

Discussion and Approval of 2018-19 Annual Report of the COA October 2019

Overview of this Report

This agenda item presents the *Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation 2018-19* for the Committee's 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 at its November 2019 meeting.

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 item is scheduled to be presented at the November 21-22, 2019 Commission meeting.

Next Steps

Upon adoption of the report, the Commission staff will ensure that comments and suggestions made during the Committee's discussion are incorporated into the version that will be presented to the Commission. In addition, appropriate appendices will be added to the document. The Committee 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 the Committee chairs at the November 2019 Commission meeting and then placed on the Commission's website in the reports section.



**Annual Report of the Committee on
Accreditation to the Commission on
Teacher Credentialing**

2018-2019

DRAFT

Dear Commissioners:

On behalf of the Committee on Accreditation (COA), we submit to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) the *2018-19 Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing* in accordance with the provisions of the California Education Code and the *Accreditation Framework*. This report presents an overview of the activities and accomplishments of the COA over the past year, the results of its accreditation decisions for the year, and its work plan for 2019-20.

In 2018-19 the COA continued the important work begun to strengthen and streamline the accreditation system. Ensuring that the various aspects of the revised accreditation system are developed and incorporated effectively into the system has required careful consideration and, at times, meticulous attention to detail. Over this past year, the COA, together with staff, continued to assess and refine new aspects of the system such as Common Standards and Program Review. We also began the implementation of other aspects of the system such as consideration and use of data provided by institutions in the data warehouse, development of data dashboards, use of survey data in site visits, and implementation of entirely new Board of Institutional Review trainings. Notably, this work was accomplished while considering site visits reports for 35 institutions, following up on the actions taken by institutions to address stipulations from the prior year, and ensuring proper oversight over numerous new programs and new program sponsors.

As we enter the 2019-20 accreditation year, we are committed to fulfilling our responsibility to ensuring that prospective new educators in California are served by high quality programs and emerge from those programs well prepared for the challenges facing our state's PK-12 public education system. 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.

Sincerely,

Dr. Anna Moore
Committee Co-Chair

Dr. Robert Frelly
Committee Co-Chair

**The Committee on Accreditation
2018-19**

Jose Luis Alvarado

Dean College of Education
California State University, Monterey Bay

Cathy Creasia

Director of Accreditation and
Credentialing
Rossier School of Education
University of Southern California

Deborah Erickson

Professor and Dean School of Education
Point Loma Nazarene University

Cheryl Forbes

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

Robert Frelly

Director of Music Education
Chapman University

Iris Riggs

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

Cynthia Amos

College and Career Coach
Los Angeles Unified School District

Suzanne Borgese

Education Specialist
Placentia-Yorba Linda USD

Jomeline Balatayo

English Language Development Teacher
Culver City High School

Katrine Czajkowski

Program Manager, Teacher Induction

Anna Moore

Principal
Olivet Elementary Charter School

Gerard Morrison

Teacher
Long Beach Unified School District School

Table of Contents

Introduction	6
Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee’s Work Plan in 2017-18.....	9
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession	10
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality	12
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards.....	17
Purpose 4. Foster Continuous Program Improvement	21
Other Activities.....	22
General Operations	23
Section II: Summary of Accreditation Activities 2017-18	24
Accreditation Status for Institutions with Site Visits	24
Institutions in 7 th Year Follow Up	29
Initial Institutional Approval.....	30
Initial Approval of New Credential Programs.....	31
Initial Approval of New Subject Matter Programs	31
Programs Entering Inactive Status	31
Program Seeking Reactivation	32
Programs Transitioning to New Standards.....	32
Withdrawal of Programs	33
Institutions No Longer an Approved Program Sponsor	35
Preconditions Review	35
Institutions in Program Review and Common Standards Review.....	37
Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee in 2017-18.....	39
Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and the Profession	39
Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality	40
Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards.....	41
Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement.....	42
Continued Development and Implementation of Accreditation System.....	43
General Operations	45
Appendix A: CTC Accreditation Cohorts.....	46

Introduction: Summary of Activities of the Accreditation System

The 2018-19 year continued the important work of refining and improving the new accreditation system. Significant progress was made by the Commission, the Committee on Accreditation (COA), and the Commission staff with respect to implementation of the revised accreditation system. The accreditation system is the primary means by which the Commission ensures quality in educator preparation in California. Following a multi-year effort to strengthen and streamline accreditation, including the development of new or revised activities and requirements envisioned by the Commission, and a year of substantial technical assistance to the field in 2016-17, the Commission resumed full accreditation activities including site visits in 2017-18 and this work continued in 2018-19.

The major objectives of the revised 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 peers determine each program's quality and effectiveness in order to retain their accreditation status review evidence.
- 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.

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

Annually	Data Submission
Years 1 and 4	Submission of Preconditions Documentation
Year 5, fall	Program Review Submission
Year 5, spring	Common Standards Submission
Year 6	Site Visit
Year 7	Follow Up to address issues of concern, if needed

Each Commission-approved institution has been assigned to a “color cohort” signifying 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

Access to consistent data elements from all institutions and programs (such as program enrollment, pathways offered, and/or length of program) and outcomes data (such as those from candidates, employers, field experience supervisor surveys, as well as information from assessment results), is an important part of the new accreditation system. The Annual Data Submission by institutions allows the Commission to better identify specific information about credential programs operating in California. The infrastructure for the system was built in 2017 with institutions submitting initial data in summer 2018. Institutions continued the reporting process by submitting data for the second year in summer 2019.

PRECONDITIONS REVIEW

Preconditions for institutions sponsoring educator preparation are grounded in California Education Code, Title 5 Regulations, or Commission policy. Responses to Preconditions are submitted in Years 1 and 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 any Precondition.

PROGRAM REVIEW

In fall of Year 5 of the cycle, each credential program provides specific required evidence or documentation demonstrating that the program is aligned to each of the Commission's adopted program standards for the particular credential area. Documentation is reviewed by trained educators with expertise in the credential area and a conclusion is formed about whether programs are preliminarily aligned with the Commission's standards. The institution is provided feedback and then must provide an addendum at least 60 days prior to the accreditation site visit addressing any areas that were not found to be preliminarily aligned. This information helps focus and inform the accreditation site visit in Year 6. To further ensure transparency, a subset of the experts that reviewed Program Review submissions in Year 5 serve as site visit team members in Year 6.

COMMON STANDARDS REVIEW

In spring of 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 is preliminarily aligned. 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 information helps focus and inform the accreditation site visit in Year 6. The same individuals that review the Common Standards in Year 5 serve on the site visit team in Year 6.

SITE VISITS

A team of trained peer evaluators who are members of the Commission's Board of Institutional Reviewers are selected for each site visit. These individuals work together to determine whether the institution and its programs meet the Commission's adopted standards and make an accreditation recommendation to the Committee on Accreditation. In

addition to determining whether standards are met, the purpose of the site visit is to evaluate the extent to which the program is effectively implemented. As part of the site visit, all data, information, and results from review of Preconditions, Program Review, and Common Standards as well as the institution's response to any feedback from these activities are provided to the site visit team not less than 60 days prior to the site visit. At the site visit in-depth interviews are conducted with program completers, candidates, employers, program faculty and administrators, advisory committees, and other appropriate stakeholders so that team members can triangulate the evidence and data provided during Years 1-5 of the accreditation cycle.

DECISION BY THE COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

The Commission is assisted in the implementation of the accreditation system by the Committee on Accreditation (COA). This body is comprised of twelve members of the education community – six from postsecondary education and six K-12 practitioners – who have been appointed by the Commission. 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 depends on the commitment of hundreds of experts in the field. Members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers are comprised of those who have a role in preparing educators and practitioners themselves - who are trained and calibrated to review programs and conduct site visits.

This report presents information about the major activities of the accreditation system, the COA decisions that were made, and some of the major areas of focus for academic year 2018-19.

Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2018-19

The Commission's Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation Project was a multipronged effort that began late in 2014 and continued throughout 2018-19. Building on the significant work accomplished in prior years, the major activities continued or begun in 2018-19 included the following:

- Development and implementation of new CalTPA and CalAPA
- Development and implementation of numerous data dashboards
- Development and implementation of surveys to inform program improvement and accreditation decisions – program completers for Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, administrator, teacher induction, employers, and master teachers
- Development and implementation of new surveys for other credential areas
- Implementation of new processes to strengthen oversight of programs such as ability to close a program (within a larger institution) and ability to differentiate more frequent site visits for some programs
- Adoption and implementation of new Special Education Program Standards
- Adoption of new Special Education Teaching Performance Expectations
- Adoption of Preconditions and Program Standards for Pupil Personnel Services Credential Programs
- Development of the revised Single Subject Matter Program Standards and review process
- Adoption of amendments to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations related to Cost Recovery Fees for Extraordinary Accreditation Activities
- Development and implementation of a process used to take action with respect to late documents
- Development of process to establish the baseline eligibility criteria for programs seeking identification as Program Exemplars
- Development and implementation of the revised Initial Program Review (IPR) process.

The items that follow represent a summary of the key aspects of the accreditation system undertaken during the 2018-19 year. Over the past year, the Commission's Professional Services Division, the Committee on Accreditation, and numerous volunteer experts from the field, have continued to work diligently to implement the vision of the Commission for its accreditation system as defined by the multi-year project to strengthen and streamline the Commission's accreditation system.

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 6, 2018
- November 7, 2018
- January 31, 2019
- March 14, 2019
- May 2-3, 2019
- June 27, 2019

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, videoconferencing technology was used 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 to travel to the Commission offices. Unfortunately, recent changes to the Commission’s communications system no longer allow for simultaneous web broadcasting and web conferencing. Because the videoconferencing capability is a necessity for COA business, the simultaneous web broadcasting had to be suspended. However, the videoconferencing link is available to anyone who wishes to listen to the meeting in real time and the meetings are recorded and available on the Commission’s website soon after the meeting.

[PSD News](#). The PSD E-news, developed in 2008, continued to be distributed weekly. This electronic notification reaches over 2,700 individuals including all approved institutions, to inform them of accreditation-related activities such as the development and revision of standards, technical assistance opportunities, and notification of requests for stakeholder comment. This number has grown each year.

[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 in the 2018-19 year, issuing 12 PSAs during the period July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 as follows:

Program Sponsor Alerts June 30, 2018-July 1, 2019

Number	Issue Date	Title
18-03	August 24, 2018	Commission Adoption of Preliminary Education Specialist Program Standards and Teaching Performance

Number	Issue Date	Title
18-04	September 28, 2018	Preliminary Education Specialist Program Implementation Timeline Update Replaced by: PSA 19-07
18-05	September 28, 2018	Requirements of the Preliminary Teacher Preparation Program to Support the Completer's Transition to a Teacher Induction Program
18-06	December 20, 2018	Accreditation Data System (ADS): Important Dates for 2018-19, Distinction between Contacts and Users,
19-01	March 12, 2019	Impact of Document Issuance Date on Educator Preparation Programs' Number of Documents Issued in a Fiscal Year (July 1 to June 30)
19-02	March 12, 2019	Guidance for Teacher Preparation Programs for Title II requirements for Supervised Clinical Experience
19-03	May 2, 2019	Approval by the Office of Administrative Law of Title 5 Regulations Allowing for a Single Induction Experience
19-04	May 8, 2019	Information for California Institutions seeking Joint Accreditation from the Commission and CAEP
19-05	May 31, 2019	Clarification on District Employed Supervisor Orientation and Support; Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Programs
19-06	June 21, 2019	Passing Score Standards for the CCTC's Redeveloped California Teaching Performance
19-07	June 26, 2019	Transition Plan for Preliminary Education Specialist Programs to the 2018 Program Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations [Replaces PSA
19-08	June 28, 2019	Additional Language in the Assessment Design Standards for Commission-Approved Teaching Performance Assessments

The PSA is used to communicate to program sponsors instructions for a particular task or information about a specific issue such as the adoption of new standards by the Commission or clarification of requirements and deadlines. Program Sponsor Alerts will continue to be used to provide information to the field when necessary as they have served the objective well.

Maintain Public Website of All Accreditation Results and Status for Each Institution. The Commission maintains a website where all [accreditation site visit reports](#) and actions taken by the COA are 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 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 member Dr. Cheryl Forbes presented the COA annual report to the Commission at the [November 29, 2018 Commission Meeting](#).

Commission Liaison. The Commission's liaison to the COA provides an important perspective to COA discussions and serves as an effective means of communication between the COA and the Commission. For the 2018-19 year, the liaison to the COA was Commissioner Haydee Rodriguez who attended the COA meetings regularly.

Implementation of an Annual Accreditation Fee and a Fee Recovery System for Certain Accreditation Activities. In 2018-19, 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 2018-19 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.

In addition, 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 2018-19 the Commission began the process to update this section of Title 5 of the regulations to align with the revised accreditation system approved by the Commission. The regulatory package was withdrawn by staff based on feedback from the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). Staff will continue to work on this with the OAL in 2019-20.

Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality

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. In 2016-17, the Commission approved the deferment of scheduled site visits for one year in order to provide time for the institutions to plan and implement the vast number of changes required by the Strengthening and Streamlining Project, including new standards and requirements for programs. Beginning in Fall 2017, site visits were reinstated for all Commission-approved programs beginning with the Green Cohort. The effort to phase in new aspects of the accreditation system continued in 2018-19 such as the submission of data in the Annual Accreditation Data System and the inclusion of survey results to inform the accreditation teams' work.

In 2018-19, thirty-five (35) institutions hosted site visits resulting in the following decisions:

- 25 institutions Accredited including 5 with a 7th year follow up report required
- 8 institutions Accredited with Stipulations
- 1 institution Accredited with Major Stipulations
- 1 institution Accredited with Probationary Stipulations

Ensuring Institutions Addressed Stipulations. All institutions with stipulations are expected to address any stipulations within one year. However, the COA may allow additional time if it believes the institution has made sufficient progress and additional time is warranted. Four institutions had received stipulations in the previous year as a result of their site visit. The COA removed the stipulations fully in 2018-19 for three institutions. The remaining institution made significant progress and was given additional time to address the remaining stipulations.

For institutions receiving major stipulations or probationary stipulations, the COA has more frequently required that the institution provide interim reports (quarterly or other) to ensure that the institution is making adequate progress towards addressing the most egregious issues. This was the case in 2018-19. This approach allows the institutions to check with COA to ensure they are moving in the direction that the COA expects, provides some additional leverage with their institutional leadership to ensure the resources or tools to enact change are provided, and allows the COA to provide some suggestions and guidance along the way. From an accountability perspective, it ensures that the institution does not wait a full year before implementing required improvements.

Technical Assistance Efforts. The Commission continued to provide technical assistance throughout 2018-19 for institutional personnel to provide information and support around changes in accreditation. The Accreditation Technical Assistance webpage on the Commission's website continued to be used and stakeholders were kept informed of upcoming technical assistance opportunities through emails and the PSD e-News. Additionally, staff made itself available to present and discuss information about the accreditation system or standards implementation at a variety of stakeholder meetings and conferences throughout the year. A partial listing of these include: the California Induction Conference, the Credential Counselor and Analysts of California Conference (CCAC), the California Council on Teacher Education (CCTE), the Special Education Administrators of County Offices, the Advisory Commission on Special Education at CDE, the statewide Special Education Local Planning Area (SELPA) director's meeting, the California Professors of Special Education (CAPSE), Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR), California Council of Academic Programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders (CAPCSD), California Association of Private Special Education Schools, and the California Association of Professors of Education Administration.

In addition, staff continues to provide critical technical assistance to institutions preparing for site visits. This includes a year out phone call/video conference or in person meeting with key accreditation staff at the institution, a minimum of a monthly phone call with the institution to

help them as they prepare final documentation or respond to reviewers feedback and, finally, a 2 month out previsit, usually held in person, to ensure that all logistics are handled appropriately and necessary evidence will be available to the team when it arrives.

Technical Assistance for Institutions Preparing for 2018-19 Site Visits (35 Institutions)

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendee
Year-Out from Site Visit Consultant Pre-visit	Spring 2018 – Summer 2019	Consultant and institution
Monthly Phone/Zoom Conferences	Began Summer 2018, continuing until visit	Consultant and institution
2 Month Out Previsit	2 months before each site visit	Consultant, Site Visit Team Lead,

Technical Assistance for Institutions Preparing for Program Review and Common Standards Submissions

Commission staff also held technical assistance sessions for institutions that were preparing to submit for their Common Standards review and Program Review.

Activity	Number or Date/Location
Preparation for Institutions Submitting Program Review and Common Standards Review	8 Sessions hosted through videoconferencing

Technical Assistance for the Accreditation Data System (ADS)

Given that the Accreditation Data System was newly implemented in 2018-19, significant technical assistance was needed to ensure that program sponsors understood how to access, change, and upload data to the system as well as how to respond to some of the requirements for the data in unique situations. As a result, the PSD staff instituted a series of office hours in which questions could be asked by institutions. These office hours proved to be instrumental in ensuring that the data was submitted within the timeframe allotted. Because of the success, office hours were instituted again for the current 2019-20 submission period.

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location
ADS Weekly Office Hours (2 hours/week)	July 1, 2018 to August 31, 2018 (9 sessions)
ADS Weekly Office Hours (1-2 hours/week)	March 6, 2019 to June 25, 2019 (16 sessions)

Training Activities for the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR)

The accreditation system is reliant upon a cadre of volunteer educators and educator preparers. Training of these volunteers to serve as reviewers for all of the components of accreditation is essential to the success of the system. The BIR site visit training was entirely redesigned in 2018-19 to align to the new system.

Activity	Number or Date/Location
Board of Institutional Review (BIR) Site Visit Training	August 16-17, 2018 September 20-21, 2018 October 23-24, 2018
BIR Team Lead Training and Review	July 10, 2018 July 17, 2018
Common Standards Reviewer Training and Review	8 Common Standards Training and Review Sessions between April 5 and June 19, 2019 (Various locations)
Program Review Training and Review	15 Program Review Sessions between October 30, 2018 and January 29, 2019 (Various locations)

Technical Assistance Provided to Institutions Seeking Initial Approval

Attending an informational session for entities that are interested in seeking initial institutional approval is a required part of the Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) process. Institutions must come with a team of individuals including their partner organizations. Attendance of Accreditation 101 is the first requirement in a multi-step process.

Date	Number of Institutions	Types of Institution
August 21, 2018	2 institutions	IHE LEAs
December 11, 2018	6 institutions	IHEs LEAs
March 25, 2019	4 institutions	IHEs LEAs

Other Related Activities

The Professional Services Division maintains numerous email accounts to ensure that specific accreditation related questions are answered quickly and accurately. The following are a list of some of the accreditation related email tools by which staff is able to provide direct technical assistance to institutional and program personnel as questions arise.

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location
Cohort Consultant Email (i.e. PSDRed@ctc.ca.gov)	Ongoing daily
Accreditation email (accreditation@ctc.ca.gov) (General accreditation emails)	Ongoing daily
Program Review Email (ProgramReview@ctc.ca.gov)	Ongoing daily
Annual Accreditation Data System (ADS@ctc.ca.gov)	Ongoing daily
Professional Services Division Consultant Emails	Ongoing daily

*Average of 50 per week per consultant

Technical Assistance for Individual Institutions. Staff fields numerous questions daily from institutions seeking input on changes they are considering making to their programs, revisions to the standards, particular candidate issues, and a host of other topics. In addition, from time to time, Commission staff travel to institutions with particular challenges (such as one that experiences a large turnover in program or institutional leadership) who need some additional guidance and direction about accreditation and program implementation. This effort is intended to address challenges or resolve issues in a more proactive manner for the benefit of the candidates in these programs.

Accreditation Handbook revisions. The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. In 2018-19, as the Commission moved into the implementation phase of the new accreditation system and adjustments were made to the processes as this implementation took place, revisions to the *Accreditation Handbook* reflecting these refinements were discussed and the handbook was updated as necessary. This work continues in 2019-20.

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 2018-19, 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. With the efforts to streamline and strengthen accreditation this function continues to be critically important in 2019-20.

Technical Assistance for California Administrator Performance Assessments (CalAPA)

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location	Attendees (approx.)
CalAPA Implementation Think Tanks	Sept. 18 / Riverside COE Sept. 26 / Sacramento COE October 18 / San Diego	65 45 55
CalAPA Virtual Think Tanks	Oct. 26 / Online presentation Dec. 7 / Online presentation Jan. 25 / Online presentation Feb. 22 / Online presentation March 29 / Online presentation April 26 / Online presentation May 31 / Online presentation	40 - 60
CalAPA Implementation Conference	May 17 / Riverside COE May 22 / Wm. Jessup University	60
Clear Induction Implementation Think Tank	Oct. 4 / Santa Clara Oct.9 / CSUN Oct. 25 / OCDOE	20 25 35

Technical Assistance for California Teaching Performance Assessments (CalTPA)

Technical Assistance Activity	Date/Location
CalTPA Virtual Office Hours	July – June Weekly, Thursday, Online
CalTPA Virtual Think Tank Sessions	July – June, Monthly, Online
CalTPA Faculty Training Chico State	August 24, Online
CalTPA Faculty Training UC Santa Cruz	September 6, Online
CalTPA Faculty Training UCLA	February 22, Online
CalTPA Implementation Conference	April 18, San Diego
	May 14, Sacramento

Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards

Review and take action to grant initial approval of new program sponsors. During 2018-19, the Commission's new initial institutional approval policy for institutions seeking to become a Commission-approved program sponsor of educator preparation programs in California was in full implementation. The requirements for an institution to become a Commission-approved educator preparation program sponsor in California were substantially revised in recent years. The Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) process now includes five stages: Stage I – Prerequisites; Stage II – Eligibility Requirements; Stage III – Alignment with all Common Standards and relevant Preconditions; Stage IV – Provisional Approval; and Stage V – Full Approval. Accreditation 101 sessions (Stage I) for institutions exploring whether to seek initial institutional approval to offer an educator preparation program continued to be held throughout 2018-19. As anticipated, fewer institutions participated in Accreditation 101 due to the fact that many did so in the previous years. Accreditation 101 was offered three times in 2018-19.

In 2018-19 four institutions were brought to the Commission for consideration and approval for either Stage II (Eligibility Requirements) or Stage III (Alignment with Standards) of the IIA process. These institutions are listed in Section II of this report. Many other entities were engaged in the submission and review process.

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 from Commission-approved institutions. Programs are only granted initial approval when reviewers have determined that all Commission standards are met and after COA acts to approve. This review process continued in 2018-19. Because institutions may submit program proposals any time 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 18 new programs were approved by the COA in 2018-19. The list of these new programs

is included in Section II of this report. Staff is currently reviewing ways in which to streamline this process as it is challenging to find sufficient number of reviewers who are willing to do this work.

Establish New COA Review Process for Initial Program Approval for Institutions Recently Approved for Provisional Approval by the Commission

In 2018-19, the COA began using a new program approval process for institutions that were recently granted provisional approval by the Commission. After the reviewers had determined that all standards for a new program proposal from a provisionally approved institution were met, all of the documentation was provided to the COA prior to its approval. Additionally, personnel from the institution is invited to attend the COA meeting to respond to questions about the proposed program. In the past, any documentation on any program proposal was available to the members of COA at their request, however, this new process provides the COA with more information about the program proposal than was made routinely available to the COA in the past.

Review of Preconditions. The Commission's new accreditation system requires that responses to preconditions be submitted and reviewed in Years 1 and 4 of the 7-year cycle. For the March 2019 submission, institutions in both the Blue and the Red cohorts were required to submit evidence of meeting all relevant preconditions. These two cohorts represent 68 institutions offering 315 different programs. For these two particular groups of institutions, this resulted in a staff review of evidence for 816 general preconditions and 2,435 program specific preconditions. While this is a significant undertaking, staff review of the information provided helps ensure that programs are complying with state statutes, regulations, and Commission policy and allows the accreditation teams to focus on review of the standards.

Because the timeliness of feedback on preconditions was not optimal in previous years, staff instituted a number of changes to the process over the past two years. While most consultants have responsibility for reviewing the submitted preconditions responses, a single staff member has been designated the responsibility of shepherding the submission process, making follow through clearer to all staff. In addition, to assist institutions in avoiding submitting unnecessary or inapplicable evidence or responses, staff developed Evidence Guidance documents to clarify what type of documentation would satisfy the requirements. Staff continues to develop these Evidence Guidance documents for all credential areas. Under the new precondition submission process, staff has been able to identify potential issues early and to begin to work with the institution to address them in a timely manner.

Program Review Process. In 2016-17, the new Program Review process was developed and finalized. Beginning in the fall of 2017, the Commission transitioned to using this new streamlined Program Review process of submitting very specific evidence with limited narratives describing how the institution was implementing the standards in its programs. This process was continued for a second year in the fall of 2018 with the Orange cohort.

The feedback from reviewers and institutions alike regarding the revised accreditation system has continued to be overwhelmingly positive reflecting strong support for the new system. Whereas under the previous system it could take many weeks or months to complete a review of the voluminous submissions, reviewers are now able to complete the task of reviewing the evidence submitted by institutions in one to two days. Reviewers have also reported a better understanding of the program under this new process. Institutional personnel have communicated that they have a better understanding of the exact types of evidence needed for program submissions and that the new process has removed some of the guess work out of knowing what is needed and limited the temptation to provide significantly more descriptive information than is what is required. Feedback is provided to the institutions in a much timelier manner.

Common Standards Review Process. Commission staff developed and the COA approved a new streamlined approach to Common Standards review. As with the new approach to Program Review, Common Standards submissions require prescribed documentation and information as well as limited but focused narrative. The new Common Standards review process was implemented for the first time in early 2018 informing site visits that took place in fall 2018 and spring 2019. In 2019, the process continued with the next cohort and the results are being used to inform the site visits taking place in 2019-20. Like the Program Review process, reviewers continue to express 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. Additionally, feedback was provided to the institution between 8-10 months prior to their site visit whereas the prior system only allowed for feedback a month or so before the visit. This has allowed institutions to address concerns well in advance of the site visit. Keeping the consistency in the reviewer from Common Standards and Program Review through the site visits has helped ensure that questions and potential issues are followed up appropriately at the site visit.

Development and Implementation of the Annual Data System. The development of a new annual data system was one of the key components to the Strengthening and Streamlining project. The contractor's work in building the infrastructure of the system which was intended to allow institutions to provide consistent data about their programs, candidates, and outcomes was completed in June of 2017. Commission staff piloted the system in 2017-18 and it was more fully implemented in 2018-19. 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 both the public-facing data dashboards and those dashboards which are designed for institutions, Commission staff, and site visit review teams.

Technical Assistance was provided to institutions by Commission staff in the summer and fall of 2019 and again from March 2019 to August 2019. Staff conducted Accreditation Data System (ADS) office hours on a weekly basis via videoconferencing technology. These office hours were to support institutions in accessing the ADS, creating accounts, connecting

individuals to the institution, giving individuals appropriate roles, and answering questions related to the data questions. Office hour dates and times were listed on the [Accreditation Technical Assistance](#) page and provided in the weekly PSD e-News. Staff continuously worked with and provided support to institutions in the use of the ADS. Updates were shared at prior COA meetings. Staff also developed ADS [resources](#) such as guidance documents, FAQs, and video presentations to support institutions in understanding the ADS.

Implementation of Survey Instruments. Using data from survey instruments is one important component to ensuring the inclusion of outcomes in the accreditation system. In 2018-19, surveys continued to play an increasing role in accreditation. Surveys from program completers in Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, and Administrative Services as well as Clear Administrative Services, General Education Induction, and Clear Education Specialist Induction programs continued to be implemented and integrated into the online credential application process. Completers may elect to not respond to the survey, yet the response rate remains high. The response rate for the surveys are such that the results are now useable for accreditation purposes. Completer Surveys are open from September 1 to August 31 annually with the survey results (Program Reports) being sent to institutions in October for the prior year.

In addition to these program completer surveys, the Commission administers both a Master Teacher Survey and an Employer Survey. The Master Teacher Survey is open from September 1 to August 31 annually. Preliminary teacher preparation programs send the link to the Master Teacher Survey to all their master teachers as well as submit information to the Commission on the total number of master teachers that program has that year. The Employer Survey is open in the fall—October to 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](#).

New in 2019 was the implementation of the “Other Educators Survey” to capture survey information from program completers for the remaining credential areas not included in teaching or administrator preparation programs. This includes those programs such as Pupil Personnel Services, School Nurse, Teacher Librarian, Speech Language Pathology and other credentials. This information is available for the first time in 2019.

Because the response rate was sufficiently high for the program completer surveys, the results were used by accreditation teams in 2018-19. All accreditation site visit teams were instructed to use the completer surveys to develop questions for further interviews, to inform their understanding of the program’s possible areas of strength and areas in potential need of improvement, and to discuss results with the program personnel. In addition, the results could be used to streamline the accreditation process. When the response rate is high and the feedback positive for an institution and its programs, a smaller number of program completers may be needed for interviews during the site visit. Staff built into the new BIR training some

time to discuss how to use the results from the various surveys.

Develop and Implement a New Team Lead Training. In early Fall of 2018, the Commission staff held two Team Lead training sessions for those individuals who would be leading site visit teams in 2018-19. 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. This training was updated and repeated in the summer and the fall of 2019 for team leads for the Orange Cohort site visits which began in fall 2019. These trainings were very successful and well attended.

Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement

Noting Programs Out of Compliance with Accreditation Timelines. 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 2018-19 at each COA meeting. These included institutions that were late in submitting required preconditions, Common Standards, Program Review, Accreditation Fees, and Annual Data submissions. 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. Staff has been monitoring how effective and efficient the new processes and procedures are with each new implementation effort. Staff frequently requests information from reviewers and institutions on these new processes. Some changes and "tweaks" to the system have been instituted as a result of feedback from reviewers and institutions. In addition, post site visit evaluations are completed by team leads, consultants, all team members, and institutional personnel. This information is used to make improvements to the system, to identify possible team leads in the future, to identify any future additions to training and technical assistance opportunities, and to address any concerns that may exist as a result of the manner in which the Commission's accreditation processes have been implemented.

Continue partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and efforts to collaborate with other national accrediting bodies, where appropriate. A Partnership Agreement between the Commission and CAEP was signed by both parties in May 2015. During 2018-19, 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. In addition, Commission staff attended 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 and are able to identify any work necessary to maintain a joint review process for institutions seeking both state and national accreditation. The first California institution to undergo a joint CTC/CAEP site visit took place in spring 2019.

Also in 2018-19, the Commission began discussions with a new national accrediting body, the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP). National accreditation is optional in California and institutions may choose seek accreditation from any national accrediting body it wishes. Because some institutions in California have expressed an interest in this new accrediting body as an alternative to CAEP, staff has been monitoring the development of this new accrediting body and its standards and requirements. Commission staff continues to work on a draft crosswalk and, if any institution in California informs the Commission that it will seek AAQEP accreditation, the Commission can also choose to determine the necessary protocols for working formally with this entity on accreditation visits.

Board of Institutional Reviewer's (BIR) Training. Following the substantial revisions to the accreditation system's processes and procedures and the incorporation of outcomes data such as survey results, it became clear that the existing training for both new and veteran members of the BIR needed significant revision. Under the previous BIR training, most of the training took place face to face over a period of 3-4 days and focused significant attention on the review of the voluminous documentation required under the previous accreditation system.

The revised BIR training is divided into two major components: 1) Program Review or Common Standards Review, and 2) Site Visit Training. In the Program Review and Common Standards Review component, the reviewers are trained to review and analyze a prescribed set of evidence as part of an institution's/program's required submission and determine, primarily on the basis of the evidence, whether the standards appear to be preliminarily aligned.

Once individuals have completed either the Program Review or Common Standards training and review, they are invited to attend the two-day face to face site visit training. The site visit training focuses on the skills and abilities necessary to serve on a site visit team. These include, but are not limited to: understanding the documentation submitted prior to the site visit (preconditions, program review, and Common Standards); the role and importance of standards; conflict of interest, bias, and confidentiality; the use of program completer survey results and other survey data; the role of the data submitted by institutions in the Annual Data submission process; interview techniques for the site visit; decision making for reaching standard findings and making accreditation recommendations; and report writing.

The first revised BIR training took place in August 2018 with approximately 30 individuals. Two more trainings have taken place in 2018-19 for a total of 90 new individuals trained as BIR members. The revised training has been well received and numerous individuals trained have served on site visits in 2018-19 and are scheduled to serve in 2019-20.

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, since 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 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 program to count as demonstration of subject matter competence for the Multiple Subject credential, reversing years under the No Child Left Behind Act in which only passage of the CSET for the Multiple Subject credential was allowed. 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 became a priority for the Commission.

In 2018-19 ten new subject matter programs were approved by the Commission after review by subject matter experts that determined the programs to be in alignment with the subject matter program standards. Five of these were Elementary subject matter programs and five were Single Subject subject matter programs. These are listed in Section II of this report.

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 2018-19 Accreditation Activities

This section of the report provides more detailed information about results of the 2018-19 Work Plan with a focus on the outcome of the accreditation activities.

Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Credential Preparation Programs

In 2018-19, accreditation site visits were hosted at 35 institutions in the Yellow Cohort. Accreditation decisions were made based upon the written reports of the evidence gathered at the site visit, recommendations made by the site visit team, and the COA interview of program leadership and the team lead. Teams reviewed documentation, interviewed a variety of constituencies (candidates, program completers, faculty, employers, administration, supervisors, etc.), deliberated, came to consensus on findings for all Common Standards, program standards, and made an accreditation recommendation to the COA. Commission consultants, team leads, and institutional representatives attended COA meetings to present the results of the site visit report and respond to questions. Upon review and discussion of the site visit reports, the COA has the authority to accept or modify the team’s accreditation recommendation. Copies of the site visit team reports are available on the [Commission’s website](#).

The COA made the following accreditation determinations in 2018-19:

Accreditation Status for Institutions with Site Visits in 2018-19 (35)

Program Sponsor	Accreditation Status
Anaheim Elementary School District	Accreditation with Stipulations
Biola University	Accreditation
California State University, Northridge	Accreditation
California State University, Stanislaus	Accreditation
Capistrano Unified School District	Accreditation
Ceres Unified School District	Accreditation
Clovis Unified School District	Accreditation
Etiwanda School District	Accreditation
Fremont Union High School District	Accreditation with Stipulations
Fresno Pacific University	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
Greenfield Union School District	Accreditation
Lodi Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations
Loyola Marymount University	Accreditation
Napa County Office of Education	Accreditation with Stipulations
Ontario-Montclair School District	Accreditation
Panama-Buena Vista Union School District	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
Pomona Unified School District	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
Riverside Unified School District	Accreditation
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations
San Diego Christian College	Accreditation

Program Sponsor	Accreditation Status
San Diego State University	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report
San Gabriel Unified School District	Accreditation
Santa Clara Unified School District	Accreditation
Santa Clara University	Accreditation with Stipulations
Santa Cruz County Office of Education	Accreditation
Shasta County Office of Education	Accreditation
Sonoma County Office of Education	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations
South San Francisco Unified School District	Accreditation with Stipulations
Stanislaus County Office of Education	Accreditation
Summit Preparatory Charter High School	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
Touro University	Accreditation
Walnut Valley Unified School District	Accreditation
Western Governors University	Accreditation with Stipulations
Whittier College	Accreditation
William Jessup University	Accreditation with a 7th Year Report

Institutions Meeting All Standards

The institutions listed in the table below hosted an accreditation site visit in 2018-19 which resulted in determining that all Common Standards and all Program standards for all programs offered by the institution had been met. Of the 35 site visits, 16 institutions (46%) with site visits in 2018-19 met all standards applicable for the programs they offer.

Institutions Receiving Accreditation with All Common and Program Standards Met, 2018-19

Program Sponsor	Number of Programs
Biola University	5
California State University, Stanislaus	10
Capistrano Unified School District	2
Ceres Unified School District	1
Clovis Unified School District	1
Etiwanda School District	1
Greenfield Union School District	1
Loyola Marymount University	11
Ontario-Montclair School District	1
Riverside Unified School District	1
San Gabriel Unified School District	1
Santa Clara Unified School District	1
Santa Cruz County Office of Education	1
Shasta County Office of Education	1
Stanislaus County Office of Education	2
Walnut Valley Unified School District	1

Summary of Findings on Common Standards

A review of the year’s site visit results serves as information for the COA and staff in determining needs for technical assistance meetings to guide institutions as they prepare for site visits. The information regarding findings using the new Common Standards for 2018-19 site visits are presented in the following table.

Findings in the Common Standards¹ 2018-19 Accreditation Site Visits (35 Institutions)

Common Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	29	4	2
2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	33	2	0
3: Study, Fieldwork, and Clinical Practice	27	8	0
4: Continuous Improvement	28	5	2
5: Program Impact	34	1	0

¹The language of the Common Standards may be found at [Common Standards](#)

Summary Findings on Program Standards

Analysis of Program Standards Decisions

The table below indicates the number of institutions in which all program standards were met for the program listed and the number of institutions that offer that program.

All Program Standards Found to be Met 2018-19 Site Visits

Programs	# of Institutions with All Program Standards Met for the listed program	Total # of Institutions that offer the listed program
Added Authorization- Adaptive Physical Education	1	1
Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders	2	2
Bilingual Authorization	4	5
Clear Administrative Services Credential	6	7
Designated Subjects- Career Technical Education	1	2
Designated Subjects- Special Subjects	1	1
Designated Subjects- Supervision and Coordination	1	1
Education Specialist- Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization	3	3
Education Specialist- Mild/Moderate	7	9
Education Specialist- Moderate/Severe	5	7

Programs	# of Institutions with All Program Standards Met for the listed program	Total # of Institutions that offer the listed program
Preliminary Administrative Services,	7	8
Preliminary Multiple Subject /Single Subject	8	14
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	5	5
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	4	4
Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare & Attendance	2	2
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	3	4
Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist	4	4
California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)	2	2
Speech--Language Pathology	3	3
Teacher Induction	15	26
Teacher Librarian Services	1	1

Program Standards

The summary of the information gathered on all educator preparation programs with determinations of *Met with Concerns* or *Not Met* are presented in the tables below. If a standard is not listed, all institutions met that standard. As with the information about the Common Standards, this information about standards that we *Not Met* or were *Met with Concerns* guides the COA and staff in determining what additional technical assistance might be helpful to the field. The full text of all credential program standards adopted by the Commission may be found at: [Commission Adopted Credential Program Standards](#).

Bilingual Authorization: Spanish Standards (1 Site Visit)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
4: Bilingual Methodology	1	

Designated Subjects: Adult Education Standards (1 Site Visit)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Design and Rationale	n/a	1

Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education Standards (1 Site Visit)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Design and Rationale	n/a	1
6: Determination of CTE Teacher Competence	n/a	1

Preliminary Administrative Services Standards (1 Site Visit)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
2: Collaboration, Communication and Coordination	1	

Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities Standards (2 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination		1
11: Typical and Atypical Development	1	
15: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options	1	
16: Assessment of Candidate Performance	2	

Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Disabilities Standards (2 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination		1
11: Typical and Atypical Development	1	
15: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options	1	
16: Assessment of Candidate Performance	2	

Preliminary Multiple / Single Subject Standards (5 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Design and Curriculum		1
2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations	3	1
3: Clinical Practice	3	1
5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment	1	

Preliminary Single Subject Standards (6 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Design and Curriculum		1
2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations	3	1
3: Clinical Practice	3	1
5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment	1	

Teacher Induction Standards (11 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1: Program Purpose		1
2: Components of the Mentoring Design	2	
3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System	6	
4: Qualifications, Selection, and Training of Mentors	5	

Teacher Induction Standards (11 Site Visits)	Met with Concerns	Not Met
6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services	3	

Institutions in 7th Year Follow Up

In 2018-19, the COA continued to monitor progress made in addressing stipulations for any institutions with outstanding issues from previous year's visits. Although any institution with stipulations must address all stipulations within one year, the COA may choose to allow the institution more time if the COA is satisfied that significant progress is being made to address the stipulations. It should be noted that five of the six institutions had all stipulations removed and their status was changed to Accreditation in 2018-19. The other institution made significant progress towards the improvement of their programs, which resulted in the committee's approval to change their accreditation status from Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations to Accreditation with Stipulations.

Action taken in 2018-19 on Institutions with Stipulations from Prior Year Site Visits

Institutions	2017-2018 Decision	2018-2019 COA Decision
Holy Names University	Accreditation with Stipulations (previously Major Stipulations 2016-17)	November 7, 2018 Accreditation
Notre Dame de Namur University	Accreditation with Stipulations	May 2, 2019 Accreditation
Saugus Union School District	Accreditation with Stipulations	May 2, 2019 Accreditation
CSU Channel Islands	Accreditation with Stipulations	June 27, 2019 Accreditation
Montebello USD	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations	June 27, 2019 Accreditation with Stipulations
Newark USD	Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations	June 27, 2019 Accreditation

Initial Institutional Approval (IIA)

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 (Stage IV), the program proposals by those institutions are brought forward to the COA for its consideration and action. The following institutions were brought before the Commission for Initial Institutional Approval. The table identifies which of the five stages that was approved.

Initial Institutional Approval

Institution	St	Approval	Date
Burton School District	Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions	Provisional Approval	8/2/2018
Atwater Elementary School District	Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions	Provisional Approval	8/2/2018
Stella Middle Charter Academy	Stage II - Eligibility Requirements	Eligibility	2/7/2019
Alameda County Office of Education	Stage II - Eligibility Requirements	Eligibility	4/11/2019

Initial Approval of New Credential Programs (IPR)

Institutions seeking Initial Program Approval for new credential programs submit an Initial Program Common Standards response (or a Common Standards addendum if the institution has recently submitted Common Standards) and documentation that indicates how the proposed program will meet each of the Commission-adopted program standards along with supporting evidence to verify the claims made. A team of educators who have expertise in the program area and are trained for the review process read the institution's submissions 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 Commission staff. The institution addresses any concerns and resubmits documentation until the program is found to be aligned with all standards. Additionally, 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, the COA takes action to grant or deny program approval at its next scheduled meeting.

Initial Program Approval actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation in 2018-19 for new institutions are listed in the tables below.

The Committee on Accreditation granted Initial Program Approval for current institutions to the following preparation programs:

New Educator Preparation Programs Sponsored by Provisionally Approved Institutions (3)

Institutional Sponsor	Credential Program
Burton School District	Teacher Induction
University of California, Merced	Preliminary Multiple Subject/Single Subject Credential
Fortune School	Preliminary Multiple Subject/Single Subject Intern
Fortune School	Preliminary Education Specialist Intern
Fortune School	Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

Initial Approval of New Subject Matter Programs

Although subject matter programs are not part of the accreditation system, reviewing new program proposals is a significant part of the Professional Services Division priorities. The nine programs approved by the Commission in 2018-19 are included in the table below.

New Subject Matter Programs (9)

Institutions	Programs
California Baptist University	Elementary Subject Matter
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo	Subject Matter: Music
California State University, Chico	Elementary Subject Matter
California State University, San Marcos	Elementary Subject Matter
California State University, Chico	Subject Matter: Foundational-Level Mathematics
California State University, Northridge	Elementary Subject Matter
Mount Saint Mary's University	Elementary Subject Matter
University of California, Santa Barbara	Subject Matter Mathematics
University of California, Santa Barbara	Subject Matter Foundational-Level Mathematics

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. 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 14 programs became inactive in 2018-19.

Programs Entering Inactive Status (14)

Institution	Program
Azusa Pacific University (1)	Teacher Induction
California State University, Bakersfield (1)	Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
California State University, Northridge (1)	Education Specialist: Added Authorization – Emotional Disturbance
Dominican University of California (1)	Education Specialist: Added Authorization – Early Childhood Special Education
Dos Palos Oro Loma Joint Unified School District (1)	Teacher Induction
Point Loma Nazarene University (1)	Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance
San Jose State University (1)	Preliminary Administrative Services and Intern
Santa Clara University (1)	Clear Administrative Services
Sonoma County Office of Education (2)	Designated Subjects - Supervision and Coordination Designated Subjects - Special Subjects
United States University (3)	Preliminary Multiple Subject Preliminary Single Subject Bilingual Authorization: Spanish
University of California, Los Angeles (1)	Education Specialist: Added Authorization – Autism Spectrum Disorder

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 and/or the program standards under which the program was approved have been modified, the institution must address the updated preconditions and/or standards before the program may be reactivated. During 2018-19, one program previously deemed inactive requested and received reactivation and is, once again, a fully approved program operating in California.

Reactivation Requests (1)

Institution	Program
Chino Valley Unified School District	Teacher Induction

Transition of Professional Preparation Program

In 2016, the Commission adopted new Teacher Induction program standards and all induction programs were required to transition to these standards. The following charts indicates the final list of institutions who have now transitioned from the General Education and Education Specialist programs to Teacher Induction.

Transition of Professional Preparation Program (15)

Program Sponsor	Program Type
Biola University	Teacher Induction - General Education only
California State University, Dominguez Hills	Teacher Induction - Education Specialist only
California State University, Fresno	Teacher Induction - Education Specialist only
California State University, Los Angeles	Teacher Induction - Education Specialist only
California State University, Northridge	Teacher Induction - Education Specialist only
Central Unified School District	Teacher Induction - General Education only
Chaffey Joint Union High School District	Teacher Induction - General Education only
Fresno Unified School District	Teacher Induction - General Education only
Hebrew Union College	Teacher Induction - General Education only
Redwood City School District	Teacher Induction - General Education only
San Francisco State University	Teacher Induction - Education Specialist & General Education
San Jose State University	Teacher Induction - Education Specialist only
Santa Clara County Office of Education	Teacher Induction - Education Specialist only
Vallejo City Unified School District	Teacher Induction - General Education only
Whittier College	Teacher Induction - General Education only

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 from withdrawal before a new program proposal will be accepted.

Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (37)

Institution	
Antioch University (1)	Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern
Argosy University (1)	Preliminary Administrative Services
Azusa Pacific University	Education Specialist: Added Authorization – Autism Spectrum Disorder Teacher Induction
California State University, Bakersfield (1)	Preliminary Administrative Services - Intern
California State University, Long Beach (2)	Preliminary Single Subject – Home Economics, Traditional and Intern Preliminary Single Subject – Industrial and Technology Education, Traditional and Intern

Institution	Programs
California State University, Northridge (2)	Specialist Teaching Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (subsequently reactivated) Preliminary Single Subject Business Traditional and Intern Preliminary Administrative Services - Intern
Sacramento State University (2)	Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Reading and Literacy Added Authorization
Concordia University (2)	Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Intern Education Specialist: Added Authorization – Early Childhood Special Education
Fresno Pacific University (1)	General Education (MS/SS) Induction
Lawndale Elementary School District (1)	General Education (MS/SS) Induction
Orange County Department of Education (2)	Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Intern Preliminary Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Intern
Pepperdine University (1)	Clear Administrative Services
Rowland Unified School District (1)	General Education (MS/SS) Induction
San Diego State University (1)	School Nurse
San Diego Unified School District (2)	Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern Preliminary Single Subject Intern- All areas
San Jose State University (1)	Preliminary Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing Preliminary and Intern
Sonoma State University (4)	Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Adapted Physical Education: Added Authorization Education Specialist: Added Authorization – Autism Spectrum Disorders
Temple City Unified School District (1)	Teacher Induction
University of California, Berkeley (1)	Preliminary Single Subject Intern (all subject

Institution	Programs
University of California, Irvine (1)	Preliminary Single Subject Intern (all subject
University of California, Los Angeles (2)	Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern
	Preliminary Single Subject Intern (all subject areas)
University of California, San Diego (1)	Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern
University of San Diego (1)	Preliminary Administrative Services Traditional and Intern
University of the Pacific (1)	Education Specialist: Added Authorization – Autism Spectrum Disorders
Whittier College (1)	Teacher Induction

Institutions that are No Longer Approved Program Sponsors

The following institutions are no longer approved program sponsors as a result of withdrawing all of their remaining approved programs.

Institutions No Longer Approved Program Sponsors (3)

Institution	Effective Date
Argosy University	Closed Educator Preparation in August 2018
Rowland Unified School District	Closed Educator Preparation in August 2018
Lawndale Elementary School District	Closed Educator Preparation in June 2019

Preconditions Review

During Year 1 and Year 4 of the accreditation cycle institutions must respond to all relevant preconditions. Preconditions are grounded in statute, regulations, and/or Commission policy, and include general preconditions (institutional level) and program-specific preconditions for each approved program. During 2018-19, institutions in two cohorts (Red and Blue) submitted preconditions for review. Preconditions for only two cohorts of institutions will be reviewed each year. A total of 68 institutions submitted preconditions for 315 Commission approved programs resulting in 816 general precondition responses and 2,435 program specific precondition responses reviewed after the submission date of March 2019. The list below includes the names of institutions that submitted preconditions during this reporting period.

Preconditions – Red Cohort Institutions

Arcadia Unified School District	California State University, Los Angeles
Bay Area School of Enterprise (REACH Institute)	Campbell Union School District
Burbank Unified School District	Chula Vista Elementary School District
California State University, Dominguez Hills	Concordia University Irvine

Contra Costa County Office of Education
Culver City Unified School District
Davis Joint Unified School District
Dos Palos Oro Loma Joint Unified School District
Hanford Elementary School District
King-Chávez Neighborhood of Schools
Los Angeles Unified School District
Manteca Unified School
Poway Unified School District
Redwood City School District
Riverside County Office of Education
Sonoma State University
Sutter County Superintendent of School
Temple City Unified School District

District
Marin County Office of Education
Oakland Unified School District
Orange Unified School District
Pacific Union College
Pepperdine University
Placer County Office of Education
Pleasanton Unified School District
Point Loma Nazarene University
Tulare City School District
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Santa Cruz
University of San Diego

Preconditions – Blue Cohort Institutions

Alliant International University
Bellflower Unified School District
California School for the Deaf, Fremont
California State University, Fullerton
Chaffey Joint Union High School District
Chino Valley Unified School District
Corona-Norco Unified School District
Dominican University of California
Elk Grove Unified School District
Encinitas Union School District
Escondido Union School District
Fresno Unified School District
Fullerton School District
Glendale Unified School District
Grossmont Union High School District
Holy Names University
Kern High School District

Loma Linda University
Long Beach Unified School District
Monterey County Office of Education
Mt. Diablo Unified School District
Oak Grove School District
Orange County Department of Education
Palmdale School District
PUC Schools
San Luis Obispo County Office of Education
San Mateo County Office of Education
Santa Clara County Office of Education
Stanford University
Tehama County Department of

Education
 Torrance Unified School District
 Tustin Unified School District
 United States University

University of California, Riverside
 Vallejo City Unified School District
 Vanguard University

Program Review and Common Standards

During Year 5 of the accreditation cycle institutions must respond to the Common Standards and complete Program Review. Program Review is the activity during which key program evidence is reviewed to determine whether the educator preparation program appears to be aligned to program standards. During 2018-19, the 33 institutions of the orange cohort identified in the table below responded to Common Standards and completed Program Review. As indicated in the table below, these 33 institutions offer a total of 114 programs. To provide some understanding of the scope of this work, each program is reviewed by two individuals. Reviewing 114 programs then required the effort of over 220 reviewers matched by expertise and availability.

Orange Cohort Program Review 2018-2019

Institution	Initial Teacher Prep*	Teacher Induction	Other Teacher Prep**	Prelim Admin	Clear Admin	Other Services***	Total
Academy of Art	1						1
Alhambra USD		1					1
Anaheim Union HSD		1					1
ASCA (Assoc. of School Admin)					1		1
Aspire Berkley Maynard Academy		1					1
Cal Baptist	4			1		3	8
Cal Poly SLO	3		2	1			6
CalState TEACH	1	1					2
Chapman	4		1			3	8
Conejo Valley USD		1					1
CSU Sacramento	5		1	1		7	14
El Rancho USD		1					1
Fontana USD		1					1
Fremont USD		1					1
Hayward USD		1					1
Keppel Union SD		1					1
Kings COE		1			1		2
Merced Union HSD		1					1
Milpitas USD		1					1

Institution	Initial Teacher Prep*	Teacher Induction	Other Teacher Prep**	Prelim Admin	Clear Admin	Other Services ***	Total
Modesto City Schools		1					1
Paramount USD		1					1
Rialto USD		1					1
San Jose State	5	1	7			4	17
Santa Barbara CEO		1		1	1		3
SIA Tech		1					1
St. Mary's	3			1		2	6
Sweetwater Union HSD		1					1
The Master's University	2						2
UCSB	4					1	5
Univ. of La Verne	3		4	1	1	2	11
Univ. of Phoenix	2		1				3
Univ. of the Pacific	4			1		2	7
West Contra Costa USD		1					1
Total: 33	41	21	16	7	4	24	113

**Initial Teacher Prep - Traditional/Intern Preliminary Multiple, Preliminary Single Subject, and Preliminary Education Specialist*

***Other Teacher Prep - All Education Specialist Added Authorizations, Bilingual Authorizations, CTEL, Teacher Librarian, Designated Subjects, Reading and Literacy Added Authorization, Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential*

****Other Services - Pupil Personnel Services, School Nurse, Speech and Language Pathology*

Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2019-20

The work plan for the Commission and COA for 2019-20 is summarized in this section. Having focused in 2018-19 on implementing many aspects of the new system, the primary objective of 2019-20 will be the continued implementation of these new processes, refining them as needed, and the further development and implementation of those aspects of the system that have yet to be implemented fully.

For 2019-20, 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 6, 2019
October 24, 2019
February 27-28, 2020
March 26-27, 2020
May 7-8, 2020
June 25-26, 2020

The Committee's agenda in 2019-20 includes a full schedule of site visits beginning in the fall of 2019 and continuing well into the spring. Thirty-three institutions are scheduled for site visits. This schedule will take place while also implementing, and refining as needed, all aspects of the new accreditation system such as Program Review, Annual Data Submission, Preconditions Review, and Common Standards Review.

Continuing in 2019-20, the *PSD ENews*, Program Sponsor Alerts, and any other appropriate and applicable communications platforms 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 November 2019. 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, requirements, and regulations proposed. The Commission staff will continue to work with the Office of Administrative Law to ensure that the regulations are promulgated and 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 primary 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 – Orange Cohort

Beginning in the fall of 2019, the 33 institutions in the Orange Cohort will undergo a site visit by a trained team of reviewers. This cohort will be the second to undergo accreditation site visits having completed the new more efficient Program Review process for reviewing credential program documentation. The information from this process will be used by the site visit team to inform them about the programs prior to the site visit and a subset of the program reviewers have been chosen to serve on the site visit team.

Program Standards Review – Red Cohort

Program Review submissions are required for the Red Cohort by October 15, 2019. The Red Cohort is comprised of 33 institutions offering numerous educator preparation programs. These programs will be reviewed in the 2018-19 year through this Program Review process. This Program Review 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 inform 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 Orange Cohort. The vast majority of these review sessions are scheduled throughout November and December 2019 and early 2020 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 and feedback from the reviewers is provided to the institutions, the programs must provide an addendum 60 days before the site visit which responds 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 are 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 of BIR training, with the site visit training being Part II of BIR training.

Common Standards Submission and Review – Red Cohort

In February 2020, the 33 institutions that are in the Red Cohort will submit their documentation with evidence, in accordance with the new procedures, to demonstrate alignment with the Common Standards. One to two Common Standards reviewers and a Team Lead are selected for each institution and will be brought together in the spring to review these submissions. The institutions must provide additional information in the form of an addendum 60 days prior to the site visit 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.

Preconditions Submission – Green and Violet Cohorts

In March 2020, the institutions in the Green and Violet 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 2020. 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, it is anticipated that there will be a need for 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. Approximately 2-4 Accreditation 101 sessions will be held in 2019-20 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. Initial Program Review (IPR) 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 2019-20. When possible, the Commission will bring reviewers together for dedicated review time.

The Commission staff has identified the IPR process as among the most challenging aspects of the current system. For 2019-20, staff will be working to determine where and how this process can be made to be more efficient. Further, obtaining sufficient number of reviewers to ensure a timely review of program proposals has been increasingly more difficult. Staff will be devoting significant time to working with the COA to revise this process so that there is a more timely, yet sufficiently rigorous process for new program proposals.

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 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.

In addition, the Commission staff will focus efforts during 2019-20 on using these data to determine if they indicate any potential areas of concern either with an institution or with a standard or requirement. Analyzing the data from both the survey data and, to some extent, the annual data submissions, may allow the Commission to better understand if concerns are distributed evenly across institutions or concentrated in single institutions, suggesting that there may need to be a focused site visit or further exploration of an institution's programs.

Continued implementation of the evaluation system for the accreditation system. The COA will continue to use and examine the results of 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 2019. 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 COA will engage in reviewing the agreement and determining whether any changes will be necessary going forward. Because the first California institution to undergo a CAEP/CTC joint site visit was in spring 2019 and because CAEP standards and protocols are more developed than when the agreement was signed a few years ago, it is an opportune time to revisit the language of the agreement.

In addition, 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 processes 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. In 2019, the Commission Commission adopted new standards for the Pupil Personnel Services credential programs. Additional work to develop a crosswalk with national accrediting bodies in these professions will have to be developed as will regulations to implement the new standards.

Continue Development and Implementation of the Revised Accreditation System

Section I of this report provides information about the many aspects of the new accreditation system developed and/or implemented in 2018-19. 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.* Further technical assistance targeted to certain cohorts will be necessary over the course of the next year as each experience a new aspect of the accreditation system. In addition, additional technical assistance will be provided as additional work is done on aspects of the system such as building out Annual Data System to include teaching performance assessment data or data related to additional preparation program pathways. Ensuring that the field understands what is required and creating opportunities to provide feedback to the Commission staff as the processes are developed has been instrumental in the effective implementation of the system and will continue to play an important role in the future.
2. *Continue Discussing the Role, Purpose, and Specificities of Annual Data.* A focus for 2019-20 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.

3. *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. Teacher Induction Completer Survey
- f. Other Credential Programs Survey
- g. Master Teacher Survey
- h. Employer Survey

In the 2018-19 year, the Education Specialist and General Education Induction Program Completer survey was combined into a single Teacher Induction Survey. Additionally, a completer survey was developed and will be implemented to capture program completer information from all other credential areas.

The Commission staff and the COA will continue to ensure the appropriate use of survey data in accreditation activities. Further work will continue on the analysis of the data itself and the determination of processes and timelines for that analysis, the identification of any possible issues and trends, and the next steps in addressing these issues will be a focus for 2019-20.

4. *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 review the various implications of that work. Providing guidance for reviewers, and ensuring that both institutions and reviewers understand the new models and related expectations as articulated in the standards, incorporating the rubric level data into the Annual Data system and any other appropriate use for the data will be an important activity in 2019-20.

5. *Establishing and implementing processes and procedures for identifying exemplary practices.* In 2018-19, staff and the COA developed a process in which institutions that met the Commission's standards in the 2018-19 site visits might have the ability to identify, for one or more programs, an area where the program has developed an exemplary practice. The program would submit information on the practice with supporting data and documentation for review by a committee of experienced educators. Institutions with programs found to have exemplary practices would be featured on a new

page for Program Exemplars and available to provide technical assistance to other institutions interested in learning about how the practice has been effective and how it may be able to implement a similar practice at their own institution.

The work around implementing this effort to identify exemplary programs and continue to explore ways in which those institutions with particularly strong or innovative practices are able to be recognized has been challenging as staff resources are lacking to devote to this area. Staff will continue to work with Commission leadership on this effort in the hopes of making progress in this area. The Committee on Accreditation will provide feedback on the system as it continues to develop 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.

DRAFT

Program Sponsors by Accreditation Cohort

California State University (23)

Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
Cal Poly, Pomona	Indigo	CSU Monterey Bay	Violet
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo	Orange	CSU Northridge	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	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	Orange
CSU Long Beach*S	Indigo	Sonoma State University	Red
CSU Los Angeles*F	Red		

University of California (8)

Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
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

University of California (8)

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

Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
Pacific Oaks College	Violet		

Other Program Sponsors (Districts/County Offices/Other) (168)

Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
Assoc. of CA School Admin/ASCA	Orange	Mt. Diablo USD: Fortune School of Education	Blue
Alhambra USD	Orange	Murrieta Valley USD	Violet
Anaheim City SD	Yellow	Napa COE	Yellow
Anaheim Union HSD	Orange	New Haven USD	Violet
Animo Leadership Charter HS	Indigo	Newark USD	Green
Antelope Valley Union HSD	Violet	Oak Grove SD	Blue
Antioch USD	Green	Oakland USD	Red
Arcadia USD	Red	Ontario-Montclair SD	Yellow
Aspire Public Schools	Orange	Orange County DOE	Blue
Bakersfield City SD	Green	Orange USD	Red
Baldwin Park USD	Indigo	Palmdale SD	Blue
Bay Area School of Enterprise/REACH	Red	Palo Alto USD	Violet
Bellflower USD	Blue	Palos Verdes Peninsula USD	Violet
Brentwood Union SD	Indigo	Panama-Buena Vista Union SD	Yellow
Burbank USD	Red	Paramount USD	Orange
Butte COE	Orange	Pasadena USD	Indigo
California School of the Deaf/Fremon	Blue	Placentia-Yorba Linda USD	Indigo
Campbell Union SD	Red	Placer COE	Red
Capistrano USD	Yellow	Pleasanton USD	Red
Central USD	Indigo	Pomona USD	Yellow
Ceres USD	Yellow	Poway USD	Red
Chaffey Joint Union HSD	Blue	PUC Schools	Blue
Chino Valley USD	Blue	Redwood City SD	Red
Chula Vista ESD	Red	Rialto USD	Orange
Clovis USD	Yellow	Riverside COE	Red
Compton USD	Violet	Riverside USD	Yellow
Conejo Valley USD	Orange	Sacramento City USD	Violet
Contra Costa COE	Red	Sacramento COE	Indigo
Corona -Norco USD	Blue	Saddleback Valley USD	Yellow
Culver City USD	Red	San Bernardino City USD	Green
Cupertino Union SD	Violet	San Diego COE	Green
Davis Joint USD	Red	San Diego USD	Indigo
Dos Palos Oro Loma Joint USD	Red	San Dieguito Union HSD	Indigo
El Dorado COE	Violet	San Francisco USD	Violet
El Rancho USD	Orange	San Gabriel USD	Yellow
Elk Grove USD	Blue	San Jose USD	Indigo
Encinitas Union SD	Blue	San Juan USD	Green
Escondido Union SD	Blue	San Luis Obispo COE	Blue
Escondido Union HSD	Violet	San Mateo-Foster City SD	Green
Etiwanda SD	Yellow	San Mateo COE	Blue
Evergreen SD	Green	San Ramon Valley USD	Indigo
Fairfield-Suisun USD	Green	Sanger USD	Violet
Fontana USD	Orange	Santa Ana USD	Green
Fremont UHSD	Yellow	Santa Barbara CEO	Orange
Fremont USD	Orange	Santa Clara COE	Blue
Fresno COE	Green	Santa Clara USD	Yellow
Fresno USD	Blue	Santa Cruz COE	Yellow

Institution	Cohort	Institution	Cohort
Assoc. of CA School Admin/ASCA	Orange	Mt. Diablo USD: Fortune School of Education	Blue
Fullerton SD	Blue	Santa Monica-Malibu USD	Indigo
Garden Grove USD	Green	Saugus Union SD	Green
Glendale USD	Blue	Selma USD	Violet
Greenfield Union SD	Yellow	Sequoia Union HSD	Violet
Grossmont Union HSD	Blue	School for Integrated Academics and Technology/SIA Tech	Orange
Hacienda La Puente USD	Green	Shasta COE	Yellow
Hanford ESD	Red	Sonoma COE	Yellow
Hayward USD	Orange	Stanislaus COE	Yellow
High Tech High	Indigo	Stockton USD	Indigo
Imperial COE	Violet	Sutter County SOS	Red
Inner City Education Foundation (LAUSD)	Violet	Summit Public Schools	Yellow
Irvine USD	Violet	South San Francisco USD	Yellow
Keppel Union SD	Orange	Sweetwater Union HSD	Orange
Kern County SOS	Violet	Tehama County DOE	Blue
Kern High SD	Blue	Temple City USD	Red
King Chavez	Red	Torrance USD	Blue
Kings COE	Orange	Tracy USD	Indigo
La Mesa-Spring Valley SD	Green	Tulare City SD	Red
Lancaster SD	Indigo	Tulare COE	Green
Lodi USD	Yellow	Tustin USD	Blue
Long Beach USD	Blue	Vallejo City USD	Blue
Los Angeles COE	Green	Ventura COE	Indigo
Los Angeles USD	Red	Visalia USD	Indigo
Los Banos USD	Violet	Vista USD	Indigo
Madera COE	Green	Walnut Valley USD	Yellow
Madera USD	Indigo	Washington USD	Violet
Manteca USD	Red	West Contra Costa USD	Orange
Marin COE	Red	West Covina USD	Indigo
Merced COE	Green	Westside Union SD	Indigo
Merced Union HSD	Orange	Wm S Hart Union HSD	Violet
Milpitas USD	Orange		
Modesto City Schools	Orange		
Montebello USD	Green		
Monterey COE	Blue		

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