Adoption of the 2008-2009 Work Plan

Professional Services Division
October 10, 2008

Overview of the Report
This item was presented for information at the Committee on Accreditation (COA) meeting in August. It contains a review of the procedures for displaying and reporting on the COA work plan. The proposed work plan for 2008-2009 is presented for COA adoption. The proposed work plan presented at this time contains additional information in the Appendix that was not included in the previous version.

Staff recommendation
Staff recommends that the COA consider adoption of the proposed work plan for 2008-09.

Background
Shortly after its organization meeting in April of 1995, the COA developed a comprehensive work plan for its first twenty-four months of operation. The work plan was based upon the analysis of the *Accreditation Framework* done by the COA at its May 1995 meeting. Eight tasks were identified as priority work for the COA and staff developed projected time frames for the completion of each of the identified tasks. Staff was asked to provide an update on the work plan at each of its scheduled meetings.

In subsequent years, the Committee on Accreditation adopted its work plan derived from the responsibilities described in the *Accreditation Framework*. Annually, the COA deleted completed tasks, added new tasks, or continued unfinished or delayed tasks from earlier work plans. The work plan was adopted at the July or August meeting each fiscal year. The identified tasks were originally presented in a table that included columns indicating proposed completion dates and how much of the task was completed as of each meeting date. As directed by the COA, revised completion dates were inserted when appropriate.

As the COA moved from its planning phase and assumed its full accreditation responsibility, there was a gradual shift in the nature of the items included as part of the work plan. In the first years of Committee operation, there were a number of tasks that needed to be completed as the COA made preparations for the full assumption of its responsibilities. Initially, the tasks tended to be those that could be identified with a start data and a completion date. The items could be displayed showing those dates and what percentage of the task had been completed. Over time, the tasks of the COA have more often been identified as part of its continuing responsibilities, rather than as a discrete "stand alone" tasks. With each task, there were "sub-tasks" that became identified with the plan for a particular year, or that became identified during the course of the year. However, the tasks did not lend themselves to the same type of schedule as in the past.

Eventually, the COA felt that it could dispense with the chart for reporting on the work plan, since it did not seem to serve the purpose it once did. Further, the COA decided that it did not need to have a formal report on the annual work plan at every meeting. Instead, the reports would be presented on an "as needed" basis.

Changes in the Organization of the 2008-2009 Work Plan

As part of the most recent review of the accreditation system, the *Accreditation Framework* now explicitly identifies four adopted purposes of accreditation upon which there is established common agreement by stakeholders. These purposes are:

- Ensure accountability – accountability to the public and the profession;
- Ensure program quality;
- Ensure adherence to standards; and
- Foster program improvement.

Given that these four purposes served as the foundation for the development of the revised accreditation system and its various components, it would seem appropriate to organize a work plan around them. As such, Commission staff proposes a revised organizational structure, in which all the upcoming accreditation activities are categorized by one of the four purposes. In addition, the COA annual report, also presented at this meeting, takes a similar approach to its organizational structure. It is anticipated that this common organizational structure will allow the annual work plan, the annual report, and evaluation of the system to work in unity.

On the basis of a review of the accomplishments of the 2007-2008 year and a review of the work plan of that year, the following items were selected for inclusion in the proposed 2008-2009 work plan. To reflect the current accreditation system and its various components, reference is made in the work plan to the seven cohorts, each represented by a color. Each institution offering educator preparation in California is assigned to one of the seven cohorts representing the accreditation activities the institution is expected to complete during a given year. The work plan can be adopted as is, with the understanding that amendments can be made in the future, or the work plan can be amended at this meeting. Also provided with the work plan in Appendix A is a COA planning document for all COA meetings through June 2009.

Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2008-2009

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

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

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

Purpose 2.   Ensure Program Quality

a)   *Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs.* This is the principal, ongoing task of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of institutions and their credential programs. In the 2008-2009 academic year, accreditation site visits are scheduled for 15 institutions in the Green cohort. In addition, seven institutions will be revisited in 2009 to ensure sufficient progress in addressing issues identified in previous accreditation visits. A list of the institutions scheduled for a site visit in 2008-2009 is included in Appendix A to this item.

b)   *Revise and finalize the Accreditation Handbook.* One of the major goals in the fall of 2008 will be to finalize the *Accreditation Handbook.* This document will explicate the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. Stakeholder review of the various chapters of the *Handbook* will be completed and the document, once approved by the COA, will be placed on the Commission's website prior to the 2008-2009 accreditation site visits.

c)   *Build the pool of accreditation reviewers.* In an effort to continue to build the pool of individuals with expertise across credential areas and train individuals on the revised accreditation system, the COA will continue to support training new BIR members. It is anticipated that a training session will take place early in 2009 and the COA may consider the possibility of developing and providing a "refresher" training for experienced reviewers who need less intense training, but an update on the new standards and the new processes of the current accreditation system. In addition, the development of a Team Lead orientation session so that all BIR members who serve as leaders of the COA's accreditation teams are prepared for the responsibilities entrusted to the team leads.

d)   *Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission.* The COA will receive information on an ongoing basis about Commission activities related to accreditation. Consistent with the Education Code, the Commission may request that the COA review, examine, and provide advice on various issues related to accreditation. To that end, the COA will continue to participate and play a major role in providing advice to the Commission on standards development and revision and other accreditation related matters.

Purpose 3.   Ensure Adherence to Standards

a)   *Conduct and review program assessment activities.* The Yellow Cohort, which is comprised of 19 institutions, is the first set of institutions currently engaged in program assessment two years prior to the accreditation site visit. The COA will monitor the review process for this first year of implementation of this component of the revised system. Reports on the Program Assessment for the institutions in the Yellow cohort will be presented at the January and April COA meetings. In addition, the Program Assessment process will begin for the Orange Cohort, which is

comprised of 17 institutions. Programs in the Orange Cohort are required to submit program assessment documents in either October 2008 or January 2009. A list of institutions engaged in program assessment in the 2008-09 year is included in Appendix A.

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

c) *Conduct technical assistance visits to institutions new to accreditation.* The COA will consider the issues identified by technical assistance review teams in their review of institutions new to the accreditation process in California. Review teams will provide technical assistance to these institutions in preparation for a full accreditation site visit. A list of institutions scheduled for a technical assistance site visit in the 2008-09 year is included in Appendix A.

d) *Complete efforts begun on Common Standards.* The COA will continue to work to finalize the remaining Common Standards work as directed by the Commission. This includes the development of descriptors or rubrics to facilitate a more consistent understanding of, and agreement about, the Common Standards. This work also includes the development of Planning Prompts for the Common Standards, and completion of any work remaining to revise the language of the Common Standards to ensure their applicability to all types of credential programs.

e) *Completion of SB 2042 revision efforts.* The COA will continue to advise the Commission on work related to revising SB 2042 standards. In particular, this will include the elimination of the "Required Elements" and the integration of any critical language of the required element into the standard statement.

Purpose 4.   Foster Program Improvement

a) *Collect, analyze, and report on the first year of biennial reports submitted in fall 2008.* The 2008-2009 academic year represents the first full year of implementation of the biennial report component of the revised accreditation system. All institutions in the Orange, Green, and Violet cohorts are required to submit candidate competence and performance data in 2008. Institutions in the Red, Yellow, and Indigo cohorts will submit their first biennial reports by the end of 2009. A list of all institutions required to submit biennial reports is listed in Appendix A. A major focus of the effort will be to provide assistance to institutions as they prepare their first biennial report and to analyze information from institutions to ensure appropriate responses to the requirements of the biennial report.

b)   *Plan for any refinements to the biennial report process.*   The COA will review information provided by staff about the first year of implementation of the biennial report component and determine whether any refinements need to be made to the report template to ensure it meets the original objectives of the revised accreditation system.

c)   *Continued development of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.*   As the various components of the system are implemented, staff and the COA will continue to work to ensure that additional evaluation components are embedded into the system. Implementing an on-line evaluation form that team members, team leaders, and institutions complete upon completion of a site visit, and establishing evaluation mechanisms for program assessment, biennial reporting, as well as other aspects of the system, will be a major focus in 2008-2009.

d)   *Continue Partnership with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate.*   The Partnership Agreement with NCATE was renewed in 2007 and is effective through 2014. The COA will continue monitoring the agreement to make certain that the implementation of the partnership results in assuring that state issues are appropriate addressed in each joint NCATE-CTC visit and that the process reduces duplication.

In addition, the COA will continue to explore ways to streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes. Should requests for analysis of the alignment of national and professional organization standards with those of the Commission be received, the COA will review the analysis, consistent with its responsibilities set forth in the Education Code, and determine issues of comparability.

General Operations

In addition to the above mentioned items, the COA will engage in routine matters necessary for general operations of the Committee. This includes the election of Co-Chairs, the adoption of a meeting schedule for 2009-2010, orientation of new members, and modification of its own procedures manual, if necessary.

Appendix A
Accreditation Activities 2008-2009

Institutions Submitting Biennial Reports (Fall 2008)		
Orange Cohort	Green Cohort	Violet Cohort
Cal State TEACH	CSU Channel Islands	CSU Fresno
CSU Sacramento	CSU East Bay	UC Davis
Sonoma State University	CSU San Bernardino	UC Irvine
UC Santa Barbara	Cal Lutheran	UC San Diego
Antioch Santa Barbara	Mills College	Antioch Los Angeles
Cal Baptist	Notre Dame de Namur	Claremont Graduate
Occidental	Patten University	Hope International
Saint Mary's College	Simpson College	La Sierra
The Master's College	Western Governors University	National University
University of La Verne	Westmont College	New College
University of San Diego	Fresno COE	Pacific Oaks College
University of Phoenix	High Tech Learning	Compton Unified School
University of the Pacific	Community	District
Butte COE	Los Angeles COE	Imperial COE
CELA	San Diego COE	Kern COE
SAIL	San Diego USD	Salinas Adult
Santa Barbara COE		

Institutions Submitting Biennial Reports (Fall 2009)		
Red Cohort	Yellow Cohort	Indigo
CSU Chico	Cal Poly SLO	Cal Poly Pomona
CSU Dominguez Hills	CSU Northridge	Humboldt State University
CSU Los Angeles	San Diego State University	CSU Long Beach
CSU Monterey Bay	San Jose State University	San Francisco State
UC Berkeley	CSU Stanislaus	San Marcos
UC Los Angeles	Biola University	Azusa Pacific
UC Santa Cruz	Fresno Pacific University	Bethany College
Chapman University	JFK University	Mount Saint Mary's
Concordia University	Loyola Marymount University	University of Redlands
Pacific Union	National Hispanic	University of San Francisco
Pepperdine University	San Diego Christian College	University of Southern
Point Loma Nazarene	Santa Clara University	California
University	Touro University	San Joaquin COE
Hebrew Union	Whittier College	Sacramento COE
Alameda COE	William Jessup University	
Contra Costa COE	Mendocino COE	
Los Angeles USD	Santa Clara USD	
Metropolitan	Stanislaus COE	
Oakland USD	Ventura COE	
Ontario-Montclair SD		
REACH		

Institutions Completing Program Assessment Process (Yellow Cohort)		
CSU Northridge San Diego State San Jose State CSU Stanislaus Biola Fresno Pacific University	JFK University Loyola Marymount University National Hispanic San Diego Christian College Santa Clara University Touro University	Mendocino COE Santa Clara USD Stanislaus COE Ventura COE Whittier College William Jessup University
Institutions Beginning Program Assessment Process (Orange Cohort)		
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo Cal State TEACH CSU Sacramento Sonoma State University UC Santa Barbara Antioch Santa Barbara Cal Baptist	Occidental Saint Mary's College The Master's College University of La Verne University of San Diego University of Phoenix	University of the Pacific Butte COE CELA SAIL Santa Barbara COE
Institutions with Site Visit (Green Cohort)		
CSU Channel Islands CSU East Bay CSU San Bernardino Cal Lutheran Mills College	Notre Dame de Namur Patten University Simpson College Western Governors University Westmont College	Fresno COE High Tech Learning Communities Los Angeles COE San Diego COE San Diego USD
Institutions with Revisit		
CSU Monterey Bay Argosy University Alliant University	Holy Names Phillips Graduate University	Project Pipeline Vanguard University
Institutions Receiving Technical Assistance Site Visits		
Santa Barbara COE	SAIL	ACSA/SCNTC

Committee on Accreditation
2008-09 Planning Document*

August 5-6	October 10	January 15	April 8-9	May 14-15	June 25-26
Agenda	Agenda	Agenda	Agenda	Agenda	Agenda
Minutes	Minutes	Minutes	Minutes	Minutes	Minutes
Program Approvals	Program Approvals	Program Approvals	Program Approvals	Program Approvals	Program Approvals
Accreditation Reports: None Joel Colbert Helene Mandell Jim Richmond Robert Monke Judi Greig Barbara Morton JL Fortson Marsha Savage Mark Cary	Accreditation Reports: None	Accreditation Reports: CSU Monterey Bay (Birch)	Accreditation Reports: CLU (Birdsell) Patten (Fairgood) Simpson (Dear) Mills (Janicki) Alliant (Fairgood) Vanguard (Hawley) HNU (Clark) Project Pipeline (Clark)	Accreditation Reports: WGU (Janicki) SDCOE (Creeggan) NDdN (JJW) FCOE (Hawley) Westmont (Parker) CSUEB (Hickey) Argosy (Fairgood)	Accreditation Reports: CSUSB (Clark) SDUSD (Noelting) CSUCI (Hickey) HTH (Parker) LACOE (Birdsell) FCOE (Hawley) Phillips Grad (Dear)
Common Standards Glossary	Common Standards Glossary and edits	Biennial Reports	Biennial Reports		Selection of Meeting Dates for 09-10
Election of Co-Chairs	Program Assessment	Program Assessment	Program Assessment		
Accreditation Handbook	Accreditation Handbook	Accreditation Handbook			
Common Standards Rubric	Common Standards Rubric	Common Standards Rubric			
Annual Report	Annual Report	Admin Services Update			Technical Assistance Visits
7th Year Follow-Up Reports	National/Professional Accreditation	TEAC	7th Year Follow-Up Reports	Plan for Accreditation Activities in 09-10	
Induction	Induction	Induction			
Work Plan for 09-10	Evaluation of the System	Evaluation of the System	Evaluation of the System		
Accreditation Recommendations	Accreditation Recommendations				

* *Document is subject to change as determined by needs of COA priorities.*