



15-DAY NOTICE

DATE:

July 12, 2017

TO:

All Individuals and Groups Interested in the Activities
of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing

FROM:

Mary Vixie Sandy
Executive Director
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

SUBJECT: Notice of Addition of Text to the Articles Incorporated by Reference and Addition of Documents to the Rulemaking Record for the Proposed Amendments to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations Pertaining to Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) conducted a public hearing on June 16, 2017 regarding the proposed additions and amendments to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) pertaining to the Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities. **Notice is Hereby Given**, pursuant to the requirements of Government Code §11347.1, that the Commission has proposed adding the following Supplement to the Initial Statement of Reasons to the rulemaking file. The Commission also proposes adding an updated version of the second half of Chapter Three of the Accreditation Handbook text to the articles incorporated by reference, pursuant to Government Code 11346.8(c). Any person who wishes to comment on the Supplement to the Initial Statement of Reasons or the additional text to be added to the articles incorporated by reference may do so by submitting written comments postmarked beginning July 13, 2017 to July 27, 2017 to the person indicated on the response form attached to this 15-Day Notice.

Note: Any written comments are to be restricted to the recent modifications to the enclosed language or to the Supplement to the Initial Statement of Reasons. The Commission is not required to respond to comments received in response to this notice on other aspects of the proposed regulations. All written comments received or postmarked by July 27, 2017, **which pertain to the modified** text of the articles incorporated by reference for the proposed regulations or the Supplement to the Initial Statement of Reasons provided in this notice will be reviewed and responded to by Commission staff as part of the compilation of the rulemaking file.

The entire rulemaking file, including this notice and the second half of Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three, is available for public inspection at the Commission's office located at 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, California from July 13, 2017 to July 27, 2017 between 8:00 am and 5:00 pm. Please ask for Kathryn Polster or Hart Boyd.

Summary of Modifications to Articles Incorporated by Reference: Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three

After the initial regulatory packet was submitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) for review and posting of the notice, Commission staff discovered that updated version of Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three was posted on the Commission website, however only the first half of the chapter included updates. This incomplete version was utilized for preparation of the rulemaking packet and was included in the initial rulemaking file, however the second half of the chapter was entirely struck through resulting in only the first half of the updated chapter and corresponding justifications for updates for the first half of the chapter being provided to OAL. This 15-day notice provides a supplement to the initial statement of reasons which contains the additional justifications for updates to the second half of Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three, and provides the underline and strike through version of the second half of the chapter to be added to the articles incorporated by reference. Additionally, [the full version of the most current version of the chapter](#) has been posted for the public on the Commission website.

Supplement to the Initial Statement of Reasons

This Supplement to the Initial Statement of Reasons provides additional justifications for rationale and modifications to Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three. The justifications and the updated text of the second half of the chapter were inadvertently left out of the original Initial Statement of Reasons and regulation packet. Below are the additional justifications for the second half of the chapter and the full version of Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three which is part of the articles incorporated by reference pertaining to the proposed amendments and addition of 5 California Code of Regulations (CCR) §80057.5 and §80089.2 for the identified subsections to comply with Government Code §11346.2(b)(1).

Below are the additional justifications pertaining to the updates made in Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three which was incorporated by reference in the original regulations.

Additional Justifications for Updates to the Articles Incorporated by Reference for Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three, Institutional and Program Approval

- II. Initial Approval of Programs: Accreditation changed to Approval to indicate that an institution must be accredited before it can have programs approved. This change is made throughout the section.
- Program Submission and Implementation: Language added to clarify the difference between subject matter program approval and educator preparation program approval and inform that there are two different websites describing the process.
- 1. Review of Preconditions: Removed and rewrote first paragraph as review of preconditions is no longer voluntary and must take place prior to an institution submitting program and common standards for review.
- 2. Review of Common and Program Standards: Added a paragraph to stress the importance of field participation in the review of Common and Program standards as Commission staff do not perform this function.
- 3. COA Action: Added a bold heading for clarity. Added a sentence clarifying that institutions can rely on Commission staff for information and assistance during the review of common and program standards.
- Appeal of an Adverse Decision: 2nd paragraph and bullets added. The previous handbook chapter did not specify any time lines around what a program may do if they feel they have adequately addressed the standards, but Commission staff or the reviewer panel does not. The handbook now provides a timeline and clearer direction for the programs to appeal reviewer or Commission staff decisions to deny moving to program proposal forward to the COA. Additionally, the steps required for an appeal appeared to apply to the second level (Executive Director) of the appeal. For clarity those steps were moved under the first appeal. Time line language was also added to the second appeal level (20 business days) to ensure a timely process.

- III. Program Status for Approved Programs: Small amount of clarification added. Stylistic changes to the chart in this section. Withdrawn and Active column were moved as authors thought it made more sense to have Active in the first column. Language added to indicate that in the new Accreditation System institutions must submit annual data reports if the program is inactive, but still has enrolled candidates during the reporting period. For example, if an institution has candidates finishing the program in the fall semester and then the program goes inactive in the spring semester they would still need to submit an annual data report with data on the spring semester, even though at the time of submitting the report the program may be inactive.
- Active Programs: Language change in header from Approved to Active as Active is a much clearer description of the programs status for the purposes of this chapter. List of activities for active programs updated to reflect the revised system requirements. Information about the Commission's approved program webpage moved to follow the bullets (was previously before the bullets) as this information is slightly less important than the bulleted list.
- Newly Approved Program Sponsors Authorized to Offer California Credentials: The first paragraph is rewritten to align with the new system. Previously new program sponsors would be placed into the cohort that was in year two of the seven year cycle. With the multi-stage approval process that is now in place the Commission decides where to place the institution in the 7 year cycle. For example, if the focused site visit goes very well they may be placed into year one or two and will not require a site visit for a longer period of time. However, if the focused site visit does not go as well, the institution may be placed into year four or five so that their next site visit happens sooner. The Commission will decide which year will provide the institution with the best amount of support. Obsolete language removed.
- Inactive Programs: Language added to indicate that a program may only go inactive when it has 15 or fewer candidates in the program. This was added to ensure that programs are not going inactive in order to avoid paying annual accreditation fees and to ensure that a request to go inactive is not going to harm the candidates in the program. A list of current candidates (lock list) is provided to the Commission so that certification staff will be aware that, even though the program has gone inactive the individuals on the lock list are still able to be recommended for credentials.
- Inactive Programs: Language added to indicate that a program may not request to go inactive more than six months from the date of notification. In the past programs were proposing to go inactive as much as 18 months out from the date of notification and this causes an unnecessary amount of administrative work to ensure that the request is tracked throughout the 18 months to be sure that it presented to the COA for approval at the meeting closest to the proposed date of withdrawal. Removed link to the Credential Information Guide as the Commission is currently in the process of moving from the Credential Information Guide as a source of approved programs to data dashboards that provide information on approved programs. These dashboards are accessible on the Commission website.

-
- **Inactive Programs:** A program may only be on inactive status for a period of no longer than 5 years, after which the program sponsor must determine if they want to activate or withdrawal the program. Language added to clarify that if a program sponsor does not make a decision within the 5 year period, the COA will automatically withdraw the program at the next scheduled meeting. Language also added to clarify that the Commission staff will notify the program at least 6 months prior to the end of the 5 year limit so that a decision can be made by the institution.
 - **Reactivating an Approved Inactive Educator Preparation Program:** Language added throughout section to align with revised system including what documents must be submitted in order to reactivate a program. Clarifying language added to indicate that a reactivation must take place at a regularly scheduled COA meeting.
 - **Withdrawal of Credential Programs:** Language added to the first paragraph to emphasize that a program must wait one year after the date of withdrawal before they can apply to become reapproved. Language added to clarify that a program must have taught out all of the candidates by the effective date of withdrawal. This has always been the process, however it was not explicitly stated in the handbook. Second bullet rewritten to indicate that a program can only request to withdraw after candidates have completed the program. Previously programs would provide the date they expected candidates to complete the program. This became problematic as candidates may have unexpected circumstances that do not allow them to complete the program by the date the institution wants to withdraw. To remedy the situation without harming candidates for unexpected circumstances the Commission now requires the program to have taught out all candidates before withdrawal. This also required the last bullet to be deleted as it is obsolete.
 - **Reaccrediting Programs that have been Withdrawn:** Added topic header for clarity. Language revised to indicate that institutions only have to wait one year after withdrawal to submit a program proposal. Previously institutions had to wait two years, however due to the teacher shortage in California the Commission wants to remove unnecessary barriers to teacher preparation wherever possible. Language has also been added to allow for an institution to petition the COA to waive the one year wait period.
 - **Discontinuation (or Closure) of Credential Program by the COA:** Additional verbiage added to topic header for clarity, particularly to indicate that the COA may close a program without having to close the entire institution and deny accreditation. Third bullet has language added to indicate that if the COA is closing a program that the institution must assist current candidates, if any, with transfer to another institution. Last bullet removed as it is obsolete.
 - **Institutional Closure due to Closure of Programs:** Header added for clarity and ease of reading. Language changed to indicate that an institution must wait two years from the date of closure to go through the initial institutional approval process again. Previously it was two years from the date of submitting the withdrawal. Language changed because the COA may close a program as well as a program choosing to close itself. This new language provides a solution for both options. Additional language added to clarify that in specific instances institutions

that have withdrawn, or had all of their programs closed may request to stay an approved program sponsor without programs for a specific amount of time. This was added because the new initial institutional approval process is more complex than it once was, and it is possible that there would be good reason to allow an institution to stay open and participate in any accreditation activity that may apply (including annual accreditation fees) while they are not operating any programs.

Below is the underline and strike through text of the latter half of Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three that was inadvertently left out of the Initial Statement of Reasons.

Chapter Three

Institutional and Program Approval and Change of Status

II. ~~Initial Accreditation~~Approval of Programs

According to the *Accreditation Framework* (Section 2-A-2), the COA is responsible for granting initial ~~accreditation~~approval to new programs of educator preparation. If the COA determines that a program meets all applicable standards, the COA grants initial ~~accreditation~~approval to the program. New credential program proposals by ~~eligible~~Commission-approved institutions must ~~fulfill preconditions established by state law and the CTC~~adhere to all applicable Preconditions. They must also fulfill the Common Standards and one of the program standards options listed in Section ~~3~~Three of the *Framework*: Option ~~1~~One, California Program Standards; Option ~~2~~Two, National or Professional Program Standards; ~~-or~~ Option ~~3~~Three, Experimental Program Standards.

Section ~~4-B~~C of the *Framework* contains the ~~P~~policies for Initial ~~Accreditation of Programs~~Program Approval. Prior to being presented to the COA for action, new programs proposed by ~~eligible~~Commission-approved institutions must go through Initial Program Review (IPR). During IPR, new program proposals are reviewed by panels of external experts, and ~~occasionally~~as appropriate, by ~~CTC~~Commission staff with expertise in the credential area. During IPR, new programs are reviewed in relation to the ~~p~~preconditions, Common Standards or Common Standards Addendum and the selected program standards. The COA considers recommendations by the external review panels and ~~CTC~~Commission staff when deciding on the ~~accreditation~~approval of each proposed program.

An institution that selects National or Professional Program Standards (Option ~~2~~Two) should consult the chapter on National or Professional Standards for appropriate procedures. The acceptability of the standards ~~should~~must be ~~assured~~approved before the institution prepares a program proposal. An institution may choose to submit a program that meets the Experimental Program Standards (Option ~~3~~) ~~adopted by the CTC when the program is designed to investigate professional preparation issues or policy questions related to the preparation of credential candidates~~Three). See Section Three of the *Framework* for additional information.

Program Submission and Implementation: Basic Steps in the Accreditation of New Programs- Initial Program Review (IPR)

There are specific steps that an approved institution must follow when submitting a program proposal.

- For **subject matter program** document submissions, institutions must follow the process included on the New Subject Matter Program webpage.
- For **educator preparation program** document submissions, institutions must follow the related process included on the New Educator Preparation Program webpage.

There are several steps that must be followed by the CTC Commission, its staff, and the COA during the process of reviewing proposals from institutions and agencies wishing to sponsor educator preparation programs.

1. Preliminary Staff Review

~~Before submitting program proposals for formal review and initial accreditation, institutions are encouraged to request preliminary reviews of *draft* proposals by the CTC's professional staff. The purpose of these reviews is to assist institutions in developing programs that are consistent with the intent and scope of the standards, and that will be logical and clear to the external reviewers. Program proposals may be submitted for preliminary staff review at any time. Institutions are encouraged to discuss the potential timeframe for such a review with CTC staff. Preliminary review is voluntary.~~

2. Review of Preconditions

1. ~~r~~ Preconditions are requirements necessary to operate a program leading to an educator preparation license program leading to a credential in California. They are based on state laws and Commission policy. An institution's response to the preconditions is reviewed by the CTC's professional staff. At the institution's discretion, preconditions may be reviewed either during the preliminary review stage, or after the institution's formal submission of a proposal. Commission's professional staff. If staff determines that the program complies with the requirements of state laws and administrative regulations, and Commission policy, the program is eligible for a further review of the standards by staff or a review panel. If the program does not comply with the preconditions, the proposal is returned to the institution with specific information about the lack of compliance. Such a program may be resubmitted. The institution may resubmit preconditions once the compliance issues have been resolved.

3. Initial Review of Common and Program Review (IPR)

2. Standards Unlike the preconditions, the Common Standards ~~or Common Standards Addendum~~ and program standards address issues of program quality and effectiveness. The institution's ~~formal~~ response to the Common Standards (full narrative or Common Standards Addendum as appropriate) and program standards are reviewed by a panel of experts in the field of preparation or by ~~CTC~~Commission staff. During the Initial Program Review process, there is opportunity for institutional representatives to confer with staff consultants to answer questions or clarify issues that may arise.

~~If staff or~~Because the review panel determines process depends entirely on the participation of experts from the field, the review process can be quite lengthy, especially for lower incidence programs. The Commission asks that each institution identify a minimum of one faculty member for each program it intends to offer that will be available to be trained and participate in Initial Program Review. This ensures that the review process occurs as quickly as possible. It is highly recommended that institutions volunteer to review documents prior to submission of their own proposal in order to gain the most in-depth understanding of the entire IPR process.

3. COA Action ~~If it is determined that a proposed program fulfills~~aligns to the standards, the program is recommended for initial ~~accreditation~~approval by the COA at one of its ~~regular~~regularly scheduled meetings. Action by the COA is communicated to the institution in writing.

~~If staff or the review panel determines~~If it is determined that the program does not meet the standards, the proposal is returned to the institution with an explanation of the findings. Specific reasons for the decision are communicated to the institution. ~~Representatives of the institution can obtain information and assistance from the CTC's staff.~~ After changes have been made in the program, the proposal may be submitted for re-consideration. During this process, representatives of the institution can obtain information and assistance from Commission staff.

Appeal of an Adverse Decision

There are two levels of appeal of an adverse decision. -The first appeal is directed to the COA and is an appeal of a decision by ~~CTC~~Commission staff, or its review panel; that the preconditions or relevant program standards were not satisfied and ~~that~~therefore the proposal should not be forwarded to the COA for action.

If a program is not recommended for approval by the COA, the institution may submit a formal request at least 30 days prior to the COA's next regularly scheduled meeting to the Administrator of Accreditation, who will place that program on the agenda of the COA for consideration. Included in the request, the institution must provide the following information:

- The original program proposal and the rationale for the adverse decision provided by the Commission's staff or review panel.
- Copies of any responses by the institution to requests for additional information from

Commission's staff or review panel, including a copy of any resubmitted proposal (if it was resubmitted).

- A rationale for the institution's request.

The COA will review the information and do one of the following:

- This appeal is directed Grant initial approval to the COA program.
- Request a new review of the institution's program proposal by a different Commission staff member or a different review panel.
- Deny initial approval to the program.

The second is an appeal of an adverse decision by the COA. This appeal is directed to the Executive Director of the ~~CTC~~Commission.

~~If a program is not recommended to the COA for approval by staff or the review panel, the institution may submit a formal request to place that program on the agenda of the COA for consideration. In so doing, the institution must provide the following information:~~

- ~~The original program proposal and the rationale for the adverse decision provided by the CTC's staff or review panel.~~
- ~~Copies of any responses by the institution to requests for additional information from CTC's staff or review panel, including a copy of any resubmitted proposal (if it was resubmitted).~~
- ~~A rationale for the institution's request.~~

~~The COA will review the information and do one of the following:~~

- ~~Grant initial accreditation to the program.~~
- ~~Request a new review of the institution's program proposal by a different CTC staff member or a different review panel.~~
- ~~Deny initial accreditation to the program.~~

~~Within twenty business days of the COA's decision to deny initial accreditation, the institution may submit evidence~~Appeals to the Executive Director of will only be considered on the CTC grounds that the decision made by of the COA was arbitrary, capricious, unfair, or contrary to the policies of the Accreditation Framework or the procedural guidelines of the COA. (The appeal must be submitted within twenty (20) business days of the COA's decision to deny initial approval with appropriate

evidence of such. Information related to the quality of the program that was not previously presented to the ~~CTC's~~Commission's staff or the review panel may not be considered by the ~~CTC~~Commission. The Executive Director will determine whether the evidence submitted by the institution responds to the criteria for appeal. If it does, the Executive Director will forward the appeal to the ~~CTC~~Commission. If it does not, the institution will be notified of the decision and provided with information describing how why the information does ~~not respond to~~adequately meet the criteria. The institution will be given ten business days to re-submit the appeal to the Executive Director.

The appeal, if forwarded to the ~~CTC~~Commission by the Executive Director, will be heard before the ~~Professional Services~~Educator Preparation Committee of the ~~CTC~~during a regularly scheduled Commission meeting. The ~~Professional Services~~Educator Preparation Committee will consider the written evidence provided by the institution and a written response from the COA. In resolving the appeal, the ~~CTC~~Commission will take one of the following actions:

- ~~A.~~• Sustain the decision of the COA to deny initial ~~accreditation~~approval to the program.
- ~~B.~~• Overturn the decision of the COA and grant initial ~~accreditation~~approval to the program.

The Executive Director communicates the ~~CTC's~~Commission's decision to the COA and the institution.

III. Program Status for Approved Programs

Once a program has been accredited by the COA, it will be considered an approved program. As conditions change, however, it is sometimes necessary for programs to be granted either ~~the~~ inactive status or to be withdrawn by the institution. Institutions are responsible ~~to initiate~~for initiating either a status change from 'approved-active' to 'approved-inactive' or 'withdrawn.'

The chart below illustrates the operational differences in the three possible status options followed by more specific information on each.

Institution/Program Sponsor	Program Approval Status		
	Active <u>Withdrawn</u>	Inactive	Withdrawn <u>Active</u>
May Accept New Candidates	No <u>Yes</u>	No	Yes <u>No</u>
May Recommend Candidates for a Credential	Only those already in the program <u>Yes</u>	Only those already in the program	Yes <u>No</u>

Institution/Program Sponsor	Program Approval Status		
	Active <u>Withdrawn</u>	Inactive	Withdrawn <u>Active</u>
Participates in Biennial Reports <u>Data Reporting Requirements</u>	No <u>Yes</u>	Modified <u>Yes (if candidates enrolled during reporting period)</u>	Yes <u>No</u>
Participates in Program Assessment <u>Review</u>	No <u>Yes</u>	Modified	Yes <u>No</u>
Participates in Site Visit	No <u>Yes</u>	Modified	Yes <u>No</u>
How to Request Reinstatement	New Program Document Submitted and reviewed by panel members <u>NA</u>	Letter to the COA Requesting Re-activation*	NA <u>New Program Document Submitted and reviewed by BIR members</u>

**See a description of the ~~Re~~-activation process below. If the ~~CTC~~Commission adopted revised program standards or if new regulations were enacted while the program is in inactive status, a new program document will be required to re-activate a program that reflects new standards and/or regulations.*

~~Approved~~Active Programs

Already-Approved Program Sponsors Authorized to Offer California Credentials

-Approved programs participate in all activities in the accreditation cycle in accordance with their assigned cohort. The ~~seven-year accreditation cycle takes seven years to complete and all~~requires activities that are- essential for on-going accreditation of all approved programs. The ~~annual~~ cycle of activities is consistent with the premise that credential preparation programs engage in annual data collection and analyses to guide program improvement.

~~An approved educator preparation program will be identified as such on the CTC's web page and may be identified as approved on the sponsor's web page, if applicable.~~

- a) ~~•~~ • All approved programs will participate in the ~~CTC's~~Commission's accreditation system, in the assigned cohort.
- Annual data collection, analysis, and submission is required.
- ~~•~~ • ~~In the first, third, and fifth years of the accreditation cycle the programs will submit Biennial Reports.~~

- In the fourth year of the accreditation cycle, the programs will submit responses to Preconditions.
- b)• In the fifth year of the accreditation cycle, programs will submit their Program Assessment documents. Review Documents and responses to Common Standards
- e)• In the sixth year of the accreditation cycle, the programs will participate in the Site Visit activities.
- In the seventh year of the accreditation cycle, the programs will participate, as needed, in the 7th Year Follow-up Report activities as determined by the COA.

An approved educator preparation program will be identified as such on the Commission's web page and may be identified as 'Approved' on the sponsor's web page, if applicable.

d)

Newly Approved Program Sponsors Authorized to Offer California Credentials

~~Once an institution and its programs have gained initial accreditation approval, the institution will be assigned to an accreditation cohort. These newly approved institutions will enter into~~ Depending upon the second year results of the cycle. Two years following the approval of a new institution and its program(s), which is the fourth year of the accreditation cycle, the approved institution will focused site visit during provisional approval, the Administrator of Accreditation will determine where in the cycle is the most appropriate placement and once placed, will be expected to participate in a Technical Assistance Site Visit rather than submit the normally required Program Assessment document. This allows the all accreditation activities. New programs at institutions with existing Commission the opportunity to provide closer oversight of an institution new approved programs are expected to California credentialing while providing some guidance and assistance. During the sixth year of the accreditation cycle, the approved institution takes part in an accreditation site visit. At that point the institution begins the regular annual cycle of activities. participate in accreditation activities in conjunction with their already assigned cohort within the accreditation cycle.

Inactive Programs

An institution or program sponsor may decide to declare a program that has been previously approved by the CTC or accredited by the COA Commission as 'inactive.' The following procedures must be followed:

- The program must have 15 or fewer candidates when it requests inactive status
- a)• The institution or program sponsor notifies the Administrator of Accreditation of its intention to declare the program inactive. The program can be deemed inactive when it no longer accepts new candidates into the program and; it is then is recognized only to exist for current candidates to complete the program for current candidates.
- b)• The notification to the Administrator must include the anticipated date that the inactive status will begin (i.e. the date from which candidates will no longer be admitted to the program). This date must be no more than six months from the date of notification.
- e)• Candidates already admitted to the program are notified in writing by the institution or program sponsor that the program is being declared inactive.

- d)• ~~The institution assists enrolled candidates in planning for the completion of their program. A plan regarding how current candidates will complete the program must accompany the inactive request.~~
- e)• ~~The institution or program sponsor determines at the date, by which all enrolled candidates will be able to finish the program, not to exceed a maximum of one year after the normative completion anticipated inactive date...~~
- f)• ~~Following the date after which all current candidates will be able to complete the program, as determined by the institution, the program may no longer operate and the institution may no longer recommend candidates for the credential until such a time as the program is re-activated. The program will not be listed on the CTE's Commission's public web page for approved programs. The program will appear as inactive in the Credential Information Guide (CIG) web page (http://134.186.81.79/fmi/xsl/CIG_apm/PPPM_all.xml).~~
- g)• ~~An inactive program will be included in accreditation activities in a modified manner as determined by the COA—Administrator of Accreditation.~~
- h)• ~~An inactive program may be re-activated reactivated only when the institution submits a request to the COA and the COA has taken action to reactivate the program. If the program standards under which the program was approved have been modified, or if new regulations have been added, the institution or program sponsor must address the updated standards before the program may be re-activated.~~
- i) An inactive program may stay on remain in inactive status for no longer than 5 years; after which, the program sponsor should must determine whether the program should be withdrawn permanently or reactivated. If the institution does not request reactivation or withdrawal within the 5-year limit, the COA will withdraw the program at its next scheduled meeting. Commission staff will notify the program sponsor at least six months prior to the automatic withdrawal date.

Re-activating

Reactivating an Approved Inactive Educator Preparation Program

An Inactive program cannot be ~~Re~~re-activated until the Committee on Accreditation (~~COA~~) takes action at a regularly scheduled meeting. The program seeking re-activation must adhere to the following procedures must be followed:

- j)• ~~Submit a letter requesting re-activation reactivation to the Commission COA indicating the requested date of re-activation reactivation, why Re-activation reactivation is being requested and if changes have been made to the program~~
- k)• ~~Submit all necessary supporting documentation. The type of documentation will vary depending on a number of factors including, but not limited to, the length of time the program has been inactive, personnel changes and curricular changes. The institution will need to contact the Administrator of Accreditation to determine what documentation will be necessary.~~

Once all requested documentation has been reviewed and approved by Commission staff, the request for ~~Rere~~-activation is placed on the COA agenda for final approval at its next regularly scheduled meeting. If approved, the ~~Rere~~-activated educator preparation program may, according to their approved activation date:

- Accept candidates to the credential program
- Begin operating the credential program
- Recommend completers for the appropriate credential

Withdrawal of Credential Programs

An institution may decide to withdraw a program that has been previously approved by the ~~CTC~~ or ~~accredited by the COA~~ Commission. The withdrawal of a program formalizes that it is no longer part of the institution's accredited program offerings and, from the ~~CTC's~~ Commission's perspective, no longer part of the accreditation system. Once a program is withdrawn, it must wait one year after the date of withdrawal before applying to become reaccredited. In order to withdraw a program, the following procedures must be followed:

- The program must have taught out all candidates by the effective date of program withdrawal.

a) ~~• The institution notifies the Administrator of Accreditation of its intention to withdraw the program at a date when the current candidates complete the program. The notification must include the date from which candidates will no longer be admitted to~~ have completed the program.

a) ~~• All Candidates already admitted to or enrolled in the program are notified in writing by the institution that the program is being withdrawn. The institution determines a date by which all enrolled candidates will be able to finish the program. The institution assists enrolled candidates in planning for the completion of their program. The institution files the list of candidates and date of their program completion with the~~ CTC Commission.

~~Once withdrawn,~~

b) ~~• Following the date after which candidates will no longer be enrolled (as determined by the institution), the program may no longer operate and the institution may no longer recommend candidates for the credential.~~

~~• A program being withdrawn will not be included in any continuing accreditation visits while candidates are finishing the program, provided that the Administrator of Accreditation was notified of the institutional intent to withdraw the program at least one year before the continuing accreditation Site Visit.~~

Reaccrediting Programs that have been Withdrawn

• AA withdrawn program may be ~~re-accredited~~reaccredited only when the institution submits a new proposal for initial ~~accreditation according to the~~program review (IPR) and is approved by the COA initial accreditation policies. ~~From the date in which candidates were no longer admitted to the program, the institution.~~ Institutions must wait at least two years~~one year~~ after the program has been formally withdrawn by the COA before requesting ~~re-accreditation of the program~~reaccreditation of the program. Under extenuating circumstances an institution may petition the COA to waive this requirement.

Discontinuation (or Closure) of Credential Programs by the COA

When an institution is required by the COA to discontinue a credential program, the following procedures must be followed:

- Within 60 days of action by the COA, the institution must ~~file, with the Administrator of Accreditation,~~submit the institution's plan for program discontinuation for approval by the Administrator of Accreditation.
- Candidates are no longer admitted to the program once the institution is required to discontinue the program.
- Candidates already admitted to the program are notified in writing by the institution that the program is being discontinued. ~~The institution determines~~plan submitted to the Administrator of Accreditation includes a date by which all enrolled candidates will ~~be able to~~ finish the program. The institution helps candidates plan for completion of their program by helping them complete their program at the institution where they are currently enrolled or ~~at~~assisting them with transferring to another institution. The institution files the list of candidates and dates of program completion with the ~~CTC~~Commission.
- ~~Following the date after which the institution will no longer enroll candidates (as determined by the institution), the program may no longer operate, and the institution may not recommend candidates for the credential.~~

A discontinued program may be ~~re-accredited~~reaccredited only when the institution submits a new proposal for initial ~~accreditation according to the COA's initial accreditation policies.~~program review (IPR) The institution must wait at least two years after ~~the date of discontinuation~~all candidates have completed the program before requesting ~~re-accreditation~~reaccreditation.

Loss of Initial Approval

Institutional Closure due to Closure of Programs

When an institution withdraws its last program, it loses approval as an accredited institution. It must wait two years from the date of ~~submitting the withdrawal before applying for approval once again and~~ closure and must then complete the Initial Program Review anew all aspects of the Initial Institutional Approval process. In specific instances, and at the request of the institution, the Committee on Accreditation may take action to determine that an institution may remain as an approved program sponsor for a specified amount of time as defined by the COA. As an approved program sponsor, annual accreditation fees would apply.



Commission on Teacher Credentialing

1900 Capitol Avenue Sacramento, CA 95811 (916) 445-0229 Fax (916) 327-3165 www.ctc.ca.gov

Professional Services Division

Attn: Kathryn Polster, Professional Services Division

Title: Notice of Adding Additional Text to the Articles Incorporated by References for the Proposed Amendments to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations Pertaining to Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities

Sections: 80691 and 80692

Response to the Modifications to the Proposed Amendments

If you disagree with the Supplement to the Initial Statement of Reasons, or addition of articles incorporated by reference, please return this response form to the Commission office, attention Kathryn, at the above address postmarked no later than July 27, 2017.

1. I do not agree with the modifications to the proposed amendments or with the Supplement to the Initial Statement of Reasons for the following reasons:

Personal opinion of the undersigned

Organizational opinion representing: (Circle One)

School District, County Schools, College/University, Professional Organization,
Other _____

Signature: _____ Date _____

Printed Name: _____

Title: _____ Phone: _____

Employer/Organization:

Mailing Address: _____

Route to kp