

Update on the Commission's Budget and Program Review Fees June 2014

Introduction

This agenda item provides an update on the Commission's budget and the proposal to charge institutions program review fees.

Staff Recommendation

This is for information only.

Background

The Governor's Budget for 2014-15 proposed providing the Commission with authority to charge fees for accreditation activities. Additionally the Administration has proposed providing to Commission with \$650,000 in expenditure authority to fund accreditation activities.

The Proposed Budget Act Trailer Bill language authorizes the Commission to charge fees to cover the standard costs of reviewing existing educator preparation programs and requires educator preparation program sponsors to submit the established fees to the Commission. In order to carry out the proposed Budget Act Trailer bill language, the Commission will consider adopting emergency regulations at its June 2014 Commission meeting. Appendix A includes a copy of the agenda item prepared for Commission consideration. In addition to the proposed emergency regulations, the item presents information on the proposed fee structure.

The Commission staff will update the COA on the Commission discussion that will have taken place prior to the COA meeting. The COA may want to discuss the impact of this potential revenue on accreditation activities and the COA priorities for ensuring educator preparation program quality.

4A

Action

Fiscal Planning and Policy Committee

Proposed Emergency Regulations Pertaining to an Accreditation Fee Policy

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents proposed emergency regulations to collect fees from sponsors of educator preparation institutions pursuant to language proposed by the Administration to implement the Budget Act of 2014.

Policy Question: Is the proposed Accreditation Fee Policy fair and should the Emergency Regulations move forward upon adoption of a state budget?

Recommended Action: That the Commission take the following actions: Adopt an Accreditation Fee structure, find that Emergency Regulations are necessary, and approve the Emergency Regulations.

Presenter: Beth Graybill, Deputy Director, Executive Office, Philip Chen, Director of Fiscal and Business Services, and Teri Clark, Director, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability

Develop and maintain rigorous, meaningful, and relevant standards that drive program quality and effectiveness for the preparation of the education workforce and are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population.

June 2014

Proposed Amendments to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations Pertaining to an Accreditation Fee Policy

Introduction

This agenda item builds on the April 2014 agenda item that described Trailer Bill language proposed by the Administration for the 2014 Budget Act to give the Commission the authority to charge fees to cover program review and accreditation activities (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-04/2014-04-5A.pdf>). This item has three parts:

- Part I presents a proposed Program Review Fee Policy that includes a fee structure that is tied to workload associated with program review. The fee varies based on the number of programs offered by a program sponsor and an annual process for reviewing and revising fees.
- Part II presents draft regulatory language to implement the Program Review Fee Policy.
- Part III recommends that the Commission declare that the Program Review Fee Policy will be implemented through Emergency Regulations in order to ensure that fees can be collected early in fiscal year 2014-15.

Background

The Commission has experienced significant budget constraints for the past several years due to an overall decline in the demand for credentials and escalating price increases for “nondiscretionary” goods and services such as rent, state administrative costs, and employee salaries and benefits. Declines in credential demand led to a 25% decline in revenue since 2008 while at the same time nondiscretionary costs increased. For example, in the salaries, wages, and benefits category, costs increased by approximately 7%, creating a structural “imbalance” that reduced the Commission’s ability to carry out its core mission, including activities mandated by statute such as accreditation site visits. Given that the credential fee is at its statutory cap of \$70 and rising nondiscretionary costs can be expected to outpace any revenue growth that would come from an increase in credential applications, new revenue is needed in order to maintain the Commission’s ability to carry out its responsibilities, including accreditation activities. The Governor’s Budget proposed providing the Commission with authority to charge fees for accreditation activities. Additionally the Administration has proposed providing to Commission with \$650,000 in expenditure authority to fund accreditation activities. Fees collected in excess of the proposed expenditure authority would help reinstate the Teacher Credentials Fund reserve whereas fees short of the proposed expenditure authority would limit the Commissions ability to carry out its mandates.

The Proposed Budget Act Trailer Bill language authorizes the Commission to charge fees to cover the standard costs of reviewing existing educator preparation programs and requires educator preparation program sponsors to submit the established fees to the Commission. The proposed bill prohibits the Commission from waiving fees for the review of existing programs for in-kind contributions from sponsors of educator preparation programs. The bill further requires that the

Commission notify the chairpersons of the committees and subcommittees in each house of the Legislature that consider the State Budget and the Department of Finance at least 30 days before implementing the fees and at least 30 days before making any subsequent fee adjustments.

The April 2014 agenda item presented various options for the implementation of an accreditation fee policy and proposed the following criteria through which the Commission would evaluate possible fee options:

- **Administrative ease** – The ease by which a fee could be administered should be a factor in the evaluation of fee options. To reduce administrative costs that impact the ability of the Commission to fully utilize revenue to cover program review activities, the fee policy should not be overly burdensome for the Commission. An efficient fee policy should also have minimal administrative costs for program sponsors.
- **Non-regressive, non-progressive** – The inherent fairness of a fee should be a factor in the evaluation of fee options. The variety of institutions suggests a range of abilities to absorb the impact of the new fees.
- **Reflective of accreditation costs** – The extent to which a fee policy reflects the Commission’s costs associated with program review workload should be considered. Because the proposed statute allows for the fees to cover the “standard” costs of accreditation, the fee should consider standard costs associated with the accreditation function. This should include costs for travel by site visit volunteers, hotel and food costs, and other accreditation related costs.
- **Addresses Cash Flow Problems** – The Commission has struggled with cash flow problems in recent history. Fees could be scheduled so that they are due in the Fall months, providing some level of cash flow relief during the months that credential application revenues are low.

The Commission directed staff to return with an agenda item with the following information: 1) a fee structure focusing on the amount of work involved for program review, 2) feedback from stakeholders, 3) an annual process to review and revise the fee structure, 4) a variable fee schedule based on the number of programs offered by a program sponsor, and 5) draft emergency regulations for consideration and action.

Part I: Proposed Fee Structure

Staff developed a proposed fee structure based on the discussion at the April 2014 Commission meeting that is tied to workload associated with the review of educator preparation programs. The criteria identified in the April 2014 agenda item and presented above were considered as the fee structure was developed.

The proposed fee structure has two components: the average number of recommendations each institution submits to the Commission and the number and type of Commission-approved educator preparation programs the institution offers.

Institution Fee: The proposed five-tier annual Institution Fee is based on the average number of recommendations submitted by the institution over the prior three fiscal years. The lowest tier is a \$1,000 fee for institutions that on average submit 50 or fewer recommendations and the highest tier is a \$2,500 fee for the institutions that average over 600 recommendations annually.

Program Fee: The proposed annual Program Fee would range from \$50 for programs that are declared by the institution to be inactive to \$400 for preliminary or initial preparation programs.

The details of the proposed fee structure are outlined in Appendix A of this agenda. Tables 1 and 2 provide the fee structure information. Tables 3 and 4 illustrate how fees will work to assist institutions in budget planning.

In an endeavor to advise Commission-approved programs about the implementation of an accreditation fee policy and to solicit feedback from stakeholders, staff vetted the proposed fee structure, provided in Appendix A, with the higher education segments, asking Ex Officio members of the Commission to share the proposed fee structure with their institutions. In addition, staff emailed the Accreditation Fee document to each Commission-approved institution that offers educator preparation. During early May, the Director of the Professional Services Division attended a number of meetings at higher education institutions and local educational agencies where the proposed fee structure was discussed. While many program sponsors expressed disappointment over the need for accreditation fees, most recognized the fees were necessary to maintain a robust and effective system of program review. Several public higher education institutions and local educational agencies noted that the fees would present certain challenges during the 2014-15 fiscal year since their budgets have already been submitted to their local approval authorities. . Several CSU deans pointed out that there are some credential areas where the state has very few Commission-approved programs and expressed concern that charging a Program Review Fee to these low-incidence programs could cause these programs to close, which could reduce access to these programs.

Should specified low incidence programs have a portion or all of the program fee excused because of the need for educators to be prepared and available to the students of California? Of the 47 different types educator preparation programs that lead to a credential or added authorization, there are 24 types in which there are ten or fewer Commission-approved programs such as Teacher Librarian Services or Added Authorizations in areas such as Special Education in Traumatic Brain Injury or Orthopedically Impaired. The low incidence programs are identified in Appendix B. Program Fees for these programs would range from \$200 to \$400 annually. Statewide, Program Review Fees for these 92 programs would amount to \$30,100. Notwithstanding the merits of maintaining access to programs that help increase the supply of educators who have specialized training, the work associated with program review, is the same whether there are 20 programs or there are only two. If the Commission were to reduce or waive fees for these programs, that revenue would need to be made up by charging other programs more or by reducing services. It would also require Commission staff to annually determine which programs would qualify for the low incidence “discount” reducing the time these staff would have for other program oversight activities.

Part Two: Proposed Emergency Regulatory Language

Part Two of this agenda item proposes the addition of a new section to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) as emergency regulations. The proposed addition of §§80693 and 80694 to Title 5 is to clarify, interpret, and make specific the anticipated 2014-2015 Budget Act Omnibus Education Trailer Bill section 10 pertaining to educator preparation program review. Assuming the new budget is adopted by July 1, 2014, the proposed emergency regulations would be submitted in early July 2014.

The Office of Administrative Law (OAL) has ten days to approve or deny emergency regulations. If approved, the emergency regulations are filed with the Secretary of State and become effective on the same date. The Commission would be authorized to begin collecting the annual accreditation fees the date the regulations are filed with the Secretary of State while seeking permanent adoption of the proposed regulations.

Findings of Emergency

Approval of the proposed regulations on an emergency basis is required for the immediate preservation of the public general welfare within the meaning of Government Code section 11346.1. The purpose of the accreditation system is to ensure the quality of California educators; the Commission's accreditation system is the only quality control mechanism the state has over educator preparation programs and helps ensure the integrity of the credentials issued by the agency (reference EC §§44370 and 44371). Delaying implementation of annual accreditation fees during the regular rulemaking process that will take at least six months to complete will cause the Commission to temporarily suspend accreditation activities. Failure by the Commission to perform its statutorily-mandated duties could result in the certification and placement of unqualified teachers in California's public schools. Unqualified teachers in the classroom would result in harm to California public school students.

Emergency regulations are necessary to ensure that the Commission has the monetary means to perform its statutorily-mandated accreditation duties thereby ensuring high quality educator preparation for the instruction of California public school pupils. The anticipated 2014-15 budget proposes an increase of \$650,000 for educator preparation program reviews. The emergency regulations are needed to implement the annual accreditation fee plan as early as possible in 2014-15.

Summary of Proposed Emergency Regulations

Subarticle 4.

Proposed additions of Title 5 of the CCR in order to clarify, interpret, and make specific the proposed annual accreditation fees is required to implement new statutory authority from the proposed Trailer Bill Language.

§80693

Introduction: Proposed new definitions for the terms associated with the proposed annual accreditation fees.

(a): Proposed language provides the definition for "Institution fee."

(b): Proposed language provides the definition for “Program fee.”

(c): Proposed language provides the definition for “Total annual accreditation fee.”

(d): Proposed language provides the definition for “Initial Preparation programs.”

(e): Proposed language provides the definition for “Second Tier and Specialist programs.”

(f): Proposed language provides the definition for “Added Authorization and Special Class/Teaching Authorization programs.”

(g): Proposed language provides the definition for “Intern programs.”

(h): Proposed language provides the definition for “Inactive programs” and incorporates by reference Chapter Three of the Accreditation Handbook.

(i): Proposed language provides the definition for “Recommendation.”

(j): Proposed language provides the definition for “Extraordinary activity fee.”

(k): Proposed language provides the definition for “Actual costs.”

Note: Cites the relevant Education Code authority and references for the proposed addition of 5 CCR §80693.

§80694

Introduction: Proposed new section to clarify the proposed annual accreditation fee.

(a): Proposed new subsection to establish the total annual accreditation fee structure, as defined in §80693(c) and includes language specifying when the fees must be submitted to the Commission (reference EC §44374.5).

(b): Proposed new subsection to establish when fees must be submitted to the Commission.

(b)(1): Proposed language establishes the extraordinary activity fee for late annual accreditation fees as defined in §80691(f).

(b)(2): Proposed language establishes that institutions shall not recommend for credentials until all fees are submitted.

(b)(2)(A): Proposed language establishes when the suspension of the institution’s ability to make recommendations commences.

(c)(1) – (c)(5): Proposed language establishes the institution fee tiers for the 2014-15 fiscal year.

(d): Proposed language establishes the manner in which the Commission shall adjust the Institution Fee in subsequent fiscal years.

(e): Proposed language establishes the program fees for the 2014-15 fiscal year.

(f): Proposed language establishes the manner in which the Executive Director shall calculate the Program Fee in subsequent fiscal years.

(g): Proposed language establishes when the Commission shall determine and notify the Legislature and Department of Finance should a change in fees occur.

(h): Proposed language establishes when the Commission shall post the Annual Accreditation fees and the calculation of the fees on the Commission website.

Note: Cites the relevant Education Code authority and references for the proposed addition of 5 CCR §80694.

**CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS
TITLE 5. EDUCATION
DIVISION 8. COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**

Subarticle 4. Annual Accreditation Fees

§80693. Definitions.

As used in this subarticle, the following terms shall have the meanings as set forth below:

- (a) "Institution fee" is part one of the total annual accreditation fee charged to an institution, as defined in section 80691(e), based on the average number of credential recommendations over the prior three fiscal years.
- (b) "Program fee" is part two of the total annual accreditation fee charged to an institution, as defined in section 80691(e), based on the number of Commission-approved educator programs offered by the institution.
- (c) "Total annual accreditation fee" is comprised of the institution fee and program fee, as defined in subsections (a) and (b), and represents the total amount due to the Commission annually.
- (d) "Initial Preparation programs" are programs that provide the coursework and field experiences for individuals earning an initial teaching or services credential.

- (e) “Second Tier and Specialist programs” apply the knowledge and skills from the preliminary program in an on-the-job mentored and supported assignment. Second tier preparation programs are such that allow the individual to earn the clear teaching or services credential. Specialist programs are programs through which a credentialed teacher may earn an authorization to teach in an additional area.
- (f) “Added Authorization and Special Class/Teaching Authorization programs” are programs that an educator may complete to add an additional authorization that is closely related to the authorization held.
- (g) “Intern programs” are a path to initial preparation program completion that allows an individual the ability to complete their preparation coursework concurrent in a paid position, upon completion of the required minimum preservice preparation as described in program standards.
- (h) “Inactive programs” refer to Commission-approved educator preparation programs that have not withdrawn but are no longer accepting new candidates as detailed in the *Accreditation Handbook Chapter Three, Institutional and Program Approval (rev. 2013)*, available on the Commission’s website and hereby incorporated by reference.
- (i) “Recommendation” refers to the process of recommending candidates to receive a credential. Institutions must recommend their candidates, as specified in Education Code section 44227(b), to receive a credential after completing an approved program as part of the credential issuing process.
- (j) “Extraordinary activity fee” refers to the fee charged to institutions that have not submitted the annual accreditation fee by the established due date.
- (k) “Actual costs” may include costs for travel, per diem and incidentals for site visit volunteers and Commission staff, reimbursement of substitute teachers, room rentals, equipment, communication, staff time, accounting and legal services to support accreditation, supplies and statewide indirect costs.

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225, and 44227 Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225(h), 44370, 44371, 44372, 44373(c) and 44374, Education Code.

§80694. Annual Accreditation Fees

- (a) The total annual accreditation fee, as defined in section 80693(c) shall be submitted to the Commission by September 1 of each year.
- (b) An institution’s failure to submit the total annual accreditation fee by November 1 annually shall result in:
 - (1) An extraordinary activity fee \$500 to be paid in addition to the total annual accreditation fee.

(2) The suspension of the institution's ability to make recommendations for credentials until all fees are paid in full.

(A) The suspension shall commence immediately upon the Commission's sending written notice that the total annual accreditation fee is not fully paid by November 1 each year.

(c) For fiscal year 2014-15 the institution fee, as defined in section 80693(a), shall be as follows:

(1) 0-50 recommendations: \$1,000.

(2) 51-100 recommendations: \$1,400.

(3) 101-300 recommendations: \$1,800.

(4) 301-600 recommendations: \$2,200.

(5) Over 600 recommendations: \$2,500.

(d) In subsequent fiscal years, the Commission shall adjust the Institution Fee specified in section 80694 (c) each year by the Implicit Price Deflator for State and Local Government, rounded to the nearest ten dollars.

(e) For fiscal year 2014-15 the program fee shall be as follows for each program:

(1) Initial Preparation program: \$400

(2) Intern program: \$150

(3) Second Tier and Specialist program: \$300

(4) Added Authorization and Special Class/Teaching Authorization program: \$200

(5) Inactive program: \$50

(f) In subsequent fiscal years, the Executive Director shall determine the program fee by calculating the actual costs of accreditation activities in the prior fiscal year and apportioning the actual costs at the same ratio as in fiscal year 2014-15, rounded to the nearest whole dollar.

(g) The Commission shall determine whether a change in fees will be necessary and provide notification should changes be necessary, to the Legislature and Department of Finance, on or before July 1 of each year. Adjustments contained in subsections (d) and (f) are not a change in fees.

(h) The Commission shall post on its website the total annual accreditation fee for each Commission-approved institution, and how it was determined, on or before August 1st each year.

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225, Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225(h), 44371, 44372, 44373(c), 44374 and 44374.5, Education Code.

Staff Recommendation:

1. That the Commission adopt the Accreditation Fee Structure as specified in Tables 1 and 2 of Appendix A.
2. That the Commission find that Emergency Regulations are necessary.
3. That the Commission approve the Emergency Regulations.
4. That the Commission make a policy decision about program fees for low incidence programs (Appendix B). If the Commission decides that some low incidence programs should be eligible for a partial reduction in the program fee, staff would prepare an agenda item for the August 2014 Commission meeting to allow the Commission to decide how to implement a fee reduction for specified programs.

Next Steps

Based on Commission action and direction at this meeting, staff will prepare the spreadsheets for the Institutional and Program Fees for 2014-15 and submit the Emergency Regulations to the Office of Administrative Law.

Appendix A: Proposed Accreditation Fee Structure

The Annual Accreditation Fee will be composed of two parts: 1) an Institution Fee based on the average number of recommendations over the past 3 years and 2) a Program Fee based on the number and type of Commission-approved educator preparation programs offered by the institution.

Part One-Institution Fee

The Institution Fee will be based on the average number of candidates recommended for a credential across all programs, over the prior three years. Commission staff will gather the total number of recommendations submitted by each Commission-approved entity (college, university, school district, county office of education or other entity) annually. Institutions will be notified by July 15, as to which of the five institutional tiers (See Table 1) the institution will be placed in for the next fiscal year. Provided in Table 2 are the five tiers and which tier each institution will be placed in for the 2014-15 year.

Part Two-Program Fee

The Program Fee will be based on the number and type of programs offered by a sponsor. The Commission will specify an Annual Program Count Date—for example July 1st. On that day, the staff will pull from the Commission's Approved Programs database all programs approved for each institution. A spreadsheet will be developed and posted on the Commission website showing the program fees based on the information gathered on the Annual Program Count Date. All types of Commission-approved programs have been organized into one of three categories: Initial Preparation programs, Second Tier or Specialist programs, and Added Authorization programs. Table 3 identifies the three types of programs and the associated fees. Table 4 identifies all 47 different types of educator preparation programs and for each type of programs shows the category in which the program falls. Each institution should check the Approved Programs page in the CIG: http://cig.ctc.ca.gov/cig/CIG_PPPM/all.php to ensure that all its programs are appropriately identified.

Intern Programs

If a Preliminary preparation program (Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, or Administrative Services) is offered in both a traditional or student teaching model and an Intern model the institution will not be charged for two separate Preliminary Preparation programs. Instead, a Preliminary preparation program that is offered in both a traditional and intern delivery model will pay an additional \$150 for the work that will need to be completed to review the program for both the Intern and traditional delivery models.

Inactive programs

An institution may elect to declare a Commission-approved educator preparation program *Inactive*. An Inactive program may not admit new candidates, must teach out the current candidates within one school year, and may be on inactive status for no more than five years. Institutions that have Inactive programs will be assessed \$50 annually for each inactive program to cover the cost of monitoring and record keeping.

Table 5 provides ten examples of how the program fee will be calculated based on the number of programs within each category.

Total Annual Fee

Annually, on or before July 15th, a spreadsheet will be posted on the Commission website that shows the total accreditation fee for each Commission-approved entity for the following fiscal year. The bill will become due on September 1st annually and will be delinquent if not paid by November 1st. Table 6 uses the ten examples from Table 5 and provides the Annual Fee for each example.

If the Accreditation Fee is not paid by November 1st in any given year, the institution's ability to recommend for credentials will be suspended until the fee, plus a \$500 extraordinary activity fee, has been received by the Commission.

Appendix A: Proposed Accreditation Fee Structure

Tier	Recommendations	# of Sponsors in Tier	Fee per institution	Potential Revenue
1	0-50	152	\$1,000	\$152,000
2	51-100	32	\$1,400	\$44,800
3	101-300	26	\$1,800	\$46,800
4	301-600	21	\$2,200	\$46,200
5	Over 600	20	\$2,500	\$50,000

Tier	Institutions
Tier I 0-50 recommends \$1000	<p>CSU (0): None</p> <p>UC (0): None</p> <p>Private(21): Academy of Art, Antioch, Argosy, Bard, Drexel, Fielding, Hebrew Union, Holy Names, Hope International, La Sierra, Loma Linda, Pacific Oaks, Pacific Union, Patten, Phillips Graduate, San Diego Christian, The Master’s College, United States University, Vanguard, Westmont, William Jessup</p> <p>LEA (134): All LEAs <i>not identified</i> in any of the 4 tiers below—see pages 15-16 for the complete list</p>
Tier II 51-100 recommends \$1,400	<p>CSU (1):, Humboldt</p> <p>UC (1): Santa Cruz</p> <p>Private (9): Biola, Mills, Mount Saint Mary’s, National Hispanic, Simpson, Teachers College of San Joaquin, Touro, Western Governors, Whittier</p> <p>LEA (21): Aspire Public Schools, Bay Area School of Enterprise (REACH Institute), Butte COE, Campbell Union SD, Capistrano USD, Chula Vista ESD, Davis Joint USD, El Dorado COE, Fresno COE, High Tech High, Kern County SOS, Monterey COE, Ontario-Montclair SD, San Bernardino City USD, San Diego USD, San Francisco USD, San Mateo COE, Tehama COE, Tulare COE, Ventura COE</p>
Tier III 101-300 recommends \$1,800	<p>CSU (3): San Luis Obispo, Channel Islands, CalState TEACH</p> <p>UC (2): Davis, Santa Barbara</p> <p>Privates (13): Cal Baptist, Cal Lutheran, Claremont, Concordia, Dominican, Notre Dame de Namur, Pepperdine, Santa Clara, Stanford, San Diego, San Francisco, St. Mary’s, Pacific</p> <p>LEA (8): Contra Costa COE, Madera COE, Metropolitan Education District, Sacramento COE, San Diego COE, Santa Cruz COE, Sonoma COE, Stanislaus COE</p>
Tier IV 301-600 recommends \$2,200	<p>CSU (8): Bakersfield, Chico, East Bay, Monterey Bay, Pomona, San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus</p> <p>UC (5): Berkeley, Irvine, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Diego</p> <p>Private (6): Alliant, Chapman, Fresno Pacific, LaVerne, Redlands, Southern California</p> <p>LEA (1): LAUSD, Riverside COE</p>

Appendix A: Proposed Accreditation Fee Structure

Table 1A: Institution Tiers and the Annual Institutional Fee: based on the Average Number of Recommendations over the most recent 3 Years	
Tier	Institutions
Tier V Over 600 recommends \$2,500	<p>CSU (11): Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose State</p> <p>UC (0): None</p> <p>Private (6): Azusa Pacific, Brandman, Loyola Marymount, National, Pt. Loma, Phoenix</p> <p>LEA (3): Los Angeles COE, San Joaquin COE, Wiseburn SD</p>

Table 2: Program Fee	
Type of Educator Preparation Program	Program Fee
<p>Initial Preparation programs—usually those with 12 or more Program Standards <i>Preliminary MS, SS, and Ed Sp-all 7 specialty content areas, Administrative Services, Pupil Personnel Services-School Psychology, School Counseling, School Social Work, Designated Subjects Career Technical Education and Adult Education, Speech-Language Pathology, Clinical or Other Rehabilitative Services: Orientation and Mobility</i></p>	\$400
<p>Intern Programs—If an institution offers an educator preparation program (preliminary teaching or administrative services programs) in both a traditional and an intern delivery model, there is an additional \$150 annual fee.</p>	\$150
<p>Second Level/Specialist programs—usually those with 6 -11 Program Standards <i>Second level Programs—General Education Induction and Clear, Clear Education Specialist Induction, Administrator Induction. Adapted Physical Education, Agriculture Specialist, Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist, Reading and Literacy Added Authorization, Bilingual Authorization, CTEL, Math Added Authorization, Math Leadership Specialist, Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance, School Nurse, Teacher Librarian, Clinical or Other Rehabilitative Services: Audiology</i></p>	\$300
<p>Added Authorization or Special Class/Teaching Authorization programs—usually those with fewer than 6 Program Standards <i>Added Authorizations in Special Education (AASE), Special Teaching Authorizations in Health, Library Services, and Speech-Language Pathology</i></p>	\$200

Proposed Accreditation Fee Structure

Table 2A: Educator Preparation Programs and Accreditation Fee	
	Type of Program
Teacher Preparation Programs (33)	
Preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential	Initial Preparation
Preliminary Single Subject Teaching Credential	Initial Preparation
General Education Induction	Second Tier/Specialist
General Education Clear	Second Tier/Specialist
Preliminary Education Specialist-Mild to Moderate Disabilities	Initial Preparation
Preliminary Education Specialist-Moderate to Severe Disabilities	Initial Preparation
Preliminary Education Specialist-Early Childhood Special Education	Initial Preparation
Preliminary Education Specialist-Deaf and Hard of Hearing	Initial Preparation
Preliminary Education Specialist-Physical and Health Impairments	Initial Preparation
Preliminary Education Specialist-Visual Impairments	Initial Preparation
Preliminary Education Specialist-Language and Academic Development	Initial Preparation
Clear Education Specialist Induction	Second Tier/Specialist
Added Authorization in Special Education-Autism Spectrum Disorder	Added Authorization
Added Authorization in Special Education-Deaf-Blind	Added Authorization
Added Authorization in Special Education-Early Childhood Special Education	Added Authorization
Added Authorization in Special Education-Emotional Disturbance	Added Authorization
Added Authorization in Special Education-Orthopedic Impairments	Added Authorization
Added Authorization in Special Education-Other Health Impairments	Added Authorization
Added Authorization in Special Education-Resource	Added Authorization
Added Authorization in Special Education-Traumatic Brain Injury	Added Authorization
California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)	Second Tier/Specialist
Bilingual Authorization	Second Tier/Specialist
Agriculture Specialist	Second Tier/Specialist
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (Certificate)	Second Tier/Specialist
Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist	Second Tier/Specialist
Mathematics Instructional Added Authorization	Second Tier/Specialist
Mathematics Instructional Leadership Specialist	Second Tier/Specialist
Adapted Physical Education	Second Tier/Specialist
Early Childhood Specialist	Second Tier/Specialist
Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education	Initial Preparation
Designated Subjects: Adult Education	Initial Preparation
Designated Subjects: Special Subjects	Second Tier/Specialist
Designated Subjects: Supervision and Coordination	Second Tier/Specialist
Services Preparation Programs (14)	
Preliminary Administrative Services	Initial Preparation
Administrative Services Induction	Second Tier/Specialist
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	Initial Preparation
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	Initial Preparation
Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work	Initial Preparation
Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance	Second Tier/Specialist
Teacher Librarian	Second Tier/Specialist
Teacher Librarian Special Teaching Authorization	Added Authorization

Proposed Accreditation Fee Structure

	Type of Program
School Nurse	Second Tier/Specialist
School Nurse-Special Teaching Authorization in Health	Added Authorization
Speech-Language Pathology	Initial Preparation
Speech-Language Pathology Special Class Authorization	Added Authorization
Clinical or Other Rehabilitative: Orientation and Mobility	Initial Preparation
Clinical or Other Rehabilitative: Audiology	Second Tier/Specialist

Example	Initial Preparation Programs (\$400)	Intern If offered in both traditional and intern delivery model (\$150)	Second Tier-Specialist Programs (\$300)	Added Authorization Programs (\$200)	Total Annual Program Fee
A	1	0	1	0	\$700
B	2	1	0	0	\$950
C	4	2	0	0	\$1,900
D	3	3	0	0	\$1,650
E	4	4	3	2	\$3,500
F	4	4	1	0	\$2,500
G	7	7	4	3	\$5,650
H	8	6	4	2	\$5,700
I	9	4	3	4	\$5,900
J	10	6	10	5	\$8,900

Example	Program Fee	<i>Annual Institutional Fee (based on average recommends over 3 years)</i>				
		<i>Tier I \$1000</i>	<i>Tier II \$1,400</i>	<i>Tier III \$1,800</i>	<i>Tier IV \$2,200</i>	<i>Tier V \$2,500</i>
A	\$700	\$1,700	\$2,100	\$2,500	\$2,900	\$3,200
B	\$950	\$1,950	\$2,350	\$2,750	\$3,150	\$3,450
C	\$1,900	\$2,900	\$3,300	\$3,700	\$4,100	\$4,400
D	\$1,650	\$2,650	\$3,050	\$3,450	\$3,850	\$4,150
E	\$3,500	\$4,500	\$4,900	\$5,300	\$5,700	\$6,000
F	\$2,500	\$3,500	\$3,900	\$4,300	\$4,700	\$5,000
G	\$5,650	-	\$7,050	\$7,450	\$7,850	\$8,150
H	\$5,700	-	\$7,100	\$7,500	\$7,900	\$8,200
I	\$5,900	-	\$7,300	\$7,700	\$8,100	\$8,400
J	\$8,900	-	\$10,300	\$10,700	\$11,100	\$11,400

Proposed Accreditation Fee Structure

Tier I Local Education Agencies and other Commission-approved Entities (134)

- [Alhambra Unified School District](#)
- [Anaheim City School District](#)
- [Anaheim Union High School District](#)
- [Animo Leadership Charter High School \(Green Dot Public Schools\)](#)
- [Antelope Valley Union High School District](#)
- [Antioch Unified School District](#)
- [Arcadia Unified School District](#)
- [Association of California School Administrators \(ACSA\)](#)
- [Azusa Unified School District](#)
- [Bakersfield City School District](#)
- [Baldwin Park Unified School District](#)
- [Bellflower Unified School District](#)
- [Brentwood Union School District](#)
- [Burbank Unified School District](#)
- [Cajon Valley Union School District](#)
- [California School for the Deaf, Fremont](#)
- [Castaic Union School District](#)
- [Central Unified School District](#)
- [Chaffey Joint Union High School District](#)
- [Chino Valley Unified School District](#)
- [Clovis Unified School District](#)
- [Compton Unified School District](#)
- [Conejo Valley Unified School District](#)
- [Corona-Norco Unified School District](#)
- [Culver City Unified School District](#)
- [Cupertino Union School District](#)
- [Dos Palos Oro Loma Joint Unified School District](#)
- [El Rancho Unified School District](#)
- [Elk Grove Unified School District](#)
- [Encinitas Union School District](#)
- [Envision Schools](#)
- [Escondido Union High School District](#)
- [Escondido Union School District](#)
- [Etiwanda School District](#)
- [Evergreen School District](#)
- [Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District](#)
- [Fontana Unified School District](#)
- [Fremont Unified School District](#)
- [Fresno Unified School District](#)
- [Fullerton School District](#)
- [Garden Grove Unified School District](#)
- [Glendale Unified School District](#)
- [Greenfield Union School District](#)
- [Grossmont Union High School District](#)
- [Hacienda La Puente Unified School District](#)
- [Hanford Elementary School District](#)
- [Hayward Unified School District](#)
- [ICEF Public Schools \(Los Angeles Unified School District\)](#)
- [Imperial County Office of Education](#)
- [Irvine Unified School District](#)
- [Keppel Union School District](#)
- [Kern High School District](#)
- [King-Chavez Academy of Excellence](#)
- [Kings County Office of Education](#)
- [La Mesa-Spring Valley School District](#)
- [Lancaster School District](#)
- [Lawndale Elementary School District](#)
- [Lodi Unified School District](#)
- [Long Beach Unified School District](#)
- [Los Banos Unified School District](#)
- [Madera Unified School District](#)
- [Magnolia Public Schools: Pacific Technology School - Orange County](#)
- [Manteca Unified School District](#)
- [Marin County Office of Education](#)
- [Merced County Office of Education](#)
- [Merced Union High School District](#)
- [Milpitas Unified School District](#)
- [Modesto City Schools](#)
- [Montebello Unified School District](#)
- [Mt. Diablo Unified School District](#)
- [Murrieta Valley Unified School District](#)
- [Napa County Office of Education](#)
- [New Haven Unified School District](#)
- [Newark Unified School District](#)
- [Oak Grove School District](#)
- [Oakland Unified School District](#)
- [Ocean View School District](#)
- [Orange County Department of Education](#)
- [Orange Unified School District](#)
- [Palmdale School District](#)
- [Palo Alto Unified School District](#)
- [Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District](#)
- [Panama-Buena Vista Union School District](#)
- [Paramount Unified School District](#)
- [Pasadena Unified School District](#)
- [Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District](#)
- [Placer County Office of Education](#)
- [Pleasanton Unified School District](#)
- [Pomona Unified School District](#)
- [Poway Unified School District](#)
- [PUC Schools](#)
- [Redwood City School District](#)
- [Rialto Unified School District](#)

Proposed Accreditation Fee Structure

- [Riverside Unified School District](#)
- [Rowland Unified School District](#)
- [Sacramento City Unified School District](#)
- [Saddleback Valley Unified School District](#)
- [San Dieguito Union High School District](#)
- [San Gabriel Unified School District](#)
- [San Jose Unified School District](#)
- [San Juan Unified School District](#)
- [San Luis Obispo County Office of Education](#)
- [San Marcos Unified School District](#)
- [San Mateo - Foster City School District](#)
- [San Ramon Valley Unified School District](#)
- [Sanger Unified School District](#)
- [Santa Ana Unified School District](#)
- [Santa Barbara County Education Office](#)
- [Santa Clara County Office of Education](#)
- [Santa Clara Unified School District](#)
- [Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District](#)
- [Santa Rosa City Schools](#)
- [Saugus Union School District](#)
- [School for Integrated Academics and Technology \(SIA Tech\)](#)
- [Selma Unified School District](#)
- [Sequoia Union High School District](#)
- [Shasta County Office of Education](#)
- [Stockton Unified School District](#)
- [Sutter County Superintendent of Schools](#)
- [Sweetwater Union High School District](#)
- [Temple City Unified School District](#)
- [Torrance Unified School District](#)
- [Tracy Unified School District](#)
- [Tulare City School District](#)
- [Tustin Unified School District](#)
- [Vallejo City Unified School District](#)
- [Visalia Unified School District](#)
- [Vista Unified School District](#)
- [Walnut Valley Unified School District](#)
- [Washington Unified School District](#)
- [West Contra Costa Unified School District](#)
- [West Covina Unified School District](#)
- [Westside Union School District](#)
- [Wm. S. Hart Union High School District](#)

Appendix B
Credential Types with 10 or Fewer Commission-Approved Programs

Type of Program	Annual Fee	2012-13 Completers	CSU	UC	Privates	LEAs*	Total Programs	Program Fees
Clinical Rehabilitative Services: Audiology	\$300	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
Mathematics Instructional Leadership	\$300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mathematics Instructional Added Authorization	\$300	0	0	0	1	0	1	\$300
Added Authorization: Deaf Blind	\$200	0	0	0	0	1	1	\$200
Preliminary Ed Sp: Language and Academic Development	\$400	0	0	0	0	1	1	\$400
Clinical Rehabilitative Services: Orientation and Mobility	\$400	30	2	0	0	-	2	\$800
Teacher Librarian Special Class Authorization	\$200	0	1	0	1	-	2	\$400
Added Authorization: Traumatic Brain Injury	\$200	11	0	0	1	1	2	\$400
Added Authorization: Other Health Impairment	\$200	0	1	0	1	0	2	\$400
Added Authorization: Orthopedically Impaired	\$200	11	2	0	0	0	2	\$400
Preliminary Education Specialist: Visually Impaired	\$400	24	2	0	0	0	2	\$800
School Nurse Special Class Authorization	\$200	0	3	0	0	-	3	\$600
Preliminary Ed Sp: Physical and Other Health Impairments	\$400	9	2	0	1	0	3	\$1,200
Teacher Librarian Services	\$300	48	2	0	2	-	4	\$1,200
Designated Subjects: Adult Education	\$400	158	0	1	0	3	4	\$1,600
Speech-Language Pathology: Special Class Authorization	\$400	4	5	0	0	-	5	\$2,000
Agriculture Specialist	\$300	39	4	1	0	-	5	\$1,500
Added Authorization: Resource Specialist	\$200	17	3	0	2	-	5	\$1,000
School Nurse	\$300	92	5	0	1	-	6	\$3,600
Designated Subjects: Supervision and Coordination	\$300	0	1	0	1	5	7	\$2,100
Designated Subjects: Special Subjects	\$300	40	1	1	1	5	8	\$2,400
Preliminary Ed Sp: Deaf/Hard of Hearing	\$400	46	3	1	4	0	8	\$3,200
Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work	\$400	72	6	2	1	-	9	\$3,600
Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance	\$200	5	2	1	5	2	10	\$2,000
Total Program Fee								\$30,100

*LEAs are not authorized by the Education Code to sponsor specific types of educator preparation programs