

## Update on SBX5 1 Implementation November 2010

### Overview of this Report

At the June 2010 meeting, the Commission took action (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-06/2010-06-5B.pdf>) to adopt the *Organizational Requirements for Organizations (NGO/CBOs) that are Not Regionally Accredited to Offer Educator Preparation Programs* in California pursuant to SBX5 1 (Chap. 2, Stats. of 2010). The Commission also discussed the fee that the legislation declared the Commission "...may assess on a community-based or nongovernmental organization that is seeking approval..." At the August 2010 meeting staff presented a proposal for an initial \$5,000 fee with the sponsoring entity also paying for all actual costs of the site visit component of the review (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-08/2010-08-5B.pdf>.) The Commission requested that additional cost information be presented at a future meeting. The requested information related to two issues: 1) fees charged for accreditation by other accrediting agencies and 2) more detailed estimates of the staff time and associated costs for conducting the initial institutional approval activities. This agenda item presents the additional financial information requested by and presented to the Commission, presents two fee structure options that the Commission considered and information on the fee structure that was adopted.

### Staff Recommendation

This is an information item.

### Background

SBX5 1 was urgency legislation that addressed, in part, a plan to recruit and prepare teachers of science, technology, engineering, mathematics and career technical education (STEM/CTE) through non-traditional routes. The measure was signed by the Governor and is now in effect. The language of SBX5 1 is provided in Appendix A of this agenda item. The *Organizational Requirements* that the Commission adopted in June 2010 are provided in Appendix B. The Commission's website has been updated to provide information related to the STEM/CTE teacher preparation provisions of SBX5 1 for both prospective sponsors and individuals who might be interested in earning a science, mathematics or career technical education credential by completing a program sponsored by an alternative sponsor: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/SBX5-1.html>.

The steps that an entity would need to complete were discussed at the August 2010 Commission meeting and are briefly described in Appendix C of this agenda item. The Committee on Accreditation (COA) concluded that an initial fee with the prospective program sponsor paying for all expenses incurred through the process of seeking initial institutional approval seemed to be the most appropriate fee structure at this time. The Commission's discussion at the June 2010 meeting indicated that the fee for this alternative process should be a 'cost recovery' fee.

At the August 2010 meeting, the Commission asked about the amount of staff time involved in monitoring and assisting with the activities that are listed as "included in the initial fee." In Part II of this agenda item, additional information is provided on these activities including estimates of staff time and the cost for the staff time. The table that describes the sequence of alternative

initial institutional approval activities is provided in Appendix C and the estimates for the required and optional expenses are provided in Appendix D. After reviewing the staff costs, including benefits, and the operating expenses associated with the work, staff has revised the recommended initial fee to two options: 1) \$5,000 or 2) \$7,000. The estimates are based upon the best available cost figures for completing the required activities. Using this updated analysis, staff believes that an initial fee of \$5,000 would be most appropriate.

In addition to information on staff costs, the Commission also requested information on the fees charged by other accrediting bodies, namely the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). Information on these fees is presented in Part I of this agenda item. Part II presents the estimated costs for the Commission work that would be included as part of the proposed initial fee.

**Part I: Fees Charged by Other Accrediting Bodies**

Western Association of Schools and Colleges, The Senior Commission (WASC)

The alternative process addressed by SBX5 1 would be completed by an entity that is not accredited by WASC or another regional accrediting body. Presented in this section is information from the WASC website on the fees it charges institutions of higher education.

WASC has a number of fees associated with the request for initial accreditation

Initial Eligibility Application	\$ 10,000
- <i>Eligibility Reapplication within 2 Years</i>	<i>\$ 5,000</i>
- <i>Eligibility Reapplication after 2 Years</i>	<i>\$ 10,000</i>
- <i>Eligibility Appeal</i>	<i>\$ 500</i>
Candidacy and Initial Accreditation	\$ 12,000
- <i>Reapplication within 2 Years</i>	<i>\$ 6,000</i>
- <i>Reapplication after 2 Years</i>	<i>\$ 12,000</i>
<i>Italics-contingent on success of initial submission</i>	

There are also fees associated with the ongoing accreditation cycle: Institutional Proposal, Capacity and Preparatory Review, and Educational Effectiveness Review

Institutional Proposal	\$3,000
Proposal Resubmission Fee	\$500
Capacity and Preparatory Review	\$3,000
Educational Effectiveness Review	\$3,000
Multi-site Visit Surcharge (for visits to more than one location)	\$500 per site
Institutions are also responsible for the expenses of all site visits	

The minimum WASC fee for the ongoing review process would be \$9,000 if the entity does not have any resubmission required and only operates at a single site. In addition, the institution pays all expenses for the site visit team. Within the WASC process two separate site visits take place: Capacity and Preparatory Review and the Educational Effectiveness Review. WASC also has annual dues which range from \$5,725 - \$48,969 depending on the enrollment at the college or university. With an enrollment up to 100 students the annual fee would be \$5,725. It is

important to remember that WASC accreditation is for the full institution and all of its degree (bachelor, master, and doctorate) programs.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

The NCATE fee is an annual fee and is based on the number of program completers per year at the institution. Once an institution is a candidate for NCATE accreditation, the annual fees begin.

Number of Program Completers/Year	Fiscal Year 2011 Fee
1-50	\$2,100
51-150	\$2,330
151-300	\$2,665
301-500	\$3,085
501-1,000	\$4,040
Over 1000	\$4,695

For institutions that are not members of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), an additional fee is assessed as follows:

Number of Program Completers/Year	Fiscal Year 2011 AACTE Sustaining Fee
1-50	\$1,290
51-150	\$1,400
151-300	\$1,570
301-500	\$1,815
Over 500	\$2,140

In addition, during the year of the site visit, a Periodic Evaluation Fee of \$4,500 – \$12,000 is required. The fee is assessed depending on institution size, number of programs, and the state protocol (<http://www.ncate.org/institutions/fees.asp?ch=16>). For a small entity that prepares under 50 new teachers per year and is not already a member of AACTE, the annual NCATE fee would be \$3,390 with an additional \$4,500 evaluation fee during the site visit year. The evaluation fee does include the costs incurred by the site visit team.

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

The initial application fee for TEAC is \$2,862 and is initially due when the institution becomes a candidate for TEAC accreditation. The fee then becomes an annual fee. In the year of the accreditation audit, the institution pays for the travel and expenses of the audit team. The audit team is fairly small, involving 2 or 3 people.

Table 1 provides a summary of the information on costs related to accreditation for WASC, NCATE, TEAC and includes the options for the fee for the Commission’s alternative process

**Table 1: Summary of Initial Accreditation Costs for a Small Teacher Preparation Sponsor**

		<b>Annual Fee</b>	<b>Initial Accreditation</b>	<b>Site Visit Costs</b>
<b>WASC</b>		\$ 5,725	Minimum of \$ 9,000	Paid by applicant
<b>NCATE</b>		\$ 3,390	\$ 4,500	Included in accreditation fee
<b>TEAC</b>		\$ 2,862	Included in Annual Fee	Paid by applicant
<i>Commission's Alternative Process</i>	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>None except for the annual audit</i>	\$ 7,000	<i>Paid by applicant</i>
	<i>Option 2</i>		\$5,000	

*Italics-Options proposed in this agenda item for Commission Consideration*

**Part II: Costs for the Commission Work that Would be Included in the Initial Fee**

Table 2 is based on the activities provided in Appendix C but has more detailed information on the activities that would be conducted, including staff time, as part of the initial fee. The optional activities have been omitted from Table 2. Provided in the right hand column of Table 2 is a generous staff estimate of the time that would be spent working with a prospective sponsor.

**Table 2: Required Expenses for Alternative Initial Institutional Approval**

	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Commission Provides</b>	<b>Staff Time Estimates</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Information gathering by prospective sponsor</b>	Technical assistance through email, phone and/or video conference	Consultant: 1 day
<b>2</b>	<b>Gather documentation addressing <i>Requirements for Organizations</i></b>  <i>If needed, gather additional documentation</i>	Staff review for completeness and supporting documentation, if acceptable, move to Step 3  <i>If submission is not ready for site visit, additional documentation must be reviewed for Step 2</i>	AGPA: .5 day Consultant: .5 day  <i>Consultant: .25 day</i>
<b>3</b>	<b>Develop responses to the Standards and Preconditions</b>  <i>If necessary, additional documentation must be gathered</i>	Provide technical assistance through email, phone and/or video conference as needed  Staff reviews Common Standards and Preconditions for completeness, if acceptable schedule site visit  <i>If submission was not ready for site visit, additional documentation must be reviewed for Step 3</i>	Consultant: 1 day  AGPA: .5 day SSA: .5 day  <i>Consultant: .25 day</i>
<b>4</b>	<b>Site visit</b>	Consultant to facilitate the site visit	Consultant: 3.5 days SSA: .5 day

	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Commission Provides</b>	<b>Staff Time Estimates</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Committee on Accreditation (COA) agenda item</b>	Consultant prepares and presents the team report to the COA	Consultant: .5 day AGPA: .5 day
<b>6</b>	<b>Commission agenda item</b>	Administrator of Accreditation and Consultant prepare and present the request for Initial Institutional Approval to the Commission	Administrator: .5 day

Once the Commission takes action in Step 6 to grant Initial Institutional Approval, the entity would be included in the Commission’s regular accreditation system where all accreditation activities are completed within the agency’s budget. An ongoing expense for these sponsors that is not required for regionally accredited program sponsors would be the annual financial report that must be audited as described in Organizational Requirement C.4. prior to submission to the Commission.

The estimate of the staff time that would be focused on a prospective program sponsor’s application for alternative initial institutional approval process was shared with the Director of the Fiscal Services Division who then provided the salary and benefit information which is provided in the table below:

<b>Staff</b>	<b>Estimated Time</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>
Staff Services Analyst	1 day	\$264
Associate Governmental Program Analyst	1.5 days	\$476
Consultant	7 days	\$2885
Administrator	.5 days	\$233
<b>Total cost (salary/benefits)</b>		<b>\$3,858</b>

In addition to the staff and benefits costs listed above, there are the ongoing operating costs of the agency, called Operating Expense and Equipment (OEE). If a prorated estimate for rent, paper, postage, phones, technology, and other general operating expenses was added, the estimate rises to \$6,700.

Therefore, the Commission is presented with two options to consider for the initial fee: (1) the \$5,000 that was discussed at the August 2010 Commission meeting or (2) a \$7,000 fee. The \$5,000 fee would recoup the staff time, including benefits and has a cushion of almost \$1,200 to cover some Operating Expense and Equipment costs. The \$7,000 fee would include the staff time and benefits, but also adds in almost \$3,000 for Operating Expense and Equipment.

In considering the two options, staff notes that there would be very limited costs related to paper, postage, or printing fees because the initial process would be conducted through the use of technology and electronic documents. In addition, the agency would be paying building rent, the phone bill and internet fees regardless of the alternative initial program approval. While both

options are presented for Commission discussion and consideration, the Commission should carefully consider whether these additional OEE costs should be included into the initial fee. Based on the information presented in this item, staff is recommending a \$5,000 initial fee.

In addition, there are two steps identified in Table 2, noted in *italics*, where it is possible that additional information might be needed to be submitted by the prospective sponsor if the initial submission was not found to meet the requirements. At times institutions submit very thorough and complete proposals and supporting documentation, and at other times, the initial submission is not complete enough to be reviewed. The staff time and resources allotted to this function vary depending on the quality and completeness of the documents submitted.

Currently, the time for the *italicized* steps is included in the estimate provided. However, it is possible that the actual time devoted to these steps could exceed, sometimes significantly, the estimate provided. To ensure that Commission costs are contained within the initial fee, the possible activities shown in italics could be defined as not covered by the initial fee and prospective sponsors could be billed for the actual time staff spends on these activities. Or, since the staff time is included in the estimate, the provision could be that one resubmission is included, but if additional submissions are necessary to move to the next step, that the entity would pay for the additional actual staff time, including benefits.

### **Staff Recommendations Presented at the September 2010 Commission Meeting**

At the September 2010 Commission meeting, staff recommended:

- (1) that the Commission take action to set the fee for the alternative initial institutional approval process at \$5,000 with the understanding that the prospective sponsor will pay for all actual expenses (including travel, per diem, and lodging at the state rate) as shown in Appendix D.
- (2) that the Commission determine which one of the following three options should be incorporated into the fee structure as it relates to the *italicized* steps in Table 2:
  - a. the staff time to complete the italicized steps are covered within the initial fee regardless of number of resubmissions;
  - b. the prospective program sponsor pays for the actual staff time for the italicized steps beyond the first resubmission; or
  - c. the prospective program sponsors pays the actual staff time for all of the italicized steps.

### **Commission Action**

On September 30, 2010 the Commission took action to set an initial fee of \$6,000 for a NGO or CBO to begin the initial institutional approval process. The initial fee includes one resubmission of materials for the IIA process, but if additional resubmissions are necessary, the prospective sponsor will pay for the actual staff time and operating expenses for the additional review of the resubmission documentation. As of October 20, there have been no requests to begin the alternative IIA process.

## 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**

### **Adopted 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.;
  - o The most current approved budget;
  - o 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.

## Appendix C

### Steps to Initial Institutional Approval for Entities that are Not Regionally Accredited or Approved by the CDE

	Activity	Prospective Institution	Commission (CTC/COA/staff)
1	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
2	Gather 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 reviews for completeness and supporting documentation. If submission is complete (Requirements, Common Standards and Preconditions) schedule a site visit
3	Develop responses to the Common Standards and the Preconditions for the intended teacher preparation program	Prepare and submit to the Commission	
4	Site visit addressing the Organizational Requirements and Common Standards-- a 2 ½ day site visit focusing on the Organizational Requirements and the Common Standards with members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) and an individual with expertise in budget	Host site visit. Bring in leadership team and stakeholders to provide information	Facilitate the site visit. Take team report and recommendation to the Committee on Accreditation (COA)
5	COA Agenda item—Staff presents the report from the site visit. Team Lead appears before the COA as well as the institution	May attend the COA meeting	COA reviews the report and decides if recommendation for IIA should be forwarded to the Commission
6	Commission agenda item-- Staff prepares an agenda item recommending Initial Institutional Approval	May attend the Commission meeting	Commission takes action
7	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
8	Approval of Teacher Preparation Program		COA takes action to approve the program
9	Once the entity has 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.		

## Appendix D

### Required and *Optional* Expenses for Alternative Initial Institutional Approval

	Activity	Commission Provides	Expense to Prospective Institution
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Information gathering by prospective sponsor</b></p> <p><i>Optional—Commission consultant make a visit to the institution or a representative comes to the CTC</i></p>	<p>Technical assistance through email, phone and/or video conference [Unknown]</p> <p><i>Optional—visit to prospective sponsor to provide technical assistance or host sponsor at CTC</i></p>	<p>Included in the initial fee</p> <p><i>Travel, lodging and per diem within state rates (\$100-\$400 depending on location)</i></p>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Gather documentation addressing Requirements for Organizations</b></p> <p><i>Optional—Commission consultant makes a visit to the institution or a representative comes to the CTC</i></p> <p>If needed, gather additional documentation</p>	<p>Staff review for completeness and supporting documentation, if acceptable, move to Step 3 [1/2 day]</p> <p><i>Optional—visit to prospective sponsor to provide technical assistance or host sponsor at CTC</i></p> <p>If submission is not ready for site visit, additional documentation must be reviewed for Step 2 [Unknown]</p>	<p>Included in the initial fee</p> <p><i>Travel, lodging and per diem within state rates (\$100-\$400 depending on location)</i></p> <p>Included in the initial fee</p>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Develop responses to the Standards and Preconditions</b></p> <p><i>Optional—request a Commission consultant make a visit to the prospective institution or a representative comes to the CTC</i></p> <p>If necessary, additional documentation must be gathered</p>	<p>Provide technical assistance through email, phone and/or video conference as needed [Unknown]</p> <p>Staff review Common Standards and Preconditions for completeness, if acceptable schedule site visit [1/2 day]</p> <p>If submission was not ready for site visit, additional documentation must be reviewed for Step 3</p>	<p>Included in the initial fee</p> <p>Included in the initial fee</p> <p><i>Travel, lodging and per diem within state rates (\$100-\$400 depending on location)</i></p> <p>Included in the initial fee</p>

	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Commission Provides</b>	<b>Expense to Prospective Institution</b>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Site visit</b></p> <p>Includes a review of Organizational Requirements C.4. and C.5. by an <u>individual with specialized expertise</u></p>	<p>Consultant to facilitate the site visit [1 day to arrange logistics and compose team and then 2 ½ days plus travel for the site visit]</p>	<p>-Planning for site visit included in the initial fee</p> <p>-Travel, lodging and per diem for all team members, including Commission consultant, within state rates. (\$2,000-\$4,000)</p> <p>-Pay fee for financial review (unknown)</p>
<b>5</b>	<p><b>Committee on Accreditation (COA) agenda item</b></p> <p><i>If the COA does not recommend IIA and identifies areas that must be addressed, the prospective sponsor would return to Step 2 or 3 and <u>might</u> need to host a focused site visit</i></p>	<p>Consultant prepares and presents the team report to the COA [1/2 day]</p> <p><i>Provide technical assistance through email, phone and/or video conference [Unknown]</i></p>	<p>- CTC work included in the initial fee</p> <p>- Travel for Team Lead to attend the COA meeting, within state rates. (\$200)</p> <p>- Prospective sponsor may attend the COA meeting</p> <p><i>If a second site visit is required: Travel, lodging and per diem for all team members, including Commission consultant, within state rates. (\$1,000-\$2,000)</i></p>
<b>6</b>	<p><b>Commission agenda item</b></p>	<p>Administrator of Accreditation and Consultant prepare and present the request for IIA to the Commission [1/2 day]</p>	<p>- CTC work included in the initial fee</p> <p>- Prospective sponsor may attend the Commission meeting</p>