents. Extensive recruitment efforts were made by reaching out to potential readers in the green and

yellow cohorts as a means to better prepare for the submission of their own documents. In addition to reading sessions held at the Commission, Brandman University, Fresno Pacific University, Los Angeles County Office of Education, CSU San Bernardino, and CSU Sacramento hosted reading sessions. Even with the assistance of hosting institutions, low reader turn out and budgetary constraints required the vast majority of the documents reviewed to take place remotely – with reviewers being sent the documents and the reviewers devoting time on their own schedule, at their homes or offices, working via technology with their program assessment partner. While this approach allowed many of these documents to be completed, it does extend the time for reviewers to complete their work and results in greater wait time for institutions to receive the results of the review.

In addition, during 2013-14, the Commission had a significant program assessment work load in the Education Specialist, Reading, and Teacher Librarian areas. Documents from institutions that transitioned to new program standards continued to arrive in addition to the normal cohort document review workload and contributed to the shortage of available reviewers.

*Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation.* Due to limited resources during 2013-2014, Technical Assistance visits did not occur.

*Preparation of volunteers to serve as Board of Institutional Review members.* During the 2013-14 year, two sessions of BIR training were held (August 2013 and January 2014). This blended training of online and onsite modules equips educators to read documents for the Initial Program Review or Program Assessment components and to serve as site review team members. The hybrid model of online and on-site training has been well received and appears to be nearly as effective as the 4 day in person training model used in the past.

*Disseminate information related to the Commission's Common Standards and Program Standards.* Efforts to assist institutions in understanding the Commission's Common and Program Standards continued in 2013-14 through a variety of strategies. Staff provided feedback regarding Common Standard 2 as part of the Biennial Report process. Additionally, a consultant was assigned to each accreditation cohort, and two consultant specific for all induction programs, to provide technical assistance throughout the accreditation process.

Specific technical assistance was also provided regarding newly adopted standards such the Administrator Preparation Standards. Fifteen (15) Think Tank sessions <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/ASC/asc-2014-think-tank.pdf>, which included 153 participants, were held throughout the state, providing both guidance from staff as well as an opportunity to network with other programs. Intern programs were also provided with assistance in implementing new regulations pertaining to English learners and new requirements regarding support and supervision both in person at regional meetings and via technology. Staff also provided guidance regarding changes to preconditions that were as a result of SB5, which lifted the one year cap on preliminary multiple and single subject programs.

*Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment.* In 2012-13 COA determined the need for strategies to ensure a thorough review of standards related to the Teaching Performance Assessment. As a result, dedicated, specially-trained readers now review program standards 17-19 for multiple and single subject documents. This team of readers is quite rigorous and it is rare for a document to be preliminarily aligned on the first read.

*Work with stakeholders and the Committee on Accreditation to develop a stronger and more streamlined accountability system and a targeted site visit model that is cost effective, rigorous, and focused on the essential attributes of high quality educator preparation.* This topic has been on several COA agendas and significant work has begun in regard to strengthening and streamlining the Commission's preparation program accountability system. Meetings have been held with a variety of stakeholder groups (CSU deans and directors, AAICU, CTE, and with other interested groups).

At the June 2014 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-06/2014-06-2E.pdf>) the Commission reviewed and affirmed a conceptual framework and related timeline including appointing expert task groups to work on standards, performance assessment requirements, outcome measures, accreditation procedures and data dash boards. An Accreditation Advisory Panel will serve as a sounding board for the task groups to ensure coherence in the new accountability system.

#### ***Purpose 4: Foster Program Improvement***

*Collect, analyze, and report on the biennial reports submitted in fall 2013.* Biennial Reports from approximately 69 approved institutions in the Green and Orange cohorts were submitted during Fall 2013. Institutions in the Indigo cohort, which is comprised of 42 approved institutions, had the option of submitting Biennial Reports in Fall 2013 and then providing an addendum in Fall 2014 or waiting and submitting reports in Fall 2014. Staff reviewed all Biennial Reports that were submitted and provided written feedback at the program and unit level. Technical assistance was also provided to individual institutions that were in need. This occurred via phone conference and was led by the consultant assigned to the institution's accreditation cohort.

In June 2012, the Commission recommended an increase to the consistency and comprehensiveness of the data collected, analyzed and reported on for each type of educator preparation program. The COA spent considerable time in 2013-14 on this topic assisting staff in developing a Biennial Report template that provides clear requirements to the field for collecting and analyzing appropriate data for each educator preparation program.

Biennial Report templates were revised to be more streamlined and provide clearer direction to institutions and direct them toward providing more specific information focusing on candidate competency, fieldwork, and program effectiveness. The COA reviewed the new Biennial Report template at their June and August meetings. The streamlined template has been provided as an optional pilot to institutions in the Indigo, Red, and Yellow cohorts for Fall 2014 submission.

Cohort consultants assigned to the Indigo, Red, and Yellow cohorts met with institutions via Google Hangout and phone conference to orient them to the streamlined template, provide technical assistance, and gather initial feedback. Submissions using the new template will be reviewed and information will be provided to the COA in Fall 2014.

*Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.* Site visit surveys were provided to site visit team leads, team members, institutions, and consultants. Analysis of 2013-14 site visit evaluation data is currently underway. Improvements to the system based upon those data will be considered by the COA in October, 2014.

*Continue partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (formerly the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate.* With the unification of TEAC and NCATE into CAEP, and the adoption of new national educator preparation standards, the COA has worked with staff and stakeholders to determine the alignment of the new standards with the Commission's Common Standards and developed the new Partnership Agreement with CAEP. The draft agreement was presented to COA at the August 2014 meeting. As of the date for this report to the Commission, discussions continue between the Commission staff and CAEP.

*Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes.* The COA adopted the standards crosswalk illustrating alignment between the PPS: School Psychology standards and the National Association of School Psychologist Standards.

### **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 II: Summary of 2013-14 Accreditation Activities

This section of the report provides more detailed information about elements of the 2013-14 Work Plan with a focus on accreditation activities.

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

2013-14 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 2013-14:

<b>COA Accreditation Decisions 2013-14 Visits (33 visits)</b>	
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
Antelope Valley Unified School District	Accreditation
Antioch University	Accreditation with Stipulations
Claremont Graduate University	Accreditation with Stipulations
Compton Unified School District	Accreditation
California State University, Fresno	Accreditation
California State University Monterey Bay	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
El Dorado County Office of Education	Accreditation
Envision Schools	Denial of Accreditation
Hebrew Union College	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Hope International University	Accreditation
Imperial County Office of Education	Accreditation
Irvine Unified School District	Accreditation
Kern County Superintendent of Schools	Accreditation
La Sierra University	Accreditation with Stipulations
Los Banos Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations
Murrieta Valley Unified School District	Accreditation
National University	Accreditation with Stipulations
New Haven Unified School District	Accreditation
Pacific Oaks College	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations
Palo Alto Unified School District	Accreditation
Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District	Accreditation
Sacramento City Unified School District	Accreditation

<b>COA Accreditation Decisions 2013-14 Visits (33 visits)</b>	
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>Accreditation Decision</b>
San Francisco Unified School District	Accreditation
San Francisco State University	Accreditation
Sanger Unified School District	Accreditation
Selma Unified School District	Accreditation
Sequoia Union High School District	Accreditation
University of California, Davis	Accreditation
University of California, Irvine	Accreditation
University of California, San Diego	Accreditation
University of Southern California	Accreditation
Washington Unified School District	Accreditation
Wm. S. Hart Union High School District	Accreditation

In addition, in 2013-14, revisits were conducted for institutions assigned stipulations as a result of site visits conducted in 2012-2013. After these revisits, the COA made the following decisions:

<b>2013-14 Accreditation Follow-Up</b>		
<b>Revisits (1)</b>		
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>2012-13 Decision</b>	<b>2013-14 Revisit Decision</b>
Bard College	Accreditation w/Stipulations	Accreditation
<b>Submission of Documentation Addressing Stipulations (1)</b>		
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>2012-13 Decision</b>	<b>2013-14 Decision</b>
Pacific Union College	Accreditation w/Stipulations	Accreditation

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

#### **Common Standards:**

The Commission's revised Common Standards (2008) and all appropriate credential program standards were utilized in the accreditation site visits in 2013-14.

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 2013-2014 is presented in the following table.

<b>Findings on the Common Standards 2013-2014 Accreditation Site Visits (33 visits)</b>			
	<b>Standard Findings</b>		
	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Standard 1: Education Leadership	24 73%	7 21%	2 6%
Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	21 64%	7 21%	5 15%
Standard 3: Resources	29 88%	3 9%	1 3%
Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel	28 85%	3 9%	2 6%
Standard 5: Admission	33 100%	0 0%	0 0%
Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	29 88%	4 12%	0 0%
Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice	30 91%	3 9%	0 0%
Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors*	15 46%	3 9%	1 3%
Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence	29 88%	2 6%	0 0%

\*: Institutions with single induction programs were not reviewed for Standard 8 as it does not apply.

### **Program Standards:**

A summary of the information gathered on all educator preparation programs with determinations of *Met with Concerns* or *Not Met* are presented in the tables below. If a standard is not listed, all institutions met that standard. As with the information about the Common Standards, this information about standards that were *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>Multiple Subject Standards (14 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom	3	-
15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork	2	-



<b>Preliminary Single Subject Standards (10 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Design	1	-
8: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject Specific Content Instruction	1	1
12: Preparation to Teach English Learners	1	-
14: Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork	1	-
15: Qualifications for Individuals who Provide School Site Support	2	-

<b>General Education (MS/SS) Induction Standards (19 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Rationale and Design	2	-
2: Communication and Collaboration	3	-
3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers	1	1
6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students	2	-

<b>General Education (MS/SS) Clear Standards (5 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers	-	1

<b>Preliminary Education Specialist Program Standards 1-16 (5 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
2: Professional, Legal and Ethical Practices	1	1
3: Educating Diverse Learners	1	1
4: Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships	1	1
5: Assessment of Students	-	2
6: Using Education and Assistive Technology	1	-
7: Transition and Transitional Planning	1	1
8: Participating in ISFP/IEP and Post-Secondary Transition Planning	1	1
9: Preparation to Teach Reading/Language Arts	1	1
10: Preparation to Teach English Language Learners	-	1
11: Typical and Atypical Development	1	-
12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning	1	-
13: Curriculum and Instruction of Students with Disabilities	1	1
14: Creating Healthy Learning Environments	-	2
15: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options	-	1
16: Assessment of Candidate Performance	1	-

<b>Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate (8 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
2: Professional, Legal and Ethical Practices	-	2
3: Educating Diverse Learners	1	1
4: Positive Behavior Support	1	-
5: Specific Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities	-	1
6: Using Educational and Assistive Technology	-	2

<b>Preliminary Education Specialist Moderate/Severe (7 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
5: Assessment of Students	-	1

<b>Preliminary Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing (3 visits)--</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination	-	1
7: Early Childhood Intervention and Education	-	1
8: Participating in IFSP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning	-	1

<b>Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder (5 visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Characteristics of ASD	-	1

<b>Clear Education Specialist Induction Standards (8 site visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Rationale and Design	2	-
2: Communication and Collaboration	1	-

<b>Preliminary Administrative Services (7 Site Visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
8: Guidance, Assistance, and Feedback	1	-
9: Assessment of Candidate Performance	1	-

<b>Clear Standards-based Administrative Services (5 Site Visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
8: Expectations for Candidate Performance	1	-

<b>Clear Guidelines-based Administrative Services (3 Site Visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
2: Evaluation of Program Quality	1	-
6: Mentor Qualifications and Assignment	1	-

<b>Reading Certificate (Added Authorization) (6 visits)</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1: Program Design, Rationale, and Coordination	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 2013-14 site visits.

<b>All Standards Found to be Met – 2013-2014 Site Visits</b>	
<b>Program</b>	<b>Number of Site Visits</b>
Agricultural Specialist	2
Bilingual Authorization	4
California Teachers of English learners (CTEL)	1
Early Childhood Education Specialist	1
Preliminary Education Specialist: Physical and Other Health Impairments	1
Preliminary Education Specialist: Visual Impairments	1
Preliminary Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education	1
Education Specialist Added Authorization: Adapted Physical Education	1
Education Specialist Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education	2
Education Specialist Added Authorization: Orthopedically Impaired	1
Education Specialist Other Related Services: Orientation and Mobility	1
Pupil Personnel Counseling: School Counseling	3
Pupil Personnel: Child Welfare and Attendance	3
Pupil Personnel: School Psychology	4
Pupil Personnel: School Social work	4
Reading Certificate (Added Authorization)	3
Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential	2
Speech-Language Pathology	2
Speech-Language Pathology (Special Class Authorization)	1
School Nurse Services	1
Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education	1

**Technical Assistance Site Visits**

Technical Assistance site visits are conducted with new programs two years after receiving initial institutional approval from the Commission. Because of the Commission’s fiscal constraints, no technical assistance site visits took place in 2013-14.

***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. 2013-2014 Initial Program Approval actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation are listed in the tables below.

<b>New Program</b>	<b>Institution</b>
Preliminary Single Subject: Art	Academy of Art University
Preliminary Single Subject Intern Program: Math and Science	Sacramento County Office of Education
Mathematics Instructional Added Authorization	Teachers College of San Joaquin
General Education (MS/SS) Induction Program	Concordia University
Bilingual Authorization	California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (Spanish)
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Credential Intern Program	Concordia University
Education Specialist Mod/Severe Credential Intern Program	Santa Clara County Office of Education
Education Specialist Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education	Concordia University
	California State University, East Bay
	Los Angeles Unified School District
	Santa Clara County Office of Education
Education Specialist Added Authorization: Other Health Impairments	Point Loma Nazarene University
Education Specialist Added Authorization:	University of Southern California

<b>New Program</b>	<b>Institution</b>
Adapted Physical Education	
Education Specialist Added Authorization: Traumatic Brain Injury	Point Loma Nazarene University
Education Specialist Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance	Wiseburn School District
	Fresno Pacific University
Professional Administrative Services	Riverside County Office of Education (Guidelines)
	Tulare County Office of Education (Guidelines)
	Kern County Superintendent of Schools (Guidelines)
Clear Education Specialist Induction Credential	Placer County Office of Education
	Kern County Superintendent of Schools
	San Diego State University
	California State University, Dominguez Hills
	Oakland Unified School District
	Panama-Buena Vista Union School District
	Brentwood Unified School District
	West Covina Unified School District
	Concordia University Irvine
	California State University, San Bernardino
	Palmdale Unified School District
	California State University, Fresno
	Clovis Unified School District
	Newark Unified School District
	School for Integrated Academics and Technologies (SIATech)
	Fresno Pacific University
	Santa Clara County Office of Education
El Rancho Unified School District	
Fontana Unified School District	
Kings County Office of Education	
Sonoma State University	
Pupil Personnel Services - School Counseling	Alliant International University
Preliminary Education Specialist Credential: Language and Academic Development	Ventura County Office of Education
	National University

### ***Transitioned Programs***

In 2013-14 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 2013-14.

Transitioned Program	Institution
Preliminary Education Specialist Added Authorization Programs: Added Authorization: Adapted Physical Education	Azusa Pacific University
	California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
	California State University, Chico
	California State University, Long Beach
	California State University, Los Angeles
	California State University, Northridge
	California State University, San Bernardino
	Humboldt State University
	San Francisco State University
	San Jose State University
Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential	San Jose State University
Teacher Librarian Services Credential	San Jose State University
	Azusa Pacific 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 13 programs noted below were declared to be in an Inactive status in 2013-14.

<b>Professional Preparation Programs Entering Inactive Status in 2013-14</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
California State University, Bakersfield	Preliminary Administrative Services
	Clear Administrative Services: Standards-Based
California State University, Long Beach	Designated Subjects: Special Subjects
	Designated Subjects: Supervision and Coordination
	Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education
	California Teachers of English Learners Certificate Program
	Preliminary Single Subject: Home Economics Methodology
	Health Services (School Nurse)
	Specialist Credential: Reading Language Arts
California State University, Monterey Bay	Reading Certificate
	Preliminary Multiple Subjects Intern Program
California State University, Fresno	School Nurse Services: Special Class Authorization
California State University, San Marcos	Preliminary Single Subject Intern Program
Humboldt State University	Preliminary Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
San Francisco State University	General Education (Multiple and Single Subject) Clear
San Jose State University	Preliminary Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing
University of California, Los Angeles	Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling
	Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling, Intern Option
University of California, San Diego	Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern Option
Alliant International University	Preliminary Single Subject: Health Methodology
Antioch University	Preliminary Multiple Subjects Intern Program
Argosy University	Preliminary Single Subject Business Methodology
	Preliminary Single Subject Art Methodology
Brandman University	Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling
California Lutheran University	Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
	General Education (Multiple and Single Subjects) Clear

Pepperdine University	Preliminary Multiple Subjects Intern Option
	Preliminary Single Subject Intern Option
Touro University	Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
University of Redlands	California Teachers of English Learners Certificate Program
Chino Valley Unified School District	General Education (Multiple and Single Subjects) Induction
El Dorado County Office of Education	Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
Escondido Union High School District	General Education (Multiple and Single Subjects) Induction Program
Glendale Unified School District	General Education (Multiple and Single Subjects) Induction
King-Chavez Academy of Excellence	Preliminary Multiple and Single Subjects Intern Option
Magnolia Public School Pacific Technology School--Orange County	Preliminary Single Subject Intern Option
Oceanside Unified School District	General Education (Multiple and Single Subject) Induction
Orange County Department of Education	Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate District Intern Option
	Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe District Intern Option
Ventura County Office of Education	Education Specialist Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education

***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. Sixteen programs at twelve institutions were withdrawn in the 2013-14 year.

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--three institutions, sponsoring four programs, selected this option in the 2013-14 year.



<b>Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (16)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo	Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling
Humboldt State University	Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern Option
Loyola Marymount University	Clear Administrative Services: Standards Based
California Lutheran University	Education Specialist: Resource Specialist
California State University, Fullerton	Preliminary Single Subject Health Methodology
Brandman University	General Education (Multiple and Single Subjects) Clear
California Baptist University	General Education (Multiple and Single Subjects) Clear
ICEF Public Schools	General Education (Multiple and Single Subjects) Induction
San Diego Christian College	General Education (Multiple and Single Subjects) Clear
San Diego State University	Education Specialist Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance
California State University, Northridge	School Nurse
	Education Specialist Added Authorization: Adapted Physical Education
University of California, Riverside	Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
	Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential
	Reading Certificate
	Designated Subjects: Special Subjects (Drivers Education & Training)

### ***Reactivation of Inactive Programs***

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 2013-14, only one program previously deemed inactive requested and received reactivation and is once again a fully approved program operating in California. Two programs were reactivated in 2013-14.

<b>Reactivation Requests in 2013-2014 (2)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
Lodi Unified School District	General Education (MS/SS) Induction Program
Dos Palos Oro Loma Joint USD	General Education (MS/SS) Induction Program

### ***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. During the 2013-14, there were no institutions that were granted Initial Institutional Approval.

### ***Institutions that are no longer Approved Program Sponsors***

During 2013-14, two institutions ceased to be Commission-approved program sponsors:

*Envision Schools – Closed due to Denial of Accreditation June 2014*

*Oceanside Unified School District – Closed February 2014*

### **Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2014-15**

The Commission and COA work plan as it relates to accreditation in 2014-15 is significant. Not only will efforts continue to implement the current system of biennial reports, program assessment, and site visits for the over 260 approved institutions, but the Commission, accreditation staff, and the COA will be also be focusing on efforts to strength and streamline the accreditation system.

This effort includes the Commission convening several task groups identified in the adopted Work Plan. In August 2014 the Commission requested applications from educators interested in serving on these task groups. The six identified task groups will each focus on specific aspects of the work as follows:

- Preliminary Teacher Preparation Standards: recommend revisions to the preliminary multiple and single subject standards.
- Induction Standards, Policies and Regulations: review recent policy changes and recommend revisions to induction standards and regulations governing the General Education (Multiple Subject and Single Subject) Clear Credential.
- Performance Assessments: provide guidance regarding teacher and administrator performance assessments, including standards governing the development and implementation of performance assessments.
- Outcomes and Data: review and redesign surveys based on changes in standards, make recommendations regarding useful reporting practices and formats, and standardize the use of this information in accreditation.
- Accreditation Policy Procedures: recommend needed changes in accreditation policy and procedures based on new standards, assessments, and outcomes data.

- Public Access and Data Dashboards: recommend ways to improve public access to information about preparation programs and institutions.

In addition, the plan calls for an Accreditation Advisory Panel to serve as a sounding board and provide feedback to the groups. Key stakeholder groups have been invited to identify a designee to serve on the Accreditation Advisory Panel, which will also include the chairs of each of the six task groups. It is expected that the first Accreditation Advisory Panel meeting will take place before the end of 2014.

The COA anticipates serving to assist the Commission in this critically important work over the next year.

For 2014-15, the COA identifies the following priorities.

***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 4-5, 2014  
October 3, 2014  
February 19, 2015  
April, 2015  
June, 2015

The Committee's schedule has been adjusted to reflect the workload of a full schedule of site visits this upcoming spring.

Continuing in 2013-14, 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 December 2014. 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.

*Implementation of a fee recovery system for certain accreditation activities and an annual accreditation fee system (pending approval by the Office of Administrative Law)* The Commission adopted a cost recovery plan, and regulations, for the review of new programs and for accreditation activities outside the typical accreditation cycle. Particular attention will continue to be paid to effective implementation of a fiscal process to invoice institutions, refining processes to ensure timeliness of reviews, and to maintaining a procedure to keep track of reviewer assignments to credit institutions for in-kind assistance in order to waive fees for initial program review.

In addition, in 2014, the Commission implemented an annual accreditation fee. The Commission's efforts in 2014-15 will be implementation of the annual accreditation fee, ensuring accurate information for institutions and maintaining a system of invoicing and processing revenue that is received for the purposes of supporting the accreditation system.

### ***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. Accreditation site visits continue as scheduled with the Indigo Cohort in 2014-2015, with the vast majority of site visit reviews taking place in the spring of 2015.

Despite additional resources from annual accreditation fees and cost recovery fees, ensuring cost effectiveness continues to be of paramount concern. In particular, the number of team members will be limited to only those essential to complete the task. In addition, all site visits with one or two similar programs (such as General Education Induction and Clear Education Specialist Induction) will continue to generally be conducted in three days, two nights instead of four days, three nights as in past years. Experience over the past couple of years with accreditation illustrate that this length of time is sufficient for institutions with a small number of programs, all of which have been found in program assessment to be preliminarily aligned. This action will continue to contain costs involved in the review while still ensuring a sufficient length of time for a thorough review.

In addition, beginning with the spring 2015 visits, the Commission no longer has the assistance of Induction Cluster Regional Directors to assist, as consultants, in site visits. Because the Commission's staff is not able to travel to be present for all accreditation visits, the decision was made to assign three consultants to support all programs undergoing accreditation site visits for institutions that offer only one or two Tier II (induction) programs. Staff consultants will assist in the preparations for the visit as with all other institutions, and be available for consultation by the team throughout during the visit, but will not attend the visit in person.

Administrators in the PSD division will monitor the effectiveness of this approach this year to see if continues to be a viable approach for institutions that offer only one or two Tier II programs.

*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 2012. The Commission staff does not anticipate a wholesale review and revision of the *Handbook* during the 2014-15 year, however, revisions and additions may occur as necessary.

*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. It is anticipated with the work of Accreditation work groups (see Purpose 3) that this function will be critically important in 2014-15.

*Continue efforts to implement surveys for use in accreditation.* The Commission staff worked with stakeholders to develop and pilot the first of these surveys in the spring of 2013 and to conduct a second pilot in 2014. Additional effort will be made during the 2014-15 year to examine the use of the data collected during the pilot, determine how it might be brought to scale, and used for accreditation purposes in the future. In addition, the Commission plans to further develop additional surveys to be completed by candidates completing induction programs, master and mentor teachers, and employers.

*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 view that all of the standards are important to quality programs. In 2014-15, the discussion of leaner and higher standards will undoubtedly be a source of deliberation by the accreditation work groups focused on standards. The COA will serve to assist in this effort as needed in 2014-15.

### ***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. Programs will only be given initial approval when the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met. This review process will continue in 2014-15. Additional resources available as the result of cost recovery and annual accreditation fees should assist in ensuring greater timeliness of reviews by allowing the Commission to bring reviewers together for some

dedicated review time, as well as encouraging the participation of additional reviewers from the in-kind contribution option.

*Conduct and review program assessment activities.* In 2013-14, institutions in the Green cohort will begin the program assessment process. The Blue cohort submitted program assessment documents in fall of 2013 and reviewers are completing these reviews. (A cohort list is provided in Appendix B.)

*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. This activity was halted for two years because of the significant budget challenges experienced by the Commission. It is unclear at this time whether technical assistance site visits will be scheduled for 2015. With over 40 visits and several revisits already scheduled, existing staff is already at capacity. Because site visits are a higher priority than technical assistance visits, the administrators in the Professional Services Division will make this determination later in the fiscal year.

*Disseminate information related to the Commission's Common Standards and Program Standards.* At this time, efforts to assist institutions and programs to understand the expectations around Commission standards will take place through routine efforts such as existing webinars, conferences, and by working with individual institutions that need additional assistance.

*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. Revised subject matter requirements for Mathematics and English to align with the Common Core necessitate that approved subject matter programs in these disciplines revise their coursework. The Commission required all approved subject matter programs in Mathematics and English Language Arts to resubmit their alignment matrices by June 2014 to demonstrate alignment with the newly adopted SMRs. The Commission is currently in the process of reviewing these documents.

*Determine and enact effective strategies for reviewing those standards related to the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment.* The issue of ensuring that reviewers with particular expertise in performance assessment implementation review the standards related to performance assessment continues to be a challenge for the Commission. The current approach of inviting selected individuals with specific expertise in this area to review these standards exclusively has been relatively successful. However, 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.* In 2014, the Commission discussed this topic at length and adopted a framework for this work. The COA remains committed to working with the Commission appointed Advisory committee and the six workgroups to provide any assistance to ensure a successful achievement of commission objectives in this area. It is anticipated that this will be a major focus for 2014-15.

***Purpose 4: Foster Program Improvement***

*Collect, analyze, and report on the biennial reports submitted in fall 2013.* The 2014-2015 academic year will be the seventh full year of implementation of the biennial report component of the revised accreditation system. All institutions in the Indigo, Red, and Yellow cohorts are required to submit candidate competence and performance data in Fall 2014.

Among the 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 worked on revising the biennial report template and a new template was released as a pilot in summer 2014. The COA and the Commission staff will work with institutions to evaluate the effectiveness of the revised template in improving the consistency and quality of the data submitted.

*Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.* The COA will continue to refine the evaluation tool that is used by site visit reviewers, team leads, and institutions to evaluate the accreditation system. This data will be collected over the course of the year, with a review of the data taking place in the summer of 2015. Improvements to the system based upon those data can then be considered by the COA in summer 2015. 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 Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (formerly the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council) 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. In 2014, the COA and the Commission worked to develop a new partnership agreement with CAEP. After adoption by the COA, the document was submitted to CAEP for its approval. At the time of the writing of this report, the Commission awaiting a response. If accepted by CAEP, this new agreement will be in place beginning in January 2015. If CAEP does not approve upon initial review, Commission staff will work with the Commission,

COA, and institutions to attempt to address these concerns and arrive at a mutually agreeable partnership agreement.

*Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes.* At this point in time the focus of aligning and streamlining the accreditation of other national and state organizations will be focused on completing the discussions about, and completing, the partnership agreement, with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

***General Operations***

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



## Appendix A: Accreditation Activities by Cohort

2013-2021

*(accreditation activity is due to CTC)*

Each institution is assigned to a cohort. There are seven cohorts. Data collection is an annual accreditation activity. The chart below indicates the accreditation activities for each cohort that require a submission to CTC over the next 7 years. After the seventh year, the cycle begins resumes again with the same activities.

Cohort	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue	Indigo	Violet
<b>2013-2014</b>	Biennial Report Year 1 (Nov. 2014)		Biennial Report Year 3 (Nov. 2014)		Program Assess (Dec. 2013)	Biennial Report Year 5 (Sept. 2014)	Site Visit
<b>2014-2015</b>		Biennial Report Year 3 (Nov. 2015)		Program Assess (Dec. 2014)	Biennial Report Year 5 (Sept. 2015)	Site Visit	7 <sup>th</sup> Year Follow-Up <sup>1</sup>
<b>2015-2016</b>	Biennial Report Year 3 (Nov. 2016)		Program Assess (Dec. 2015)	Biennial Report Year 5 (Sept. 2016)	Site Visit	7 <sup>th</sup> Year Follow-Up <sup>1</sup>	Biennial Report Year 1 (Nov. 2016)
<b>2016-2017</b>		Program Assess (Dec. 2016)	Biennial Report Year 5 (Sept. 2017)	Site Visit	7 <sup>th</sup> Year Follow-Up <sup>1</sup>	Biennial Report Year 1 (Nov. 2017)	
<b>2017-2018</b>	Program Assess (Dec. 2017)	Biennial Report Year 5 (Sept. 2018)	Site Visit	7 <sup>th</sup> Year Follow-Up <sup>1</sup>	Biennial Report Year 1 (Nov. 2018)		Biennial Report Year 3 (Nov. 2018)
<b>2018-2019</b>	Biennial Report Year 5 (Sept. 2019)	Site Visit	7 <sup>th</sup> Year Follow-Up <sup>1</sup>	Biennial Report Year 1 (Nov. 2019)		Biennial Report Year 3 (Nov. 2019)	Program Assess (Dec. 2018)
<b>2019-2020</b>	Site Visit	7 <sup>th</sup> Year Follow-Up <sup>1</sup>	Biennial Report Year 1 (Nov. 2020)		Biennial Report Year 3 (Nov. 2020)	Program Assess (Dec. 2019)	Biennial Report Year 5 (Sept. 2020)
<b>2020-2021</b>	7 <sup>th</sup> Year Follow-Up <sup>1</sup>	Biennial Report Year 1 (Nov. 2021)		Biennial Report Year 3 (Nov. 2021)	Program Assess (Dec. 2020)	Biennial Report Year 5 (Sept. 2021)	Site Visit

<sup>1</sup> All institutions address issues, concerns or questions raised during the site visit process. The COA may require some institutions to submit a report to Commission staff detailing the activities completed in the 7<sup>th</sup> Year Follow-Up.

## Appendix B: Institutions by Cohort

Cohort	RED	ORANGE	YELLOW
2014-15	<b>Year 7 Biennial Report</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 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 Western Governors 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>33</b>
<b>SV</b>	<b>2019-2020</b>	<b>2018-2019</b>	<b>2017-2018</b>

Cohort	GREEN	BLUE	INDIGO	VIOLET
2014-2015	<b>Year 3 Program Assessment</b>	<b>Year 4 --</b>	<b>Year 5 (Biennial Report) Site Visit</b>	<b>Year 6 7th Year Follow-up</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 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>31</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>