



**The Committee on Accreditation's  
Annual Accreditation Report to the  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
2016-2017**

Dear Commissioners:

On behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation (COA), we submit to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) the *2016-17 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 over the past year, the results of its activities for the year, and its work plan for 2017-18.

As you well know, 2016-17 was a year of tremendous change for the educator preparation community as it worked to implement the Commission's vision for the new strengthened and streamlined accreditation system. The new system is comprised of new outcomes measures, the implementation and use of a wide range of survey instruments, new teaching and administrator performance assessments, new standards for a number of credential areas including preliminary teaching, administrator preparation, and induction for both teachers and administrators, the development of a new accreditation data system and data warehouse, and implementation of data dashboards to ensure transparency to the public. Also critical to the new system was the development of new processes and procedures that enhance efficiencies while still ensuring that programs are of sufficiently high quality and meet Commission adopted standards.

We thank the Commission for allowing the COA and the educator preparation community the opportunity to take this past year to ensure these new systems were well planned and effectively executed. The extensive efforts of the Commission staff to provide technical assistance to the field over this past year as it adjusted to and implemented the changes was critically important to the overall success of the accreditation system. As we enter the 2017-18 accreditation year, we look forward to ensuring that the system that has been put in place, does in fact, meet the Commission's objectives.

The COA shares with the Commission the goal of having a strong accountability system that holds educator preparation programs to high standards, recognizes excellence, and encourages innovation. We continue to offer our collective expertise and assistance to the Commission in this important effort to ensure a rigorous and robust system of accreditation that focuses on ensuring that educators emerge from programs prepared to address the complexities of California's K-12 education system.

Sincerely,

Dr. Anna Moore  
Committee Co-Chair

Dr. Pia Wong  
Committee Co-Chair

**The Committee on Accreditation  
2016-17**

**Jomeline Balatayo**

ELD Teacher  
Culver City High School

**Suzanne Borgese**

Education Specialist  
Placentia-Yorba Linda USD

**Deborah Erickson**

Professor and Dean  
School Of Education  
Point Loma Nazarene University

**Cheryl Forbes**

Director of Teacher Education and  
Lecturer  
University of California, San Diego

**Robert Frelly**

Director of Music Education  
Chapman University

**Anna W. Moore**

Regional Director II  
Educational Services  
Sonoma County Office of Education

**Gerard Morrison**

Teacher  
Long Beach Unified School District

**Margo Pensavalle**

Professor of Clinical Education  
Director of Evaluation and Accreditation  
University of Southern California

**Iris Riggs**

Professor, Teacher Education and  
Foundations  
California State University, San  
Bernardino

**Kelly Skon**

District Coordinator of Secondary STEM  
Saddleback Valley Unified School District

**Yvonne White**

Science Teacher  
Oakland Unified School District

**Pia Wong**

Professor  
College of Education  
California State University, Sacramento

## Table of Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Introduction .....</b>  | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee’s Work Plan in 2015-16 .....</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession.....      | 5         |
| Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality .....  | 7         |
| Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards.....                                  | 12        |
| Purpose 4. Foster Continuous Program Improvement .....                         | 15        |
| Other Activities.....  | 16        |
| General Operations .....   | 16        |
| <b>Section II: Summary of Accreditation Activities 2015-16.....</b>            | <b>17</b> |
| Institutions in 7 <sup>th</sup> Year Follow Up .....                           | 17        |
| Initial Approval of New Credential Programs.....                               | 19        |
| Initial Approval of New Subject Matter Programs.....                           | 20        |
| Programs Entering Inactive Status .....  | 21        |
| Withdrawal of Programs .....   | 21        |
| Reactivation of Programs .....   | 23        |
| Initial Institutional Approval.....  | 23        |
| Institutions No Longer Approved Program Sponsors.....                          | 24        |
| <b>Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee in 2016-17.....</b>       | <b>25</b> |
| Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and the Profession .....        | 25        |
| Purpose 2: Ensure Program Quality .....  | 26        |
| Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards.....                                  | 28        |
| Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement.....                                     | 28        |
| Continued Development and Implementation of Accreditation System .....         | 29        |
| General Operations .....   | 30        |
| <b>Appendix A: CTC Accreditation Cohorts .....</b>                             | <b>31</b> |

## **Introduction: Summary of Activities of the Accreditation System**

The 2016-17 year was a year of significant progress by the Commission, the Committee on Accreditation, and the Commission staff with respect to accreditation. The accreditation system is the primary means by which the Commission ensures quality in educator preparation in California. Not only did the Commission and its staff implement the routine accreditation activities required under the *Accreditation Framework* of 2006, but were simultaneously engaged in the Commission's Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation Project which consisted of reviewing and significantly revising numerous aspects of accreditation, including the adoption of a new [\*Accreditation Framework\*](#) (2015) to guide future accreditation efforts.

The major objectives of the new accreditation system, as outlined in the Accreditation Framework include the following:

- Accreditation assures that programs meet state standards for professional preparation programs, and, in so doing, are allowed to recommend candidates for state licensure.
- Accreditation assures candidates and the public that educator preparation programs are of high quality and effective in preparing candidates to meet licensure requirements.
- Accreditation assures candidates and the public that programs are accountable for the quality and effectiveness of the preparation they provide to candidates.
- Accreditation assures that evidence is reviewed by peers to determine each program's quality and effectiveness in order to retain their accreditation status.
- Accreditation provides the means for programs to continuously improve based on evidence of candidate outcomes, program effectiveness, and on feedback from ongoing peer review processes.

In 2016-17, institutions were making the transition from the former accreditation system to the new accreditation system. For the Green cohort, which is the cohort of institutions that is undergoing an accreditation site visit in 17-18, this past year was a combination of some aspects of the former system and many aspects of the new (currently adopted) system. Beginning with the next cohort, Yellow, all institutions and cohorts will be operating fully under the new accreditation system.

The current system is designed as a 7 year cycle comprised of several major components or activities:

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Annually       | Data Submission   |
| Years 1 and 4  | Submission of Preconditions Documentation                                 |
| Year 5, fall   | Program Review (program assessment for Green) Submission                  |
| Year 5, spring | Common Standards Submission   |
| Year 6         | Site Visit  |
| Year 7         | Follow Up to address issues of concern identified by the Site Visit Teams |

Each of the over 260 Commission-approved institutions has been assigned a color cohort which identifies which component or activity is expected of those institutions in any given year. A full schedule of accreditation activities for each cohort can be found on the Commission’s accreditation [webpage](#).

#### *ANNUAL DATA SUBMISSION*

Consistency in data across institutions and across similar programs, including outcomes data, is an important part of the new accreditation system. The Annual Data Submission by institutions will allow the Commission to better identify specific information about credential programs operating in California. The system is scheduled to begin basic operation in late 2017.

#### *PRECONDITIONS SUBMISSION AND REVIEW*

Preconditions are grounded in California Education Code, Title 5 Regulations, or Commission policy. Responses to preconditions are submitted in Years 1 and Years 4 by each institution for each program that an institution is approved to offer. Immediate correction is required if an institution is deemed to be out of compliance with Preconditions.

#### *PROGRAM REVIEW*

During the new Program Review Process, each credential program provides specific required evidence or documentation demonstrating that the program is aligned to each of the Commission adopted program standards for the particular credential area. Documentation is reviewed by trained educators with expertise in the credential area and a decision about whether the program standards are preliminarily aligned is made. The institution is provided feedback and then must provide an addendum, at least 60 days prior to the Site Visit, addressing any areas that were not found to be preliminarily aligned. This addendum is then used by the site visit team as additional information to consider when determining whether the standard is met.

#### *COMMON STANDARDS REVIEW*

Also in Year 5 of the cycle, program sponsors submit specific documentation that indicates alignment with the Commission’s adopted Common Standards. Reviewers examine the documentation and determine whether the standard can be preliminarily aligned. This information helps focus and inform the accreditation site visit in Year 6.

### *SITE VISITS*

All data are provided to a trained team of evaluators and these evaluators determine whether the standards are met and to determine an accreditation recommendation for the Committee on Accreditation. Site visits include in-depth interviews of graduates, candidates, employers, and program faculty and administrators. The purpose of the site visit is to determine whether standards are met and to what extent the program is effectively implemented.

The Commission is assisted in the implementation of the accreditation system by the Committee on Accreditation. This body is comprised of twelve members of the education community – six from postsecondary education and six 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. Further, the success of the accreditation system also depends on the commitment of hundreds of experts in the field - those who have a role in preparing educators and practitioners themselves - who are trained and calibrated to serve as reviewers for document review and for site visits.

This report presents information about the accreditation system, the COA decisions, and the major components for the academic year 2016-17.

The Commission completed its year of technical assistance and transition in 2016-17. All future reports will be focused on the activities that fall under the umbrella of the recently adopted [Accreditation Framework \(2016\)](#) and will reflect the revised accreditation cycle of activities, the new data warehouse and dashboards, inclusion of statewide survey data, revised processes and procedures and, perhaps most importantly, strengthened and streamlined standards and competencies adopted by the Commission.

## Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2016-17

The Commission's Strengthening and Streamlining Project was a multipronged effort that began late in 2014 and continued throughout 2016-17. Among its various critical components were the following:

- Adoption of a New [Accreditation Framework](#)
- Adoption of a New Accreditation Handbook
- Implementation of New Initial Institutional Approval Process
- Implementation of New Common Standards
- Implementation of New General Preconditions
- Implementation of New Teaching Performance Expectations for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Programs
- Implementation of New Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Program Standards
- Implementation of New Preliminary Administrator Preparation Standards
- Implementation of New Induction Standards for Teachers and for Administrators
- Adoption and Implementation of New California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs)
- Development and Piloting of New CalTPA and CalAPA
- Development and Implementation of New Procedures for Common Standards and Program Standards Submission and Review
- Development of New Data Warehouse and New Annual Data Submission System
- Development and Implementation of Numerous Data Dashboards
- Implementation of Surveys to Inform Program Improvement and Accreditation Decisions – Program Completers for Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, Administrator, Teacher Induction, Employers, and Master Teachers

Implementation of the numerous aspects of the new accreditation system listed above has been no small undertaking. Below is a brief summary of some of the major components of the 2016-17 accreditation activities. In an effort to ensure successful implementation of the numerous aspects of the *Strengthening and Streamlining Project*, the 2016-17 year was not an average year with routine accreditation activities such as site visits. Rather, at the Commission's direction, efforts were focused on developing efficient and effective processes and procedures, materials, training reviewers, and the provision of extensive technical assistance to all program sponsors. All accreditation site visits, with the exception of revisits and follow up for institutions with issues previously identified by site visit teams, were deferred by one year. Site visits resume in the fall of 2017.

Because of the unusual nature of the year's accreditation activities, this report is also different than previous reports as there are fewer institutional accreditation findings on which to report. However, where appropriate, the efforts to implement the above list of components of the Strengthening and Streamlining Project are included in this report.



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

Maintain public access to the [Committee on Accreditation](#).

The COA held meetings on the following dates:

- August 8, 2016
- November 9, 2016
- February 3, 2017
- March 24, 2017
- June 29, 2017

All Committee meetings were held in public and all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. The Commission’s website was utilized fully to provide agenda items and 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 and to ensure access for all participants, phone conferencing and Zoom, a videoconferencing program, were used frequently, where possible and appropriate, in order that those located in various regions of California who are involved in accreditation activities could participate without the time and cost commitments required of traveling to the Commission offices. Unfortunately, recent changes to the Commission’s communication system no longer allows for simultaneous web broadcasting and web conferencing. Because the Zoom capability is a necessity for COA business, the simultaneous web broadcasting had to be suspended. However, the zoom link is available to anyone who wishes to listen to the meeting in real time.

*PSD News*. The PSD E-news, developed in 2008, continued to be distributed weekly. This electronic notification reaches over 2,000 individuals 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 comment.

[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 2016-2017 year, issuing 12 PSAs. The 12 PSAs issued from July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017 are as follows:

| Number                | Issue Date      | Title   |
|-----------------------|-----------------|---|
| <a href="#">16-08</a> | July 8, 2016    | Adoption of Revised California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) |
| <a href="#">16-09</a> | August 19, 2016 | Institution Profile Dashboard: Adding Institution's Comment             |

| Number                | Issue Date         | Title  |
|-----------------------|--------------------|--|
| <a href="#">16-10</a> | September 7, 2016  | Updates on Implementation of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) Subject Matter Requirements (SMRs)   |
| <a href="#">16-11</a> | September 30, 2016 | English Learner Authorizations for Holders of Preliminary Teaching Credentials   |
| <a href="#">16-12</a> | November 4, 2016   | Reinstating Elementary Subject Matter Programs   |
| <a href="#">16-13</a> | December 15, 2016  | Clear Induction Administrative Services Credential: Change to 120 Day Enrollment Requirement and Clarification of Professional Learning                                  |
| <a href="#">16-14</a> | December 15, 2016  | 2016 General Preconditions and Revised Website   |
| <a href="#">16-15</a> | December 16, 2016  | Bachelor's Degree Requirement for a California Credential  |
| <a href="#">17-01</a> | January 23, 2017   | Commission Adoption of Teacher Induction Preconditions and Program Standards (2016)  |
| <a href="#">17-02</a> | January 30, 2017   | Required Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Preparation Program Use of an Updated Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) Model Beginning in the 2018-19 Program Year |
| <a href="#">17-03</a> | February 22, 2017  | Revised Preconditions for Subject Matter Proficiency Requirements Applicable to Candidates in Undergraduate Integrated Programs  |
| <a href="#">17-04</a> | April 26, 2017     | Board of Institutional Review (BIR) Training   |

The PSA is used to communicate to program sponsors a specific issue such as requirements and deadlines 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 when necessary.

Maintain a [Public Website of All Accreditation Results and Status for Each Institution](#). For a number of years, the Commission has maintained a website where all accreditation site visit reports and actions taken by the COA is available to the public. The site includes the team report for each institution as well as the letter to the institution with the formal COA Action taken. The website is: [https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmp/accreditation/accreditation\\_reports.php](https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmp/accreditation/accreditation_reports.php).

The website is updated after each COA meeting to reflect any additional actions taken and includes the reports and actions for the most recent accreditation cycle.

*Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission.* COA Co-Chairs Pia Wong and Anna Moore presented the COA annual report to the Commission at the [December 2016 Commission Meeting](#).

*Commission Liaison.* 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. For the 2016-17 year, the liaison to the COA was Commissioner Haydee Rodriguez who attended the COA meetings regularly.

*Implementation of a Fee Recovery System for Certain Accreditation Activities and Annual Accreditation Fee.* The Commission continued implementation of a cost recovery plan (regulations effective October 2013), for the review of new programs and for accreditation activities outside the typical accreditation cycle. In addition, in 2016-17, the Commission began looking at revisions to the regulations to align the language to aspects of the new accreditation system. This work will continue in 2017-18.

In addition, the Commission continued implementation of the Annual Accreditation Fee structure (Emergency regulations became effective in August 2014, followed by permanent regulations that became effective as of April 1, 2015.) As routinely scheduled, in 2016-17, Commission staff calculated the appropriate annual accreditation fees, invoiced institutions, collected the fees, and communicated with institutions when questions or disputes arose. These funds continue to be critical to supporting the infrastructure of the Commission's accreditation system.

*Removing Ability to Recommend: Strengthening the Implications for Noncompliance with Accreditation Requirements.* The ability to remove an institution's authority to recommend credentials continues to help to ensure that institutions comply with accreditation requirements in a timely manner. As noted in the Annual Report for 2014-15, the Commission began to increase the use of its ability to remove an institutional authority to recommend credentials in instances in which an institution is not complying with accreditation timelines and expectations. During 2016-17 five institutions did not pay the annual accreditation by the October 31, 2016 deadline at which time their ability to recommend credentials was removed until payment of the fees and a \$500 extraordinary fee was received. Each of the five institutions subsequently paid these fees and the ability to recommend credentials was reinstated.

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

*Professional Accreditation of Institutions and their Credential Preparation Programs.* This is one of the primary 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 2016-17 year was a highly unusual year as the Commission approved the deferment of site visits scheduled for 2016-17 by one year in order to provide time for the institutions to plan and implement the vast number of changes required of the Strengthening and Streamlining Project including new standards and requirements for programs. The Commission staff used this year to provide extensive technical assistance to institutions as well as to refine the processes and procedures of the various components of the new accreditation system. The Commission did, however, ensure follow up would continue to take place for any institution that had to address stipulations, including revisits. This section includes a summary of both of those activities.

*Ensuring Institutions Addressed Stipulations.* A list of the institutions that had stipulations placed upon it by the COA in a previous year is included in Section II of this report. Of the ten institutions that were accredited with stipulations in previous years, the COA removed the stipulations fully in the 2016-17 for six of them. Of the remaining four institutions, all made significant progress and were given additional time to address any remaining stipulations.

*Technical Assistance Efforts.* At the September 2016 meeting, staff brought forward a plan for technical assistance for the 2016-17 year and it was approved by the Commission. An Accreditation Technical Assistance Webpage was established on the Commission’s website and stakeholders were kept informed of upcoming technical assistance opportunities through emails and the PSD Enews. Additionally, staff made itself available to present and discuss information at a variety of stakeholder meetings and conferences throughout the year. More than 2,000 institutional representatives from approximately 250 institutions participated in a wide variety of technical assistance activities.

This technical assistance work was summarized in a Commission agenda item presented at the June 2017 Commission meeting [June 2017 Technical Assistance Summary](#). The tables below illustrate the numerous technical assistance meetings and webinars that staff and the field were engaged in to ensure that the Commission’s newly adopted standards, requirements, and accreditation system would be implemented effectively and efficiently. Additional detail on these activities can be found in the Commission agenda item referenced above but summary tables are provided in order to demonstrate the frequency and scope of these technical assistance activities in 2016-17.

**Technical Assistance for an Overview of the Accreditation System**

| Technical Assistance Activity                    | Date/Location                 | Attendees |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Webcast: Overview of the Accreditation System    | <a href="#">Watch Webcast</a> | Unknown   |
| Presentation and Discussion at CCAC (2 sessions) | October 2016, Sacramento      | 80        |
| Presentation and Discussion at CCTE (2 sessions) | October 2016, San Diego       | 200       |

**Technical Assistance for Common Standards, Preconditions, and Program Review**

| Technical Assistance Activity                                   | Date/Location                           | Attendees |
|---|---|-----------|
| Webcast: Common Standards                                       | <a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>           | Unknown   |
| Webcast: Preconditions  | <a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>           | Unknown   |
| Webcast: Program Review Preliminary Programs                    | <a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>           | Unknown   |
| Webcast: Program Review Induction Programs                      | <a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>           | Unknown   |
| Common Standards, Preconditions, for Green Cohort Institutions. | Commission Office                       | 72        |
|   | Brandman University                     |           |
| Program Review: Yellow Cohort Preliminary Programs              | November 16, Commission Office          | 38        |
|   | January 18, Loyola Marymount University |           |

| Technical Assistance Activity   | Date/Location                              | Attendees |
|---|--|-----------|
| Program Review: Yellow Cohort Induction Programs  | November 18, Commission Office             | 43        |
|   | January 13, Loyola Marymount University    |           |
| Program Review: Yellow Cohort Q and A   | May 1, 9, 11, 16, Zoom Meetings            | 29        |
| Accreditation Year Five: Program Review and Common Standards Submission: Induction Programs   | February 7, Brandman University            | 152       |
|   | February 8, National University, San Diego |           |
|   | February 24, Commission Offices            |           |
|   | March 16, New Haven USD                    |           |
|   | April 21, Kings COE                        |           |
| Accreditation Year Five: Program Review and Common Standards Submission: Preliminary Programs | January 25, St. Mary's College             | 108       |
|   | February 17, Fresno Pacific University     |           |
|   | February 23, Commission Offices            |           |
|   | March 10, CSU Fullerton, Irvine            |           |
|   | March 17, Mount St. Mary's                 |           |
| Common Standard 5: Program Impact   |  | ~70       |
| Leadership for Accreditation for Deans and Directors  | March 31, CCTE Sacramento                  | ~50       |

#### Technical Assistance for Preliminary Multiple/Single Subject Standards and TPEs

| Technical Assistance Activity              | Date/Location                           | Attendees |
|--|---|-----------|
| Webcast: MS/SS Standards                   | <a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>           | Unknown   |
| Webcast: Teaching Performance Expectations | <a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>           | Unknown   |
| Transition Plan Zoom Meetings (7 meetings) | <a href="#">Recorded Zoom Meeting</a>   | 74        |
| Regional Meetings (6)                      | September 26, Fresno Pacific University | 202       |
|  | September 27, Commission Offices        |           |
|  | September 27, St. Mary's College        |           |
|  | October 4, Claremont Graduate Univ.     |           |
|  | October 4, National University          |           |
|  | October 5, CSU Northridge               |           |
| MS/SS Standard 3: Implications for Interns | October 4, CSU East Bay                 | 75        |
|  | October 18, Los Angeles COE             |           |
|  | October 19, Cal Poly Pomona             |           |

#### Initial Technical Assistance for Administrator/Teacher Performance Assessments

| Technical Assistance Activity | Date/Location                             | Attendees |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------|
| Cal APA (2 Sessions)          | October 7, CAPEA San Diego                | 80        |
| Cal APA Webinar Meetings      | Dec. 16, Jan. 14, Feb. 8, Mar. 1, Mar. 15 | 93        |
| In-Person Cal APA Meeting     | February 17, Point Loma University        | 7         |
| Office Hours CalAPA           | Fridays, beginning January 2017 (phone)   | 25        |
| Cal TPA Webinar Meetings      | Dec. 15, Jan. 13, Feb. 8, Mar 1, Mar. 15  | 143       |

| Technical Assistance Activity | Date/Location                            | Attendees |
|-------------------------------|--|-----------|
| In-Person Cal TPA Meeting     | January 23, University of San Diego      | 21        |
| Cal TPA Coordinators Meeting  | March 24, Brandman University            | 27        |
| Office Hours Cal TPA          | Fridays, beginning January. 2017 (phone) | 24        |

### Technical Assistance for Teacher Induction Program Standards Implementation

| Technical Assistance Activity   | Date/Location  | Attendees |
|---|--|-----------|
| Webcast: Transitioning to the New Teacher Induction Preconditions and Standards | <a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>                                | Unknown   |
| Support for Implementing New Standards Fall Meetings                            | September 28, Los Angeles USD                                | 328       |
|   | September 29, Fontana USD                                    |           |
|   | September 30, Merced COE                                     |           |
|   | October 17, Davis Joint USD                                  |           |
|   | October 19, New Haven USD                                    |           |
|   | November 4, San Diego COE                                    |           |
| Transitioning to Induction, Presentation and Discussion                         | October 12-14, CCAC  | 220       |
| How Data Drives Improvement within the Commission's New Accreditation System    | January 27, Induction Program Evaluation Meeting, Sacramento | 130       |
| Support for Implementing New Standards Spring Meetings                          | January 24, Los Angeles COE                                  | 70        |
|   | February 3, Tulare COE                                       | 47        |
|   | February 8, St. Mary's College                               | 97        |
|   | May 4, Riverside COE   | 54        |
|   | May 9, San Diego COE   | 29        |

### Technical Assistance for Institutions Preparing for 2017-18 Site Visits

| Technical Assistance Activity                | Date/Location                              | Attendees       |
|--|--|-----------------|
| Site Visit Preparation: Green Cohort         | January 19, Commission Offices             | 62              |
|  | January 19, Brandman University, Irvine    |                 |
| Year-Out from Site Visit Consultant Previsit | Spring - Summer 2017                       | 29 institutions |
| Monthly Phone/Zoom Conferences               | Begun Spring 2017, continuing until visit. |                 |

### Initial Technical Assistance Activities for the Board of Institutional Reviewers

| Technical Assistance Activity                 | Date/Location                                | Attendees |
|---|--|-----------|
| Program Reviewer Training and Review          | February 13, Santa Clara COE                 | 64        |
|   | February 23, Commission Office               |           |
|   | April 21, Brandman University, Irvine        |           |
| Common Standards Reviewer Training and Review | May 2, Commission Office                     | 6         |
|   | May 10, Loyola Marymount University          | 13        |
|   | May 12, St. Mary's College                   | 7         |
|   | June 6, Riverside County Office of Education | 10        |
|   | June 16, Commission Office                   | 4         |
|   | June 23, Fresno Pacific University           | 18        |

| Technical Assistance Activity | Date/Location  | Attendees |
|-------------------------------|--|-----------|
|                               | July 7-August 17, make-up reviews, various locations | 15        |

### Technical Assistance Provided to Institutions Seeking Initial Approval

| Technical Assistance Activity   | Date/Location                  | Attendees                        |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Accreditation 101: Expectations and Responsibilities for Commission Approved Institutions | August 31, Commission Office   | 80 (16 prospective institutions) |
|   | September 1, Commission Office |                                  |
|   | December 13, Commission Office |                                  |
|   | April 12, Commission Office    |                                  |

### Other Related Activities

| Technical Assistance Activity  | Date/Location                               | Attendees |
|--|---|-----------|
| Think Tanks in Preparation for Transition to New Administrative Services Program Standards (Table 4) | Multiple dates and locations during 2015-16 | 73        |
| Update for Interns, Q and A (2 sessions)   | October 12-14, CCAC, Sacramento             | 185       |
| Update on Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services  | October 12-14, CCAC, Sacramento             | 80        |
| Webcast: Elementary Subject Matter Programs  | <a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>               | Unknown   |
| Cohort Consultant Email, program-specific email, and phone calls                                     | Ongoing daily                               | Unknown*  |

\*Average of 50 per week per consultant

Overall, approximately 85% of institutions took part in one or more technical assistance events. The transition year allowed time and resources for staff to assist institutions and programs to successfully implement new standards and accreditation activities by the 2017-18 academic year. An unintended, but welcomed outcome was that new relationships with program sponsors were forged and existing ones were strengthened.

*Accreditation Handbook revisions.* The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. As the various components of the new accreditation system were developed, staff and the COA considering what language needed to be included in the *Handbook*. Considering revisions to processes and procedures as a result of the strengthening and streamlining accreditation project were a considerable part of the COA work in 2016 and the COA adopted many of the revisions to the *Accreditation Handbook* in March and April of 2016 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook.html>). As implementation of the various components began in 2016-17, the *Handbook* language became critically important and adjustments to the *Handbook* will continue to be made as staff and COA have more experiences with implementation. An example of a significant *Handbook* change in 2017 included the additional revision to the Initial Institutional Approval Process enacted by the Commission in February 2017. The COA incorporated those changes into the *Handbook* in March 2017.

*Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission.* During 2016-17 staff continued to prepare agenda items for the COA on issues related to the Commission's work as directed by the Commission or as appropriate to the continuing work of the Committee. The COA continued to discuss issues referred to it by the Commission and provide guidance as appropriate. With the efforts to streamline and strengthen accreditation this function continued to be critically important in 2016-17.

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

*Review and take action to grant initial approval of new program sponsors.* In October 2015, the Commission approved a new initial institutional approval policy for institutions seeking to become a Commission-approved program sponsor of educator preparation programs in California. The requirements for an institution to become a Commission-approved educator preparation program sponsor in California was an area in which significant strengthening and revision was necessary as it had not been reviewed in many years. The Commission lifted the temporary moratorium on Initial Institutional Approval in February 2016. As the Commission updated the [Accreditation Framework](#) and the [Accreditation Handbook](#), implementation began in early spring 2016 with the first Accreditation 101 session being held on May 10, 2016. Additional sessions of Accreditation 101 sessions were held in August 2016, September 2016, December 2016, and April 2017. A total of 16 institutions interested in offering educator preparation in California attended with a team of key individuals, as required.

During this reporting period the Commission also made significant adjustments to the new process for Initial Institutional Approval. The Commissioners directed the staff to review and provide recommendations on some of the Eligibility Criteria, specifically with respect to areas of lesser discretion which then allowed the Commission to focus its attention and review on those areas believed to require greater Commission deliberation, discretion, and agreement. The Commission approved these changes at the February 2017 meeting and they were incorporated into the [Accreditation Handbook](#) by the COA at its March 2017 meeting.

As a result of the establishment of the new Initial Institutional Approval process, the first 5 (five) institutions were brought to the Commission for consideration and approval for one of the Stages of Initial Institutional Approval. These are listed in Section II of this report.

*Review and take action to grant initial program approval for 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 for Commission-approved institutions. Programs are only granted initial approval when reviewers have determined that all Commission's standards are met and after COA acts to approve. This review process continued in 2016-17. Because institutions may submit program proposals anytime throughout the year, the Commission attempts to find reviewers willing and able to review the documents as soon as possible. As a result, the vast majority of the reviews for new program proposals are conducted remotely – with reviewers being sent the documents and devoting time on their own schedule, at their homes or offices, working via technology with their initial program



review partner. A total of 29 new programs were approved by the COA in 2016-17. The list of these new programs is included in Section II of this report.

*Complete the “old” Program Assessment activities and begin the “new” Program Review process.* The Green cohort was the last cohort to submit Program Assessment documents under the former process in 2014. The results of this process will be used in accreditation site visits in 2017-18. All institutions, commencing with the Yellow Cohort in Fall 2017, will submit Program Review. In 2016-17, the streamlined evidence requirements and processes for the new Program Review process were developed and finalized. In addition, the process was piloted with the Administrative Services credential programs since the timing of the adoption of new standards and performance expectations proved ideal to pilot the new system prior to going to scale. The feedback from reviewers of the Administrative Service credential Program Review was overwhelmingly positive with most reviewers expressing that they believed they better understood the program they were reviewing than the lengthy narrative of the previous process, and yet they were able to complete the review task in a much shorter window of time. This new process has every indication of meeting the Commission’s charge to both strengthen and streamline the accreditation process.

*Begin the New Common Standards Review Process.* Commission staff developed and the COA approved a new streamlined approach to Common Standards review which included the submission of prescribed documentation and information along with very limited narrative. Common Standards submissions for the Green Cohort were due in March 2017 and during the spring and summer 2017, the new Common Standards review process was implemented for the first time and will be used to inform this year’s site visits. Like the Program Review process, reviewers expressed overwhelming positive support for the new process noting that they were able to complete the review process and reach preliminary findings in a much shorter timeframe than the previous process. Knowing that the team lead and the Common Standards reviewers who read the submissions would also be at the site visit allowed them to feel confident that any areas needing follow up or further inquiry that resulted from the document review would take place since they were already familiar with the issues and outstanding questions.

*Begin the New Process of Review of the Preconditions.* The Commission’s new accreditation system requires that preconditions be submitted and reviewed in Years 1 and 4 of the 7-year cycle. Three cohorts of institutions submitted preconditions in Spring 2017. They included Yellow and Violet who were in years 1 and 4 of the cycle and the Green Cohort, who because of where they fell within the timeframe of shifting from one accreditation system to another, were also required to submit updated preconditions documents. Reviewing these preconditions was a significant endeavor that required the participation of most of the consultants and analysts in the Professional Services Division. Follow up and corrections were required of many programs and hence required a second review. Numerous potential improvements in the submission and review process were identified and will be incorporated in time for the submission of the preconditions for spring 2018.

*Development of the new Annual Data System.* The development of a new annual data system was one of the key components to the work plan for 2016-17. The Commission entered into an agreement with a technology contractor who worked closely with the Commission staff over the course of the year to build the infrastructure necessary to allow institutions to provide consistent data about their programs, candidates, and outcomes. The data system is multi-pronged and multi-purposed. Various aspects of the system and the data will be used by institutions, the Commission and its staff, and accreditation teams. In addition, where appropriate, some of the data will interface with the data dashboards and be available to members of the public. First year efforts include establishing institutional logins, designating the type of authority individuals from each institution will have within the system, and beginning to establish program “sets” with basic data (pathways offered, enrollment, completion information, etc.). As the data system is more developed over time, additional information, particularly outcomes-based data, will be included in the annual data system.

*Implementation of Survey Instruments.* Using data from survey instruments is one important component to increasing the focus on outcomes in the accreditation system. In 2016-17 the Completer Surveys (Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, Clear Admin Services, General Education Induction, and Clear Education Specialist Induction) were integrated into the credential recommendation process so that program completers must go through the survey to pay for the credential that was earned. A completer may elect to not respond to the survey, but the number of completers who have done this is small. The response rate for the surveys in prior years had varied between 20 and 30% for the state with some institutions having no completers submit a survey. With the survey embedded into the credential recommendation process the response rate for the 2016-17 surveys varied from 92-96%. Completer Surveys are open from September 1 to August 31 annually with the program reports being sent to institutions in October for the prior year.

In addition to the six Completer Surveys, the Commission administers both a Master Teacher survey and an Employer survey. The Master Teacher survey was in its second year of administration while the Employer Survey was piloted in 2016-17. The Master Teacher survey is open from September 1-August 31 annually. Preliminary teacher preparation programs send the link to the Master Teacher survey to all their master teachers. The Employer Survey is open in the fall—November-December—and asks employers to provide feedback on an institution’s programs if the employer has hired at least 2 completers from that program in the past 3 years. More information on the Surveys can be found on this [webpage](#):

The results from the surveys will be used by accreditation site visit teams in 2017-18 to inform accreditation findings and, when appropriate, to streamline the review. When the response rate is high and the feedback positive for an institution and its programs, a smaller proportion of program completers may be needed for interviews during the site visit. At the conclusion of this first year of using the survey instruments to inform accreditation activities, staff and the COA will review how the teams used survey information to focus their review.

*Develop and Implement a New Team Lead Training.* In early Fall of 2017, the Commission staff held two Team Lead training sessions for those individuals who would be leading site visit teams in 2017-18 with the Green Cohort institutions. This training covered a variety of topics including the overall approach of the new accreditation system, an overview of new aspects of the standards, and the new processes and procedures required. These trainings were very successful and well attended.

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

*Noting Late Submission.* Providing a report on institutions that have not complied with the required timelines and due dates has become a standard agenda item for the COA. Staff continued the reports in 2016-17 at each COA meeting. These included institutions that were late in submitting required transition plans for the transition to new standards. This information has improved the COA's understanding of institutions that have not complied with the Commission's timelines for accreditation activities and has served as additional leverage with institutions to ensure compliance.

*Continue implementation of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.* Because no initial site visits were conducted in 2016-17, site visit surveys for team leads, team members, institutions, and consultants were not necessary. Staff uses this information to determine what additional trainings are needed in the future, how consultants and team leads can be assisted in their responsibilities, and to identify both leadership potential in members of the BIR and or biases and issues that may have arisen with BIR members. This feature will be reinstated as site visits resume in fall 2017.

*Continue partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate.* A new Partnership Agreement with CAEP was signed by both parties in May 2015. During 2016-17, Commission staff continued to work with the CAEP staff to better understand new CAEP standards and processes and to determine their applicability to California's context. Commission staff communicated with CAEP staff on issues as they arose and were able to secure a deferment of site visits to align with the Commission's timeline for deferment of site visits by one year for extensive technical assistance activities. In addition, Commission staff attends both the CAEP clinic for state agencies charged with the responsibility of program approval and accreditation and the annual CAEP conference. These meetings ensure staff has an understanding of the requirements of CAEP review as well as is able to identify any work necessary to maintain a joint review process for institutions seeking both state and national accreditation. This work continues.

*Board of Institutional Reviewer's (BIR) Training.* Following the substantial revisions to processes and procedures and to incorporate outcomes data such as survey results, it becomes necessary to significantly revise the training for both new and veteran reviewers. Under the previous BIR training, most of the training took place face to face over a period of 3-4 days. Under the new system, training is divided into two major activities: 1) Program Review or Common Standards Review, and 2) Site Visit Training. Under the first activity – Program Review or Common Standards

Review - the reviewers are trained to review and analyze a prescribed set of evidence that is required to be submitted by institutions and programs and determine, primarily on the basis of the evidence alone with very limited narrative whether the standards appear to be preliminarily aligned. Staff conducted the training for all of the Common Standards reviews in 2016-17 for the Green Cohort, the pilot Program Reviews for the Administrative Services credential programs, and will now begin to implement this training in Fall 2017 with program review for all credential areas for the Yellow Cohort in preparation for their 2018-19 accreditation site visits.

The second part of the training is site visit training which is comprised of part online modules and face to face training. Staff is currently in the process of revising this training and the first sessions will begin in late spring/early summer 2018.

### **Other Activities Not Directly In the Accreditation System**

*Review and Approve Subject Matter Programs - Elementary Subject Matter Programs (ESM) and Single Subject Matter Programs.* Subject Matter programs do not fall within the Commission's accreditation system, nevertheless, reviewing subject matter programs is an important function of the Professional Services Division and approving these programs is an important function of the Commission, this activity is reported here. All teaching candidates must demonstrate subject matter competence. In the years following No Child Left Behind, those pursuing Single Subject credentials could demonstrate subject matter competence through either a Commission approved subject matter program or successful passage of the CSET examination in the subject area of the credential. Those pursuing Multiple Subject credentials were required to pass the CSET Multiple Subject examination and completion of a Commission approved elementary subject matter program was not sufficient. In 2016, the Commission approved regulations, which were subsequently approved by the Office of Administrative Law in 2017, to allow passage of a Commission approved Elementary Subject Matter examination to count as demonstration of subject matter competence. With the change in policy that once again allowed for Commission approved subject matter programs to waive the CSET examination for demonstration of subject matter competence for multiple subject candidates, the responsibility to review and approve these programs once again became a priority for the Commission. All total, 7 institutions were approved by the Commission after review by subject matter experts that determined the programs to be in alignment with the Elementary Subject Matter standards. In addition, the Commission continues to review and approve all proposals submitted for Single Subject Matter programs. These programs are included in Section II.

### **General Operations**

In addition to the above mentioned items, the COA engaged 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 2016-17 Accreditation Activities

This section of the report provides more detailed information about results of the 2016-17 Work Plan with a focus on accreditation activities.

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

In 2016-17 accreditation site visits for the Green cohort institutions were deferred until 2017-18 per Commission action in order to allow for extensive technical assistance and to allow the Commission staff the opportunity to develop and implement processes and procedures in accordance with the new accreditation system. These site visits resume in fall 2017 and will continue throughout the Spring 2018. The results of the 29 site visits will be included in next year's Annual Report to the Commission.

### ***Institutions in 7<sup>th</sup> Year Follow Up***

Although the initial accreditation visits for the Green cohort were deferred by one year, follow up for those institutions that were reviewed in previous years was continued. In some cases the follow up included a document or evidence review only and in other cases a revisit was conducted, depending on the COA decision.

| <b>2016-17 Accreditation Follow-Up<br/>Institutions with Stipulations</b> |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| <b>Revisits</b>   |  |   | <b>Current Status for Institutions<br/>with Stipulations Remaining</b>   |
| <b>Program<br/>Sponsor</b>  | <b>2015-2016<br/>Decision</b>                | <b>2016-2017<br/>Revisit Decision</b>                                       |  |
| Alliant University  | Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations | Accreditation   |  |
| Baldwin Park Unified school District                                      | Accreditation with Stipulations              | Accreditation   |  |
| California School for the Deaf  | Accreditation with Stipulations              | Accreditation with Stipulations<br>COA removed 3 of 5 stipulations (6/2017) | COA removed 1 of 2 remaining stipulations (11/2017)<br>COA to review actions taken by institution to address final stipulation (spring 2018) |
| Dominican University  | Accreditation with Major Stipulations        | Accreditation   |  |
| Holy Names University   | Accreditation with Major Stipulations        | Accreditation with Stipulations<br>COA removed 7 of 8 stipulations (6/2017) | COA to review actions taken by institution to address final stipulation (spring 2018)  |

| <b>2016-17 Accreditation Follow-Up<br/>Institutions with Stipulations</b> |                                 |   |  |
|---|---------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Revisits</b>   |                                 |   | <b>Current Status for Institutions<br/>with Stipulations Remaining</b>                   |
| <b>Program<br/>Sponsor</b>  | <b>2015-2016<br/>Decision</b>   | <b>2016-2017<br/>Revisit Decision</b>                                       |  |
| Oak Grove School District   | Accreditation with Stipulations | Accreditation   |  |
| Tehama Department of Education  | Accreditation with Stipulations | Accreditation with Stipulations<br>COA removed 5 of 6 stipulations (6/2017) | Will return to COA early 2018 for consideration of removal of last remaining stipulation |
| UC Riverside  | Accreditation with Stipulations | Accreditation   |  |
| United States University  | Accreditation with Stipulations | Accreditation with Major Stipulations                                       | All Stipulations Removed 11/2017 Accreditation   |
| Vallejo City Unified School District                                      | Accreditation with Stipulations | Accreditation   |  |

The institutions below were granted the status of “Accreditation” and did not have stipulations. However, the COA requested a 7<sup>th</sup> year report from the institution. This occurs when there is an aspect of the program that the COA wants to be certain was actually implemented or maintained one year later.

| <b>7<sup>th</sup> Year Reports</b>       |   |               |
|--|---|---------------|
| Chaffey Joint Union High School District | Accreditation w/7 <sup>th</sup> Year Report | Accreditation |
| Vanguard University                      | Accreditation w/7 <sup>th</sup> Year Report | Accreditation |

***Parts of this Section that Cannot Be Completed this Year***

Because all site visits were deferred by one year pursuant to Commission action, there were no site visits other than revisits in 2016-17. Typically, this section of the report includes data on the results of the accreditation site visits for the reporting year. In addition, it includes analysis of this data. The following tables and charts are typically provided in this section:

- 1) Institutions Receiving Accreditation with All Common and Program Standards Met
- 2) A list credential programs included in site visits for a given year where all program standards were met for all institutions visited that year
- 3) A table of the findings on each of the Common Standards (Met, Met with Concerns, Not Met) for the institutions that were visited in that year
- 4) A five year trend for Common Standards results

- 5) A summary of the findings for each of the Program Standards for all the programs that were reviewed during the site visits for the reporting period

These charts, tables, and analysis of the results of the site visits taking place in 2017-18 will be provided in next year’s Annual Report. This information will provide the Commission with insight as to how well some of the new program standards are being implemented in these early years of implementation and which ones institutions are having difficulty implementing effectively.

**Initial Approval of New Credential Programs (IPR)**

Institutions seeking Initial Program Approval for new credential programs 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, and 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. In addition, the institution submits a response to all relevant program specific preconditions, which are reviewed by Commission staff. When all standards are found to be met and all relevant preconditions are determined to be addressed, Commission staff includes the item, along with a paragraph about the program written by the institution, in the COA agenda at the next scheduled meeting. Initial Program Approval actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation in 2016-17 are listed in the tables below.

| <b>New Educator Preparation Programs Approved (29)</b> |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Credential Program</b>                              | <b>Institutional Sponsor</b>                        |
| Added Authorization: Orthopedic Impairment (1)         | San Diego County Office of Education                |
| Administrative Services Clear Induction (4)            | Brandman University                                 |
|  | Orange Unified School District                      |
|  | Sonoma County Office of Education                   |
|  | Pomona Unified School District                      |
| Bilingual Authorization (5)                            | California State University, Chico (Hmong, Punjabi) |
|  | University of California, Los Angeles (Mandarin)    |
|  | San Francisco Unified School District (Spanish)     |
|  | Santa Clara University                              |
| Clear Education Specialist Induction (3)               | Dos Palos Oro Loma Joint Unified School District    |
|  | Hayward Unified School District                     |
|  | Culver City Unified School District                 |
| Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Intern (4)          | San Francisco Unified School District               |
|  | Sonoma County Office of Education                   |
|  | Biola University                                    |

| <b>New Educator Preparation Programs Approved (29)</b>    |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Credential Program</b>                                 | <b>Institutional Sponsor</b>              |
|   | Sacramento County Office of Education     |
| General Education (Multiple and Single Subject) Induction | CalState TEACH                            |
| Multiple Subject Intern (2)                               | San Francisco Unified School District     |
|   | Sonoma County Office of Education         |
| Preliminary Administrative Services (4)                   | Placer County Office of Education         |
|   | Shasta County Office of Education         |
|   | Riverside County Office of Education      |
|   | University of California, Los Angeles     |
| Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate (1)        | University of California, Santa Barbara   |
| Preliminary Single Subject (1)                            | Summit Public Schools                     |
| Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling (1)           | La Sierra University                      |
| Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology (1)           | California State University, Monterey Bay |
| Single Subject Intern (1)                                 | Sonoma County Office of Education         |
| Speech-Language Pathology (1)                             | Biola University                          |

**Initial Approval of New Subject Matter Programs**

Although subject matter programs are not part of the accreditation system, reviewing new program proposals are a significant part of the Professional Services Division priorities. The programs reviewed and approved by the Commission in 2016-17 are included in the table below.

| <b>New Subject Matter Programs</b> |                               |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| CSU Channel Islands                | Elementary Subject Matter     |
| CSU Dominguez Hills                | Elementary Subject Matter     |
| CSU Long Beach                     | Elementary Subject Matter     |
| CSU Stanislaus                     | Elementary Subject Matter     |
| Concordia University               | Elementary Subject Matter     |
| Point Loma Nazarene University     | Elementary Subject Matter     |
| San Jose State University          | Elementary Subject Matter     |
| California Baptist University      | Single Subject - English      |
| California Baptist University      | Single Subject Social Science |
| William Jessup University          | Single Subject - English      |

**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. Inactive programs may be teaching out the remaining candidates but are not enrolling additional students. 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 COA and Administrator of Accreditation. The following programs noted below were initially declared to be in an Inactive status in 2016-17.

| <b>Programs Entering Inactive Status (17)</b> |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Institution</b>                            | <b>Program</b>   |
| Argosy University                             | Preliminary Administrative Services Credential                     |
| Azusa Unified School District                 | General Education (Multiple/Single Subject) Induction Program      |
| California State University, Chico            | Single Subject Credential Program: Health Science                  |
|   | Single Subject Credential Program: Home Economics                  |
|   | Single Subject Credential Program: Music                           |
| California State University, San Marcos       | California Teacher of English Learners (CTEL) Program              |
| Concordia University                          | Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Preliminary Intern Program      |
| Fresno Pacific University                     | Clear Education Specialist Induction Program                       |
|   | Clear General Education (MS/SS) Credential Program                 |
| San Joaquin County Office of Education        | Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education Program    |
|   | Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disorders Program              |
|   | Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Disorders Program            |
|   | Multiple Subject Intern Credential Program                         |
| Santa Clara University                        | Single Subject Intern Credential Program                           |
|   | Education Specialist-Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder |
| Temple City Unified School District           | General Education (Multiple/Single Subject) Induction Program      |
| Touro University                              | Clear Education Specialist Induction Program                       |

***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 one year before a new program proposal will be accepted.

| <b>Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (31)</b> |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Institution</b>   | <b>Program</b>  |
| Azusa Pacific University                                   | Preliminary Single Subject Program Health Services                            |
|  | Preliminary Single Subject Program Home Economics                             |
|  | Preliminary Single Subject Program Industrial and Technology Education        |
|  | Preliminary Single Subject Program Agriculture                                |
| Butte County Office of Education                           | Clear Education Specialist Induction Program                                  |
|  | General Education (Multiple/Single Subject) Induction Program                 |
| California State University Fresno                         | Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder          |
| California State University, Bakersfield                   | Clear Education Specialist Induction Program                                  |
|  | Education Specialist Level II – Mild/Moderate Credential Program              |
|  | Education Specialist Level II – Moderate/Severe Credential Program            |
| California State University, San Bernardino                | Clear Education Specialist Induction Program                                  |
|  | Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder          |
|  | Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education |
|  | Reading Certificate   |
| California State University, Stanislaus                    | California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) Program                        |
| Fielding Graduate University                               | Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program                        |
| Fresno Pacific University                                  | Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder          |
|  | Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance             |
| Madera County Superintendent of Schools                    | Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder          |
| National University  | Career Technical Education (CTE) Teacher Preparation Program                  |
| Ocean View School District                                 | General Education (Multiple/Single Subject) Induction Program                 |
| Patten University  | Multiple/Single Subject Credential Program                                    |
|  | Single Subject Credential Program   |
| San Joaquin County Office of Education                     | Clear Education Specialist Induction Program                                  |
|  | Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder          |
|  | Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program                        |
| University of California, Riverside                        | Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling                                   |

| <b>Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (31)</b> |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Institution</b>   | <b>Program</b>  |
| Wiseburn Unified School District                           | Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder          |
|  | Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education |
|  | Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance             |
|  | Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Traumatic Brain Injury            |

### ***Reactivation of Inactive Program***

An inactive program may be reactivated only when the institution submits a request to the COA and the COA has taken action to reactivate the program. If the preconditions or the program standards under which the program was approved have been modified, the institution or program sponsor must address the updated preconditions or standards before the program may be reactivated. During 2016-17, eight programs previously deemed inactive requested and received reactivation and are once again fully approved programs operating in California.

| <b>Reactivation Requests (8)</b>        |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Institution</b>                      | <b>Program</b>  |
| Butte County Office of Education        | Clear Education Specialist Induction Program                  |
|   | General Education (Multiple/Single Subject) Induction Program |
| California State University, Fullerton  | Multiple Subject Intern Program                               |
| California State University, Long Beach | Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education Program       |
| Escondido Union High School District    | General Education (Multiple/Single Subject) Induction Program |
| Glendale Unified School District        | General Education Induction Program                           |
| San Diego Unified School District       | Single Subject Intern Program                                 |
| University of Southern California       | Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling                   |

### ***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. This new processes were approved by the Commission in 2016 and were revisited and changes made in February 2017. The following institutions are the first institutions to be approved under the new system.

| <b>Initial Institutional Approval (5)</b> |                      |
|---|----------------------|
| Turlock Unified School District           | Provisional Approval |
| Fortune School                            | Eligibility Approved |

| <b>Initial Institutional Approval (5)</b> |                      |
|---|----------------------|
| Santa Barbara Unified School District     | Eligibility Approved |
| Las Virgenes School District              | Eligibility Approved |
| Burton School District                    | Eligibility Approved |

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

The following institutions are no longer approved program sponsors.

| <b>Institutions No Longer Approved Program Sponsors<br/>Previously Approved to Offer</b> |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Institution</b>   |   |
| Wiseburn Unified School District   | Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders<br>Added Authorization: Early Childhood special Education<br>Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance<br>Added Authorization: Traumatic Brain Injury |
| Patten University  | Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject   |

### **Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2017-18**

The work plan for the Commission and COA for 2017-18 is summarized in this section. Having spent considerable time devoted to technical assistance in 2016-17 and in establishing the new processes and procedures of the accreditation system, the focus of 2017-18 will be in completing those aspects of the new system that need to be further developed, restarting a full schedule of site visits, and further development and implementation of those aspects of the system that need have yet to be developed or implemented fully.

For 2017-18, 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 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 7, 2017  
November 17, 2017  
February 22-23, 2018  
March 22-23, 2018  
May 10-11, 2018  
June 28-29, 2018

The Committee's schedule in 2017-18 includes a full schedule of site visits beginning in the fall of 2017 and well into the spring. Twenty-nine site visits are scheduled for site visits. This schedule will take place while also implementing all aspects of the new accreditation system such as Program Review, Annual Data Submission, Preconditions Review, and Common Standards Review.

Continuing in 2017-18, the *PSD ENews*, Program Sponsor Alerts, and press releases will be routinely used to ensure a transparent accreditation process.

*Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission.* The Committee on Accreditation will present its annual report to the Commission in December 2017. 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 key to ensuring that the work of the COA and the accreditation system are aligned with the objectives and vision for the new accreditation system set forth by the Commission. 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.

*Continued Implementation of a fee recovery system for certain accreditation activities and an annual accreditation fee system.* The Commission adopted a cost recovery plan, and regulations, for the review of new programs and for accreditation activities outside the typical accreditation cycle in October 2013. In addition, in 2014, the Commission implemented an annual accreditation fee. The annual accreditation fee structure was reviewed in 2016 by the Commission in light of new standards and new requirements and new regulations proposed. The Commission staff will continue to work with the Office of Administrative Law to ensure that the regulations are adjusted to fit the various aspects of the new 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 accreditation of education institutions and their credential programs.

### *Site Visits – Green Cohort*

Beginning in the fall of 2017, the Green Cohort, comprised of 29 institutions, will undergo a site visit by a trained team of reviewers. These site visits will be the last site visits for which some aspects of the old accreditation system will be used while also incorporating aspects of the new aspects of the system. For instance program assessment documents were submitted by the Green cohort institutions and reviewed in 2014-2015. This was prior to the implementation of the new Program Review process which is now in use for all other cohorts. However, the site visits for the green cohort in 2017-18 was also the first to use the new Common Standards review process whereby narrative is limited and there is much more reliance on authentic documentation.

### *Program Standards Review – Yellow Cohort*

Program Review submissions were required for the Yellow Cohort by October 15, 2017. The Yellow Cohort is comprised of 36 institutions offering numerous educator preparation programs. These programs will be reviewed in the 2017-18 year through this Program Review process. This Program Review process, like the new Common Standards process, focuses on very specific evidence and documentation submitted that allows reviewers to determine, without extensive narrative, whether the program is preliminarily aligned to program standards. This information will be used to determine the focus of the site visit in Year 6.

The Commission staff has coordinated and assigned at least two experts in each of the credential areas to review each program submission from the Yellow Cohort. The vast majority of these review sessions are scheduled throughout November and December 2017 and will take place in a face to face manner at different locations in the state in order to review the documents expeditiously. Once the review session has taken place, the programs have an opportunity to provide an addendum responding to any areas of concern or areas needing additional information. This addendum will be used by the site visit team to determine whether the standards are met.

The Program Review sessions also serve as Part I of a two part BIR training. Those who participate either in Program Review or Common Standards review will be considered to have completed Part I BIR training, with the site visit training being Part II of BIR training.

#### *Common Standards Submission and Review – Yellow Cohort*

In February 2018, the 36 institutions that are in the Yellow Cohort will submit their documentation, in accordance with the new procedures, to demonstrate alignment with the Common Standards. One to two Common Standards reviewers and a Team Lead will be selected for each institution and will be brought together in the spring to review these submissions. The institutions will have the opportunity to provide additional information in the form of an addendum to respond to concerns or questions from reviewers. This addendum will serve to further inform the site visit reviewers. The Common Standards reviewers and the team lead that reviewed the Common Standards, will also be the Common Standards team and the team lead for the site visit so they will be very familiar with the evidence and documentation prior to arriving on site for the site visit.

Those that serve on a Common Standards review will have completed Part I of the BIR training. (See Program Standards Review).

#### *Preconditions Submission – Indigo and Orange Cohorts*

In March 2018, the institutions in the Indigo and Orange cohorts will submit their preconditions responses. Staff will review these preconditions and require follow up as soon as it is determined that there are questions involving any preconditions. If some preconditions responses are unresolved, the COA will be notified and further action will be taken as deemed appropriate by the COA.

#### *Annual Data Submission*

All Commission approved program sponsors will submit required data in 2018. It is anticipated that staff will work closely with the COA, the Commission and the field in general to further refine and clarify the information that is required in the Annual Data System. In addition, further work will be done to determine what data should be incorporated into the data dashboards with easy access for the general public.

*Review and revise the [Accreditation Handbook](#).* The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. The COA has already completed a comprehensive review and update of the *Accreditation Handbook* to ensure that any new or changed aspects of the accreditation system were reflected in this document. As the new system is implemented, if any language needs to be adjusted in the Handbook to reflect these changes, Commission staff with the COA will make sure the language is clear. In addition, there is likely to need to be some clarification of language in the Handbook in order to ensure approval of the cost recovery regulations and to satisfy the Office of Administrative Law.

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

*Review and take action to grant initial approval of new program sponsors.* As part of the Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation Project the Commission approved a new, more rigorous Initial Institutional Approval process for institutions seeking to become a Commission-approved program sponsor. At least 2 Accreditation 101 sessions will be held at various times during the year for institutions interested in becoming a Commission-approved program to better understand the expectations and responsibilities of being a program sponsor and to begin the approval process. Commission staff and BIR members will continue to review proposals for Initial Institutional Approval as they are received.

*Review and take action to grant initial program approval for 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 are only being given initial approval when the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met. This review process will continue in 2017-18. When possible, the Commission will bring reviewers together for dedicated review time, as well as encourage the participation of additional reviewers from the in-kind contribution option.

*Continue to Review and Approve Subject Matter Programs.* Although subject matter programs are not fully part of the accreditation system, there is a continued need to review and approve Elementary Subject matter programs to allow completion of a subject matter program to waive the subject matter examination. Given the significant and continuing interest in this effort, it is anticipated that the Commission will continue to need numerous trained reviewers and dedicated review time to ensure that this activity is conducted efficiently in order to allow these programs to begin operations quickly. In addition, the Commission will continue to review and approve other subject matter programs as they are submitted.

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

*Data – Annual Data Submission and Survey Data.* The Commission will continue to develop and refine the annual survey data collection process and hold discussions with the COA about the appropriate use of that data in accreditation decisions. In addition, there remains significant work to be done around the annual data submission. These discussions will continue this year and it is anticipated that specific data elements, definitions for data sources, and means of collecting, reporting, and analyzing within the newly developed data system and data dashboards will take place. The technical advisory committee convened in 2017 will be consulted as necessary as the further development and implementation of the Annual Data System progresses.

*Continued implementation 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 2018. Improvements will be discussed and incorporated into the revised accreditation system.



*Continue partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate.* The Commission staff will continue to work with institutions that seek to be both nationally accredited and state accredited as well as with CAEP and any other potential accrediting bodies, to ensure that the process is as streamlined as possible. The Commission staff continues to keep abreast with changes to the CAEP accreditation system, determine the alignment or misalignment with California's process and standards, and to clarify areas of uncertainty with respect to some of the CAEP standards for applicability to California's institutions.

*Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes.* With the advent of the work around the Pupil Personnel Services program standards, it will also be important to revisit the alignment of any new standards adopted by the Commission with the appropriate national accrediting bodies.

### **Continue Development and Implementation of the Revised Accreditation System**

Section 1 of this report provides information about the many aspects of the new accreditation system developed and/or implemented in 2016-17. The list below provides some brief information on some of the remaining aspects of the work that will need to continue in order to realize the full vision of the Commission for its accreditation system.

1. *Provide Technical Assistance on the Wide Variety of Revisions to Standards, Policy and Procedures.* Although 2016-17 was devoted to technical assistance, it may be necessary to continue to provide the field with further technical assistance over the course of the next year as new aspects of the accreditation system are further developed. For instance, the Annual Data System is at this point in its infancy and already, there is a need for more technical assistance on this topic.
2. *Revising the Board of Institutional Review Training.* Given how significantly the standards and competencies have changed, as well as the shift in reviewing programs and standards without such a reliance on long narrative, an important focus of 2017-18 will be to continue to revamp the Board of Institutional Review training. As previously mentioned in this document, the BIR training is now comprised of two parts – Part I is participation in either A) Common Standards Review or B) Program Review, and Part II is participation in Site Visit Training. The training involved in Part I for both Common Standards and Program Standards reviewers has been implemented successfully this past year. The focus of 2017-18 will be on developing the Site Visit training.

The success of the new accreditation system will depend on reviewers not only understanding the intricacies of what is being asked, but also a big picture understanding of the objectives of the Strengthening and Streamlining project. Commission staff anticipates developing a site visit training session that will be successful for the veteran reviewer who needs retraining with the new approach and vision as well as new reviewers with little to no experience, but expertise in the credential areas.

3. *Continue Discussing the Role, Purpose, and Specificities of Annual Data.* A focus for 2017-18 will be to continue the discussion about the types of required data that institutions should submit annually, the expectations around that data, and its uses in accreditation. Staff will work to establish the specific protocols necessary to ensure smooth submission of the data into the data system and identify which data elements are part of the data dashboard. In addition, BIR members will need to be trained in how to analyze and use the data appropriately in accreditation.
4. *Continued implementation of surveys for the following constituencies:*
  - a. Preliminary Multiple Subject Completer Survey
  - b. Preliminary Single Subject Completer Survey
  - c. Preliminary Education Specialist Completer Survey
  - d. Preliminary Administrative Services Completer Survey
  - e. Clear/Induction Multiple and Single Subject Completer Survey
  - f. Clear Education Specialist Induction Completer Survey
  - g. Master Teacher Survey
  - h. Employer Survey

In addition, significant work will need to be done in 2017-18 to ensure that consistent policies and procedures are established regarding the manner in which the survey results are used in accreditation.

5. *Next generation of performance assessments* – As the development of the next generation of teaching performance assessments and the development of administrator performance assessments continues, the COA and Commission staff will begin to review the various implications of that work. Providing some guidance for reviewers, and ensuring that both institutions and reviewers understand the new models, any data from the rubrics, as well as the implementation standards that support the new models will be critical in 2017-18.
6. *Establishing and implementing processes and procedures for identifying exceptional programs.* Building on the discussions that have taken place thus far, the Commission will continue to explore a variety of options to ensure that those institutions with particularly strong or innovative programs are able to be recognized and share their experiences and accomplishments with the broader education community. The Committee on Accreditation will provide feedback on the system as it develops and in its early implementation.

### **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.

### Program Sponsors by Accreditation Cohort

| <b>California State University (23)</b> |        |                                |        |
|---|--------|--------------------------------|--------|
| Institution                             | Cohort | Institution                    | Cohort |
| Cal Poly, Pomona                        | Indigo | CSU Monterey Bay               | Violet |
| Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo               | Orange | CSU Northridge*F               | Yellow |
| CalState TEACH                          | Orange | CSU Sacramento                 | Orange |
| CSU Bakersfield*F                       | Indigo | CSU San Bernardino             | Green  |
| CSU Channel Islands                     | Green  | CSU San Marcos                 | Indigo |
| CSU Chico*S                             | Indigo | CSU Stanislaus                 | Yellow |
| CSU Dominguez Hills*F                   | Red    | Humboldt State University      | Indigo |
| CSU East Bay                            | Green  | San Diego State University     | Yellow |
| CSU Fresno*S                            | Violet | San Francisco State University | Violet |
| CSU Fullerton*F                         | Blue   | San Jose State University*S    | Orange |
| CSU Long Beach*S                        | Indigo | Sonoma State University        | Red    |
| CSU Los Angeles*F                       | Red    |                                |        |

| <b>University of California (8)</b> |        |                  |        |
|-------------------------------------|--------|------------------|--------|
| Institution                         | Cohort | Institution      | Cohort |
| UC Berkeley                         | Red    | UC Riverside     | Blue   |
| UC Davis                            | Violet | UC San Diego     | Violet |
| UC Irvine                           | Violet | UC Santa Barbara | Orange |
| UC Los Angeles                      | Red    | UC Santa Cruz    | Red    |

| <b>Independent Institutions (56)</b> |        |                                    |        |
|--------------------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|--------|
| Institution                          | Cohort | Institution                        | Cohort |
| Academy of Art                       | Orange | Notre Dame de Namur University     | Green  |
| Alliant International University     | Blue   | Pacific Oaks College               | Violet |
| Antioch University                   | Violet | Pacific Union College              | Red    |
| Argosy University*                   | Indigo | Pepperdine University              | Red    |
| Azusa Pacific University*S           | Indigo | Phillips Graduate Institution      | Blue   |
| Bard College                         | Blue   | Point Loma Nazarene University*S   | Red    |
| Biola University                     | Yellow | St. Mary's College of California   | Orange |
| Brandman University*S                | Indigo | San Diego Christian College        | Yellow |
| California Baptist University        | Orange | Santa Clara University             | Yellow |
| California Lutheran University*F     | Green  | Simpson University                 | Green  |
| Chapman University~                  | Orange | Stanford University                | Blue   |
| Claremont Graduate University        | Violet | Teachers College of San Joaquin    | Indigo |
| Concordia University                 | Red    | The Master's College               | Orange |
| Dominican University of California   | Blue   | Touro University                   | Yellow |
| Fielding Graduate University         | Indigo | United States University           | Blue   |
| Fresno Pacific University            | Yellow | University of La Verne*S           | Orange |
| Hebrew Union College                 | Violet | University of Phoenix              | Orange |
| Holy Names University                | Blue   | University of Redlands             | Indigo |
| Hope International University        | Violet | University of San Diego*F          | Red    |
| Humphreys College                    | Green  | University of San Francisco        | Indigo |
| La Sierra University                 | Violet | University of Southern California* | Violet |
| Loma Linda University                | Blue   | University of the Pacific*S        | Orange |
| Loyola Marymount University*S        | Yellow | Vanguard University                | Blue   |
| Mills College                        | Green  | Western Governors University       | Yellow |
| Mount St. Mary's College             | Indigo | Westmont College                   | Green  |
| National Hispanic University         | Yellow | Whittier College                   | Yellow |

| Independent Institutions (56) |        |                           |        |
|-------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|--------|
| Institution                   | Cohort | Institution               | Cohort |
| National University*          | Violet | William Jessup University | Yellow |

\*Those institutions highlighted are nationally accredited (NCATE/TEAC) and currently moving toward CAEP accreditation.

| Other Program Sponsors (Districts/County Offices/Other) (168) |        |                             |        |
|---|--------|-----------------------------|--------|
| Institution   | Cohort | Institution                 | Cohort |
| Assoc. of CA School Admin/ASCA                                | Orange | Monterey COE                | Blue   |
| Alhambra USD  | Orange | Mt. Diablo USD              | Blue   |
| Anaheim City SD   | Yellow | Murrieta Valley USD         | Violet |
| Anaheim Union HSD   | Orange | Napa COE                    | Yellow |
| Animo Leadership Charter HS                                   | Indigo | New Haven USD               | Violet |
| Antelope Valley Union HSD                                     | Violet | Newark USD                  | Green  |
| Antioch USD   | Green  | Oak Grove SD                | Blue   |
| Arcadia USD   | Red    | Oakland USD                 | Red    |
| Aspire Public Schools   | Orange | Ocean View SD               | Blue   |
| Azusa USD   | Orange | Oceanside USD               | Green  |
| Bakersfield City SD   | Green  | Ontario-Montclair SD        | Yellow |
| Baldwin Park USD  | Indigo | ORANGE County DOE           | Blue   |
| Bay Area School of Enterprise/REACH                           | Red    | ORANGE USD                  | Red    |
| Bellflower USD  | Blue   | Palmdale SD                 | Blue   |
| Brentwood Union SD  | Indigo | Palo Alto USD               | Violet |
| Burbank USD   | Red    | Palos Verdes Peninsula USD  | Violet |
| Butte COE   | Orange | Panama-Buena Vista Union SD | Yellow |
| California School of the Deaf/Fremont                         | Blue   | Paramount USD               | Orange |
| Campbell Union SD   | Red    | Pasadena USD                | Indigo |
| Capistrano USD  | Yellow | Placentia-Yorba Linda USD   | Indigo |
| Central USD   | Indigo | Placer COE                  | Red    |
| Ceres USD   | Yellow | Pleasanton USD              | Red    |
| Chaffey Joint Union HSD                                       | Blue   | Pomona USD                  | Yellow |
| Chino Valley USD #  | Yellow | Poway USD                   | Red    |
| Chula Vista ESD   | Red    | PUC Schools                 | Blue   |
| Clovis USD  | Yellow | Redwood City SD             | Red    |
| Compton USD   | Violet | Rialto USD                  | Orange |
| Conejo Valley USD   | Orange | Riverside COE               | Red    |
| Contra Costa COE  | Red    | Riverside USD               | Yellow |
| Corona –Norco USD   | Blue   | Rowland USD                 | Yellow |
| Culver City USD   | Red    | Sacramento City USD         | Violet |
| Cupertino Union SD  | Violet | Sacramento COE              | Indigo |
| Davis Joint USD   | Red    | Saddleback Valley USD       | Yellow |
| Dos Palos Oro Loma Joint USD                                  | Red    | San Bernardino City USD     | Green  |
| El Dorado COE   | Violet | San Diego COE               | Green  |
| El Rancho USD   | Orange | San Diego USD               | Indigo |
| Elk Grove USD   | Blue   | San Dieguito Union HSD      | Indigo |
| Encinitas Union SD  | Blue   | San Francisco USD           | Violet |
| Envision Schools  | Violet | San Gabriel USD             | Yellow |
| Escondido Union SD  | Blue   | San Joaquin COE             | Indigo |
| Escondido Union HSD   | Violet | San Jose USD                | Indigo |
| Etiwanda SD   | Yellow | San Juan USD                | Green  |
| Evergreen SD  | Green  | San Luis Obispo COE         | Blue   |

| <b>Other Program Sponsors (Districts/County Offices/Other) (168)</b> |               |  |               |
|--|---------------|--|---------------|
| <b>Institution</b>   | <b>Cohort</b> | <b>Institution</b>                             | <b>Cohort</b> |
| Fairfield-Suisun USD   | Green         | San Marcos USD                                 | Orange        |
| Fontana USD  | Orange        | San Mateo-Foster City SD                       | Green         |
| Fremont UHSD   | Yellow        | San Mateo COE                                  | Blue          |
| Fremont USD  | Orange        | San Ramon Valley USD                           | Indigo        |
| Fresno COE   | Green         | Sanger USD                                     | Violet        |
| Fresno USD   | Blue          | Santa Ana USD                                  | Green         |
| Fullerton SD   | Blue          | Santa Barbara CEO                              | Orange        |
| Garden Grove USD   | Green         | Santa Clara COE                                | Blue          |
| Glendale USD   | Blue          | Santa Clara USD                                | Yellow        |
| Greenfield Union SD  | Yellow        | Santa Cruz COE                                 | Yellow        |
| Grossmont Union HSD  | Blue          | Santa Monica-Malibu USD                        | Indigo        |
| Hacienda La Puente USD   | Green         | Santa Rosa City Schools #                      | Orange        |
| Hanford ESD  | Red           | Saugus Union SD                                | Green         |
| Hayward USD  | Orange        | Selma USD                                      | Violet        |
| High Tech High   | Indigo        | Sequoia Union HSD                              | Violet        |
| Imperial COE   | Violet        | School for Integrated Academics and Technology | Orange        |
| Inner City Education Foundation (ICEF)                               | Violet        | Shasta COE                                     | Yellow        |
| Irvine USD   | Violet        | Sonoma COE                                     | Yellow        |
| Keppel Union SD  | Orange        | Stanislaus COE                                 | Yellow        |
| Kern County SOS  | Violet        | Stockton USD                                   | Indigo        |
| Kern High SD   | Blue          | Sutter County SOS                              | Red           |
| King Chavez  | Green         | Summit Public Schools                          | Yellow        |
| Kings COE  | Orange        | South San Francisco USD                        | Yellow        |
| La Mesa-Spring Valley SD   | Green         | Sweetwater Union HSD                           | Orange        |
| Lancaster SD   | Indigo        | Tehama County DOE                              | Blue          |
| Lawndale ESD   | Blue          | Temple City USD                                | Red           |
| Lodi USD   | Yellow        | Torrance USD                                   | Blue          |
| Long Beach USD   | Blue          | Tracy USD                                      | Indigo        |
| Los Angeles COE  | Green         | Tulare City SD                                 | Red           |
| Los Angeles USD  | Red           | Tulare COE                                     | Green         |
| Los Banos USD  | Violet        | Tustin USD                                     | Blue          |
| Madera COE   | Green         | Vallejo City USD                               | Blue          |
| Madera USD   | Indigo        | Ventura COE                                    | Indigo        |
| Magnolia Public Schools: Pacific Tech Schools #                      | Blue          | Visalia USD                                    | Indigo        |
| Manteca USD  | Red           | Vista USD                                      | Indigo        |
| Marin COE  | Red           | Walnut Valley USD                              | Yellow        |
| Merced COE   | Green         | Washington USD                                 | Violet        |
| Merced Union HSD   | Orange        | West Contra Costa USD                          | Orange        |
| Milpitas USD   | Orange        | West Covina USD                                | Indigo        |
| Modesto City Schools   | Orange        | Westside Union SD                              | Indigo        |
| Montebello USD   | Green         | Wm S Hart Union HSD                            | Violet        |

#Inactive program