

## Discussion and Approval of 2016-17 Annual Report of the COA November 2017

### Overview of this Report

This agenda item presents the *Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation 2016-17* for COA consideration and approval.

### Staff Recommendation

This is an action item. The Commission staff seeks approval of the report. Any suggested edits and comments can be incorporated into the report before it is presented to the Commission in December 2017.

### Background

California Education Code and the *Accreditation Framework* require the COA to provide the Commission with a report on accreditation activities on an annual basis. Typically, the two Co-Chairs present the *Annual Report* at a fall meeting of the Commission. The current schedule is for the previous COA chairs to present the report at the December 7-8, 2017 Commission meeting.

### Next Steps

Upon adoption of the report, the Commission staff will ensure that comments and suggestions made during this discussion are incorporated into the version that will be presented to the Commission. In addition, appropriate appendices will be added to the document. The COA chairs can review the final version before it goes to the Commission to ensure that the comments were incorporated appropriately. The report will then be presented by COA chairs at the December 2017 Commission meeting and then placed on the Commission's website in the reports section.



**The Committee on Accreditation's  
Annual Accreditation Report to the  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
2016-2017**

**DRAFT**

Dear Commissioners:

On behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation (COA), we submit to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) the *2016-17 Annual Accreditation Report* by the Committee on Accreditation in accordance with the provisions of the *Accreditation Framework*. This report presents an overview of the activities and accomplishments of the Committee over the past year, the results of its activities for the year, and its work plan for 2017-18.

As you well know, 2016-17 was a year of tremendous change for the educator preparation community as it worked to implement the Commission's vision for the new strengthened and streamlined accreditation system. The new system is comprised of new outcomes measures, the implementation and use of a wide range of survey instruments, new teaching and administrator performance assessments, new standards for a number of credential areas including preliminary teaching, administrator preparation, and induction for both teachers and administrators, the development of a new accreditation data system and data warehouse, and implementation of data dashboards to ensure transparency to the public. Also critical to the new system was the development of new processes and procedures that enhance efficiencies while still ensuring that programs are of sufficiently high quality and meet Commission adopted standards.

We thank the Commission for allowing the COA and the educator preparation community the opportunity to take this past year to ensure these new systems were well planned and effectively executed. The extensive efforts of the Commission staff to provide technical assistance to the field over this past year as it adjusted to and implemented the changes was critically important to the overall success of the accreditation system. As we enter the 2017-18 accreditation year, we look forward to ensuring that the system that has been put in place, does in fact, meet the Commission's objectives.

The COA shares with the Commission the goal of having a strong accountability system that holds educator preparation programs to high standards, recognizes excellence, and encourages innovation. We continue to offer our collective expertise and assistance to the Commission in this important effort to ensure a rigorous and robust system of accreditation that focuses on ensuring that educators emerge from programs prepared to address the complexities of California's K-12 education system.

Sincerely,

Dr. Anna Moore  
Committee Co-Chair

Dr. Pia Wong  
Committee Co-Chair

**The Committee on Accreditation  
2016-17**

**Jomeline Balatayo**

ELD Teacher  
Culver City High School

**Gerard Morrison**

Teacher  
Long Beach Unified School District

**Suzanne Borgese**

Education Specialist  
Placentia-Yorba Linda USD

**Margo Pensavalle**

Professor of Clinical Education  
Director of Evaluation and Accreditation  
University of Southern California

**Deborah Erickson**

Professor and Dean  
School Of Education  
Point Loma Nazarene University

**Iris Riggs**

Professor, Teacher Education and  
Foundations  
California State University, San Bernardino

**Cheryl Forbes**

Director of Teacher Education and Lecturer  
University of California, San Diego

**Kelly Skon**

District Coordinator of Secondary STEM  
Saddleback Valley Unified School District

**Robert Frelly**

Director of Music Education  
Chapman University

**Yvonne White**

Science Teacher  
Oakland Unified School District

**Anna W. Moore**

Regional Director II  
Educational Services  
Sonoma County Office of Education

**Pia Wong**

Professor  
College of Education  
California State University, Sacramento

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee’s Work Plan in 2015-16 .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession.....	11
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality .....	13
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards.....	18
Purpose 4. Foster Continuous Program Improvement .....	21
General Operations .....	23
<b>Section II: Summary of Accreditation Activities 2015-16 .....</b>	<b>24</b>
Institutions in 7 <sup>th</sup> Year Follow Up .....	24
Initial Approval of New Credential Programs.....	25
Programs Entering Inactive Status .....	28
Withdrawal of Programs .....	28
Reactivation of Programs .....	30
Initial Institutional Approval.....	31
Institutions No Longer Approved Program Sponsors.....	31
<b>Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee in 2016-17 .....</b>	<b>32</b>
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and the Profession .....	32
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality.....	33
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards.....	35
Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement.....	35
Continued Development and Implementation of Accreditation System .....	36
General Operations .....	38
<b>Appendix A: CTC Accreditation Cohorts .....</b>	<b>39</b>

## Introduction: Summary of Activities of the Accreditation System

The 2016-17 year was a year of significant progress by the Commission, the Committee on Accreditation, and the Commission staff with respect to accreditation. The accreditation system is the primary means by which the Commission ensures quality in educator preparation in California. Not only did the Commission and its staff implement the routine accreditation activities required under the *Accreditation Framework* of 2006, but were simultaneously engaged in the Commission's Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation Project which consisted of reviewing and significantly revising numerous aspects of accreditation, including the adoption of a new [Accreditation Framework](#) (2015) to guide future accreditation efforts.

The major objectives of the new accreditation system, as outlined in the Accreditation Framework include the following:

- Accreditation assures that programs meet state standards for professional preparation programs, and, in so doing, are allowed to recommend candidates for state licensure.
- Accreditation assures candidates and the public that educator preparation programs are of high quality and effective in preparing candidates to meet licensure requirements.
- Accreditation assures candidates and the public that programs are accountable for the quality and effectiveness of the preparation they provide to candidates.
- Accreditation assures that evidence is reviewed by peers to determine each program's quality and effectiveness in order to retain their accreditation status.
- Accreditation provides the means for programs to continuously improve based on evidence of candidate outcomes, program effectiveness, and on feedback from ongoing peer review processes.

In 2016-17, institutions were making the transition from the former accreditation system to the new accreditation system. For the Green cohort, which is the cohort of institutions that is undergoing an accreditation site visit in 17-18, this past year was a combination of some aspects of the former system and many aspects of the new (currently adopted) system. Beginning with the next cohort, Yellow, all institutions and cohorts will be operating fully under the new accreditation system.

The current system is designed as a 7 year cycle comprised several major components or activities:

Annually	Data Submission
Years 1 and 4	Submission of Preconditions Documentation
Year 5, Fall	Program Review (program assessment for Green) Submission
Year 5, Spring	Common Standards Submission

Year 6	Site Visit
Year 7	Follow Up to address issues of concern identified by the Site Visit Teams.

Each of the over 260 Commission-approved institutions has been assigned a color cohort which identifies which component or activity is expected of those institutions in any given year. A full schedule of accreditation activities for each cohort can be found on the Commission’s accreditation [webpage](#).

*ANNUAL DATA SUBMISSION*

Consistency in data across institutions and across similar programs, including outcomes data, is an important part of the new accreditation system. The Annual Data Submission by institutions will allow the Commission to better identify specific information about credential programs operating in California. The system is scheduled to begin basic operation in late 2017.

*PRECONDITIONS SUBMISISON AND REVIEW*

Preconditions are grounded in California Education Code, Title 5 Regulations, or Commission policy. Responses to preconditions are submitted in Years 1 and Years 4 by each institution for each program that an institution is approved to offer. Immediate correction is required if an institution is deemed to be out of compliance with Preconditions.

*PROGRAM REVIEW*

During the new Program Review Process, each credential program provides specific required evidence or documentation demonstrating that the program is aligned to each of the Commission adopted program standards for the particular credential area. Documentation is reviewed by trained educators with expertise in the credential area and a decision about whether the program standards are preliminarily aligned is made. The institution is provided feedback and then must provide an addendum, at least 60 days prior to the Site Visit, addressing any areas that were not found to be preliminarily aligned. This addendum is then used by the site visit team as additional information to consider when determining whether the standard is met.

*COMMON STANDARDS REVIEW*

Also in Year 5 of the cycle, program sponsors submit specific documentation that indicates alignment with the Commission’s adopted Common Standards. Reviewers examine the documentation and determine whether the standard can be preliminarily aligned. This information helps focus and inform the accreditation site visit in Year 6.

*SITE VISITS*

All data are provided to a trained team of evaluators and these evaluators determine whether the standards are met and to determine an accreditation recommendation for the Committee on Accreditation. Site visits include in-depth interviews of graduates, candidates, employers, and program faculty and administrators. The purpose of the site visit is to determine whether standards are met and to what extent the program is effectively implemented.

The Commission is assisted in the implementation of the accreditation system by the Committee on Accreditation. This body is comprised of twelve members of the education community – 6 from postsecondary education and 6 K-12 practitioners. While the Commission sets policy for accreditation, the COA implements the accreditation system and makes accreditation decisions for institutions offering educator preparation in California. Further, the success of the accreditation system also depends on the commitment of hundreds of experts in the field - those who have a role in preparing educators and practitioners themselves - who are trained and calibrated to serve as reviewers for document review and for site visits.

This report presents information about the accreditation system, the COA decisions, and the major components for the academic year 2016-17.

The Commission completed its year of technical assistance and transition in 2016-17. All future reports will be focused on the activities that fall under the umbrella of the recently adopted [Accreditation Framework \(2016\)](#) and will reflect the revised accreditation cycle of activities, the new data warehouse and dashboards, inclusion of statewide survey data, revised processes and procedures and, perhaps most importantly, strengthened and streamlined standards and competencies adopted by the Commission.



## Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2016-17

The Commission's Strengthening and Streamlining Project was a multipronged effort that began late in 2014 and continued throughout 2016-17. Among its various critical components were the following:

- Adoption of a New [Accreditation Framework](#)
- Adoption of a New Accreditation Handbook
- Implementation of New Initial Institutional Approval Process
- Implementation of New Common Standards
- Implementation of New General Preconditions
- Implementation of New Teaching Performance Expectations for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Programs
- Implementation of New Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Program Standards
- Implementation of New Preliminary Administrator Preparation Standards
- Implementation of New Induction Standards for Teachers and for Administrators
- Adoption and Implementation of New California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs)
- Development and Piloting of New CaTPA and CalAPA
- Development and Implementation of New Procedures for Common Standards and Program Standards Submission and Review
- Development of New Data Warehouse and New Annual Data Submission System
- Development and Implementation of Numerous Data Dashboards
- Implementation of Surveys to Inform Program Improvement and Accreditation Decisions – Program Completers for Preliminary Multiple, Single Subject, and Education Specialist, Employers,

Implementation of the numerous aspects of the new accreditation system listed above has been no small undertaking. Below is a brief summary of some of the major components of the 2016-17 accreditation activities. In an effort to ensure successful implementation of the numerous aspects of the *Strengthening and Streamlining Project*, the 2016-17 year was not an average year with routine accreditation activities such as site visits. Rather, at the Commission's direction, efforts were focused on developing efficient and effective processes and procedures, materials, training reviewers, and the provision of extensive technical assistance to all program sponsors. All accreditation site visits, with the exception of revisits and follow up for institutions with issues previously identified by site visit teams, were deferred by one year. Site visits resume in the fall of 2017.

Because of the unusual nature of the year's accreditation activities, this report is also different than previous reports as there are fewer institutional accreditation findings on which to report. However, where appropriate, the efforts to implement the above list of components of the Strengthening and Streamlining Project are included in this report.

**Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession**

Maintain public access to the [Committee on Accreditation](#). The COA held meetings on the following dates:

August 8, 2016  
November 9, 2016  
February 3, 2017  
March 24, 2017  
June 29, 2017

All Committee meetings were held in public and all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. The Commission’s website was utilized fully to provide agenda items and notification of meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation.

As a continuing cost saving measure and to ensure access for all participants, phone conferencing and Zoom, a videoconferencing program, were used frequently, where possible and appropriate, in order that those located in various regions of California who are involved in accreditation activities could participate without the time and cost commitments required of traveling to the Commission offices. Unfortunately, recent changes to the Commission’s communication system no longer allows for simultaneous web broadcasting and web conferencing. Because the Zoom capability is a necessity for COA business, the simultaneous web broadcasting had to be suspended. However, the zoom link is available to anyone who wishes to listen to the meeting in real time.

*PSD News*. The PSD E-news, developed in 2008, continued to be distributed weekly. This electronic notification reaches over 2,000 individuals including all approved institutions, to inform them of accreditation-related activities such as information regarding standards development and revision, technical assistance opportunities, and notification of requests for stakeholder comment.

[Program Sponsor Alerts](#). Program Sponsor Alerts (PSA) continued to be used to provide important and timely information on specific topics of interest to program sponsors. The Commission staff used this resource frequently in the 2016-2017 year, issuing 12 PSAs. The 12 PSAs issued from July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017 are as follows:

PSA Number	Issue Date	Title
<a href="#">16-08</a>	July 8, 2016	Adoption of Revised California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)
<a href="#">16-09</a>	August 19, 2016	Institution Profile Dashboard: Adding Institution's Comment
<a href="#">16-10</a>	September 7, 2016	Updates on Implementation of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) Subject Matter Requirements (SMRs)
<a href="#">16-11</a>	September 30, 2016	English Learner Authorizations for Holders of Preliminary Teaching Credentials
<a href="#">16-12</a>	November 4, 2016	Reinstating Elementary Subject Matter Programs
<a href="#">16-13</a>	December 15, 2016	Clear Induction Administrative Services Credential: Change to 120 Day Enrollment Requirement and Clarification of Professional Learning
<a href="#">16-14</a>	December 15, 2016	2016 General Preconditions and Revised Website
<a href="#">16-15</a>	December 16, 2016	Bachelor's Degree Requirement for a California Credential
<a href="#">17-01</a>	January 23, 2017	Commission Adoption of Teacher Induction Preconditions and Program Standards (2016)
<a href="#">17-02</a>	January 30, 2017	Required Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Preparation Program Use of an Updated Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) Model Beginning in the 2018-19 Program Year
<a href="#">17-03</a>	February 22, 2017	Revised Preconditions for Subject Matter Proficiency Requirements Applicable to Candidates in Undergraduate Integrated Programs
<a href="#">17-04</a>	April 26, 2017	Board of Institutional Review (BIR) Training

The PSA is used to communicate to program sponsors a specific issue such as requirements and deadlines for transition to new standards and has served the Commission and the field well. Program Sponsor Alerts will continue to be used to provide information to the field when necessary.

*Maintain a [Public Website of All Accreditation Results](#) and Status for Each Institution*

For a number of years, the Commission has maintained a website where all accreditation site visit reports and actions taken by the COA is available to the public. The site includes the team report for each institution as well as the letter to the institution with the formal COA Action taken. The website is: [https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmp/accreditation/accreditation\\_reports.php](https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmp/accreditation/accreditation_reports.php)

The website is updated after each COA meeting to reflect any additional actions taken and includes the reports and actions for the most recent accreditation cycle.

*Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission.* COA Co-Chairs Pia Wong and Anna Moore presented the COA annual report to the Commission at the [December 2016 Commission Meeting](#).

*Commission Liaison.* The Commission's liaison provides an important perspective to COA discussions and serves as an effective means of communication between the COA and the Commission. For the 2016-17 year, the liaison to the COA was Commissioner Haydee Rodriguez who attended the COA meetings regularly.

*Implementation of a Fee Recovery System for Certain Accreditation Activities and Annual Accreditation Fee.* The Commission continued implementation of a cost recovery plan (regulations effective October 2013), for the review of new programs and for accreditation activities outside the typical accreditation cycle. In addition, in 2016-17, the Commission began looking at revisions to the regulations to align the language to aspects of the new accreditation system. This work will continue in 2017-18.

In addition, the Commission continued implementation of the Annual Accreditation Fee structure (Emergency regulations became effective in August 2014, followed by permanent regulations that became effective as of April 1, 2015.) As routinely scheduled, in 2016-17, Commission staff calculated the appropriate annual accreditation fees, invoiced institutions, collected the fees, and communicated with institutions when questions or disputes arose. These funds continue to be critical to supporting the infrastructure of the Commission's accreditation system.

*Removing Ability to Recommend: Strengthening the Implications for Noncompliance with Accreditation Requirements*

The ability to remove an institution's authority to recommend credentials continues to help to ensure that institutions comply with accreditation requirements in a timely manner. As noted in the Annual Report for 2014-15, the Commission began to increase the use of its ability to remove an institutional authority to recommend credentials in instances in which an institution is not complying with accreditation timelines and expectations. During 2016-17 five institutions did not pay the annual accreditation by the October 31, 2016 deadline at which time their ability to recommend credentials was removed until payment of the fees and a \$500 extraordinary fee was received. Each of the five institutions subsequently paid these fees and the ability to recommend credentials was reinstated.

## **Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality**

*Professional Accreditation of Institutions and their Credential Preparation Programs.* This is one of the primary ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of institutions and their credential programs. However, the 2016-17 year was a highly unusual year as the Commission approved the deferment of site visits scheduled for 2016-17 by one year in order to provide time for the institutions to plan and implement the vast number of changes required of the Strengthening and Streamlining Project including new

standards and requirements for programs. The Commission staff used this year to provide extensive technical assistance to institutions as well as to refine the processes and procedures of the various components of the new accreditation system. The Commission did, however, ensure follow up would continue to take place for any institution that had to address stipulations, including revisits. This section includes a summary of both of those activities.

*Ensuring Institutions Addressed Stipulations*

A list of the institutions that had stipulations placed upon it by the COA in a previous year is included in Section II of this report. Of the ten institutions that were accredited with stipulations in previous years, the COA removed the stipulations fully in the 2016-17 for six of them. Of the remaining four institutions, all made significant progress and were given additional time to address any remaining stipulations.

*Technical Assistance Efforts*

At the September 2016 meeting, staff brought forward a plan for technical assistance for the 2016-17 year and it was approved by the Commission. An Accreditation Technical Assistance Webpage was established on the Commission’s website and stakeholders were kept informed of upcoming technical assistance opportunities through emails and the PSD Enews. Additionally staff made itself available to present and discuss information at a variety of stakeholder meetings and conferences throughout the year. More than 2,000 institutional representatives from approximately 250 institutions participated in a wide variety of technical assistance activities.

This technical assistance work was summarized in a Commission agenda item presented at the June 2017 Commission meeting [June 2017 Technical Assistance Summary](#). The tables below illustrate the numerous technical assistance meetings and webinars that staff and the field were engaged in to ensure that the Commission’s newly adopted standards, requirements, and accreditation system would be implemented effectively and efficiently. Additional detail on these activities can be found in the Commission agenda item referenced above but summary tables are provided in order to demonstrate the frequency and scope of these technical assistance activities in 2016-17.

**Summary of Technical Assistance for an Overview of the Accreditation System**

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees
Webcast: Overview of the Accreditation System	<a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>	Unknown
Presentation and Discussion at CCAC (2 sessions)	October 2016, Sacramento	80
Presentation and Discussion at CTE (2 sessions)	October 2016, San Diego	200

**Summary of Technical Assistance for Common Standards, Preconditions, and Program Review**

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees
Webcast: Common Standards	<a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>	Unknown
Webcast: Preconditions	<a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>	Unknown
Webcast: Program Review Preliminary Programs	<a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>	Unknown

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees
Webcast: Program Review Induction Programs	<a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>	Unknown
Common Standards, Preconditions, for Green Cohort Institutions.	September 13, Commission Office	72
	September 14, Brandman University	
Program Review: Yellow Cohort Preliminary Programs	November 16, Commission Office	38
	January 18, Loyola Marymount University	
Program Review: Yellow Cohort Induction Programs	November 18, Commission Office	43
	January 13, Loyola Marymount University	
Program Review: Yellow Cohort Q and A	May 1, 9, 11, 16, Zoom Meetings	29
Accreditation Year Five: Program Review and Common Standards Submission: Induction Programs	February 7, Brandman University	152
	February 8, National University, San Diego	
	February 24, Commission Offices	
	March 16, New Haven USD	
	April 21, Kings COE	
Accreditation Year Five: Program Review and Common Standards Submission: Preliminary Programs	January 25, St. Mary's College	108
	February 17, Fresno Pacific University	
	February 23, Commission Offices	
	March 10, CSU Fullerton, Irvine	
	March 17, Mount St. Mary's	
Common Standard 5: Program Impact	March 31, CCTE Sacramento	Approximately 70
Leadership for Accreditation for Deans and Directors		Approximately 50

**Summary of Technical Assistance for Preliminary Multiple/Single Subject Standards and TPEs**

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees
Webcast: MS/SS Standards	<a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>	Unknown
Webcast: Teaching Performance Expectations	<a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>	Unknown
Transition Plan Zoom Meetings (7 meetings)	<a href="#">Recorded Zoom Meeting</a>	74
Regional Meetings (6)	September 26, Fresno Pacific University	202
	September 27, Commission Offices	
	September 27, St. Mary's College	
	October 4, Claremont Graduate Univ.	
	October 4, National University	
	October 5, CSU Northridge	
MS/SS Standard 3: Implications for Interns	October 4, CSU East Bay	75
	October 18, Los Angeles COE	
	October 19, Cal Poly Pomona	

### Summary of Initial Technical Assistance for Administrator/Teacher Performance Assessments

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees
Cal APA (2 Sessions)	October 7, CAPEA San Diego	80
Cal APA Webinar Meetings	Dec. 16, Jan. 14, Feb. 8, Mar. 1, Mar. 15	93
In-Person Cal APA Meeting	February 17, Point Loma University	7
Office Hours CalAPA	Fridays, beginning January 2017 (phone)	25
Cal TPA Webinar Meetings	Dec. 15, Jan. 13, Feb. 8, Mar 1, Mar. 15	143
In-Person Cal TPA Meeting	January 23, University of San Diego	21
Cal TPA Coordinators Meeting	March 24, Brandman University	27
Office Hours Cal TPA	Fridays, beginning January. 2017 (phone)	24

### Summary of Technical Assistance for Teacher Induction Program Standards Implementation

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees
Webcast: Transitioning to the New Teacher Induction Preconditions and Standards	<a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>	Unknown
Support for Implementing New Standards Fall Meetings	September 28, Los Angeles USD	328
	September 29, Fontana USD	
	September 30, Merced COE	
	October 17, Davis Joint USD	
	October 19, New Haven USD	
November 4, San Diego COE		
Transitioning to Induction, Presentation and Discussion	October 12-14, CCAC	220
How Data Drives Improvement within the Commission's New Accreditation System	January 27, Induction Program Evaluation Meeting, Sacramento	130
Support for Implementing New Standards Spring Meetings	January 24, Los Angeles COE	70
	February 3, Tulare COE	47
	February 8, St. Mary's College	97
	May 4, Riverside COE	54
	May 9, San Diego COE	29

### Summary of Technical Assistance for Institutions Preparing for 2017-18 Site Visits

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees
Site Visit Preparation: Green Cohort	January 19, Commission Offices	62
	January 19, Brandman University, Irvine	
Year-Out from Site Visit Consultant Previsit	Spring - Summer 2017	Attendance Varies, 29 institutions
Monthly Phone/Zoom Conferences	Begun Spring 2017, continuing until visit.	

### Summary of Initial Technical Assistance Activities for the Board of Institutional Reviewers

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees
Program Reviewer Training and Review	February 13, Santa Clara COE	64
	February 23, Commission Office	
	April 21, Brandman University, Irvine	
Common Standards Reviewer Training and Review	May 2, Commission Office	6
	May 10, Loyola Marymount University	13
	May 12, St. Mary's College	7
	June 6, Southern California TBD	10
	June 16, Commission Office	4
	June 23, Fresno Pacific University	Not yet available
	July TBD, Commission Office	Not yet available

### Summary of Technical Assistance Provided to Institutions Seeking Initial Approval

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees
Accreditation 101: Expectations and Responsibilities for Commission Approved Institutions	August 31, Commission Office	80 (16 prospective institutions)
	September 1, Commission Office	
	December 13, Commission Office	
	April 12, Commission Office	

### Summary of Other Related Activities

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees
Think Tanks in Preparation for Transition to New Administrative Services Program Standards (see Table 4)	Multiple dates and locations during 2015-16.	73
Update for Interns, Q and A (2 sessions)	October 12-14, CCAC, Sacramento	185
Update on Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services	October 12-14, CCAC, Sacramento	80
Webcast: Elementary Subject Matter Programs	<a href="#">Watch Webcast</a>	Unknown
Cohort Consultant Email, program-specific email, and phone calls	Ongoing daily	Average of 50 per week per consultant

Overall, approximately 85% of institutions took part in one or more technical assistance events. The transition year allowed time and resources for staff to assist institutions and programs to successfully implement new standards and accreditation activities by the 2017-18 academic year. An unintended, but welcomed outcome was that new relationships with program sponsors were forged and existing ones were strengthened.

*Accreditation Handbook revisions.* The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. As the various components of the new accreditation system were developed, staff and the COA considering what language needed to be included in the *Handbook*. Considering revisions to processes and procedures as a



result of the strengthening and streamlining accreditation project were a considerable part of the COA work in 2016 and the COA adopted many of the revisions to the *Accreditation Handbook* in March and April of 2016 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook.html>). As implementation of the various components began in 2016-17, the *Handbook* language became critically important and adjustments to the *Handbook* will continue to be made as staff and COA have more experiences with implementation. An example of a significant *Handbook* change in 2017 included the additional revision to the Initial Institutional Approval Process enacted by the Commission in February 2017. The COA incorporated those changes into the *Handbook* in March 2017.

*Receive regular updates on Commission activities related to accreditation and provide Commission with advice on issues related to accreditation as requested by the Commission.* During 2016-17 staff continued to prepare agenda items for the COA on issues related to the Commission's work as directed by the Commission or as appropriate to the continuing work of the Committee. The COA continued to discuss issues referred to it by the Commission and provide guidance as appropriate. With the efforts to streamline and strengthen accreditation this function continued to be critically important in 2016-17.

### **Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards**

*Review and take action to grant initial approval of new program sponsors.* In October 2015, the Commission approved a new initial institutional approval policy for institutions seeking to become a Commission-approved program sponsor of educator preparation programs in California. The requirements for an institution to become a Commission-approved educator preparation program sponsor in California was an area in which significant strengthening and revision was necessary as it had not been reviewed in many years. The Commission lifted the temporary moratorium on Initial Institutional Approval in February 2016. As the Commission updated the [Accreditation Framework](#) and the [Accreditation Handbook](#), implementation began in early spring 2016 with the first Accreditation 101 session being held on May 10, 2016. Additional sessions of Accreditation 101 sessions were held in August 2016, September 2016, December 2016, and April 2017. A total of 16 institutions interested in offering educator preparation in California attended with a team of key individuals, as required.

During this reporting period the Commission also made significant adjustments to the new process for Initial Institutional Approval. The Commissioners directed the staff to review and provide recommendations on some of the Eligibility Criteria, specifically with respect to areas of lesser discretion which then allowed the Commission to focus its attention and review on those areas believed to require greater Commission deliberation, discretion, and agreement. The Commission approved these changes at the February 2017 meeting and they were incorporated into the [Accreditation Handbook](#) by the COA at its March 2017 meeting.

As a result of the establishment of the new Initial Institutional Approval process, the first 5 (five) institutions were brought to the Commission for consideration and approval for one of the Stages of Initial Institutional Approval. These are listed in Section II of this report.

*Review and take action to grant initial program approval for new credential programs.* This is also one of the major ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs for Commission-approved institutions. Programs are only granted initial approval when reviewers have determined that all Commission's standards are met and after COA acts to approve. This review process continued in 2016-17. Because institutions may submit program proposals anytime throughout the year, the Commission attempts to find reviewers willing and able to review the documents as soon as possible. As a result, the vast majority of the reviews for new program proposals are conducted remotely – with reviewers being sent the documents and devoting time on their own schedule, at their homes or offices, working via technology with their initial program review partner. A total of 29 new programs were approved by the COA in 2016-17. The list of these new programs is included in Section II of this report.

*Complete the “old” Program Assessment activities and begin the “new” Program Review process.* The Green cohort was the last cohort to submit Program Assessment documents under the former process in 2014. The results of this process will be used in accreditation site visits in 2017-18. All institutions, commencing with the Yellow Cohort in Fall 2017, will submit Program Review. In 2016-17, the streamlined evidence requirements and processes for the new Program Review process were developed and finalized. In addition, the process was piloted with the Administrative Services credential programs since the timing of the adoption of new standards and performance expectations proved ideal to pilot the new system prior to going to scale. The feedback from reviewers of the Administrative Service credential Program Review was overwhelmingly positive with most reviewers expressing that they believed they better understood the program they were reviewing than the lengthy narrative of the previous process, and yet they were able to complete the review task in a much shorter window of time. This new process has every indication of meeting the Commission's charge to both strengthen and streamline the accreditation process.

#### *Begin the New Common Standards Review Process*

Commission staff developed and the COA approved a new streamlined approach to Common Standards review which included the submission of prescribed documentation and information along with very limited narrative. Common Standards submissions for the Green Cohort were due in March 2017 and during the spring and summer 2017, the new Common Standards review process was implemented for the first time and will be used to inform this year's site visits. Like the Program Review process, reviewers expressed overwhelming positive support for the new process noting that they were able to complete the review process and reach preliminary findings in a much shorter timeframe than the previous process. Knowing that the team lead and the Common Standards reviewers who read the submissions would also be at the site visit allowed them to feel confident that any areas needing follow up or further inquiry that resulted from the document review would take place since they were already familiar with the issues and outstanding questions.

### *Begin the New Process of Review of the Preconditions*

The Commission's new accreditation system requires that preconditions be submitted and reviewed in Years 1 and 4 of the 7-year cycle. Three cohorts of institutions submitted preconditions in Spring 2017. They included Yellow and Violet who were in years 1 and 4 of the cycle and the Green Cohort, who because of where they fell within the timeframe of shifting from one accreditation system to another, were also required to submit updated precondition documents. Reviewing these preconditions was a significant endeavor that required the participation of most of the consultants and analysts in the Professional Services Division. Follow up and corrections were required of many programs and hence required a second review. Numerous potential improvements in the submission and review process were identified and will be incorporated in time for the submission of the preconditions for spring 2018.

### *Development of the new Annual Data System*

The development of a new annual data system was one of the key components to the work plan for 2016-17. The Commission entered into an agreement with a technology contractor who worked closely with the Commission staff over the course of the year to build the infrastructure necessary to allow institutions to provide consistent data about their programs, candidates, and outcomes. The data system is multi-pronged and multi-purposed. Various aspects of the system and the data will be used by institutions, the Commission and its staff, and accreditation teams. In addition, where appropriate, some of the data will interface with the data dashboards and be available to members of the public. First year efforts include establishing institutional logins, designating the type of authority individuals from each institution will have within the system, and beginning to establish program "sets" with basic data (pathways offered, enrollment, completion information, etc.). As the data system is more developed over time, additional information, particularly outcomes-based data, will be included in the annual data system.

### *Implementation of Survey Instruments*

Using data from survey instruments is one important component to increasing the focus on outcomes in the accreditation system. In 2016-17 the Completer Surveys (Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, Clear Admin Services, General Education Induction, and Clear Education Specialist Induction) were integrated into the credential recommendation process so that program completers must go through the survey to pay for the credential that was earned. A completer may elect to not respond to the survey, but the number of completers who have done this is small. The response rate for the surveys in prior years had varied between 20 and 30% for the state with some institutions having no completers submit a survey. With the survey embedded into the credential recommendation process the response rate for the 2016-17 surveys varied from 92-96%. Completer Surveys are open from September 1 to August 31 annually with the program reports being sent to institutions in October for the prior year.

In addition to the six Completer Surveys, the Commission administers both a Master Teacher survey and an Employer survey. The Master Teacher survey was in its second year of administration while the Employer Survey was piloted in 2016-17. The Master Teacher survey is open from September 1-August 31 annually. Preliminary teacher preparation programs send the

link to the Master Teacher survey to all their master teachers. The Employer Survey is open in the fall—November-December—and asks employers to provide feedback on an institution’s programs if the employer has hired at least 2 completers from that program in the past 3 years. More information on the Surveys can be found on this [webpage](#):

The results from the surveys will be used by accreditation site visit teams in 2017-18 to inform accreditation findings and, when appropriate, to streamline the review. When the response rate is high and the feedback positive for an institution and its programs, a smaller proportion of program completers may be needed for interviews during the site visit. At the conclusion of this first year of using the survey instruments to inform accreditation activities, staff and the COA will review how the teams used survey information to focus their review.

#### *Develop and Implement a New Team Lead Training*

In early Fall of 2017, the Commission staff held two Team Lead training sessions for those individuals who would be leading site visit teams in 2017-18 with the Green Cohort institutions. This training covered a variety of topics including the overall approach of the new accreditation system, an overview of new aspects of the standards, and the new processes and procedures required. These trainings were very successful and well attended.

#### **Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement**

*Noting Late Submission.* Providing a report on institutions that have not complied with the required timelines and due dates has become a standard agenda item for the COA. Staff continued the reports in 2016-17 at each COA meeting. These included institutions that were late in submitting required transition plans for the transition to new standards. This information has improved the COA’s understanding of institutions that have not complied with the Commission’s timelines for accreditation activities and has served as additional leverage with institutions to ensure compliance.

*Continue implementation of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.* Because no initial site visits were conducted in 2016-17, site visit surveys for team leads, team members, institutions, and consultants were not necessary. Staff uses this information to determine what additional trainings are needed in the future, how consultants and team leads can be assisted in their responsibilities, and to identify both leadership potential in members of the BIR and or biases and issues that may have arisen with BIR members. This feature will be reinstated as site visits resume in fall 2017.

*Continue partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate.* A new Partnership Agreement with CAEP was signed by both parties in May 2015. During 2016-17, Commission staff continued to work with the CAEP staff to better understand new CAEP standards and processes and to determine their applicability to California’s context. Commission staff communicated with CAEP staff on issues as they arose and were able to secure a deferment

of site visits to align with the Commission's timeline for deferment of site visits by one year for extensive technical assistance activities. In addition, Commission staff attends both the CAEP clinic for state agencies charged with the responsibility of program approval and accreditation and the annual CAEP conference. These meetings ensure staff has an understanding of the requirements of CAEP review as well as is able to identify any work necessary to maintain a joint review process for institutions seeking both state and national accreditation. This work continues.

*Board of Institutional Reviewer's (BIR) Training.* Following the substantial revisions to processes and procedures and to incorporate outcomes data such as survey results, it becomes necessary to significantly revise the training for both new and veteran reviewers. Under the previous BIR training, most of the training took place face to face over a period of 3-4 days. Under the new system, training is divided into two major activities: 1) Program Review or Common Standards Review, and 2) Site Visit Training. Under the first activity – Program Review or Common Standards Review - the reviewers are trained to review and analyze a prescribed set of evidence that is required to be submitted by institutions and programs and determine, primarily on the basis of the evidence alone with very limited narrative whether the standards appear to be preliminarily aligned. Staff conducted the training for all of the Common Standards reviews in 2016-17 for the Green Cohort, the pilot Program Reviews for the Administrative Services credential programs, and will now begin to implement this training in Fall 2017 with program review for all credential areas for the Yellow Cohort in preparation for their 2018-19 accreditation site visits.

The second part of the training is site visit training which is comprised of part online modules and face to face training. Staff is currently in the process of revising this training and the first sessions will begin in late spring/early summer 2018.

### **Other Activities Not Directly In the Accreditation System**

#### *Review and Approve Subject Matter Programs - Elementary Subject Matter Programs (ESM) and Single Subject Matter Programs*

Subject Matter programs do not fall within the Commission's accreditation system, nevertheless, reviewing subject matter programs is an important function of the Professional Services Division and approving these programs is an important function of the Commission, this activity is reported here. All teaching candidates must demonstrate subject matter competence. In the years following No Child Left Behind, those pursuing Single Subject credentials could demonstrate subject matter competence through either a Commission approved subject matter program or successful passage of the CSET examination in the subject area of the credential. Those pursuing Multiple Subject credentials were required to pass the CSET Multiple Subject examination and completion of a Commission approved elementary subject matter program was not sufficient. In 2016, the Commission approved regulations, which were subsequently approved by the Office of Administrative Law in 2017, to allow passage of a Commission approved Elementary Subject Matter examination to count as demonstration of subject matter competence. With the change in policy that once again allowed for Commission approved

subject matter programs to waive the CSET examination for demonstration of subject matter competence for multiple subject candidates, the responsibility to review and approve these programs once again became a priority for the Commission. All total, 7 institutions were approved by the Commission after review by subject matter experts that determined the programs to be in alignment with the Elementary Subject Matter standards. In addition, the Commission continues to review and approve all proposals submitted for Single Subject Subject Matter programs. These programs are included in Section II.

### **General Operations**

In addition to the above mentioned items, the COA engaged in routine matters necessary for general operations of the Committee. This includes the election of Co-Chairs, the adoption of a meeting schedule, and orientation of new members.

## Section II: Summary of 2016-17 Accreditation Activities

This section of the report provides more detailed information about results of the 2016-17 Work Plan with a focus on accreditation activities.

### ***Professional Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Credential Preparation Programs***

In 2016-17 accreditation site visits for the Green cohort institutions were deferred until 2017-18 per Commission action in order to allow for extensive technical assistance and to allow the Commission staff the opportunity to develop and implement processes and procedures in accordance with the new accreditation system. These site visits resume in Fall 2017 and will continue throughout the Spring 2018. The results of the 29 site visits will be included in next year’s Annual Report to the Commission.

### ***Institutions in 7<sup>th</sup> Year Follow Up***

Although the initial accreditation visits for the Green cohort were deferred by one year, follow up for those institutions that were reviewed in previous years was continued. In some cases the follow up included a document or evidence review only and in other cases a revisit was conducted, depending on the COA decision.

<b>2016-17 Accreditation Follow-Up Institutions with Stipulations</b>		
<b>Revisits</b>		
<b>Program Sponsor</b>	<b>2015-2016 Decision</b>	<b>2016-2017 Revisit Decision</b>
Alliant University	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations	Accreditation
Baldwin Park Unified school District	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
California School for the Deaf	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation with Stipulations
Dominican University	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation
Holy Names University	Accreditation with Major Stipulations	Accreditation with Stipulations
Oak Grove School District	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
Tehama Department of Education	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation with Stipulations
UC Riverside	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation
United States University	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation with Major Stipulations

2016-17 Accreditation Follow-Up Institutions with Stipulations		
Vallejo City Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations	Accreditation

The institutions below were granted the status of “Accreditation” and did not have stipulations. However, the COA requested a 7<sup>th</sup> year report from the institution. This occurs when there is an aspect of the program that the COA wants to be certain was actually implemented or maintained one year later.

7 <sup>th</sup> Year Reports			
Chaffey Joint Union High School District	Accreditation Report	w/7 <sup>th</sup> Year	Accreditation
Vanguard University	Accreditation Report	w/7 <sup>th</sup> Year	Accreditation

**Parts of this Section that Cannot Be Completed this Year**

Because all site visits were deferred by one year pursuant to Commission action, there were no site visits beyond revisits in 2016-17. Typically, this section of the report includes data on the results of the accreditation site visits for the reporting year. In addition, it includes analysis of this data. The following tables and charts are typically provided in this section:

- 1) Institutions Receiving Accreditation with All Common and Program Standards Met
- 2) A list credential programs included in site visits for a given year where all program standards were met for all institutions visited that year
- 3) A table of the findings on each of the Common Standards (Met, Met with Concerns, Not Met) for the institutions that were visited in that year
- 4) A five year trend for Common Standards results
- 5) A summary of the findings for each of the Program Standards for all the programs that were reviewed during the site visits for the reporting period:

These charts, tables, and analysis of the results of the site visits taking place in 2017-18 will be provided in next year’s Annual Report. This information will provide the Commission with insight as to how well some of the new program standards are being implemented in these early years of implementation and which ones institutions are having difficulty implementing effectively.

**Initial Approval of New Credential Programs (IPR)**

Institutions seeking Initial Program Approval for new credential programs submit a document that indicates how the program will meet each of the Commission-adopted program standards



along with supporting documents that serve as evidence to verify the claims made, and a Common Standards document (or a Common Standards addendum if the institution has recently submitted Common Standards). A team of educators who have expertise in the program area and are trained for the review process read the standards documents and consult with one another to determine whether standards are met. If the reviewers jointly agree that standards are met, it is so noted. If the review team agrees that standards are not met, reviewers request specifically what additional information is needed. This feedback is shared with the institution by the CTC staff. In addition, the institution submits a response to all relevant program specific preconditions, which are reviewed by Commission staff. When all standards are found to be met and all relevant preconditions are determined to be addressed, Commission staff includes the item, along with a paragraph about the program written by the institution, in the COA agenda at the next scheduled meeting. Initial Program Approval actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation in 2016-17 are listed in the tables below.

<b>New Credential Programs Approved (29)</b>	
<b>Credential Program</b>	<b>Institutional Sponsor</b>
Added Authorization: Orthopedic Impairment (1)	San Diego County Office of Education
Administrative Services Clear Induction (4)	Brandman University
	Orange Unified School District
	Sonoma County Office of Education
	Pomona Unified School District
Bilingual Authorization (5)	California State University, Chico (Hmong, Punjabi)
	University of California, Los Angeles (Mandarin)
	San Francisco Unified School District (Spanish)
	Santa Clara University
Clear Education Specialist Induction (3)	Dos Palos Oro Loma Joint Unified School District
	Hayward Unified School District
	Culver City Unified School District
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Intern (4)	San Francisco Unified School District
	Sonoma County Office of Education
	Biola University
	Sacramento County Office of Education
General Education (Multiple and Single Subject) Induction	CalState TEACH
Multiple Subject Intern (2)	San Francisco Unified School District
	Sonoma County Office of Education
Preliminary Administrative Services (4)	Placer County Office of Education
	Shasta County Office of Education
	Riverside County Office of Education
	University of California, Los Angeles

New Credential Programs Approved (29)	
Credential Program	Institutional Sponsor
Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate (1)	University of California, Santa Barbara
Preliminary Single Subject (1)	Summit Public Schools
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling (1)	La Sierra University
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology (1)	California State University, Monterey Bay
Single Subject Intern (1)	Sonoma County Office of Education
Speech-Language Pathology (1)	Biola University

### Initial Approval of New Subject Matter Programs

Although subject matter programs are not part of the accreditation system, reviewing new program proposals are a significant part of the Professional Services Division priorities. The programs reviewed and approved by the Commission in 2016-17 are included in the table below.

New Subject Matter Programs	
CSU Channel Islands	Elementary Subject Matter
CSU Dominguez Hills	Elementary Subject Matter
CSU Long Beach	Elementary Subject Matter
CSU Stanislaus	Elementary Subject Matter
Concordia University	Elementary Subject Matter
Point Loma Nazarene University	Elementary Subject Matter
San Jose State University	Elementary Subject Matter
California Baptist University	Single Subject - English
California Baptist University	Single Subject Social Science
William Jessup University	Single Subject - English

### Inactive Status

Institutions may temporarily cease offering an approved program for a variety of reasons such as decreased need in the service area or changes in faculty with expertise in the area. Inactive programs may be teaching out the remaining candidates but are not enrolling additional students. In the past, once a program was approved, it was listed as approved on the Commission website even if the program was not being offered at the institution. At the May 2008 meeting, the COA took action to allow institutions to declare a program to be **inactive**. A program may be declared inactive for a maximum of five years. Inactive status does not excuse an institution from accreditation activities. All inactive programs must participate in accreditation activities in a modified manner as determined by the COA and Administrator of Accreditation. The following programs noted below were initially declared to be in an Inactive status in 2016-17.

<b>Programs Entering Inactive Status (17)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
Argosy University	Preliminary Administrative Services Credential
Azusa Unified School District	General Education (Multiple/Single Subject) Induction Program
California State University, Chico	Single Subject Credential Program: Health Science
	Single Subject Credential Program: Home Economics
	Single Subject Credential Program: Music
California State University, San Marcos	California Teacher of English Learners (CTEL) Program
Concordia University	Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Preliminary Intern Program
Fresno Pacific University	Clear Education Specialist Credential Program
	Clear General Education (MS/SS) Credential Program
San Joaquin County Office of Education	Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education Program
	Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disorders Program
	Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Disorders Program
	Multiple Subject Intern Credential Program
	Single Subject Intern Credential Program
Santa Clara University	Education Specialist-Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
Temple City Unified School District	General Education (Multiple/Single Subject) Induction Program
Touro University	Clear Education Specialist Credential Program

***Withdrawal of an Approved Program***

For a variety of reasons, institutions may choose to no longer offer an approved program. Institutions are encouraged to formally seek a withdrawal of these programs thus removing the program from the Commission’s accreditation system. The program is then no longer considered a Commission-approved program. If an institution decides to offer a program in the future, it is a minimum of one year before a new program proposal will be accepted.

<b>Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (31)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
Azusa Pacific University	Preliminary Single Subject Program Health Services
	Preliminary Single Subject Program Home Economics
	Preliminary Single Subject Program Industrial and Technology Education
	Preliminary Single Subject Program Agriculture
Butte County Office of Education	Clear Education Specialist Induction Program
	General Education (Multiple/Singles Subject) Induction Program
California State University Fresno	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
California State University, Bakersfield	Clear Education Specialist Induction Program
	Education Specialist Level II – Mild/Moderate Credential Program
	Education Specialist Level II – Moderate/Severe Credential Program
California State University, San Bernardino	Clear Education Specialist Induction Program
	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education
	Reading Certificate
California State University, Stanislaus	California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) Program
Fielding Graduate University	Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program
Fresno Pacific University	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance
Madera County Superintendent of Schools	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
National University	Career Technical Education (CTE) Teacher Preparation Program
Ocean View School District	General Education (Multiple/Single Subject) Induction Program
Patten University	Multiple/Single Subject Credential Program

<b>Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (31)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
	Single Subject Credential Program
San Joaquin County Office of Education	Clear Education Specialist Induction Program
	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
	Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program
University of California, Riverside	Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling
Wiseburn Unified School District	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education
	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance
	Education Specialist – Added Authorization: Traumatic Brain Injury

***Reactivation of Inactive Program***

An inactive program may be reactivated only when the institution submits a request to the COA and the COA has taken action to reactivate the program. If the preconditions or the program standards under which the program was approved have been modified, the institution or program sponsor must address the updated preconditions or standards before the program may be reactivated. During 2016-17, eight programs previously deemed inactive requested and received reactivation and are once again fully approved programs operating in California.

<b>Reactivation Requests (8)</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program</b>
Butte County Office of Education	Clear Education Specialist Induction Program
	General Education (Multiple/Singles Subject) Induction Program
California State University, Fullerton	Multiple Subject Intern Program
California State University, Long Beach	Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education Program
Escondido Union High School District	General Education (Multiple/Single Subject) Induction Program
Glendale Unified School District	General Education Induction Program
San Diego Unified School District	Single Subject Intern Program
University of Southern California	Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling

***Initial Institutional Approval***

The Committee on Accreditation does not have authority to approve the eligibility of institutions to offer educator preparation programs in California. Rather, Initial Institutional Approval is within the purview of the Commission. Once the Commission determines that an institution is eligible to offer educator preparation in California, the program proposals by those institutions are brought forward to the COA for its consideration and action. This new processes were approved by the Commission in 2016 and were revisited and changes made in February 2017. The following institutions are the first institutions to be approved under the new system.

<b>Initial Institutional Approval (5)</b>	
Turlock Unified School District	Provisional Approval
Fortune School	Eligibility Approved
Santa Barbara Unified School District	Eligibility Approved
Las Virgenes School District	Eligibility Approved
Burton School District	Eligibility Approved

***Institutions that are No Longer Approved Program Sponsors***

The following institutions are no longer approved program sponsors.

<b>Institutions No Longer Approved Program Sponsors</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Previously Approved to Offer</b>
Wiseburn Unified School District	Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization: Early Childhood special Education Added Authorization: Emotional Disturbance Added Authorization: Traumatic Brain Injury
Patten University	Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject

### Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2017-18

The work plan for the Commission and COA for 2017-18 is summarized in this section. Having spent considerable time devoted to technical assistance in 2016-17 and in establishing the new processes and procedures of the accreditation system, the focus of 2017-18 will be in completing those aspects of the new system that need to be further developed, restarting a full schedule of site visits, and further development and implementation of those aspects of the system that need have yet to be developed or implemented fully.

For 2017-18, the COA identifies the following priorities.

#### **Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession**

*Maintain public access to the Committee on Accreditation.* All Committee meetings will continue to be held in public and all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. In addition, meetings will be broadcast to allow any individual with access to the Internet the ability to hear live or recorded broadcasts of all Committee meetings. The Commission's website will continue to be utilized fully to provide agenda items, notification of meetings, as well as broad-based access to critical accreditation materials for institutions and others interested in accreditation. Meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

August 7, 2017  
November 17, 2017  
February 22-23, 2018  
March 22-23, 2018  
May 10-11, 2018  
June 28-29, 2018

The Committee's schedule in 2017-18 includes a full schedule of site visits beginning in the fall of 2017 and well into the spring. Twenty-nine site visits are scheduled for site visits. This schedule will take place while also implementing all aspects of the new accreditation system such as Program Review, Annual Data Submission, Preconditions Review, and Common Standards Review.

Continuing in 2017-18, the *PSD ENews*, Program Sponsor Alerts, and press releases will be routinely used to ensure a transparent accreditation process.

*Preparation and presentation of COA reports to the Commission.* The Committee on Accreditation will present its annual report to the Commission in December 2017. Additional updates and reports to the Commission will be provided as necessary and appropriate throughout the year.

*Commission liaison.* Maintaining a liaison from the Commission to the COA continues to be key to ensuring that the work of the COA and the accreditation system are aligned with the objectives and vision for the new accreditation system set forth by the Commission. The Commission's

liaison will continue to provide an important perspective to COA discussions and serve as an effective means of communication between the COA and the Commission.

*Continued Implementation of a fee recovery system for certain accreditation activities and an annual accreditation fee system.* The Commission adopted a cost recovery plan, and regulations, for the review of new programs and for accreditation activities outside the typical accreditation cycle in October 2013. In addition, in 2014, the Commission implemented an annual accreditation fee. The annual accreditation fee structure was reviewed in 2016 by the Commission in light of new standards and new requirements and new regulations proposed. The Commission staff will continue to work with the Office of Administrative Law to ensure that the regulations are adjusted to fit the various aspects of the new accreditation system.

## **Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality**

*Professional accreditation of institutions and their credential preparation programs.* This is one of the principal ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has been given full responsibility for making the legal decisions regarding the continuing accreditation of education institutions and their credential programs.

### *Site Visits – Green Cohort*

Beginning in the fall of 2017, the Green Cohort, comprised of 29 institutions, will undergo a site visit by a trained team of reviewers. These site visits will be the last site visits for which some aspects of the old accreditation system will be used while also incorporating aspects of the new aspects of the system. For instance program assessment documents were submitted by the Green cohort institutions and reviewed in 2014-2015. This was prior to the implementation of the new Program Review process which is now in use for all other cohorts. However, the site visits for the green cohort in 2017-18 was also the first to use the new Common Standards review process whereby narrative is limited and there is much more reliance on authentic documentation.

### *Program Standards Review – Yellow Cohort*

Program Review submissions were required for the Yellow Cohort by October 15, 2017. The Yellow Cohort is comprised of 36 institutions offering numerous educator preparation programs. These programs will be reviewed in the 2017-18 year through this Program Review process. This Program Review process, like the new Common Standards process, focuses on very specific evidence and documentation submitted that allows reviewers to determine, without extensive narrative, whether the program is preliminarily aligned to program standards. This information will be used to determine the focus of the site visit in Year 6.

The Commission staff has coordinated and assigned at least two experts in each of the credential areas to review each program submission from the Yellow Cohort. The vast majority of these review sessions are scheduled throughout November and December 2017 and will take place in a face to face manner at different locations in the state in order to review the documents expeditiously. Once the review session has taken place, the



programs have an opportunity to provide an addendum responding to any areas of concern or areas needing additional information. This addendum will be used by the site visit team to determine whether the standards is met.

The Program Review sessions also serve as Part I of a two part BIR training. Those who participate either in Program Review or Common Standards review will be considered to have completed Part I BIR training, with the site visit training being Part II of BIR training.

#### *Common Standards Submission and Review – Yellow Cohort*

In February 2018, the 36 institutions that are in the Yellow Cohort will submit their documentation, in accordance with the new procedures, to demonstrate alignment with the Common Standards. One to two Common Standards reviewers and a Team Lead will be selected for each institution and will be brought together in the spring to review these submissions. The institutions will have the opportunity to provide additional information in the form of an addendum to respond to concerns or questions from reviewers. This addendum will serve to further inform the site visit reviewers. The Common Standards reviewers and the team lead that reviewed the Common Standards, will also be the Common Standards team and the team lead for the site visit so they will be very familiar with the evidence and documentation prior to arriving on site for the site visit.

Those that serve on a Common Standards review will have completed Part I of the BIR training. (See Program Standards Review).

#### *Preconditions Submission –*

In March 2018, the institutions in the Indigo and Orange cohorts will submit their preconditions responses. Staff will review these preconditions and require follow up as soon as it is determined that there are questions involving any preconditions. If some preconditions responses are unresolved, the COA will be notified and further action will be taken as deemed appropriate by the COA.

#### *Annual Data Submission*

All Commission approved program sponsors will submit required data in 2018. It is anticipated that staff will work closely with the COA, the Commission and the field in general to further refine and clarify the information that is required in the Annual Data System. In addition, further work will be done to determine what data should be incorporated into the data dashboards with easy access for the general public.

*Review and revise the [Accreditation Handbook](#).* The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. The COA has already completed a comprehensive review and update of the *Accreditation Handbook* to ensure that any new or changed aspects of the accreditation system were reflected in this document. As the new system is implemented, if any language needs to be adjusted in the Handbook to reflect these changes, Commission staff with the COA will make sure the language is clear. In

addition, there is likely to need to be some clarification of language in the Handbook in order to ensure approval of the cost recovery regulations and to satisfy the Office of Administrative Law.

### **Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards**

*Review and take action to grant initial approval of new program sponsors.* As part of the Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation Project the Commission approved a new, more rigorous Initial Institutional Approval process for institutions seeking to become a Commission-approved program sponsor. At least 2 Accreditation 101 sessions will be held at various times during the year for institutions interested in becoming a Commission-approved program to better understand the expectations and responsibilities of being a program sponsor and to begin the approval process. Commission staff and BIR members will continue to review proposals for Initial Institutional Approval as they are received.

*Review and take action to grant initial program approval for new credential programs.* This is also one of the major ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The COA has developed procedures for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Programs are only being given initial approval when the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's standards are met. This review process will continue in 2017-18. When possible, the Commission will bring reviewers together for dedicated review time, as well as encourage the participation of additional reviewers from the in-kind contribution option.

*Continue to Review and Approve Subject Matter Programs.* Although subject matter programs are not fully part of the accreditation system, there is a continued need to review and approve Elementary Subject matter programs to allow completion of a subject matter program to waive the subject matter examination. Given the significant and continuing interest in this effort, it is anticipated that the Commission will continue to need numerous trained reviewers and dedicated review time to ensure that this activity is conducted efficiently in order to allow these programs to begin operations quickly. In addition, the Commission will continue to review and approve other subject matter programs as they are submitted.

### **Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement**

*Data – Annual Data Submission and Survey Data.* The Commission will continue to develop and refine the annual survey data collection process and hold discussions with the COA about the appropriate use of that data in accreditation decisions. In addition, there remains significant work to be done around the annual data submission. These discussions will continue this year and it is anticipated that specific data elements, definitions for data sources, and means of collecting, reporting, and analyzing within the newly developed data system and data dashboards will take place. The technical advisory committee convened in 2017 will be consulted as necessary as the further development and implementation of the Annual data System progresses.

*Continued implementation of the evaluation system for the accreditation system.* The COA will continue to refine the evaluation tool that is used by site visit reviewers, team leads, and institutions to evaluate the accreditation system. This data will be collected over the course of

the year, with a review of the data taking place in the summer of 2018. Improvements will be discussed and incorporated into the revised accreditation system.

*Continue partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate.* The Commission staff will continue to work with institutions that seek to be both nationally accredited and state accredited as well as with CAEP and any other potential accrediting bodies, to ensure that the process is as streamlined as possible. The Commission staff continues to keep abreast with changes to the CAEP accreditation system, determine the alignment or misalignment with California's process and standards, and to clarify areas of uncertainty with respect to some of the CAEP standards for applicability to California's institutions.

*Explore ways to align and streamline the accreditation of other national and professional organizations with that of the state processes.* With the advent of the work around the Pupil Personnel Services program standards, it will also be important to revisit the alignment of any new standards adopted by the Commission with the appropriate national accrediting bodies.

### **Continue Development and Implementation of the Revised Accreditation System**

Section 1 of this report provides information about the many aspects of the new accreditation system developed and/or implemented in 2016-17. The list below provides some brief information on some of the remaining aspects of the work that will need to continue in order to realize the full vision of the Commission for its accreditation system.

1. *Provide Technical Assistance on the Wide Variety of Revisions to Standards, Policy and Procedures.* Although 2016-17 was devoted to technical assistance, it may be necessary to continue to provide the field with further technical assistance over the course of the next year as new aspects of the accreditation system are further developed. For instance, the Annual Data System is at this point in its infancy and already, there is a need for more technical assistance on this topic.
2. *Revising the Board of Institutional Review Training.* Given how significantly the standards and competencies have changed, as well as the shift in reviewing programs and standards without such a reliance on long narrative, an important focus of 2017-18 will be to continue to revamp the Board of Institutional Review training. As previously mentioned in this document, the BIR training is now comprised of two parts – Part I is participation in either A) Common Standards Review or B) Program Review, and Part II is participation in Site Visit Training. The training involved in Part I for both Common Standards and Program Standards reviewers has been implemented successfully this past year. The focus of 2017-18 will be on developing the Site Visit training.

The success of the new accreditation system will depend on reviewers not only understanding the intricacies of what is being asked, but also a big picture understanding of the objectives of the Strengthening and Streamlining project. Commission staff

anticipates developing a site visit training session that will be successful for the veteran reviewer who needs retraining with the new approach and vision as well as new reviewers with little to no experience, but expertise in the credential areas.

3. *Continue Discussing the Role, Purpose, and Specificities of Annual Data.* A focus for 2017-18 will be to continue the discussion about the types of required data that institutions should submit annually, the expectations around that data, and its uses in accreditation. Staff will work to establish the specific protocols necessary to ensure smooth submission of the data into the data system and identify which data elements are part of the data dashboard. In addition, BIR members will need to be trained in how to analyze and use the data appropriately in accreditation.
4. *Continued implementation of surveys for the following constituencies:*
  - a. Preliminary Multiple Subject Completer Survey
  - b. Preliminary Single Subject Completer Survey
  - c. Preliminary Education Specialist Completer Survey
  - d. Preliminary Administrative Services Completer Survey
  - e. Clear/Induction Multiple and Single Subject Completer Survey
  - f. Clear Education Specialist Induction Completer Survey
  - g. Master Teacher Survey
  - h. Employer Survey

In addition, significant work will need to be done in 2017-18 to ensure that consistent policies and procedures are established regarding the manner in which the survey results are used in accreditation.

5. *Next generation of performance assessments* – As the development of the next generation of teaching performance assessments and the development of administrator performance assessments continues, the COA and Commission staff will begin to review the various implications of that work. Providing some guidance for reviewers, and ensuring that both institutions and reviewers understand the new models, any data from the rubrics, as well as the implementation standards that support the new models will be critical in 2017-18.
6. *Establishing and implementing processes and procedures for identifying exceptional programs.* Building on the discussions that have taken place thus far, the Commission will continue to explore a variety of options to ensure that those institutions with particularly strong or innovative programs are able to be recognized and share their experiences and accomplishments with the broader education community. The Committee on Accreditation will provide feedback on the system as it develops and in its early implementation.

**General Operations**

In addition to the above-mentioned items, the COA will engage in routine matters necessary for general operations of the Committee. This includes the election of Co-Chairs, the adoption of a meeting schedule, and orientation of new members.

## Program Sponsors by Accreditation Cohort

<b>California State University (23)</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
Cal Poly, Pomona	Indigo	CSU Monterey Bay	Violet
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo	Orange	CSU Northridge*F	Yellow
CalState TEACH	Orange	CSU Sacramento	Orange
CSU Bakersfield*F	Indigo	CSU San Bernardino	Green
CSU Channel Islands	Green	CSU San Marcos	Indigo
CSU Chico*S	Indigo	CSU Stanislaus	Yellow
CSU Dominguez Hills*F	Red	Humboldt State University	Indigo
CSU East Bay	Green	San Diego State University	Yellow
CSU Fresno*S	Violet	San Francisco State University	Violet
CSU Fullerton*F	Blue	San Jose State University*S	Orange
CSU Long Beach*S	Indigo	Sonoma State University	Red
CSU Los Angeles*F	Red		

<b>University of California (8)</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
UC Berkeley	Red	UC Riverside	Blue
UC Davis	Violet	UC San Diego	Violet
UC Irvine	Violet	UC Santa Barbara	Orange
UC Los Angeles	Red	UC Santa Cruz	Red

<b>Independent Institutions (56)</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
Academy of Art	Orange	Notre Dame de Namur University	Green
Alliant International University	Blue	Pacific Oaks College	Violet
Antioch University	Violet	Pacific Union College	Red
Argosy University*	Indigo		
Azusa Pacific University*S	Indigo	Pepperdine University	Red
Bard College	Blue	Phillips Graduate Institution	Blue
Biola University	Yellow	Point Loma Nazarene University*S	Red
Brandman University*S	Indigo	St. Mary's College of California	Orange
California Baptist University	Orange	San Diego Christian College	Yellow
California Lutheran University*F	Green	Santa Clara University	Yellow
Chapman University~	Orange	Simpson University	Green
Claremont Graduate University	Violet	Stanford University	Blue
Concordia University	Red	Teachers College of San Joaquin	Indigo
Dominican University of California	Blue	The Master's College	Orange
Fielding Graduate University	Indigo	Touro University	Yellow
Fresno Pacific University	Yellow	United States University	Blue
Hebrew Union College	Violet	University of La Verne*S	Orange
Holy Names University	Blue	University of Phoenix	Orange
Hope International University	Violet	University of Redlands	Indigo
Humphreys College	Green	University of San Diego*F	Red
La Sierra University	Violet	University of San Francisco	Indigo
Loma Linda University	Blue	University of Southern California*	Violet
Loyola Marymount University*S	Yellow	University of the Pacific*S	Orange
Mills College	Green	Vanguard University	Blue
Mount St. Mary's College	Indigo	Western Governors University	Yellow
National Hispanic University	Yellow	Westmont College	Green
National University*	Violet	Whittier College	Yellow
		William Jessup University	Yellow

<b>Other Program Sponsors (Districts/County Offices/Other) (168)</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
Assoc. of CA School Admin/ASCA	Orange	Mt. Diablo USD (210): Fortune School of Education	Blue
Alhambra USD (401)	Orange	Murrieta Valley USD (616)	Violet
Anaheim City SD (501)	Yellow	Napa COE (111)	Yellow
Anaheim Union HSD (502)	Orange	New Haven USD (211)	Violet
Animo Leadership Charter HS (438)	Indigo	Newark USD (205)	Green
Antelope Valley Union HSD (601)	Violet	Oak Grove SD (237)	Blue
Antioch USD (101)	Green	Oakland USD (212)	Red
Arcadia USD (435)	Red	Ocean View SD (530)	Blue
Aspire Public Schools (232)	Orange	Oceanside USD (517)	Green
Azusa USD (402)	Orange	Ontario-Montclair SD (609)	Yellow
Bakersfield City SD (301)	Green	ORANGE County DOE (518)	Blue
Baldwin Park USD (403)	Indigo	ORANGE USD (519)	Red
Bay Area School of Enterprise/REACH (234)	Red	Palmdale SD (610)	Blue
Bellflower USD (404)	Blue	Palo Alto USD (213)	Violet
Brentwood Union SD (108)	Indigo	Palos Verdes Peninsula USD (416)	Violet
Burbank USD (405)	Red	Panama-Buena Vista Union SD (314)	Yellow
Butte COE (103)	Orange	Paramount USD (431)	Orange
California School of the Deaf/Fremont (238)	Blue	Pasadena USD (419)	Indigo
Campbell Union SD (203)	Red	Placentia-Yorba Linda USD (520)	Indigo
Capistrano USD (504)	Yellow	Placer COE (114)	Red
Central USD (302)	Indigo	Pleasanton USD (230)	Red
Ceres USD	Yellow	Pomona USD (420)	Yellow
Chaffey Joint Union HSD (602)	Blue	Poway USD (521)	Red
		PUC Schools (437)	Blue
Chino Valley USD (603) #	Yellow	Redwood City SD (214)	Red
Chula Vista ESD (505)	Red	Rialto USD (611)	Orange
Clovis USD (303)	Yellow	Riverside COE (612)	Red
Compton USD (434)	Violet	Riverside USD (613)	Yellow
Conejo Valley USD (231)	Orange	Rowland USD (421)	Yellow
Contra Costa COE (204)	Red	Sacramento City USD (116)	Violet
Corona –Norco USD (604)	Blue	Sacramento COE (115)	Indigo
Culver City USD (407)	Red	Saddleback Valley USD (528)	Yellow
Cupertino Union SD (236)	Violet	San Bernardino City USD (614)	Green
Davis Joint USD (104)	Red	San Diego COE (515/525)	Green
Dos Palos Oro Loma Joint USD (323)	Red	San Diego USD (522)	Indigo
El Dorado COE (105)	Violet	San Dieguito Union HSD (524)	Indigo
El Rancho USD (430)	Orange	San Francisco USD (215)	Violet
Elk Grove USD (106)	Blue	San Gabriel USD (422)	Yellow
Encinitas Union SD (514)	Blue	San Joaquin COE (315)	Indigo
Envision Schools (235)	Violet	San Jose USD (216)	Indigo
Escondido Union SD (508)	Blue	San Juan USD (117)	Green
Escondido Union HSD (507)	Violet	San Luis Obispo COE (218)	Blue
Etiwanda SD (605)	Yellow	San Marcos USD (531)	Orange
Evergreen SD (229)	Green	San Mateo-Foster City SD (233)	Green
Fairfield-Suisun USD (107)	Green	San Mateo COE (219)	Blue
Fontana USD (606)	Orange	San Ramon Valley USD (222)	Indigo
Fremont UHSD	Yellow	Sanger USD (324)	Violet
Fremont USD (206)	Orange	Santa Ana USD (533)	Green
Fresno COE (304)	Green	Santa Barbara CEO (223)	Orange
Fresno USD (305)	Blue	Santa Clara COE	Blue
Fullerton SD (516)	Blue	Santa Clara USD (225)	Yellow
Garden Grove USD (532)	Green		
Glendale USD (409)	Blue	Santa Cruz COE (226)	Yellow

<b>Other Program Sponsors (Districts/County Offices/Other) (168)</b>			
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Cohort</b>
Greenfield Union SD (306)	Yellow	Santa Monica-Malibu USD (424)	Indigo
Grossmont Union HSD (510)	Blue	Santa Rosa City Schools (118) #	Orange
Hacienda La Puente USD (410)	Green	Saugus Union SD (423)	Green
Hanford ESD (321)	Red	Selma USD (316)	Violet
Hayward USD (207)	Orange	Sequoia Union HSD (227)	Violet
High Tech High (537)	Indigo	School for Integrated Academics and Technology/SIA Tech (536)	Orange
Imperial COE (511)	Violet	Shasta COE	Yellow
Inner City Education Foundation (ICEF)/LAUSD (436)	Violet	Sonoma COE (112)	Yellow
Irvine USD (535)	Violet	Stanislaus COE (317)	Yellow
Keppel Union SD (607)	Orange	Stockton USD (119)	Indigo
Kern County SOS (307)	Violet	Sutter County SOS (121)	Red
Kern High SD (308)	Blue	Summit Public Schools	Yellow
King Chavez (539)	Green	South San Francisco USD	Yellow
Kings COE (309)	Orange	Sweetwater Union HSD (526)	Orange
La Mesa-Spring Valley SD (512)	Green	Tehama County DOE (113)	Blue
Lancaster SD (608)	Indigo	Temple City USD (425)	Red
Lawndale ESD (411)	Blue	Torrance USD (426)	Blue
Lodi USD (109)	Yellow	Tracy USD (120)	Indigo
Long Beach USD (412)	Blue	Tulare City SD (318)	Red
Los Angeles COE (413)	Green	Tulare COE (319)	Green
Los Angeles USD (414/443/441-448)	Red	Tustin USD (527)	Blue
Los Banos USD (325)	Violet	Vallejo City USD (123)	Blue
Madera COE	Green	Ventura COE (228)	Indigo
Madera USD (310)	Indigo	Visalia USD (320)	Indigo
Magnolia Public Schools (538): Pacific Tech Schools-ORANGE County #	Blue	Vista USD (529)	Indigo
Manteca USD (311)	Red	Walnut Valley USD (428)	Yellow
Marin COE (110)	Red	Washington USD (125)	Violet
Merced COE (312)	Green	West Contra Costa USD (124)	Orange
Merced Union HSD (322)	Orange	West Covina USD (427)	Indigo
Metropolitan Education District	Indigo	Westside Union SD (615)	Indigo
Milpitas USD (208)	Orange	Wm S Hart Union HSD (429)	Violet
Modesto City Schools (313)	Orange		
Montebello USD (417)	Green		
Monterey COE (209)	Blue		

*\*Those institutions highlighted are nationally accredited (NCATE/TEAC) and currently moving toward CAEP accreditation.*