

## **Discussion of Processes and Procedures Regarding Denial of Accreditation June 2012**

### **Overview of this Report**

This agenda item continues the discussion regarding the changing the Commission's policies and processes related to denying accreditation after an initial accreditation site visit. This agenda item presents additional language for the Denial of Accreditation section of the Accreditation Handbook.

### **Staff Recommendation**

This is an action item. Staff proposes that the COA complete its discussion from the February, March, April, and May 2012 meetings to determine language regarding the inclusion of Denial of Accreditation at an initial site visit. Text reflecting these changes will be made in the Accreditation Framework and Handbook to guide both review teams and institutions undergoing accreditation. Staff has developed this agenda item based on input from the COA at its May meeting.

### **Background**

The COA initially discussed the topic of Denial of Accreditation at its February 2012 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2012-02/2012-02-item-15.pdf>) and revisited the topic at the March 2012 ([http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2012-03/13-Denial\\_of\\_Accreditation\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2012-03/13-Denial_of_Accreditation_FINAL.pdf)), April 2012 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2012-04/2012-04-item-15.pdf>), and May 2012 meetings (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2012-05/2012-05-item-14.pdf>).

Previous COA discussions have determined the need to change procedures to allow the denial of accreditation at an initial site visit, and focused on what parameters and processes should be used in exercising this option. At the May meeting, COA members discussed a four-part agenda item that considered

Part 1: Definitions

Part 2: Procedures

Part 3: Due Process

Part 4: Guidelines table

At that meeting, the COA approved some proposed language and identified additional clarifying language for Parts 1 and 2, incorporated Part 3 into Part 2, and approved changes to Part 4. This agenda item revisits Parts 1 and 2 from the May agenda and proposes additional language for the COA's approval.

## **Part 1: General Definitions, Parameters, and Operational Implications for Denial of Accreditation**

### ***Denial of Accreditation***

The COA can deny accreditation upon either an initial visit or a revisit to an institution. Although a recommendation of Denial of Accreditation typically comes after a finding of probationary status at an initial visit and after the institution has been provided with an opportunity to institute improvements a review team can recommend Denial of Accreditation at **any time** if the situation warrants the finding in accordance with this section of the Handbook.

#### *a) Initial Visits*

A COA decision of Denial of Accreditation upon an initial visit means that extremely serious and pervasive issues exist at an institution. In these instances, the COA has determined that it is highly unlikely that the issues and concerns identified by a review team and COA can be successfully addressed and rectified in a timely manner. The particular facts, the leadership and/or the infrastructure indicate that a significant amount of time and work must be devoted should the institution choose to address the identified issues during which time it is not prudent to have candidates enrolled in the credential program.

#### *Parameters to be Used in Considering a Team Recommendation of Denial of Accreditation at an initial site visit*

If on an initial site visit, the review team's findings are more serious than what is defined in the Accreditation with Probationary Stipulation section above, the review team may consider Denial of Accreditation at an initial site visit. These findings might include:

- Significant misrepresentations that were apparently intentionally made to the site visit team and/or in the documents presented to the site visit team
- The institution qualifies for the ruling of Probationary Stipulations in the table General Guidance for Initial Site Visit Team Recommendations (based upon the number of standards unmet), but the team feels that candidates and/or students in the K-12 classroom are possibly being harmed or a disservice is being done to them due to the degree to which those standards are not being met. The degree of harm makes the determination "denial" instead of "probationary".
- The institution has blatantly and systematically disregarded the policies and processes of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing regarding credential program approval, credential program implementation, and candidate completion, establishing a pattern of disregard.
- The institution is routinely credentialing candidates who were clearly not meeting all credential requirements
- An overwhelming number of the standards were found to be not met, suggesting that candidates are not able to acquire the knowledge, skills, and abilities required in the standards.

*b) Revisits*

If an accreditation team, upon conducting a revisit to an institution that received major or probationary stipulations, finds that the stipulations have not been adequately addressed or remediated, or determines that significant and sufficient progress has not been made towards addressing the stipulations. If an accreditation team finds that: (a) sufficient progress has been made, and/or (b) special circumstances described by the institution justify a delay, the COA may, if requested by the institution, permit an additional period of time for the institution to remedy its severe deficiencies. If the COA votes to deny accreditation, all credential programs must close at the end of the semester or quarter in which the decision has taken place. In addition, the institution's institutional approval ceases to be valid at that time and the institution will no longer be a CTC approved credential program sponsor.

Operational Implications (for either Initial Visits or Revisits)

An institution receiving *Denial of Accreditation* **must**:

- Take immediate steps to close all credential programs at the end of the semester or quarter in which the COA decision occurs.
- Announce that it has had its accreditation for educator preparation denied. All students enrolled in all credential programs must be notified within 10 days of Commission action that accreditation has been denied and that all credential programs will end at the end of the semester, quarter, or within 3 months of when the COA decision occurs. The Commission must receive a copy of this correspondence.
- File a plan of discontinuation within 90 days of the COA's decision. The plan must give information and assurances regarding the institution's efforts to place currently enrolled students in other credential programs to provide adequate assistance to permit students to complete their particular credential programs.
- Upon the effective date of the closure of credential programs, as determined by the COA, remove from all institutional materials and website any statements that indicate that its credential programs are accredited by the CTC.

The revisit report of the team, the action of the COA, and the new accreditation decision will be posted on the CTC's website.

Furthermore, an institution receiving a *Denial of Accreditation* would be prohibited from re-applying for institutional approval for a minimum of two years.

## **Part II. Discussion of Procedures to Be Used by COA Regarding Denial of Accreditation**

### Revisits

Denial of Accreditation after a **revisit** by a site visit team requires a simple majority vote by the COA.

### Initial Visits

A Denial of Accreditation after an **initial site** visit requires a 2/3 majority vote of COA members present at the meeting. In determining a decision of Denial of Accreditation after an **initial** site visit, the COA will employ the following protocol:

- The COA takes action at a regularly scheduled meeting (via a 2/3 vote) to deny accreditation.
- Subsequent to the COA vote to deny accreditation, the COA **may** send a focused site visit team (2 or more experienced staff or BIR members) to revisit the institution to verify the initial findings or outline additional information that may influence the COA's decision/vote and to work with the institution to identify possible next steps for the institution.
- If a focused site visit team has been convened, the COA revisits its decision at the next regularly scheduled COA meeting after receiving focused site visit team report.

After COA's final action of Denial of Accreditation, the institution may file an appeal with the Commission, in accordance with procedures outlined in the Accreditation Framework and Chapter 7 of the Accreditation Handbook.

### **Next Steps**

Should the COA members vote to include additional language for the *Accreditation Handbook*, staff will revise the chapter(s) and post it on the Commission's website.