

Discussion of Revised Initial Institutional Approval Process February 2017

Overview of this Report

In this item, staff will review the proposed revisions for Commission consideration as it relates to the Initial Institutional Approval process.

Background to this Report

The Commission adopted a new Initial Institutional Approval process in February 2016. Two institutions have been presented thus far for consideration under the new process. However, in doing so, the Commission expressed a desire to revisit particular aspects of the process and to have an opportunity to refine the process.

The Commission staff will present these potential revisions at the Commission's February 9-10, 2017 Commission meeting. The agenda item being presented and discussed by the Commission are included as Appendix A to this item.

Commission staff will summarize the issues presented by the Commission at its last meeting on the IIA process and review the proposed changes to address the Commissioners concerns

2C

Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Initial Institutional Approval: Potential Revisions to the Criteria and Process

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents for consideration and potential action revisions to the Initial Institutional Approval process adopted in February 2016.

Recommended Action:

- 1) That the Commission adopt the reordered chart as presented in Appendix A of this item.
- 2) That the Commission adopt the following process for review of all eligibility criteria as follows:
 - Staff will make a recommendation to the Commission regarding the first 8 eligibility criteria,
 - For the remaining 4 Eligibility Criteria, staff will summarize the information provided by the institution and the Commission will make a determination on these criteria as well as on staff recommendations on the first 8.

Presenters: Cheryl Hickey, Administrator, and Teri Clark, Director, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability

- a) 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.

February 2017

Initial Institutional Approval: Potential Revisions to the Criteria and Process

Introduction

This agenda item presents potential revisions to the criteria and process for Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) adopted at the February 2016 Commission meeting. The Commission had placed a moratorium on IIA in October 2015 while it was developing the revised IIA process. The Commission lifted the moratorium when it adopted the revised *Accreditation Framework* in February 2016. At the October 2016 Commission meeting, members of the Commission expressed a desire to revisit the process. A discussion of possible revisions to the process took place at the December 2016 Commission meeting. This agenda item presents possible revisions for consideration and possible approval that are based upon the discussion at the December 2016 meeting.

Background

Education Code §44372(c) sets forth the Commission's responsibility to rule on the eligibility of an applicant for initial accreditation when the applying institution is not approved to prepare educators for state certification in California. The Committee on Accreditation (Committee) is charged with making decisions about the initial accreditation of new programs of educator preparation through Education Code §44373(b)(2).

Although the Committee is the responsible entity for approving new educator preparation programs, the Commission adopts the *Accreditation Framework* which sets the accreditation policies in place, adopts all standards that institutions and programs are required to meet, and interviews and selects the members of the Committee.

Staff developed a graphic to highlight the key activities and decision points in each stage of the revised IIA process. The chart on the following page indicates the various steps involved in the IIA process. The Eligibility Criteria is Stage II of a five Stage process and completion of this stage of the process does not allow institutions to begin to offer any educator preparation program, rather it allows the institution to continue to the next stage which is the submission of Common Standards, preconditions and program standards for review.

Initial Institutional Approval

I	II	III	IV	V
Prerequisites	Eligibility Criteria	Address Standards & Preconditions a) Common b) Program	Provisional Approval	Full Approval
<p>To ensure that the prospective sponsor is legally eligible to offer educator preparation programs in California.</p> <p>To ensure that the prospective sponsor understands the requirements of the Commission's accreditation system.</p> <p>Staff Determination If the institution is a legal entity and the team attends Accreditation 101, then may move to Stage II</p>	<p>To provide initial information to the Commission about the entity so that the Commission can make a decision if the prospective sponsor is one that has the potential to sponsor effective educator preparation programs.</p> <p>Commission Decision</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Grant Eligibility 2) Grant Eligibility with specific topics to be addressed in Stage III 3) Require resubmission with additional information 4) Deny Eligibility 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) To ensure that the institution meets all of the Commission's Common Standards (e.g., infrastructure, resources, faculty, recruitment and support, continuous improvement, and program impact). Standards are reviewed by the BIR prior to going to Commission. b) To ensure that the proposed program meets all of the Commission's adopted program standards. Standards are reviewed by the BIR prior to going to the Commission. <p>a) Commission Decision</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Grant Provisional Approval 2) Deny Provisional Approval <p>b) Committee on Accreditation Decision</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Approve Program(s) 2) Deny Approval 	<p>After the program operates for 2-3 years, sufficient time so that a minimum of one cohort has completed the program and the institution has had ample time to collect data on candidate outcomes and program effectiveness, the institution will host an accreditation site visit. The report from this site visit, including related data, will be presented to the Commission.</p> <p>Commission Decision</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Grant Full Approval 2) Retain Provisional Approval with additional requirements 3) Deny Approval 	<p>Once an entity has earned Full Approval from the Commission, the institution will be placed in one of the accreditation cohorts and will participate in the Commission's regularly scheduled accreditation activities.</p> <p>Committee on Accreditation Decision Monitors through the accreditation system</p>

Issues Identified at the December 2016 Commission Meeting

Several issues were raised at the December 2016 Commission meeting. Staff summarizes these issues and, based on direction received from the Commission propose possible revisions to the IIA process that could be considered by the Commission.

Issue 1: Ensure Greater Transparency Regarding Which Institutions Are Seeking Initial Institutional Approval

This particular issue arose not from the Commission but from the audience during public comment. It was suggested that the public should have more information about which institutions have applied for IIA. Staff notes that the Commission endeavors to have transparency where feasible and appropriate. To that end, staff will publish the name of the institution seeking IIA on the Commission website upon receipt of the formal application, which is required after the satisfactory completion of the Prerequisites (Stage I). This list would be accompanied by the email address (input@ctc.ca.gov) to allow members of the public to provide information about the institution for Commission consideration.

The information gathered through public input would be provided to the Commission to consider. The information submitted may be pertinent to one or more of the 12 Eligibility Criteria.

Issue 2: Create More Efficiencies for the Commission's Review of the Eligibility Criteria by Reordering and Categorizing the 12 Eligibility Requirements and Determining Where Staff Should Provide Recommendations

Members of the Commission indicated support for the concept included in the December 2016 agenda item that the Eligibility criteria could be reordered and differentiated by those that are simpler and those that are more complex. For simpler criteria staff proposes that it would review and analyze the submission and provide a recommendation to the Commission on the item. For complex criteria, staff proposes that it would not provide a recommendation but would provide a summary and highlight evidence for the Commission for their consideration of the item.

At the December Commission meeting, the Commission staff suggested which of the 12 Eligibility Criteria might fall under which category. Members of the Commission suggested modifications to the list as suggested at that time by staff. The list below reflect the reordering and the distribution of the 12 criteria.

Eligibility Criteria Proposed New Order	Commission Staff Recommendation
1. Responsibility and Authority	Yes
2. Lawful Practices	Yes
3. Commission Assurances and Compliance	Yes
4. Requests for Data	Yes
5. Grievance Process	Yes
6. Communication and Information	Yes
7. Student Record Management, Access and Security	Yes

Eligibility Criteria Proposed New Order	Commission Staff Recommendation
8. Disclosure	Yes
9. Mission and Vision	No – Staff Summary
10. Veracity in Claims and Documentation	No – Staff Summary
11. History of Prior Experience and Effectiveness in Offering Educator Preparation Programs	No – Staff summary
12. Capacity and Resources	No – Staff summary

Of the twelve Eligibility criteria adopted by the Commission, eight of the criteria appear to be fairly simple and the Commission could allow staff to review and make a recommendation as to whether the entity is in compliance. However, the remaining four criteria are quite complex and reasonable people could have different views of the information. Because this analysis could lead reasonable people to varying conclusions, it is appropriate for the decision on the four complex criteria to be made by the Commission.

Issue 3: Clarify the Evidence Required for Each of the 12 Eligibility Criteria Requirements

In responding to the Commission’s directive to ensure that the evidence that should be submitted is clearly understood by the institutions seeking IIA, the Commission staff has developed the table included as Appendix A for Commission consideration. The table includes the Eligibility Criteria, the required information, the factors to consider, and what will be provided by staff for the Commission in preparation for their consideration and action on the application or Eligibility. In creating the table, it became apparent that the criteria needed to be stated in a clearer manner when the required information was moved to a separate column. As a result, the information provided in the Appendix A includes, in regular font, that which was previously adopted and, in italics, any revised or proposed new language. Any clarification to sentence structure or minor, non-substantive edits are not indicated with italics.

Staff Recommendation

- 1) That the Commission adopt the reordered chart as presented in Appendix A of this item.
- 2) That the Commission adopt the following process for review of all eligibility criteria as follows:
 - Staff will make a recommendation to the Commission regarding the first 8 eligibility criteria,
 - For the remaining 4 Eligibility Criteria, staff will summarize the information provided by the institution and the Commission will make a determination on these criteria as well as on staff recommendations on the first 8.

Next Steps

Should the Commission approve the revisions to the IIA process, the Commission staff will make all changes necessary to the information provided on the website with respect to IIA materials and directions for submitting applications. In addition, staff will communicate these changes with institutions that have submitted documents and are in the IIA process.

Appendix A-Eligibility Criteria, Required Evidence, Factors to Consider, and Recommendation and Analysis

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider	Recommendation and Analysis
Criterion 1: Responsibility and Authority			
<p><i>The institution clearly identifies the lines of authority and responsibility for any and all educator preparation programs within the institution and provides assurance that only those person(s) employed by the program sponsor will recommend individuals to the Commission for a credential or authorization.</i></p>	<p>a) Identify the position within the organizational structure that is responsible for ongoing oversight of all educator preparation programs offered by the entity including educator preparation programs offered by extension divisions, <i>if applicable</i>.</p> <p>b) Identify the individual <i>and position</i> within the organizational structure that will coordinate each educator preparation program sponsored by the entity. Include a description of the reporting relationship between this person(s) and (a). If a reporting relationship is indirect, describe the levels of authority and responsibility for each educator preparation program.</p> <p>c) Provide an organizational chart for the institution as well as the division(s) within the institution responsible for the oversight of educator preparation programs; include any parent organization, outside organization(s), or partner(s) who will be involved in the oversight of the educator preparation unit and/or responsible for program delivery. <i>Ensure that these charts depict lines of authority.</i></p>	<p>a) <i>Has the institution identified the position within the organizational structure that will be responsible for oversight of all educator preparation?</i></p> <p>b) <i>Has the institution provided information about the person(s) responsible for the day to day coordination of the program(s)?</i></p> <p>c) <i>Is the reporting relationship between the person responsible for coordination and the person responsible for oversight clearly described?</i></p> <p><i>Does the organizational chart include all relevant persons responsible for the overall oversight, delivery, and success of the program and their relationship to one another?</i></p> <p><i>Does the organizational chart indicate the likelihood that the program(s) will be well supported and monitored?</i></p>	<p><i>Staff reviews, analyzes evidence submitted by the institution and makes a recommendation to the Commission as to whether the criterion is met.</i></p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider	Recommendation and Analysis
	<p>d) Provide <i>assurance</i> to ensure that duties regarding credential recommendations are not delegated to persons other than employees of the Commission approved institution.</p> <p>e) Provide assurance that those individuals identified as responsible for credential recommendations will participate in Commission training related to the recommendation process.</p>	<p>d) <i>Did the institution provide assurances that clearly establish that only employees of the approved program sponsor will make credential recommendations?</i></p> <p>e) <i>Did the institution provide assurance that all persons responsible for making recommendations will participate in Commission trainings?</i></p>	
Criterion 2: Lawful Practices			
<p>A program of professional preparation must be proposed and operated by an entity that makes all personnel decisions regarding the employment, retention or promotion of employees without unlawful discrimination. The entity must make all decisions regarding the admission, retention and graduation of students without unlawful discrimination.</p>	<p>a) <i>A copy of the institution's policies governing personnel decisions including employment, retention, and promotion (employee handbook, recruiting materials, or other published personnel materials) that include reference to an unlawful discrimination policy.</i></p> <p>b) <i>A copy of the institution's policies related to candidate admissions, retention, and graduation (candidate handbook, website, or other materials) that include reference to an unlawful discrimination policy.</i></p>	<p>a) <i>Does the institution have policies in place indicating that it makes all personnel decisions free from unlawful discrimination?</i></p> <p>b) <i>Does the institution have policies for candidates that set forth that decisions regarding admission, retention and graduation/completion of candidates must be free from unlawful discrimination?</i></p>	<p><i>Staff reviews, analyzes evidence submitted by the institution and makes a recommendation to the Commission as to whether the criterion is met.</i></p>
Criterion 3: Commission Assurances and Compliance			
<p><i>The institution assures all of the following:</i></p>	<p>a) <i>A statement of assurance from institutional leadership that the institution will be in compliance at all</i></p>	<p>a) <i>Did the institution provide a statement of assurance from institutional leadership that address each and every area identified in the criterion?</i></p>	<p><i>Staff reviews, analyzes evidence submitted by the</i></p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider	Recommendation and Analysis
<p>a) That there will be compliance with all preconditions required for the initial program(s) the institution would like to propose (General and program specific preconditions for proposed programs must accompany this document)</p> <p>b) That all required reports to the Commission including but not limited to data reports and accreditation documents, will be submitted by the Commission approved entity for all educator preparation programs offered including extension divisions.</p> <p>c) That it will cooperate in an evaluation of the program by an external team or a monitoring of the program by a Commission staff member.</p> <p>d) That the sponsor will participate fully in the Commission's</p>	<p><i>times with all relevant preconditions for the programs it will offer.</i></p> <p><i>b) A statement of assurance from institutional leadership that the institution will provide all required data reports, including but not limited to data reports and accreditation documents.</i></p> <p><i>c) A statement of assurance from institutional leadership that the institution will cooperate in an evaluation of the program by an external team and monitoring of the program by Commission staff.</i></p> <p><i>d) A statement of assurance from institutional leadership that it will participate fully in the accreditation</i></p>		<p><i>institution and makes a recommendation to the Commission as to whether the criterion is met.</i></p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider	Recommendation and Analysis
<p>accreditation system and adhere to submission timelines.</p> <p>e) That once a candidate is accepted and enrolled in the educator preparation program, the sponsor will offer the approved program, meeting the adopted standards, until the candidate;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Completes the program; ii. Withdraws from the program; iii. Is dropped from the program; iv. Is admitted to another approved program to complete the requirements, with minimal disruption, for the authorization in the event the program closes. In this event, an individual transition plan would need to be developed with each candidate. 	<p><i>system and adhere to submission timelines.</i></p> <p>e) <i>A statement of assurance from institutional leadership that clearly states that the institutional leadership understands its responsibilities to enrolled candidates; in the event the program is to close, whether it be by voluntary action on the part of the institution or as a result of Commission action.</i></p>	<p>e) <i>Did the institution provide assurance from institutional leadership that they understand their commitment to enrolled candidates in the event of program and/or institutional closure?</i></p>	
Criterion 4: Requests for Data			
<p><i>The institution must identify a qualified officer responsible for reporting</i></p>	<p>a) <i>Identify the individual(s), (including name, title, and division or department of the institution) who will be</i></p>	<p>a) <i>Did the institution provide sufficient information about who would be responsible for responding to all data</i></p>	<p><i>Staff reviews, analyzes evidence submitted by the</i></p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider	Recommendation and Analysis
<p>and responding to all requests from the Commission within the specified timeframes for data including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) program enrollments b) program completers c) examination results d) state and federal reporting e) candidate competence f) organizational effectiveness data g) other data as indicated by the Commission 	<p>responsible for submitting any and all data to the Commission.</p>	<p><i>reporting requirements and all requests for data?</i></p>	<p><i>institution and makes a recommendation to the Commission as to whether the criterion is met.</i></p>
Criterion 5: Grievance Process			
<p><i>The institution has a clearly identified grievance process for handling all candidate grievances in a fair and timely manner. The grievance process is readily accessible for all applicants and candidates and is shared with candidates early in their enrollment in the program.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Provide a clearly delineated grievance process for candidates and applicants that is fair and is likely to ensure timely resolutions for candidate and applicants. b) Demonstrate how information pertaining to the grievance process is accessible to all candidates and applicants. c) Provide documentation that candidates will be informed of the grievance process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>Does the program have a clearly identified grievance process for handling all candidate grievances?</i> <i>Does the grievance procedure seem fair and likely to ensure timely resolutions for candidates?</i> b) <i>Is it clear how the information will be accessible to all candidates and applicants?</i> c) <i>Is it clear when and in what manner candidates will be informed of the grievance process?</i> 	<p><i>Staff reviews, analyzes evidence submitted by the institution and makes a recommendation to the Commission as to whether the criterion is met.</i></p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider	Recommendation and Analysis
Criterion 6: Communication and Information			
<p><i>The institution</i> must provide a plan for communicating and informing the public about the institution and the educator preparation programs. The plan must demonstrate that:</p> <p>a) The institution will create and maintain a website that includes information about the institution and all approved educator preparation programs. The website must be easily accessible to the public and must not require login information (access codes/password) in order to obtain basic information about the institution’s programs and requirements as listed in (b).</p> <p>b) The institution will make public information about its mission, governance and administration, admission procedures, and information about all Commission approved educator preparation programs.</p>	<p>a) <i>Provide a plan that describes the website that will be developed.</i></p> <p>b) <i>Affirm that the information will be available to the public and that the information on mission, governance, and administration, and admission procedures will be included.</i></p>	<p>a) <i>Does the institution assure that no login (access code or password) will be required for the public to access information about the educator preparation programs?</i></p> <p>b) <i>Is a plan provided that includes information about the creation and maintenance of a website for the educator preparation programs?</i></p> <p><i>Does the institution affirm that information will be made available to the public including mission, governance,</i></p>	<p><i>Staff reviews, analyzes evidence submitted by the institution and makes a recommendation to the Commission as to whether the criterion is met.</i></p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider	Recommendation and Analysis
Information will be made available through various means of communication including but not limited to website, institutional catalog, and admission material.		<i>and administration and admission procedures?</i>	
Criterion 7: Student Records Management, Access, and Security			
<p>The <i>institution</i> must demonstrate that it will maintain and retain student records. Institutions seeking Initial Institutional Approval will provide verification that:</p> <p>a) Candidates will have access to and be provided with transcripts and/or other documents for the purpose of verifying academic units and program completion.</p> <p>b) All candidate records will be maintained at the main institutional site or central location (paper or digital copies).</p> <p>c) Records will be kept securely in locked cabinets or on a secure server located in a room</p>	<p>a) <i>Provide information on the manner in which candidates will have access to and be provided with transcripts and/or documents for the purpose of verifying academic units and program completion.</i></p> <p>b) <i>Provide information as to where candidate records will reside and how candidates will be able to access these records when necessary.</i></p> <p>c) <i>Provide evidence and assurances that all candidate records will be kept in either securely locked cabinets or on a</i></p>	<p>a) <i>Did the institution provide sufficient information as to the manner in which candidates will have access to and be provided with transcripts or other documents for the purpose of verifying academic units and program completion?</i></p> <p>b) <i>Did the institution provide sufficient information that indicates that candidate records will be maintained at the main institutional site or central location (paper or digital copies)?</i></p> <p>c) <i>Did the institution provide sufficient information that ensures that all</i></p>	<p><i>Staff reviews, analyzes evidence submitted by the institution and makes a recommendation to the Commission as to whether the criterion is met.</i></p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider	Recommendation and Analysis
not accessible by the public.	<i>secure server, both of which are in rooms not accessible by the public.</i>	<i>candidate records will be kept in secure locations not accessible by the public?</i>	
Criterion 8: Disclosure			
<p>Institutions must disclose <i>information regarding:</i></p> <p>a) The proposed delivery model (online, in person, hybrid, etc.)</p> <p>b) All locations of the proposed educator preparation programs including satellite campuses.</p> <p>c) Any outside organizations (those individuals not formally employed by the institution seeking IIA) that will be providing any direct educational services, <i>and what those services will be, as all or part of the proposed programs.</i></p>	<p>a) Provide information regarding the proposed delivery model for the proposed program(s).</p> <p>b) <i>Provide the Commission with a chart indicating all locations of the proposed program(s) including any satellite campus.</i></p> <p>c) <i>Provide a list of any entities (such as partner organizations, businesses, vendors) that will be providing any direct educational services to candidates. (This is not intended to include vendors used to collect, house, and report data). Include a description of the anticipated services the outside entities listed in (c) will provide.</i></p>	<p>a) <i>Did the institution provide sufficient information about the anticipated delivery model for the proposed program(s)?</i></p> <p>b) <i>Did the institution provide sufficient information about all the locations of the proposed programs including satellite campuses?</i></p> <p>c) <i>Did the institution clearly identify any outside entities that would provide any direct educational services to candidates?</i></p>	<p><i>Staff reviews, analyzes evidence submitted by the institution and makes a recommendation to the Commission as to whether the criterion is met.</i></p>
Criterion 9: Mission and Vision			
<p><i>An institution's mission and vision for educator preparation is consistent with California's approach to educator preparation.</i></p>	<p>a) Statement of the institution's mission and vision for Educator Preparation.</p> <p>b) A statement confirming that the mission and vision will be published on the</p>	<p>a) <i>Did the institution provide a clear mission and vision for educator preparation programs that the institution seeks to offer to prospective California candidates?</i></p>	<p><i>Staff will review the documents, highlight for the Commission the information and evidence provided</i></p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider	Recommendation and Analysis
	<p>website and in institutional documents provided to candidates.</p> <p>c) <i>Information about how the mission and vision for educator preparation reflects the institution's commitment to California's adopted state standards and frameworks for TK-12 students.</i></p> <p>d) <i>Information that demonstrates the institution's commitment to preparing candidates to work effectively with the full range of California TK-12 students.</i></p> <p>e) <i>Statement that includes which educator preparation program(s) the institution will seek to offer.</i></p> <p>f) <i>Information about the institution's philosophical and/or theoretical framework or approach underlying the design of educator preparation.*</i></p> <p>g) <i>If applicable, provide a description of the ways in which the proposed program for California would be similar or different from programs operated in another state.</i></p> <p>h) <i>Any other relevant information the institution believes will allow the Commission to better understand the institution and its programs.</i></p>	<p>b) <i>Did the institution confirm that the mission and vision will be published on the website and in institutional documents provided to candidates?</i></p> <p>c) <i>Is there evidence in the mission and vision that demonstrates the institution's commitment to California's adopted state standards and frameworks for TK-12 students?</i></p> <p>d) <i>Is there evidence in the mission and vision that demonstrates the institution's commitment to the health and success of all students?</i></p> <p>f) <i>Is there evidence that the institution, in developing their proposed program design, will ensure that sufficient attention will be paid to both the theoretical foundations of teaching and learning and effective professional practice?</i></p>	<p><i>that is most relevant to the criterion.</i></p> <p><i>The Commission will review and make a determination as to whether the information provided is sufficient to meet this criterion.</i></p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider	Recommendation and Analysis
	<p><i>*A complete program design with significant detail included is not what is intended here as that will be submitted to ensure alignment with the Commission’s adopted program standards in Stage III. Rather, the intent is to provide the Commission with sufficient information to ensure that the institution’s philosophy and approach about educator preparation is consistent with California’s.</i></p>		
Criterion 10: Veracity in all Claims and Documentation Submitted			
<p><i>The institution and its personnel demonstrate veracity in all statements and documentation submitted to the Commission. Evidence of a lack of veracity is cause for denial of IIA.</i></p>	<p>a) <i>A statement signed by institutional leadership affirming that all information provided to the Commission and prospective candidates in all matters is truthful and accurate.</i></p> <p>b) <i>Any evidence that arises on this matter may be considered by the Commission to be relevant.</i></p>	<p>a) <i>From all indications, does the institution appear to be providing the Commission, prospective candidates, and the public with accurate and truthful information?</i></p> <p>b) <i>Has there been any evidence that may indicate that the institution has not provided the Commission, potential candidates, and the public with accurate and truthful information?</i></p>	<p><i>Staff will review the documents, highlight for the Commission the information and evidence provided that is most relevant to the criterion.</i></p> <p><i>The Commission will review and make a determination as to whether the information provided is sufficient to meet this criterion.</i></p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider	Recommendation and Analysis
Criterion 11: History of Prior Experience and Effectiveness in Educator Preparation			
<p>Institutions seeking IIA must have sponsored an educator preparation program leading to licensure, or participated as a partner in any educator preparation programs and/or programs focused on K-12 public education and provide history related to that experience.</p> <p>CTC staff reserve the right to conduct Google/Nexus searches regarding the institution, governing board and administration. Institutions must submit:</p> <p>Proof of third party notification enlisting comments to be sent to: Input@ctc.ca.gov</p>	<p>Evidence listed above could be amended as following:</p> <p>a) History related to its prior experience preparing, training and supporting educators within California or in other states.</p> <p>b) A list of all states and/or countries in which the institution is currently operating an educator preparation program and the status of the institution’s approval in each of those locations.</p> <p>c) <i>If applicable, a copy of the most recent approval document (state approval/accreditation and, if applicable, letter or report from regional accrediting body, if applicable, indicating accreditation status.</i></p> <p>d) <i>For institutions currently operating educator preparation programs in another state, data from the most recent 2-3 years indicating number of candidates enrolled in the institution’s programs and number who have completed program (taking into account the length of time of the program design).</i></p> <p>e) <i>If offering educator preparation program in other state, any information available</i></p>	<p>a) <i>Is there evidence that the institution has prior experience successfully preparing, training, and/or supporting educators or partnering with institutions that prepare educators?</i></p> <p>b) <i>Did the institution provide a complete and accurate list of all the states and/or counties in which it is operating an educator preparation program?</i></p> <p>c) <i>Is there sufficient evidence that the entity is operating in good standing in other jurisdictions where it is/has sponsored educator preparation or other related work?</i></p> <p>d) <i>Does the data provided regarding completion indicate that most candidates are able to successfully complete the program in a timely manner?</i></p> <p>e) <i>Does the data provided indicate that candidates that complete the institution’s programs are likely to be employed as educators?</i></p>	<p><i>Staff will review the documents, highlight for the Commission the information and evidence provided that is most relevant to the criterion.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, staff will conduct Google and Nexus searches to identify any information that should be provided to the Commission.</i></p> <p><i>The Commission will review and make a determination as to whether the information provided is sufficient to meet this criterion.</i></p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider	Recommendation and Analysis
	<p><i>on placement rates for candidates in the schools.</i></p> <p>f) <i>Evidence that the entity has fostered positive working relationships with educational partners in establishing its programs in California to meet local educational needs.</i></p> <p>g) <i>Evidence that candidates have been satisfied with the educator preparation programs offered by the entity and the services they received by the institution.</i></p>	<p>f) <i>Does the institution have either a positive history of working collaboratively with local educational partners and/or evidence that it will work collaboratively with local educational partners (for instance, TK-12 institutions working with feeder IHE programs or IHE programs working collaboratively with TK-12 employers)</i></p> <p>g) <i>Does the evidence provided indicate that candidates are satisfied with the institution and with the services they receive?</i></p>	
Criterion 12: Capacity and Resources			
<p>An institution must submit a Capacity and Resources plan providing evidence about how it will sustain the educator preparation program(s) through a 2 – 3 year provisional approval (if granted) at a minimum. A plan to teach out candidates if, for some reason, the institution is unable to continue providing educator preparation program(s).</p>	<p>a) Copy of the most recent audited budget for the institution.</p> <p>b) A proposed operational budget for the educational unit.</p> <p>c) Information about instructional and support personnel for the educational unit. <i>This information shall include, but not be limited to:</i></p> <p>1) <i>The number and type of faculty (full time faculty, pt. time adjunct, etc.) and/or instructional personnel, including support providers and coaches if induction, who will be employed or used to provide services</i></p>	<p>a) <i>Did the institution provide evidence from a recent audit that indicates that the institution is economically stable?</i></p> <p>b) <i>Is there sufficient evidence that the institution will provide adequate resources to operate effective educator preparation programs in the first 2-3 years of the program?</i></p> <p>c) <i>Is there sufficient evidence that the leadership, instructional personnel and support staff are capable of maintaining and delivering an effective educator preparation program.</i></p>	<p><i>Staff will review the documents, highlight the information and evidence provided that is most relevant to the criterion.</i></p> <p><i>The Commission will review and make a determination as to whether the information provided is sufficient to meet this criterion.</i></p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider	Recommendation and Analysis
	<p><i>to candidates in the first 2-3 years of the program's operation.</i></p> <p>2) <i>The criteria or minimum qualifications for each of the positions listed above.</i></p> <p>3) <i>If the institution applying is an out of state institution, provide all relevant information about how the instructional services will be delivered to candidates. For instance, will faculty and instructional personnel remain located in the home state and provide services via technology to candidates in California?</i></p> <p>d) <i>If the institution applying is an out of state institution, the institution must provide all relevant information as to which of the educational services would be located outside of California. For instance, if candidates must go through the out of state offices in order to get financial aid services, the institution should provide that information to the Commission.</i></p> <p>e) Evidence of TK-12 partnerships for the purposes of providing fieldwork.</p>	<p>d) <i>Did the institution provide clear information about which educational services would be located outside of California? And does the plan indicate that prospective California candidates would be well served by the plan?</i></p> <p><i>Did the institution provide sufficient information to indicate that if any of the instructional services will be delivered from outside of California, that these services will meet the needs of prospective California candidates.</i></p> <p>e) <i>Did the institution provide evidence that demonstrate that it is working collaboratively with TK-12 schools to ensure appropriate fieldwork experiences for candidates?</i></p> <p>f) <i>Did the institution provide evidence that there will be sufficient facilities and/or</i></p>	

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider	Recommendation and Analysis
	<p><i>f)</i> Information <i>demonstrating sufficient</i> facilities and/or digital learning platforms <i>for candidates.</i></p> <p>g) A plan to teach out candidates if, for some reason, the institution is unable to continue providing educator preparation program(s).</p>	<p><i>effective digital learning platforms for candidates?</i></p> <p><i>g)</i> <i>Did the institution provide a Teach Out plan that identifies, at least broadly what actions would be taken to ensure that the interest of enrolled candidates will be sufficiently addressed in the event of program and/or institution closure?</i></p>	