

Discussion of Approval Process of New Programs by Institutions Recently Receiving Accreditation

March 2017

Introduction

This agenda item introduces a discussion around initial accreditation of new preparation programs for institutions completing *Stage III – Alignment with all Applicable Standards and Preconditions* of the Initial Institutional Approval process and the information to be presented to COA for initial accreditation.

Staff Recommendation

This item is for information and discussion only. No action is needed at this time.

Background

When an institution seeks initial accreditation of professional preparation programs, the program proposal goes through the peer review process for Initial Program Review (IPR). A team of two reviewers with expertise in the program area review the program narrative and supporting documentation for alignment to program standards.

Reviewers complete a Report of Findings (Appendix A) which includes written feedback and shows the status of each program standard, either *aligned* or *more information needed*. The review team sends program feedback to staff, who then review the feedback and send to the submitting institution. The institution revises the original submission based on reviewer feedback and resubmits for subsequent review. This process continues until reviewers find all program standards aligned. Once an institution has completed the review process, staff makes a recommendation to the COA for final approval.

Currently, the staff recommendation for initial accreditation of new programs is reported in *Item 6 Program Approval Recommendations* of a regularly scheduled COA meeting. For institutions that have existing programs and are offering new programs, staff has included a brief paragraph describing the proposed program. The COA votes on the approval. The COA may ask questions and discuss the proposed programs, but because most of the new programs are being offered by programs that have been within the accreditation system and because the prospective program has been reviewed by BIR members, often there is little discussion.

The COA indicated a desire to have additional information provided to them prior to considering approval for prospective programs being offered by institutions that have only recently received provisional initial institutional approval and are offering their first educator preparation program in California.

To that end, staff identified the following areas for which the COA may wish to receive additional information prior to approval for initial accreditation of new preparation programs:

- Program design and structure
- Sequence of courses for preliminary programs or professional development for induction
- Candidate assessments
- Candidate fieldwork and clinical practice placements
- Number of units in program

The COA may consider reviewing the final Report of Findings showing all program standards aligned and any comments that were made by the reviewers prior to determining that all standards were aligned. The final Report of Findings contains comments and feedback made throughout the review process.

Questions for Discussion

1. What level of information does the COA wish to have presented for an institution recently receiving accreditation by the Commission?
2. Does the COA wish to have the Report of Findings available for review while making a determination to approve a new program?
3. Should the information be provided to COA in a separate agenda item, similar to Item 6 each meeting, but separate from Item 6.

Next Steps

The COA's discussion will inform next steps should the COA determine it would like to have program information presented for new programs by institutions recently receiving accreditation.

Appendix A

Report of Findings Commission on Teacher Credentialing Feedback Initial Program Review

Induction Program Standards 2015

Institution	Institution Name
Date of initial review	
Subsequent dates of review	
Date Preconditions Complete	
Date Common Standard Aligned	
Date Program Standards Aligned	

General Comments: Reviewers provide comments that are general to the program.

Status	Standard
Aligned	1: Program Purpose Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: Reviewers determine the standard is aligned if narrative and supporting documentation clearly show how the program will meet the standard.
or	2: Components of the Mentoring Design Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:
More Information Needed	3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: Reviewer comments guide the program in responding to feedback. Comments may include what was missing from the submission, what was not clear, etc.
	4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:
	5: Determining Candidate Competence for the Clear Credential Recommendation Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:
	6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: