

Discussion and Adoption of Proposed Accreditation Handbook
Chapter 3: Initial Institutional Approval
March 2017

Introduction

This agenda item provides an update of the *Accreditation Handbook* based on the recent revisions adopted by the Commission to the Initial Institutional Approval process.

Staff Recommendation

Staff requests that the Committee on Accreditation discuss and adopt the updates to *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter 3.

Background

At the October 2016 Commission meeting, members of the Commission expressed a desire to revisit the Initial Institutional Approval process. A discussion of possible revisions to the process took place at the [December 2016](#) Commission meeting at which time several issues were identified and during the [February 2016](#) meeting, Commissioners adopted revisions addressing those issues. Below is a summary of the issues and subsequent revisions to IIA that were approved by the Commission (See [Agenda Item 2c](#)).

- 1) Ensuring greater transparency regarding which institutions are seeking initial institutional approval.

Update to IIA: Staff will publish the name of the institution seeking IIA on the Commission website upon receipt of a formal application and the list will 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.

- 2) Creating 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.

Update to IIA: In response to this issue, staff has reordered the 12 Eligibility Requirements to differentiate between the simpler criteria and more complex criteria. As a result of the reordering, the following criteria were deemed to be more complex in nature and are now positioned as the final four of the twelve Eligibility Criteria: Mission and Vision; Veracity in all Claims, and Documentation Submitted; History of Prior Experience and Effectiveness in Educator Preparation; and Capacity and Resources. These changes have been integrated into the *Accreditation Handbook Chapter 3*. (See Appendix A).

- 3) Clarifying the evidence required for each of the 12 Eligibility Criteria Requirements.

Update to IIA: In response to clarifying the evidence required for each of the 12 eligibility criteria requirements, a table was developed that is comprised of three columns: the

language of each criterion, the required information for that criterion and factors to consider as an institution responds to each criterion. (See Appendix A).

In order to align the *Accreditation Handbook* to these revisions, language within *Chapter 3 Institutional and Program Approval and Change of Status* must be updated. Appendix B is a proposed updated version of Chapter 3 of the *Accreditation Handbook* with all proposed edits in track changes.

Next Steps

If approved, staff will update Chapter 3 of the *Accreditation Handbook* on the Commission website.

Appendix A
Eligibility Criteria Adopted by the Commission

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider
Criterion 1: Responsibility and Authority		
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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, if applicable. b) Identify the individual and position 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. 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. Ensure that these charts depict lines of authority. d) Provide assurance to ensure that duties regarding credential recommendations are not delegated to persons other than employees of the Commission approved institution. e) Provide assurance that those individuals identified as responsible for credential recommendations will participate in Commission training related to the recommendation process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Has the institution identified the position within the organizational structure that will be responsible for oversight of all educator preparation? b) Has the institution provided information about the person(s) responsible for the day to day coordination of the program(s)? c) To what extent is the reporting relationship between the person responsible for coordination and the person responsible for oversight clearly described? To what extent 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? To what extent does the organizational chart indicate the likelihood that the program(s) will be well supported and monitored? d) To what extent did the institution provide assurances that clearly establish that only employees of the approved program sponsor will make credential recommendations? e) To what extent did the institution provide assurance that all persons responsible for making recommendations will participate in Commission trainings?

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider
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) 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.</p> <p>b) 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.</p>	<p>a) To what extent does the institution have policies in place indicating that it makes all personnel decisions free from unlawful discrimination?</p> <p>b) To what extent 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?</p>
Criterion 3: Commission Assurances and Compliance		
<p>The institution assures all of the following:</p> <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</p>	<p>a) A statement of assurance from institutional leadership that the institution will be in compliance at all times with all relevant preconditions for the programs it will offer.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>a) To what extent did the institution provide a statement of assurance from institutional leadership that address each and every area identified in the criterion?</p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider
<p>Commission staff member.</p> <p>d) That the sponsor will participate fully in the Commission's 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>d) A statement of assurance from institutional leadership that it will participate fully in the accreditation system and adhere to submission timelines.</p> <p>e) 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.</p>	<p>e) To what extent 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?</p>
Criterion 4: Requests for Data		
<p>The institution must identify a qualified officer responsible for reporting and responding to all requests from the Commission within the specified timeframes for data including, but not limited to:</p> <p>a) program enrollments</p>	<p>a) Identify the individual(s), (including name, title, and division or department of the institution) who will be responsible for submitting any and all data to the Commission.</p>	<p>a) To what extent did the institution provide sufficient information about who would be responsible for responding to all data reporting requirements and all requests for data?</p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider
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		
Criterion 5: Grievance Process		
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.	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.	a) To what extent does the program have a clearly identified grievance process for handling all candidate grievances? To what extent does the grievance procedure seem fair and likely to ensure timely resolutions for candidates? b) Is it clear how the information will be accessible to all candidates and applicants? c) Is it clear when and in what manner candidates will be informed of the grievance process?
Criterion 6: Communication and Information		
The institution must provide a plan for communicating and informing the public about the institution and the educator preparation programs. The plan must demonstrate that: 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	a) Provide a plan that describes the website that will be developed. b) Affirm that the information will be available to the public and that the information on mission, governance, and	a) 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? b) Is a plan provided that includes information about the creation and

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider
<p>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>Information will be made available through various means of communication including but not limited to website, institutional catalog, and admission material.</p>	<p>administration, and admission procedures will be included.</p>	<p>maintenance of a website for the educator preparation programs?</p> <p>Does the institution affirm that information will be made available to the public including mission, governance, and administration and admission procedures?</p>

Criterion 7: Student Records Management, Access, and Security

<p>The institution 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) 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.</p> <p>b) Provide information as to where candidate records will reside and how candidates will be able to access these records when necessary.</p> <p>c) Provide information and assurances that all candidate records will be kept in either securely locked cabinets or on a secure server, both of which are in rooms not accessible by the public.</p>	<p>a) To what extent 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?</p> <p>b) To what extent 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)?</p> <p>c) To what extent did the institution provide sufficient information that ensures that all candidate records will be kept in secure locations not accessible by the public?</p>
--	---	--

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider
not accessible by the public.		
Criterion 8: Disclosure		
<p>Institutions must disclose information regarding:</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 IA) that will be providing any direct educational services, and what those services will be, as all or part of the proposed programs.</p>	<p>a) Provide information regarding the proposed delivery model for the proposed program(s).</p> <p>b) Provide the Commission with a chart indicating all locations of the proposed program(s) including any satellite campus.</p> <p>c) 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.</p>	<p>a) To what extent did the institution provide sufficient information about the anticipated delivery model for the proposed program(s)?</p> <p>b) To what extent did the institution provide sufficient information about all the locations of the proposed programs including satellite campuses?</p> <p>c) To what extent did the institution clearly identify any outside entities that would provide any direct educational services to candidates?</p>
Criterion 9: Veracity in all Claims and Documentation Submitted		
<p>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.</p>	<p>a) A statement signed by institutional leadership affirming that all information provided to the Commission and prospective candidates in all matters is truthful and accurate.</p> <p>b) Any information that arises on this matter may be considered by the Commission to be relevant.</p>	<p>a) From all indications, does the institution appear to be providing the Commission, prospective candidates, and the public with complete, accurate and truthful information?</p> <p>b) Has there been any information that may indicate that the institution has not provided the Commission, potential candidates, and the public with complete, accurate and truthful information?</p>
Criterion 10: Mission and Vision		
<p>An institution's mission and vision for educator preparation is consistent with California's approach to educator preparation.</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 website and in institutional documents provided to candidates.</p>	<p>a) To what extent did the institution provide a clear mission and vision for educator preparation programs that the institution seeks to offer to prospective California candidates?</p> <p>b) To what extent did the institution confirm that the mission and vision will be published on the website and in</p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider
<p>*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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) 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. d) Information that demonstrates the institution’s commitment to preparing candidates to work effectively with the full range of California TK-12 students. e) Statement that includes which educator preparation program(s) the institution will seek to offer. f) Information about the institution’s philosophical and/or theoretical framework or approach underlying the design of educator preparation.* g) 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. h) Any other relevant information the institution believes will allow the Commission to better understand the institution and its programs. 	<p>institutional documents provided to candidates?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) To what extent does the information about the institution’s mission and vision demonstrates the institution’s commitment to California’s adopted state standards and frameworks for TK-12 students? d) To what extent does the information about the institution’s mission and vision demonstrates the institution’s commitment to the health and success of all students? f) To what extent does the information provided about the proposed program design indicate that sufficient attention will be paid to both the theoretical foundations of teaching and learning and effective professional practice?
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 will research available information about the institution</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) History related to its prior experience preparing, training and supporting educators within California or in other states. 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. c) 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is there information that the institution has prior experience successfully preparing, training, and/or supporting educators or partnering with institutions that prepare educators? b) To what extent 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? c) Is there sufficient information that the entity is operating in good standing in other jurisdictions where it is/has

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider
<p>relevant to the application for initial institutional approval.</p> <p>Institutions must submit:</p> <p>Proof of third party notification enlisting comments to be sent to: Input@ctc.ca.gov</p>	<p>d) For institutions currently operating educator preparation programs in another state, data from the most recent 5 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).</p> <p>e) If offering educator preparation program in other state, any information available on placement rates for candidates in the schools.</p> <p>f) Evidence that the entity has fostered positive working relationships with educational partners in establishing its programs in California to meet local educational needs.</p> <p>g) Evidence that candidates have been satisfied with the educator preparation programs offered by the entity and the services they received by the institution.</p>	<p>sponsored educator preparation or other related work?</p> <p>d) To what extent does the data provided regarding completion indicate that most candidates are able to successfully complete the program in a timely manner?</p> <p>e) To what extent does the data provided indicate that candidates that complete the institution’s programs are likely to be employed as educators?</p> <p>f) To what extent does the institution have either a positive history of working collaboratively with local educational partners and/or information 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)</p> <p>g) To what extent does the information provided indicate that candidates are satisfied with the institution and with the services they receive?</p>

Criterion 12: Capacity and Resources

<p>An institution must submit a Capacity and Resources plan providing information 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. This information shall include, but not be limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 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 to candidates in the first 2-3 years of the program’s operation. 2) The criteria or minimum qualifications for each of the positions listed above. 	<p>a) To what extent did the institution provide information from a recent audit that indicates that the institution is economically stable?</p> <p>b) Does the information provided indicate that that the institution will provide adequate resources to operate effective educator preparation programs in the first 2-3 years of the program?</p> <p>c) Does the information provided indicate that the leadership, instructional personnel and support staff are capable of maintaining and delivering an effective educator preparation program.</p>
---	---	--

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider
	<p>3) 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?</p> <p>d) 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.</p> <p>e) Evidence of TK-12 partnerships for the purposes of providing fieldwork.</p> <p>f) Information demonstrating sufficient facilities and/or digital learning platforms for candidates.</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>d) To what extent 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?</p> <p>To what extent 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?</p> <p>e) To what extent did the institution provide information that demonstrate that it is working collaboratively with TK-12 schools to ensure appropriate fieldwork experiences for candidates?</p> <p>f) To what extent did the institution provide information that there will be sufficient facilities and/or effective digital learning platforms for candidates?</p> <p>g) To what extent 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?</p>

Chapter Three

Institutional and Program Approval and Change of Status

Introduction

This chapter describes the processes by which an institution gains initial institutional approval from the Commission, which allows the institution to propose specific credential preparation programs for approval by the COA. This chapter also provides information about the status options for programs: approved, inactive, discontinued, or withdrawn.

I. Initial Institutional Approval

According to the *Accreditation Framework* (Section 1-C-1), the Commission is responsible for determining the eligibility of a postsecondary education institution, local education agency (LEA), or other entity that is not currently approved to prepare educators for California’s public schools. These institutions must submit an application to the Commission for initial institutional approval to submit programs.

The Initial Institutional Approval process has been organized into three sequential requirements

- I) Completion of the prerequisites;
- II) Successful completion of all eligibility requirements; and
- III) Alignment to the applicable standards and preconditions.

Commission action after completion of the first two ~~parts~~ stages determines if an institution is eligible to continue with Part III of the Initial Institutional Approval process.

PART-STAGE I – Prerequisites

Prerequisite 1: Regional Accreditation and Academic Credit

Institutions interested in seeking Initial Institutional Approval must identify which of the following applies to their institution.

- The institution is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges or another of the six regional accrediting associations. A copy of a letter from the accrediting association must be hyperlinked as verification.
- The institution is a public school, school district, or county office of education and has received approval of sponsorship from the agency’s governing board. Verification must be submitted in the form of a letter or board minutes signed by the superintendent or CEO of the agency.
- The institution is neither of the above and is preparing to offer STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math) programs pursuant to SBX5 1 (Chap. 2, Stats. of 2010). Additional requirements are necessary for institutions applying under this category (See <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/SBX5-1.html>)

Prerequisite 2: Accreditation 101 - Expectations and Responsibilities for Commission Approved Institutions

Prior to accepting an application for Initial Institutional Approval, the Commission requires that the institution send a team to *Accreditation 101 - Expectations and Responsibilities for Commission Approved Institutions*, a professional training that provides information regarding eligibility, and outlines the expectations and responsibilities of Commission-approved program sponsors including reporting requirements, applicable program standards, annual accreditation fees, credential recommendation and student record responsibilities, and other expectations for Commission approved institutions that sponsor educator preparation in California.

Required attendees include:

- Unit Head
- Fiscal Officer or designee
- Directors of Proposed Program(s)
- Partner Employing Organization or Educational Entity
- Other participants deemed necessary by the institution

All travel expenses for attending Accreditation 101 are borne by the institution.

Following completion of the Prerequisites, an institution is required to submit a formal application and may move forward to Stage II – Eligibility Requirements. Institutions moving forward to Stage II by submitting the Eligibility Requirements will be listed on the Commission website for Initial Institution Approval.

PART-STAGE II – Eligibility Criteria Requirements

Eligibility Requirements include twelve criteria to which prospective program sponsors must respond. Specific evidence and factors to consider for each of the eligibility requirements will be listed on the Commission’s Initial Institutional Approval website. Once submitted, an institution’s responses to the twelve criteria are reviewed. Responses to criteria 1 through 9 will be reviewed by Commission staff who will then make a recommendation to the Commission. Staff will not make a recommendation to the Commission regarding criteria 10, 11 and 12 but will summarize the information provided by the institution for the Commission. The Commission will make a determination on all criteria and grant an institution one of the following: 1) Eligibility; 2) Eligibility with specific topics to be addressed in Stage III; 3) Resubmission with additional information, or 4) Deny eligibility. A determination of either 1) Eligibility or 2) Eligibility with specific topics to be addressed in Stage III, allows an institution to move forward to Stage III of the Initial Institutional Approval process.

~~Responses to Eligibility Criteria (see below) will be brought before the Commission for consideration and a determination of approval or denial. A finding of approval permits an institution to move forward to Part III of the Initial Institutional Approval process. The determination of the Commission is binding and final. Entities that are found to be ineligible may reapply at such a time when there have been adequate changes to the institutional structure~~

~~to meet the requirements. _ Reconsideration of an entity that has been denied eligibility will be at the sole discretion of the Commission.~~

Criterion 1: Responsibility and Authority

~~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. Institutions seeking Initial Institutional Approval must:~~

- ~~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.~~
- ~~b) Identify the individual who will coordinate each educator preparation program sponsored by the entity. Provide a description of the reporting relationship between this person(s) and the person identified in (a). If a reporting relationship is indirect, describe the levels of authority and responsibility for each educator preparation program.~~
- ~~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.~~
- ~~d) Provide policies to ensure that duties regarding credential recommendations are not delegated to persons other than employees of the Commission approved institution. Provide assurance that individuals identified as responsible for credential recommendations will participate in training necessary for the credential recommendation process as required by the Commission.~~

Criterion 2: Mission and Vision

~~To be granted initial institutional accreditation, an institution must:~~

- ~~a) provide its mission and vision related to educator preparation~~
- ~~b) confirm that the mission and vision will be published on the website and in institutional documents provided to candidates~~

Criterion 23: Lawful Practices

~~To be granted initial institutional accreditation, a) a program of professional preparation must be proposed and operated by an entity that makes all personnel decisions regarding employment, retention or promotion of employees without unlawful discrimination. The entity must provide written policy as verification that make all decisions regarding the admission, retention or and graduation of students, and all personnel decisions regarding the employment, retention or promotion of employees are made without unlawful discrimination.~~

Criterion 34: Commission Assurances and Compliance

~~To be granted Initial Institutional Approval, the initial institutional proposal must include the following assurances: The institution assures all of the following:~~

- a) That there will be compliance with all preconditions required for the initial program(s) the institution would like to propose (General preconditions, initial program preconditions and program-specific preconditions for proposed programs must accompany this document).
- b) ~~Provide assurance t~~ 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 being offered including extension divisions.
- c) That ~~the institution it~~ will cooperate in an evaluation of the program by an external team or a monitoring of the program by a Commission staff member.
- d) That the institution sponsor will participate fully in the Commission's accreditation system and adhere to submission timelines.
- e) That once a candidate is accepted and enrolled in the educator preparation program, the institution sponsor must offer the approved program, meeting the adopted standards, until the candidate ~~s~~;
 - 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.

Criterion ~~45~~: Requests for Data

~~The An~~ institution seeking Initial Institutional Approval must identify a qualified officer responsible for reporting and responding to all requests from the Commission within the specified timeframes for data including, but not limited to:

- 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

~~Criterion 6: Veracity in all Claims and Documentation Submitted~~

~~To be granted Initial Institutional Approval, the institutional leadership (Dean or Superintendent) must positively affirm the veracity of all statements and documentation submitted to the Commission. Evidence of a lack of veracity is cause for denial of initial institutional accreditation~~

Criterion ~~57~~: Grievance Process

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.

~~To be granted Initial Institution Approval, the institution must:~~

- ~~a) Provide a clearly delineated grievance process for candidates and applicants.~~
- ~~b) Demonstrate that information pertaining to the grievance process is accessible to all candidates and applicants.~~
- ~~c) Provide documentation that candidates have been informed of the grievance process and that the process has been followed.~~

Criterion 68: Communication and Information

~~To be granted Initial Institution Approval, the~~The institution must provide a plan for communicating and informing the public about the institution and the educator preparation programs. The plan must demonstrate that:

- 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).
- b) The institution will make public information about its mission, governance and administration, admission procedures, and information about all Commission approved educator preparation programs. Information will be made available through various means of communication including but not limited to website, institutional catalog, and admission material.

Criterion 79: Student Records Management, Access, and Security

~~To be granted Initial Institution Approval, the~~The institution sponsor must demonstrate that it will maintain and retain student records. Institutions seeking Initial Institutional Approval will provide verification that:

- a) Candidates will have access to and ~~will~~ be provided with transcripts and/or other documents for the purpose of verifying academic units and program completion.
- b) All candidate records will be maintained at the main institutional site or central location (paper or digital copies).
- c) Records will be kept securely in locked cabinets or on a secure server located in a room not accessible by the public.
- d) ~~Candidates will be provided with transcript and/or other documents for the purpose of verifying academic units or program completion.~~

~~Criterion 10: History of Prior Experience and Effectiveness in Educator Preparation~~

~~Institutions seeking Initial Institutional Approval 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. Commission staff reserves the right to conduct Google/Nexus searches regarding the institution, governing board and administration. Institutions must submit:~~

- ~~a) History related to its prior experience preparing, training and supporting educators within California or in other states~~
- ~~b) A list of all states and/or countries in which the institution is currently operating and the status of the institution's approval in each of those locations~~
- ~~c) Retention and completion data in educator preparation programs or other programs when educator preparation data are not available.~~
- ~~d) Proof of third party notification enlisting comments to be sent to Input@ctc.ca.gov.~~

~~Criterion 11: Capacity and Resources~~

~~To be granted Initial Institutional Approval, 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. An institution's Capacity and Resource plan must include:~~

- ~~a) Copy of the most recent audited budget for the institution~~
- ~~b) A proposed operational budget for the educational unit~~
- ~~c) Information about instructional and support personnel for the educational unit~~
- ~~d) Evidence of K-12 partnerships for the purposes of providing fieldwork~~
- ~~e) Information about facilities and/or digital learning platforms~~
- ~~f) A plan to teach out candidates if, for some reason, the institution is unable to continue providing educator preparation program(s)~~
- ~~g)~~

~~Criterion 812: Disclosure~~

~~Institutions must disclose information regarding:~~

- ~~a) Information regarding theThe proposed delivery model (online, in person, hybrid, etc.)~~
- ~~b) All locations of the proposed educator preparation programs including satellite campuses.~~
- ~~c) Any outside organizations (those individuals not formally employed by the institution seeking Initial Institutional Approval) that will be providing any direct educational services, and what those services will be,-as all or part of the proposed programs.~~

~~Criterion 69: Veracity in all Claims and Documentation Submitted~~

~~To be granted Initial Institutional Approval, the institutional leadership (Dean or Superintendent)The institution and its personnel demonstrate must positively affirm the veracity of all statements and documentation submitted to the Commission. Evidence of a lack of veracity is cause for denial of initial institutional accreditation.~~

~~Criterion 2 10: Mission and Vision~~

~~To be granted initial institutional accreditation, an institution must:~~

- ~~a) provide its mission and vision related to educator preparation~~
- ~~b)a) confirm that the mission and vision will be published on the website and in institutional documents provided to candidates~~

~~An institution's mission and vision for educator preparation is consistent with California's approach to educator preparation.~~

Criterion ~~10~~11: History of Prior Experience and Effectiveness in Educator Preparation

~~Institutions seeking Initial Institutional Approval 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. Commission staff will research available information about the institution relevant to the application for initial institutional approval. reserves the right to conduct Google/Nexus searches regarding the institution, governing board and administration. Institutions must submit:~~

- ~~e) History related to its prior experience preparing, training and supporting educators within California or in other states~~
- ~~f) A list of all states and/or countries in which the institution is currently operating and the status of the institution's approval in each of those locations~~
- ~~Retention and completion data in educator preparation programs or other programs when educator preparation data are not available.~~
- a) Proof of third party notification enlisting comments to be sent to Input@ctc.ca.gov.

Criterion ~~11~~12: Capacity and Resources

~~To be granted Initial Institutional Approval, an~~An institution must submit a Capacity and Resources plan providing ~~evidence~~information 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). An institution's Capacity and Resource plan must include:

- ~~h) Copy of the most recent audited budget for the institution~~
- ~~i) A proposed operational budget for the educational unit~~
- ~~j) Information about instructional and support personnel for the educational unit~~
- ~~k) Evidence of K-12 partnerships for the purposes of providing fieldwork~~
- ~~k) Information about facilities and/or digital learning platforms~~
- a) ~~A plan to teach out candidates if, for some reason, the institution is unable to continue providing educator preparation program(s)~~

PART-STAGE III – Alignment with all Applicable Standards and Preconditions

Once an institution seeking Initial Institutional Approval receives Commission approval for ~~e~~Eligibility following ~~Part Stage~~ II, Eligibility ~~Criteria~~Requirements, the institution may continue in the Initial Institutional Approval process by submitting the following:

- 1) Common Standards - Common Standards reflect aspects of program quality that are common across all educator preparation programs, regardless of type of program. The program sponsor must respond to each Common Standard by providing information and supporting documentation that is inclusive of all credential programs to be offered by the institution. An institution's responses are reviewed by Commission staff and must be aligned to the Common Standards before Initial Institutional Approval can be brought before the Commission for consideration.

- 2) All General Preconditions, Initial Program Preconditions and Program Specific Preconditions – Preconditions are statements of Commission policy or state statute. An institution’s responses are reviewed and must be in compliance with the general and program specific preconditions before the initial Institutional Approval can be brought before the Commission for consideration.
- 3) Program Standards Document – A document addressing the specific educator preparation credential program standards for programs which the institution seeks to initially offer must be submitted before the institution’s application for Initial Institutional Approval is brought to the Commission for consideration.

Commission Approval

Once an institution has satisfied Parts–Stages I, II, and III of the Initial Institutional Approval process, the institution’s application will again be brought before the Commission for its consideration and determination regarding Initial Institutional Approval/Provisional Approval. If the Commission determines that the institution is provisionally approved, the program(s) the institution wishes to offer during Provisional Approval must then be approved by the Committee on Accreditation.

Provisional Approval

If the Commission approves the new institution, it would be allowed to operate under *Provisional Approval*. The provisional timeframe will be determined by the Commission and will span two to three years, in accordance with the program’s design. At a minimum of two years, this timeframe will be adequate for at least an initial group of candidates to complete the program thereby allowing for data to be collected to determine the institution’s effectiveness in educator preparation. No additional programs will be approved during this period.

Full Approval

Full Approval will be determined by the Commission based on the following information:

1. Analysis of data collected during the 2-3 year provisional time period.
2. Recommendation of the accreditation site team as a result of a focused site visit conducted at the conclusion of the Provisional Approval. Any expenses incurred during the focused site visit are the responsibility of the institution seeking full approval.

Once granted full approval, the institution will then be required to meet the continuing accreditation procedures adopted by the COA.