

SBX5 1: Process to Review Prospective Program Sponsors

June 2010

Introduction

SBX5 1 (Steinberg) required the Commission to develop a process by June 1, 2010 that authorizes additional high quality alternative route educator preparation programs in the areas of science, mathematics and career technical education, provided by school districts, county offices of education, community-based organizations (CBO) and nongovernmental organizations (NGO). SBX5 1 is provided in Appendix A of this agenda item. The COA began discussion of the implementation of SBX5 1 at its January meeting and continued the discussion at its April and May meetings. In addition, the Commission discussed the COA's preliminary work on this topic at its April 2010 meeting and took action to adopt the *Organizational Requirements* (Appendix B) at the June 2010 meeting. This agenda item presents additional details for the COA to consider for the process that an NGO or CBO would complete to demonstrate initial institutional viability.

The Commission's web site has been updated to provide information related to SBX5 1 for prospective sponsors and individuals who might be interested in becoming a science, mathematics or career technical education teacher by completing a program sponsored by an alternative sponsor: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/SBX5-1.html>

Staff Recommendation

That the COA discuss, and possibly take action to recommend to the Commission the adoption of a fee structure for cost recovery for program sponsors undergoing the SBX 5 1 alternative institutional review process.

Background

At its June 2010 meeting, the Commission took action to adopt the following recommendations. These were the recommendations from the COA with a change in two of the four recommendations. In the second recommendation the word 'sentences' was replaced with the word 'components.' In the fourth recommendation the word 'possibly' was deleted by the Commission. The following language was approved by the Commission:

- That the *Requirements for Organizations that are not Regionally Accredited to Offer Educator Preparation Programs in California* presented in this item serve as the Commission's initial process for NGO or CBOs to establish institutional viability as required by SBX5 1.
- That full accreditation by NCATE be deemed to have met the Commission's requirement of regional accreditation for initial institutional approval if the entity submits adequate information for the four components of the Commission's Common Standards which are not adequately addressed by the NCATE Unit Standards.
- That the COA monitor the alternative process for institutional approval and report to the Commission at least annually on the process and entities that have utilized the process.

- That the process adopted by the Commission in June 2010 be considered the initial process and as information is collected on the process, the Commission review and fine tune the process in the future.

The Commission made it clear that the actions taken at the June 2010 Commission meeting will be revisited at a future meeting and that the Commission will review the procedures developed by the COA that a NGO or CBO would complete to demonstrate initial institutional viability. At its June 2010 meeting the Commission also discussed the costs associated with the alternative initial review process. The law states that the Commission “may assess a fee on a community-based or nongovernmental organization that is seeking approval to participate in the program.” The discussion at the June Commission meeting was supportive of a fee being charged for this new process, with one Commissioner stating that the fee should be “a full cost recovery fee.” This agenda item provides introductory information on possible fees that might be assessed and asks that the COA discuss the draft fee structure.

Procedures to Implement a Process to Review the *Organizational Requirements* as an Alternative Process to Regional Accreditation and Establish Initial Institutional Viability

This agenda item continues the work on SBX5 1 and provides a set of draft procedures an entity that is not regionally accredited but is interested in preparing teachers in the areas of science, mathematics and career technical education in California might complete. The Commission’s accreditation system is based upon the assumption that an approved entity, a regional accrediting agency, had examined the broader institution and determined that basic issues of capacity and quality are in place at the institution. This precursor review and approval process allows the Commission to have a reasonable assurance that students will receive the educational services promised by the institution. This precursor process then allows the Commission’s accreditation system to focus more directly on the educational unit and all its credential processes.

Usually the initial institutional approval process involves the institution submitting documentation and supporting evidence that demonstrates the entity meets the Commission’s Common Standards and the adopted Preconditions for the intended educator preparation program. Staff reviews the documentation and when the documentation is deemed to be complete, recommends to the Commission that the institution be approved to offer educator preparation programs in California. Prior to this review, the institution has already completed the regional accreditation process, usually by the *Western Association of Schools and Colleges* (WASC) for institutions in California. The WASC review involves two types of site visits which review the institution and all of its educational programs for both i) a Capacity and Preparatory Review and ii) an Educational Effectiveness Review.

For entities that are not regionally accredited, the *Organizational Requirements* (Appendix B) require the prospective sponsor to provide information to the Commission. Staff would initially review the response to the *Organizational Requirements* to ensure that the responses appropriately address the Requirements and include documentary support. Staff would also provide technical assistance as the prospective sponsor develops a full response to the Commission’s Common Standards and the Preconditions.

The full review of the response and supporting documentation for both the *Organizational Requirements* and the Commission’s Common Standards would be completed during a site visit with individuals from the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) and possibly an additional individual with specialized fiscal expertise serving as the team members. This site visit would be a process that only exists for prospective sponsors that are not eligible for regional accreditation or are local education agencies approved by the California Department of Education. According to SBX5 1, the prospective program sponsor may be charged for the initial institutional viability process. Staff recommends that the COA recommend to the Commission that it should charge prospective sponsors for all costs associated with this initial institutional viability site visit.

The site visit report would be presented to the COA with the team lead and the institutional representative present. If the COA desires, a subcommittee of COA members might convene prior to the scheduled meeting to review the actual documentation the prospective sponsor submits in addition to the full COA reviewing site visit team report.

If the COA reviews the report and finds that the institution meets the *Organizational Requirements* and the Commission’s Common Standards, it would take action to forward a recommendation to the Commission for Initial Institutional Approval. If the COA reviews the report and identifies areas where the prospective sponsor has not demonstrated compliance with all *Organizational Requirements* and found to be meeting all the Common Standards, the COA would clearly identify the area or areas where the prospective sponsor needs to focus and suggest a timeline for a re-visit. The prospective sponsor would be eligible to request a re-visit when it has addressed the issues that were not found to be met at the initial review. Table 1 provides a summary of the steps an entity and the Commission might complete in the alternative initial institutional approval process.

Table 1: Steps to Initial Institutional Approval for Entities that are Not Regionally Accredited

Activity	Prospective Institution	Commission (CTC/COA/staff)
Information gathering—Understand the steps of institutional and program approval in California.	Contact staff, consult web page for information on Initial Institutional Approval (IIA)	Provide technical assistance to prospective institution
Documentation addressing <i>Requirements for Organizations that are Not Regionally Accredited to Offer Educator Preparation Programs in California</i>	Prepare and submit to the Commission	Staff review for completeness and supporting documentation. If submission is complete (Requirements, Common Standards and Preconditions) schedule a site visit.
Responses to the Common Standards and the Preconditions for the intended teacher preparation program	Prepare and submit to the Commission	
Site visit addressing the Organizational Requirements and Common Standards-- a 2 ½ day site visit focusing on the	Host site visit. Bring in leadership team and stakeholders to	Facilitate the site visit. Take team report and recommendation to the

Activity	Prospective Institution	Commission (CTC/COA/staff)
Organizational Requirements and the Common Standards with members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) and an individual with expertise in budget	provide information	COA
Committee on Accreditation (COA) Agenda item—Staff presents the report from the site visit. Team Lead appears before the COA as well as the institution	Attend the COA meeting- <i>optional</i>	COA reviews the report and decides if recommendation for IIA should be forwarded to the Commission
Commission agenda item-- Staff prepares an agenda item recommending Initial Institutional Approval	Attend the Commission meeting- <i>optional</i>	Commission takes action
Program Proposal—narrative and supporting documentation addressing all adopted program standards for the intended teacher preparation program	Prepare narrative addressing all program standards	Facilitate initial review of proposed program. Once the proposal meets all program standards, place on the COA agenda
Approval of Teacher Preparation Program		COA takes action to approve the program
Once the entity has Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) and an approved teacher preparation program, the entity will be placed in an accreditation cohort. The institution will be responsible for completing all required accreditation activities with the assigned cohort. A technical assistance site visit will be scheduled at the end of the second year of program operation.		

Based on the Commission’s discussion related to charging a prospective sponsor for the alternative initial institutional review process and the language in the Education Code allowing for this option, staff has compiled a list of activities and the tasks that would be completed by the prospective program sponsor. Table 2 provides for the COA’s discussion.

Table 2: Possible Costs for Alternative Initial Institutional Review Process

Type of Activity	Specific Tasks	Cost Recovery Estimate
Technical assistance for prospective program sponsors	Phone and email contact with the institution to support development of initial submission. One technical assistance visit from a consultant to the institution to support the understanding of the <i>Organizational Requirements</i> and Common Standards and provide guidance on the documentation necessary to support the narratives addressing the requirements and standards.	\$1,000
Initial review of narrative and supporting	Staff review of narrative and supporting documentation addressing <i>Organizational Requirements</i> and Common Standards to judge if the submission is complete and	\$1,000

Type of Activity	Specific Tasks	Cost Recovery Estimate
documentation	would support a site visit team	
Site visit	2 ½ day site visit with a four member team and a staff consultant. This includes travel, lodging, and per diem for team members. To review the fiscal information would require an individual with specialized fiscal knowledge. This individual would need to be compensated.	\$6,000
COA Review of the Site Visit Report	Time for a subcommittee of the COA to review the documentation prior to the scheduled COA meeting. Team lead and staff consultant attend the COA meeting and present the team report. Travel for team lead included.	\$1,000
Commission Review of the Request for Initial Institutional Approval and Ongoing Accreditation Activities	An agenda item presented to the Commission. An option would be to present the documentation submitted by the prospective sponsor to the Commission or a small group of Commissioners. This step might be duplicative of the COA review.	No Charge

A second fee structure option could be considered by the COA. Currently, the Bureau for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education (BPPVE) charges a flat \$5,000 fee for its approval process. The COA could consider recommending to the Commission the adoption of a flat fee structure for all institutions undergoing the SBX 5 1 alternative institutional review process.

Next Steps

If the COA takes action at its June meeting to approve a recommended fee structure to the Commission, staff will prepare an agenda item for the Commission’s August agenda. If the COA determines that further discussion and/or information is warranted, the staff will prepare another agenda item for the COA’s discussion and consideration at its August meeting. In addition, staff will collect information on entities expressing interest in the alternative process to demonstrate initial institutional viability and provide this information to the COA at future meetings.

Appendix A

SEC. 5. Section 44227.2 is added to the Education Code, to read:

44227.2. (a) The Legislature hereby establishes the Science, Technology, Engineering, Math, and Career Technical Education Educator Credentialing Program for purposes of providing alternative routes to credentialing, in accordance with the guidelines for the federal Race to the Top Fund, authorized under the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5), that do not compromise state standards.

(b) No later than June 1, 2010, the commission, in consultation with the Committee on Accreditation established pursuant to Section 44373, shall develop a process to authorize additional high-quality alternative route educator preparation programs provided by school districts, county offices of education, community-based organizations, and nongovernmental organizations. Organizations participating in this project may offer educator preparation programs for any science, mathematics, and career technical education credential type issued by the commission if the organization meets the requirements for being authorized pursuant to criteria established by the commission.

(c) The commission shall authorize community-based or nongovernmental organizations accredited by an accrediting organization that is recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation and the United States Department of Education. The commission may also establish alternative criteria, if necessary, for project participants that are not eligible for accreditation by one of the accredited organizations.

(d) Participating organizations shall electronically submit credential applications to the commission.

(e) The commission may assess a fee on a community-based or nongovernmental organization that is seeking approval to participate in the program. For purposes of this section, an independent college or university in California is not a community-based or nongovernmental organization.

Appendix B

Organizational Requirements for NGO/CBOs that are Not Regionally Accredited to Offer Educator Preparation Programs in California

A: Articulating Organizational Goals and Addressing Educator Preparation Objectives

The organization defines its educator preparation purposes and establishes objectives. The organization functions with integrity and autonomy.

- A. 1. The organization's formally approved statements of purpose and operational practices are appropriate for an educator preparation organization in California. The organization's objectives are clearly recognized and consistent with stated purposes.
- A. 2. The organization demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, practices and programs.
- A. 3. The organization has educator preparation as a primary purpose regardless of political, corporate, or religious affiliations.
- A. 4. The organization exhibits integrity in its operations, as demonstrated by the implementation of appropriate, equitable, open and honest communication with candidates and the public, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas.
- A. 5. The organization demonstrates knowledge of and the capacity to participate in the Commission's accreditation process including Biennial Reports, Program Assessment, accreditation site visits, the Common Standards, Preconditions and Program Standards.
- A. 6. The organization is committed to honest and open communication with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor, to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the organization, and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures.

B: Commitment to Learning and Continuous Improvement to Achieve California Educator Preparation Objectives

The organization achieves its educator preparation objectives. The organization maintains a sustained, evidence-based, evaluation system to ensure that high quality educator preparation objectives are met.

- B. 1. The organization's learning outcomes and expectations for candidate attainment are clearly stated and widely shared among stakeholders and at the course, program and organizational levels. The organization's staff takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations.

- B. 2. The organization's educator preparation programs actively involve prospective educators in learning, ensure they meet high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.
- B. 3. The organization regularly identifies the characteristics of its candidates and assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences. The organization collects and analyzes prospective educator data, disaggregated by demographic categories and type of credential program. The organization takes security measures to ensure the security and integrity of candidate records.
- B. 4. The organization's planning processes identify and align program, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the educator preparation program. Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data from multiple sources including those identified in B3.

C: Developing, Sustaining and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality Educator Preparation

The organization sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educator preparation objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal, and information resources. These key resources promote the achievement of quality educator preparation.

- C. 1. The organization demonstrates that it employs an adequate number of instructional staff with commitment to educator preparation of high quality. The staff is sufficient in number, professional qualifications, and diversity to achieve the organization's educator preparation objectives.
- C. 2. Staff recruitment and evaluation practices are aligned with educator preparation objectives. For instructional staff, evaluation involves consideration of evidence of teaching effectiveness, including candidate's evaluations of instruction.
- C. 3. The organization maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported staff development activities designed to improve teaching and learning, consistent with its educator preparation objectives.
- C. 4. Initially, the organization provides clean independent audits of a full set of financial statements of the legal entity planning to offer educator preparation programs for the three years prior to submission of the "Intent to Seek Institutional Approval Form." The audits should meet the standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants or other appropriate accounting standards generally accepted in the U.S. After initial approval by the Commission, the organization submits the legal entity's 990 Form (for non-profits) or corporate income tax returns (for for-profits) for the past two years on a biennial basis. Resources are aligned with educator preparation objectives.
- C. 5. A business plan that focuses on the unit being accredited. The business plan should include:
 - o A business model that briefly describes the services to be delivered, the area to be served, the current and projected number of candidates, recruitment activities, a description of faculty, tuition costs, a budget narrative, etc.;

- The most current approved budget;
 - Revenue and expense projections for the next two years, including funding streams, the length and percentage of funding from foundation grants, appropriated governmental funds, tuition, funds from elsewhere in the legal entity or its affiliates; costs of facility, payroll, maintenance, etc.;
 - A one to two page narrative describing revenue and expenditure projections for the next 4 years;
 - A one to two page narrative describing the relationship between the unit and the legal entity offering the educator preparation programs; and
 - If tuition based, the tuition refund policy should the educator preparation programs be discontinued.
- C. 6. The organization's facilities are safe, secure and healthy. The organization's information technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educator preparation purposes.
- C. 7. The organization policies related to fees and other financial obligations of candidates, conflicts of interest, non-discrimination and sexual harassment are clearly stated.
- C. 8. The organization has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over organizational integrity, policies, staffing and ongoing operations.
- C. 9. The primary administrator responsible for the educator preparation program shall possess a post baccalaureate degree or credential and experience in education. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators, including a chief financial officer, to provide effective educational leadership and management.