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

## 2020-21

DRAFT

Dear Commissioners:

On behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation we are pleased to present the *2020-21 Annual Report on Accreditation.*

The 2020-21 academic year was one like few other and presented a unique set of challenges for all of us involved in education and educator preparation. The traditional face to face, in person nature of our educational system was impacted in profound ways due to the continuing COVID-19 pandemic. As students, teachers, and prospective educators learned to navigate this new reality and the ever-changing circumstances in which they worked, adaptability and resilience became critical skills required of all. Despite the challenges presented to the COA as a result of the pandemic –many of which will be with us for years to come – we are heartened by the actions of California's educational community to search for new opportunities, to evaluate long held practices, and to pivot with varying levels of success to meet the challenges of the moment.

It is often said that from tragedy comes triumph and renewed commitment and transformed priorities. The past year has underscored the importance of understanding and responding to the needs of the whole child, the impact of inequities, the significance of social-emotional learning, the impact of trauma and mental health on a student's ability to learn, and the need for educators to build meaningful connections with families and caregivers. While candidates who were enrolled in preparation programs during the 2020-21 academic year may not have had the same experiences as their earlier counterparts, they nevertheless demonstrated strong commitment to the education profession through their persistence and progress in overcoming daily challenges, and thus are deserving of our continued, collective support and assistance.

As we begin 2021-2022 with a renewed sense of optimism, the COA welcomes the opportunity to partner with the Commission, California's vast array of preparation programs, and educators across the state, to address the long-term impacts of the pandemic on educator preparation and position our programs to address unanticipated changes and new realities. We are excited to enter this year and do our part to ensure that the challenges and lessons of 2020-21 continue to motivate all stakeholders towards the development of even richer and more meaningful programs.

Sincerely,

Dr. Anna Moore
Committee Co-Chair

Dr. Robert Frelly
Committee Co-Chair

DRAFT

**The Committee on Accreditation**
**2020-21**

**J. Kevin Taylor**
Director, School of Education
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

**Cathy Creasia**
Director of Accreditation and Credentialing
Rossier School of Education University of Southern California

**Cheryl Forbes**
Director of Teacher Education and Lecturer
University of California, San Diego

**Robert Frelly**
Director of Music Education
Chapman University

**Michael Hillis**
Dean, Graduate School of Education
California Lutheran University

**Lynn Larsen**
Professor
Brandman University

**Cynthia Amos**
College and Career Coach
Los Angeles Unified School District

**Jomeline Balatayo**
English Language Development Teacher
Culver City High School

**Katrine Czajkowski**
Program Manager, Teacher Induction
Sweetwater Union High School District

**Anna Moore**
Principal
Olivet Elementary Charter School

**Gerard Morrison**
Teacher
Long Beach Unified School District School

**Martin Martinez**
Director, School of Education
Sacramento County Office of Education

DRAFT

## Table of Contents

*Executive Summary* ..... *5*

*Introduction: Summary of Activities of the Accreditation System* ..... *7*

*Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2020-21* ..... *10*
- Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession ..... 11
- Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality ..... 16
- Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards ..... 21
- Purpose 4. Fostering Program Improvement ..... 25

*Section II: Summary of 2020-21 Accreditation Activities* ..... *27*
- Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Educator Preparation Programs ..... 27
- Accreditation Status for Institutions with Site Visits in 2020-21 (36) ..... 27
- Institutions Meeting All Standards ..... 28
- Institutions Receiving Accreditation with All Common and Program Standards Met, 2020-21 ..... 29
- Summary of Findings on Common Standards ..... 29
- Findings on Common Standards[1] 2020-21 Accreditation Site Visits (36 institutions) ..... 29
- Summary Findings on Program Standards ..... 30
- All Program Standards Found to be Met During 2020-21 Site Visits ..... 30
- Program Standards that are Met with Concerns or Not Met ..... 30
- Institutions in 7th Year Follow Up ..... 32
- Action taken in 2020-21 on Institutions with Stipulations from Prior Year Site Visits ..... 33
- Initial Approval of New Credential Programs (IPR) at Provisionally Approved Institutions ..... 34
- New Educator Preparation Programs Sponsored by Provisionally Approved Institutions (5) ..... 35
- New Educator Preparation Programs Approved by COA at Existing Commission Approved Program Sponsors (20) ..... 35
- Initial Approval of New Subject Matter Programs ..... 36
- Inactive Status ..... 37
- Reactivation of an Inactive Program ..... 37
- Transition of Professional Preparation Program to New Standards ..... 37
- Withdrawal of an Approved Program ..... 38
- Institutions No Longer Approved Program Sponsors (2) ..... 39
- Preconditions Review ..... 39
- Program Review and Common Standards ..... 43
- Violet Cohort Program Review 2020-2021 ..... 43

*Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2021-22* ..... *46*
- Purpose 1. Ensure Accountability to the Public and to the Profession ..... 46
- Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality ..... 48
- Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards ..... 50
- Purpose 4. Foster Program Improvement ..... 50

*General Operations* ..... *53*

*Appendix A: Program Sponsors by Accreditation Cohort* ..... *54*

DRAFT

## Executive Summary

The 2020-21 accreditation year continued to be impacted by in significant ways by the ongoing nature of the worldwide COVID-19 pandemic. All accreditation activities, including site visits, were also adjusted to reflect this new reality and to maintain full implementation of the system while continuing efforts to refine the newer aspects of the current system. Below is a summary of some of the major accreditation activities during the 2019-2020 year.

*Ongoing Accreditation Activities*

- Thirty six (36) site visits were completed in 2020-21. Out of the 36 site visits:
  - 33 visits were at institutions in the Red cohort
  - 3 visits rescheduled from 2019-20 due to the pandemic and reviewed in fall 2020.

- Of the 36 institutions with a site visit, 30 or 83 percent, received a status of Accreditation.
  - 6, or 17 percent of, institutions received Accreditation with Stipulations, Major Stipulations, or Probationary Stipulations.

- Additionally, site visits took place at:
  - 3 institutions that required revisits as a result of the 2019-20 visit that resulted in stipulations.
  - 3 institutions in provisional status seeking Initial Institutional Approval.

- Progress was monitored and stipulations removed for six (6) institutions reviewed in previous years including (including the 3 with revisits):
  - Four (4) with Stipulations
  - One (1) institution with Major Stipulations
  - One (1) received Probationary Stipulations.

  In all cases the COA removed stipulations and full accreditation was granted.

- Preconditions Review: Staff reviewed preconditions for 70 institutions (yellow and indigo cohorts), 2,362 preconditions (840 general preconditions and 1,522 program-specific preconditions).

- Program Review - Program review was completed for the 34 institutions in the Violet cohort, totaling 125 programs using approximately 253 reviewers.

- Common Standards review was completed for the 34 institutions with site visits.
  New Credential Program Approvals: Twenty (20) new educator preparation programs were approved.

- New Subject Matter Program Approvals: Six (6) new subject matter programs were approved – three (3) of them Elementary Subject Matter programs, one (1) in Mathematics, (1) in World Language: Spanish, and one (1) in Social Science.

DRAFT

- Changes in status were managed for the currently approved programs, including:
  - 10 programs that went inactive across several different credential areas.
  - 29 programs that were withdrawn.
  - Two (2) institutions that ceased offering any educator preparation programs and therefore ceased to be Commission-approved program sponsors.

*Continued Progress on Other Aspects of Implementation of the Accreditation System*

- Continued the Board of Institutional Review Site Visit Trainings that resulted in approximately 97 additional individuals trained and available for accreditation site visits in the future.
- Continued to implement an extensive technical assistance program of weekly office hours, webinars, and one on one assistance with programs.
- Continued to use feedback from the Program Review process for site visit teams.
- Continued to use implement a system of surveying program completers, employers, and master teacher/mentors and using these survey results from to inform team decisions about programs.
- Continued to implement and refine the Annual Accreditation Data system.
- Continued to refine and develop additional data dashboards, using data available from the accreditation data system, surveys, and performance assessments for use by institutions, programs and accreditation site visit teams for the institutions and programs they are reviewing.
- Implemented improvements to the Initial Program Approval process to more closely mirror the Program Review process.

DRAFT

## Introduction: Summary of Activities of the Accreditation System

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.
- 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 seven-year cycle comprised of the following major components or activities:

| Year of the Accreditation Cycle | Corresponding Component or Activity |
|---|---|
| Annually | Submission of Annual Data to the Accreditation Data System |
| Years 1 and 4 | Preconditions Submission |
| Year 5, fall | Program Review Submission |
| Year 5, spring | Common Standards Submission |
| Year 6 | Site Visit |
| Year 7 | Follow up activities to address issues of concern, if needed |

Each Commission-approved institution has been assigned to a "color cohort" on a seven year cycle 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.

DRAFT

*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 continue the reporting process by submitting data every summer and the system is refined and improved each year. Data Dashboards have been developed to ensure more effective use of the data contained in the data system.

*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 standards are 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 COA. 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, mentors/supervisors, advisory committees, and other appropriate stakeholders so that team members can triangulate the evidence and data provided during Years 1 to 5 of the accreditation cycle.

*DECISION BY THE COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION*

The COA assists the Commission in the implementation of the accreditation system. 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 2020-21.

DRAFT

## Section I: Accomplishment of the Committee's Work Plan in 2020-21

While the activities of 2020-21 were focused on the immediate needs posed by the pandemic, the Commission continued to work to implement and refine the vision set forth in the Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation Project that began late in 2014 and that has continued ever since. Some of the significant work accomplished over the years include the following:

- Adoption of the revised Accreditation Framework.
- Development and implementation of the redesigned CalTPA and new 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, Administrative Services, teacher induction, administrator induction, as well as employers and master teachers.
- Development and implementation of a new survey for other credential areas.
- Implementation of new processes to strengthen oversight of programs such as the ability to close a program (within a larger institution) and the ability to differentiate more frequent site visits for some programs.
- Adoption and transition efforts towards implementation of new Preliminary Education Specialist Program Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations.
- Adoption of Preconditions, Program Standards, and Performance Expectations for Pupil Personnel Services Credential Programs.
- Development of the revised Single Subject Matter Program Standards and review process.
- Development and implementation of a process used to take action with respect to late documents from approved program sponsors.
- Beginning the review and update of the Accreditation Handbook.
- Development of a process to identify Program Exemplars.
- Development and implementation of the revised Initial Program Review (IPR) process.
- Adoption of the revised CTC/ASHA American Speech Language-Hearing Association) crosswalk.
- Adoption of the CTC/AAQEP (Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation) Standards Alignment Matrix
- Review of accreditation activities related to inactive programs.

In 2020-21 in particular, some of the major accomplishments included:

- Development and implementation of program flexibilities due to COVID-19
- Review and adoption of updated COA procedures manual.
- Monitoring the progress on the revision to CAEP standards
- Adoption of PPS School Counseling Crosswalk
- Adoption of PPS School Social Work Crosswalk
- Preparing for the first AAQEP concurrent site visit in California

DRAFT

**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 3, 2020 | March 2, 2021 |
| October 29, 2020 | May 6-7, 2021 |
| January 28, 2021 | June 21, 2021 |

All Committee meetings were held in public and all meeting agendas posted in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act and Executive Order N-29-20. 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. In accordance with the Executive Order and to ensure the safety of all participants in the meetings, the Committee on Accreditation (COA) conducted the meetings via Zoom webcast. Members of the COA and Commission staff were not present at the Commission office but participated by technology from other locations throughout the state. The public was able to access this meeting through the Zoom webcast. For those without computer access they were able to participate by telephone via the US Toll-Free call-in numbers delineated in the meeting agenda.

*PSD e-News.* The PSD e-News, developed in 2008, continued to be distributed weekly. This electronic notification has increased its readership each year and now reaches over 3,526 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.

*Program Sponsor Alerts.* Program Sponsor Alerts (PSAs) continued to be a primary tool 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. This has served particularly useful during 2020-21 in communicating information to the field as the education community navigated the pandemic and the various and changing new laws and flexibilities. Program Sponsor Alerts will continue to be used to provide information to the field when necessary as they have served the objective well. The Commission staff issued the following 22 PSAs between July 1, 2020, to June 30, 2021:

DRAFT

**Program Sponsor Alerts July 1, 2020, to June 30, 2021**

| Issue Date | Number | Title |
|---|---|---|
| June 28. 2021 | 21-05 | Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Program Flexibilities Extended into 2021-2022 due to the Continued Impact of COVID 19 |
| April 30, 2021 | 21-04 | Authorization to Teach Theater and/or Dance |
| April 30, 2021 | 21-03 | 2018 Preliminary Education Specialist Mild to Moderate and Extensive Support Needs Teaching Performance Expectations |
| April 29, 2021 | 21-02 | COVID-19 Flexibility Provisions for Educator Preparation Programs: Demonstration of Subject Matter Competency Prior to Student Teaching |
| March 16, 2021 | 21-01 | Individual Development Plan for Documentation of Educator Preparation during COVID-19 |
| December 18, 2020 | 20-22 | Revised Initial Program Preconditions for Institutions seeking Initial Program Accreditation – Adopted by the Commission December 2020 |
| November 18, 2020 | 20-21 | Development and Implementation of Teacher Preparation Programs and Subject Matter Programs for Single Subject Credentials in Theatre and in Dance |
| November 13, 2020 | 20-20 | Approval of the Crosswalk comparing the Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology Program Standards and Performance Expectations with the National Association of School Psychology (NASP) standards |
| October 26, 2020 | 20-19 | Accreditation Data System (ADS): Institution Accreditation Data Dashboards |

DRAFT

| Issue Date | Number | Title |
|---|---|---|
| October 22, 2020 | 20-18 | CTC Approval Process for Changing Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) Models |
| September 29, 2020 | 20-17 | Preliminary Teacher Preparation Program Support for Candidates who are Accepted Prior to Meeting the Basic Skills and/or the Subject Matter Competency Requirement |
| September 29, 2020 | 20-16 | Senate Bill 820 Signed by Governor Newsom Extends COVID Flexibilities for Academic Year 2020-21 |
| September 11, 2020 | 20-15 | Timeline for Implementing California Literacy Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) |
| September 10, 2020 | 20-14 | Guidance to Administrative Services Induction Programs Regarding the Support of Candidates Impacted by COVID-19 |
| September 9, 2020 | 20-13 | Guidance to Teacher Induction Programs About Supporting New Candidates Impacted by COVID-19 |
| August 26, 2020 | 20-12 | Out-of-State Candidates, Fingerprint Cards, and the Certificate of Clearance |
| August 14, 2020 | 20-11 | Commission-approved Flexibilities and Specificities for Preliminary Education Specialist Candidates in the 2020-21 Academic Year |
| August 14, 2020 | 20-10 | Commission-approved Flexibilities and Specificities for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Candidates in the 2020-21 Academic Year |
| August 14, 2020 | 20-09 | Deferral of the Transition Date for Pupil Personnel Services Credential Programs to Transition to the 2019 Program Standards to Academic Year 2022-23 |
| July 20, 2020 | 20-08 | Suspension of All Accreditation Fees – 2020-2021 Fiscal Year |

DRAFT

| Issue Date | Number | Title |
|---|---|---|
| July 17, 2020 | 20-07 | Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program Field Practice Assignment Flexibility |
| July 2, 2020 | 20-06 | Program Modification Document |

DRAFT

*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 Co-Chairs Anna Moore and Robert Frelly presented the 2019-20 COA annual report to the Commission at the December 2020 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 2020-21 year, the liaison to the COA was Commissioner Kevin Kung who attended the COA meetings regularly through March 2021 when his term on the Commission ended.

*Implementation of an Annual Accreditation Fee and a Fee Recovery System for Certain Accreditation Activities.* The annual accreditation fee structure was originally established through emergency regulations effective in August 2014, followed by permanent regulations that became effective as of April 1, 2015. In 2020-21, the California State Budget suspended all accreditation fees which include annual accreditation fees as well as cost recovery accreditation fees for the period between July 1, 2020 and June 30, 2021. No invoices were sent out in 2020-21 for accreditation purposes.

DRAFT

## Purpose 2. Ensure Program Quality

*Accreditation of Institutions and their Credential Preparation Programs.* This is one of the primary ongoing tasks of the COA. 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 2020-21, a total of forty-two (42) institutions had various types of site visits. This included thirty-three (33) accreditation site visits for the red cohort institutions, three (3) rescheduled site visits from the previous year, three (3) provisional site visits, and two (3) revisits.

The results of the 36 regular site visits conducted (the 33 red cohort institutions plus the 3 rescheduled from the orange cohort that were rescheduled from 2019-20 due to the pandemic) are as follows:

- 30 institutions Accredited, including four (4) with a 7 year follow up report required
- Four (4) institutions Accredited with Stipulations
- One (1) institution Accredited with Major Stipulations
- One (1) institution Accredited with Probationary Stipulations

*Ensuring Institutions Addressed Stipulations.* All institutions with stipulations are expected to address any stipulations within one year. The COA may allow additional time if it believes the institution has made sufficient progress and additional time is warranted. In 2020-21, the COA removed the stipulations fully for five (5) institutions with stipulations from the previous year. One institution had its site visit in 2018-19, had many stipulations removed in 2019-20, but some remained. The COA granted the institution more time given the progress that had been made addressing the stipulations, and the remaining stipulations were removed in 2020-21.

For institutions receiving major stipulations or probationary stipulations, a revisit is often required. In addition, 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 2020-21. 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 2020-21 for institutional personnel to provide information and support around changes in accreditation and to address challenges related to the COVID 19 pandemic. 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

DRAFT

information about the accreditation system or standards implementation at a variety of stakeholder meetings and conferences throughout the year. These typically include, but are not limited to: 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/video conference with the institution to help them as they prepare final documentation or respond to reviewers' feedback.
- A 2 month out pre-visit to ensure that all logistics are scheduled to be handled appropriately and necessary evidence will be available to the team when it arrives.

**Technical Assistance for Institutions Preparing for 2020**

| Technical Assistance Activity | Attendees |
|---|---|
| Year-Out Pre-visit | Consultant and institution representatives |
| Monthly Phone/Zoom Conferences | Consultant and institution representatives |
| 2 Month Out Pre-visit | Consultant, Site Visit Team Lead, and institution representatives |

**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 and Program Review documentation. Staff reviewed the required exhibits and answered questions from the institutional representatives.

| Activity | Number, Date and/or Location |
|---|---|
| Preparation for Institutions Submitting Program Review and Common Standards Review | Common Standards Webinar – November 2019 |

**Technical Assistance for the Accreditation Data System (ADS)**

Given that the Accreditation Data System is in its early years of implementation, significant technical assistance needed to continue 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.

| Technical Assistance Activity | Date/Location |
|---|---|
| ADS Weekly Office Hours (30 mins-1 hour per week) | March 9, 2021 to September 15, 2021 (28 sessions) through videoconferencing |

**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, Date and/or Location |
|---|---|
| BIR Site Visit Training | August 12-13, 2020<br>September 17-18, 2020<br>January 13-14, 2021<br>May 20-21, 2021 |
| BIR Team Lead Training and Review | August 31, 2020<br>October 16, 2020 |
| Common Standards Reviewer Training and Review | 10 Common Standards Training and Review Sessions between March and July 2, 2021 (Virtual) |
| Program Review Training and Review | 18 Program Review Sessions between October 27, 2020 and August 12, 2021 (Virtual) |

**Technical Assistance Provided to Institutions Seeking Initial Approval**

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

| Date | Number of Institutions | Types of Institution | Attendees |
|---|---|---|---|
| December 16, 2020 | 5 institutions | 5 LEAs | 16 attendees |
| December 22, 2020 | 1 institution | 1 NGO/CBO | 2 attendees |

**Technical Assistance Office Hours for Programs**

Since the beginning of the pandemic, the Professional Services Division staff began hosting a variety of office hours to provide technical assistance and support the sharing of best practices by programs. These sessions have been well received by the field and has allowed the Commission to better understand and address the challenges. Staff has continued to hold these sessions and will continue it for the foreseeable future.

DRAFT

| Program Area | Day |
|---|---|
| Early Childhood Education | 1st Tuesdays<br>3rd Tuesdays |
| Preliminary Multiple & Single Subject | 1st and 3rd Tuesdays |
| Interns | 1st and 3rd Tuesdays |
| Preliminary Education Specialist | 2nd and 4th Mondays |
| Induction | 1st and 3rd Thursdays |
| Pupil Personnel Services | 2nd Thursday of the Month |

**Technical Assistance and Guidance for COVID-19**

The Professional Services Division continues to provide updates and guidance of actions taken due to the COVID-19 pandemic. PSD continues to provide technical assistance and guidance to programs for COVID -19. This information is posted on the Commission's COVID-19 webpage. Additionally, this information is made available in the PSD Enews and in numerous Program Sponsor Alerts.

**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 which allow staff to provide ongoing daily, direct technical assistance to institutional and program personnel as questions arise.

*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, Commission staff work with institutions on 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. In addition to individual staff emails, the following email addresses are maintained and monitored daily to provide assistance to the field in matters related to the accreditation process:

- Cohort Consultant Email (i.e. PSDRed@ctc.ca.gov
- Accreditation email (accreditation@ctc.ca.gov) (General accreditation emails)
- Program Review Email (ProgramReview@ctc.ca.gov)
- Annual Accreditation Data System (ADS@ctc.ca.gov
- Initial Institutional Approval (IIA@ctc.ca.gov)

DRAFT

*Technical Assistance Related to the Implementation of Performance Assessments*
Numerous technical assistance sessions have been held by staff to ensure that programs understand and are provided necessary support around the implementation of performance assessments. These sessions are listed in the chart below:

**Technical Assistance for Programs Related to the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) and the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)**

| Support Event | Dates |
|---|---|
| Candidate Office Hours | CalTPA: Weekly Wednesday 4:15-5:00<br>CalAPA: Weekly Wednesday 5:00 – 5:45 pm |
| PASC Office Hours, hosted by the PA Team and ES | CalTPA: Weekly Thurs. 10:00 – 11:00<br>CalAPA: Weekly Thurs. 11:00 - noon |
| Clear Induction Office Hours, hosted by the PA Team and ES | Teacher: Weekly Thurs. 9:00-9:45<br>Admin: Weekly Thurs. 8:00 – 9:00 am |
| Education Specialist CalTPA Office Hours | Weekly during pilot study (October 2020 – May 2021); will resume in October 2021 with launch of field test for Education Specialist CalTPA for MMSN and ESN programs |
| Virtual Think Tanks | CalTPA: 9 monthly sessions (Sept. to May)<br>CalAPA: 9 monthly sessions (Sept. to May) |
| Lead Assessor Weekly Meetings | CalTPA: Weekly Mon. 3:00-4:00, Tue. 4:00-5:00<br>CalAPA: Weekly Thursday, 3:00-4:00 (Started Spring 2021) |
| Coordinator Meetings (Webinar) | CalTPA: September, January, March, June<br>CalAPA: September, January, March, and June<br>CASC: Spring 2021 |
| "Deep Dive" Webinars into Specific PA Cycles | CalTPA: 2 sessions, September<br>CalAPA: 2 sessions |
| Induction Conference | CalTPA and CalAPA December 7, 2020 |
| New Assessor Training | CalTPA— 11 October, 7 December/January<br>CalAPA - 12 sessions (2/ cycle held) January and February 2021 |
| Returning Assessor Training | CalTPA—2 August, 7 September,<br>CalAPA 6 sessions online, 2 for each of the three cycles |
| Marker Assessor Training and Consensus Scoring for EdSp CalTPA Pilot Study | Cycle 1 (MMSN, ESN, ECSE, VI) – January/February 2021<br>Cycle 2 (MMSN, ESN) & Cycle 1 (DHH, VI) – May/June 2021 |
| Conference Attendance | CAPEA fall 2020 (CalAPA)<br>CCAC February 2021 (CalTPA & CalAPA)<br>Cal Council -- fall 2020 (CalTPA and CalAPA)<br>CAPSE – January 2021 (Education Specialist CalTPA) |
| Ed Specialist CalTPA Design Team Meetings | Monthly, February 2020 – present |
| Bilingual Advisory Meetings | CalTPA—Trans-languaging Seminar April |

DRAFT

*Receive Regular Updates on Commission Activities Related to Accreditation and Provide Commission with Advice on Issues Related to Accreditation.* During 2020-21, 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 unique challenges presented by the pandemic, this function continued to be especially important in 2020-21.

**Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards**

*Review and Take Action to Grant Initial Approval of New Program Sponsors.* The requirements for an institution to become a Commission-approved educator preparation program sponsor in California had been substantially revised in recent years. The IIA process includes five stages:

- Stage I – Prerequisites
- Stage II – Eligibility Requirements
- Stage III –Common Standards, Preconditions, and Provisional Approval
- Stage IV – Program Approval; and
- Stage V – Full Approval.

Accreditation 101 sessions (Stage I) for institutions exploring whether to seek IIA to offer an educator preparation program continued to be held throughout 2020-21. Two sessions were held in 2020-21 for interested institutions.

In 2020-21 fifteen (15) institutions were brought to the Commission for consideration for approval under one or more of the multistep initial institutional approval process. These institutions are listed in Section II of this report.

*Review and Take Action to Grant Initial Program Approval for New Credential Programs.* This is also one of the major ongoing tasks of the COA. 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 2020-21. 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. These reviews are conducted remotely with reviewers being sent the documents and devoting time from their own schedule, at their homes or offices, working via technology with their initial program review partner. A total of 20 new programs were approved by the COA in 2020-21. 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 a 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*. Since 2018-19, the documentation

provided to COA to inform their decision about program approval was changed. COA began receiving all of the program proposal documentation for institutions that had recently receive provisional approval from the Commission to inform the COA's review and approval. Additionally, personnel from the institution were invited to attend the COA meeting to respond to questions about the proposed program. In the past, any documentation was available to the members of COA at their request. This new process provides the COA with more information about the program proposal than was made routinely available in the past and provides more transparency for the public as well.

*Review of Preconditions.* The Commission's accreditation system requires that responses to preconditions be submitted and reviewed in Years 1 and 4 of the 7-year cycle. For the 2020-21 year, institutions in both the Yellow and Indigo cohorts were required to submit evidence of meeting all relevant preconditions. These two cohorts represent 70 institutions. For these two particular groups of institutions, this resulted in a staff review of evidence for 840 general preconditions and 1,522 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.

*Program Review Process.* In 2016-17, the current Program Review process was developed and finalized. Beginning in fall 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 has continued with success to the present time.

The feedback from reviewers and institutions alike regarding the revised accreditation system has continued to be overwhelmingly positive reflecting strong support for the current 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 continue to report a better understanding of the program than the previous system. Institutional personnel express appreciation for having a clear understanding of the exact types of evidence needed for program submissions and that the current process has removed some of the guesswork out of knowing what is needed and limited the temptation to provide significantly more descriptive information than what is required. Feedback is provided to the institutions in a much timelier manner.

*Common Standards Review Process.* As with the new approach to Program Review, Common Standards submissions require prescribed documentation and information as well as limited, but focused, narrative. The Common Standards review process was implemented for the first time in early 2018. Like the Program Review process, reviewers continue to express overwhelming positive support for the 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 is able to be provided to the institution between eight and 10

months prior to their site visit whereas the prior system only allowed for feedback a month or so before the visit. This allows institutions to address concerns well in advance of the site visit and to make program improvements much more quickly. 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 an annual data system was one of the key components to the revised accreditation system. 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 2017. Commission staff piloted the system in 2017-18 and it continues to be refined and used ever since. The data system is multi-pronged and multi-purposed. Various aspects of the system and the data are being used by institutions, the Commission and its staff, and accreditation teams. In addition, where appropriate, some of the data interfaces with both the public-facing data dashboards and those dashboards which are designed for institutions, Commission staff, and site visit review teams.

Technical Assistance continues to be provided to institutions on the system. Staff conducted Accreditation Data System (ADS) office hours 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 an important component to ensuring the inclusion of outcomes in the accreditation system. In 2020-21, surveys continued to play an important role in accreditation. Surveys from program completers in Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services, and Teacher 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 two (2) completers from that program in the past three (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 Agriculture Specialist, and the Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist credential. This survey was implemented for a second year in 2020.

Because the response rate was sufficiently high for the program completer surveys, the results were used by accreditation teams in 2020-21. 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 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 fall 2020, the Commission staff held three Team Lead training sessions for those individuals who would be leading site visit teams in 2020-21. This training covered a variety of topics including logistics involved in conducting virtual site visits given that the pandemic required that all visits be held virtually. These trainings were very successful and well attended.

DRAFT

## Purpose 4. Fostering 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 2020-21 at each COA meeting. These included institutions that were late in submitting required preconditions, Common Standards Review, 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. Since implementation of this requirement, staff has seen an overall increase in compliance with the required timeframes for accreditation activities and only a small number of institutions were reported in 2020-21.

*Continued Implementation of the Evaluation System for the Accreditation System*. Staff monitors the accreditation system in different ways. 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.

*Continued Partnership with National Accrediting Bodies.* A Partnership Agreement between the Commission and *Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (*CAEP) was signed by both parties in May 2015. During 2020-21, 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. The first California institution to undergo a joint Commission/CAEP site visit took place in spring 2019 and no joint CAEP/CTC site visits took place in 2020-21.

Also in 2020-21, the Commission continued discussions with a new national accrediting body, the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP). AAQEP received approval by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) in 2021. Several institutions in California have expressed an interest in this new accrediting body as an alternative to CAEP. Staff has had numerous conversations and meetings with AAQEP staff and institutions who will be seeking AAQEP accreditation in addition to CTC accreditation. An agreement was reached in 2020 with AAQEP that outlines the manner and protocols for working formally with this entity on accreditation visits. The first two concurrent site visits are schedule to take place in spring 2022.

*Board of Institutional Reviewer's (BIR) Training.*
The current BIR training, first implemented in August 2018, 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 served as a reviewer, 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 use of performance assessment 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.

**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 2020-21, six 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. Three of these were Elementary Subject Matter (ESM) programs and three were Single Subject matter programs (Mathematics, World Language, and Social Science). These are listed in Section II of this report.

**General Operations**

In addition to the aforementioned 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.

DRAFT

## Section II: Summary of 2020-21 Accreditation Activities

This section of the report provides more detailed information about results of the 2020-21 Work Plan with a focus on the outcome of the accreditation activities.

### Accreditation of Program Sponsors and their Educator Preparation Programs

In 2020-21, 42 accreditation related site visits took place. Thirty-three of these were institutions in the Red Cohort that were scheduled for visits in 2020-2021 and three were site visits at institutions from the Orange Cohort that were originally scheduled for a review in 2019-20 but were rescheduled due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, three institutions with stipulations from a 2019-20 visit received a revisit in 2020-21. And finally, three additional institutions in the provisional period of initial institutional approval received a site visit in 2020-21.

The COVID-19 pandemic made it necessary for all site visits to be completed via technology. During the site visits, 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 and 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 reports 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. Accreditation decisions were made by the COA after consideration of the written reports of the evidence gathered at the virtual site visit, recommendations made by the site visit team, and the information shared by program leadership and the team lead at the COA meeting. Copies of the site visit team reports are available on the Commission's website.

The table below lists the accreditation decisions made by the COA for institutions in the Red Cohort and those remaining visits in the Orange Cohort that had to be rescheduled in 2020-21:

### Accreditation Status for Institutions with Site Visits in 2020-21 (36)

Includes 33 Red Cohort Institutions as well as 3 Orange Cohort Institutions that were rescheduled due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

| Program Sponsor | Accreditation Decision |
|---|---|
| Anaheim Union High School District (rescheduled from 2019-20) | Accreditation with Stipulations |
| Arcadia Unified School District | Accreditation |
| Bay Area School of Enterprise (REACH Institute) | Accreditation with Major Stipulations |
| Burbank Unified School District | Accreditation with a 7th Year Report |
| California State University, Dominguez Hills | Accreditation with Stipulations |
| California State University, Los Angeles | Accreditation with a 7th Year Report |
| Campbell Union School District | Accreditation |
| Chula Vista Elementary School District | Accreditation |

DRAFT

| Program Sponsor | Accreditation Decision |
|---|---|
| Concordia University Irvine | Accreditation |
| Contra Costa County Office of Education | Accreditation |
| Culver City Unified School District | Accreditation |
| Davis Joint Unified School District | Accreditation |
| Hanford Elementary School District | Accreditation |
| Hayward Unified School District (rescheduled from 2019-20) | Accreditation |
| King-Chavez Academy of Excellence | Accreditation with a 7th Year Report |
| Los Angeles Unified School District | Accreditation |
| Manteca Unified School District | Accreditation |
| Marin County Office of Education | Accreditation |
| Oakland Unified School District | Accreditation |
| Orange Unified School District | Accreditation |
| Pacific Union College | Accreditation with Stipulations |
| Pepperdine University | Accreditation |
| Placer County Office of Education | Accreditation |
| Pleasanton Unified School District | Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations |
| Point Loma Nazarene University | Accreditation with Stipulations |
| Poway Unified School District | Accreditation |
| Redwood City School District | Accreditation |
| Riverside County Office of Education | Accreditation |
| School for Integrated Academics and Technology (SIATech) (rescheduled from 2019-20) | Accreditation |
| Sonoma State University | Accreditation |
| Sutter County Superintendent of Schools | Accreditation |
| Tulare City School District | Accreditation |
| University of California, Berkeley | Accreditation |
| University of California, Los Angeles | Accreditation |
| University of California, Santa Cruz | Accreditation |
| University of San Diego | Accreditation with a 7th Year Report |

**Institutions Meeting All Standards**

The institutions listed in the table below hosted an accreditation site visit in 2020-21 which resulted in a determination that all Common Standards and all Program Standards for all programs offered by the institution had been met. Of the 36 site visits, 20 institutions (56 percent) with site visits in 2020-21 met all standards applicable for the programs they offer.

DRAFT

**Institutions Receiving Accreditation with**
**All Common and Program Standards Met, 2020-21**

| Program Sponsor (20) | Number of Educator Programs Offered by the Institution |
|---|---|
| Arcadia Unified School District | 1 |
| Campbell Union School District | 1 |
| Chula Vista Elementary School District | 1 |
| Concordia University Irvine | 6 |
| Contra Costa County Office of Education | 1 |
| Culver City Unified School District | 1 |
| Hanford Elementary School District | 2 |
| Hayward Unified School District | 1 |
| Los Angeles Unified School District | 12 |
| Manteca Unified School District | 1 |
| Marin County Office of Education | 1 |
| Oakland Unified School District | 1 |
| Orange Unified School District | 2 |
| Poway Unified School District | 1 |
| Redwood City School District | 1 |
| Riverside County Office of Education | 5 |
| School for Integrated Academics and Technology (SIATech) | 1 |
| Tulare City School District | 1 |
| University of California, Los Angeles | 9 |
| University of San Diego | 4 |

**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 Common Standards for 2020-21 site visits are presented in the following table.

**Findings on Common Standards[1] 2020-21**
**Accreditation Site Visits (36 institutions)**

| Common Standards | Met | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation | 33 | 2 | 1 |
| 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support | 33 | 3 | 0 |
| 3: Study, Fieldwork, and Clinical Practice | 31 | 5 | 0 |
| 4: Continuous Improvement | 29 | 4 | 3 |
| 5: Program Impact | 34 | 2 | 0 |

[1]*The language of the Common Standards may be found at Common Standards*

DRAFT

## Summary Findings on Program Standards

### Analysis of Program Standards Decisions

The table below indicates the number of institutions for 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 During 2020-21 Site Visits**

| Programs | # of Institutions that Offer the Listed Program | # of Institutions with All Program Standards Met by Program | % of programs with all program standards met |
|---|---|---|---|
| Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization | 2 | 1 | 50% |
| Clear Administrative Services | 9 | 5 | 56% |
| Education Specialist: Added Authorization Early Childhood Special Education | 4 | 1 | 25% |
| Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education, w/Intern | 3 | 1 | 33% |
| Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, w/intern | 10 | 5 | 50% |
| Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe, w/Intern | 8 | 3 | 36% |
| Preliminary Administrative Services, w/Intern | 11 | 5 | 45% |
| Preliminary Multiple Subject, w/intern | 14 | 4 | 28% |
| Preliminary Single Subject, w/intern | 13 | 4 | 31% |
| Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance | 4 | 1 | 25% |
| Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling, w/intern | 6 | 2 | 33% |
| Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work | 2 | 1 | 50% |
| Specialist Teaching: Bilingual Authorization | 7 | 3 | 42% |
| Specialist Teaching: California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) | 2 | 1 | 50% |
| Teacher Induction | 30 | 21 | 70% |

### Program Standards that are Met with Concerns or Not Met

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 were *Met with Concerns* or *Not Met* 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.

DRAFT

| Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization (1 Site Visit) | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
|---|---|---|
| Standard 5: Assessment of Students | 0 | 1 |
| Standard 8: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options | 0 | 1 |
| Standard 11: Motor Behavior as Applied to Adapted Physical Education | 1 | 0 |
| Standard 13: Instructional Strategies and Adaptation | 1 | 0 |

| Clear Administrative Services (2 Site Visits) | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
|---|---|---|
| Standard 2: Program Collaboration, Communication, and Coordination | 2 | 0 |
| Standard 3: Selection and Training of Coaches | 1 | 0 |
| Standard 5: California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders | 1 | 0 |

| Designated Subjects: Adult Education (1 Site Visit) | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
|---|---|---|
| Standard 4: Beginning Teacher Support, Supervision, and Advisement | 1 | 0 |

| Preliminary Administrative Services, w/intern Standards (3 Site Visits) | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
|---|---|---|
| Standard 2: Collaboration, Communication and Coordination | 2 | 0 |
| Standard 3: Development of Professional Leadership Perspectives | 1 | 0 |
| Standard 4: Equity, Diversity and Access | 1 | 0 |
| Standard 5: Role of Schooling in a Democratic Society | 1 | 0 |
| Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences | 1 | 0 |

| Preliminary Multiple Subject w/Intern (4 Site Visits) | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
|---|---|---|
| Standard 2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) | 1 | 0 |
| Standard 3: Clinical Practice | 4 | 0 |

| Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling, w/intern (1 Site Visits) | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
|---|---|---|
| Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale, Collaboration, Communication and Partnerships | 1 | 0 |

DRAFT

| Preliminary Single Subject w/Intern (5 Site Visits) | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
|---|---|---|
| Standard 2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) | 1 | 0 |
| Standard 3: Clinical Practice | 5 | 0 |

| Specialist Teaching: California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) (1 Site Visit) | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
|---|---|---|
| Standard 1: Program Design and Rationale | 1 | 0 |

| Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (1 Site Visit) | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
|---|---|---|
| Standard 4: Integrating Curriculum through Fieldwork | 0 | 1 |
| Standard 5: Planning, Organizing, and Providing Literacy Instruction | 1 | 0 |

| Teacher Induction Standards (8 Site Visits) | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
|---|---|---|
| Standard 1: Program Purpose | 1 | 0 |
| Standard 2: Components of the Mentoring Design | 2 | 0 |
| Standard 3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System | 3 | 2 |
| Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors | 4 | 2 |
| Standard 5: Determining Candidate Competence for the Clear Credential Recommendation | 1 | 1 |
| Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services | 1 | 2 |

**Institutions in 7th Year Follow Up**

The COA continues to monitor progress made in addressing stipulations for any institutions with outstanding issues from previous years' visits. Although any institution with stipulations must address all stipulations within one year, the COA may choose to allow an institution more time if the COA is satisfied that significant progress is being made to address the stipulations.

In 2020-21, the COA closely monitored five institutions that had stipulations placed on them in the previous year as a result of their accreditation site visit in 2019-20. Additionally, the COA continued to monitor one program sponsor, Sonoma County Office of Education, that had stipulations remaining from their site visit in 2018-19. Many of the stipulations placed on this institution had been addressed in 2019-20 but the institution was granted additional time by the COA to continue making progress in addressing the remaining stipulations and the COA continued to monitor the institution during this time. All six of the program sponsors addressed all identified issues such that the COA removed the stipulations in 2020-21 and their status was changed to Accreditation. This information is summarized in the table below.

DRAFT

**Action taken in 2020-21 on Institutions with Stipulations from Prior Year Site Visits**

| Institutions | 2019-2020 Decision | 2020-2021 COA Decision |
|---|---|---|
| Conejo Valley Unified School District (revisit) | Accreditation with Stipulations | Accreditation – March 2021 |
| Milpitas Unified School District | Accreditation with Stipulations | Accreditation – March 2021 |
| University of La Verne (revisit) | Accreditation with Major Stipulations | Accreditation – May 2021 |
| California Baptist University | Accreditation with Stipulations | Accreditation – May 2021 |
| Aspire Berkley Maynard Academy (revisit) | Accreditation with Major Stipulations | Accreditation – May 2021 |
| Sonoma County Office of Education | Accreditation with Stipulations | Accreditation – May 2021 |

**Initial Institutional Approval (IIA)**

When a new institution wishes to offer an educator preparation program in California it must go through a five-stage process that includes both Initial Institutional Approval (Stages I-III), Initial Program Approval (Stage IV), and a Provisional Site Visit (Stage V). Initial Institutional Approval falls within the purview of the Commission. Once the Commission determines that an institution is eligible to offer educator preparation in California, the institution's responses to standards that have been reviewed by the Board of Institutional Review are brought forward to the COA, in Stage IV, for its consideration and action. The following institutions were brought before the Commission for Initial Institutional Approval for 2020-21. The table identifies at which stage the institution appeared before the Commission, the type of approval, and the date of the Commission meeting at which the approval was granted.

| Approval Date | Program Sponsor | Approval Status | Stage |
|---|---|---|---|
| 08/07/20 | San Benito County Office of Education | Provisional Approval | Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions |
| 08/07/20 | Los Angeles Pacific University | Provisional Approval | Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions |
| 10/09/20 | Newhall School District | Provisional Approval | Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions |

DRAFT

| Approval Date | Program Sponsor | Approval Status | Stage |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10/09/20 | Lake County Office of Education | Provisional Approval | Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions |
| 10/09/20 | University of Antelope Valley | Provisional Approval | Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions |
| 12/04/20 | Cambridge College | Granted Eligibility | Stage II – Eligibility Requirements |
| 02/12/21 | Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District | Granted Eligibility | Stage II – Eligibility Requirements |
| 04/16/21 | Relay Graduate School of Education | Granted Eligibility | Stage II – Eligibility Requirements |
| 04/16/21<br><br>06/18/21 | Huntington Beach Union<br><br>High School District | Granted Eligibility<br><br>Provisional Approval | Stage II – Eligibility Requirements<br><br>Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions |
| 06/18/21 | Folsom Cordova Unified School District | Provisional Approval | Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions |
| 06/18/21 | San Mateo Union High School District | Provisional Approval | Stage III – Alignment of Standards and Preconditions |

**Initial Approval of New Credential Programs (IPR)**
**at Provisionally Approved Institutions**

Provisionally-approved institutions submit documentation that indicates how the proposed program will meet each of the Commission-adopted program standards along with supporting evidence to verify alignment with the standards. A team of educators who have expertise in the program area, and are trained for the review process, read the institution's submission, 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 additional information.

This feedback is shared with the institution by Commission staff. The institution addresses any concerns and resubmits documentation until the program is found to be aligned with all standards. 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. If COA approves the program, the institution may operate the program for the specified provisional period of time as determined by the Commission. Typically, this is 2-4 years after which the institution will host a site visits and an accreditation team will determine findings that are used to inform the Commission's approval of the institution as a program sponsor in the last Stage of IIA.

Initial Program Approval actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation in 2020-21 for new

DRAFT

institutions in IIA are listed in the tables below.

**Provisional Site Visits**

In 2020-21, accreditation site visits were conducted at four institutions in the final stage (Stage V) of the Initial Institutional Approval process. At the end of a provisional period of between two and four years, an institution in provisional status hosts an accreditation site visit team that determines how the institution and program are aligned to the Commission's adopted standards and preconditions. The information resulting from the provisional site visit is provided to the Commission to inform their decision as to whether to approve the institution in this final stage of IIA. The chart below includes information on the institutions that completed their provisional period, the results of the accreditation site visit, and the Commission action.

| Institution in Stage IV | Status of Accreditation | Commission Action |
|---|---|---|
| Turlock Unified School District | Accreditation | Approved |
| High Tech High Graduate School of Education | Accreditation with Stipulations (PSV) | Approved and remanded back to the COA for follow up on the stipulations |
| Las Virgenes Unified School District | Accreditation with Stipulations (PSV) | Approved and remanded back to the COA for follow up on the stipulations |
| University of California, Merced | Accreditation with Stipulations (PSV) | Approved and remanded back to the COA for follow up on the stipulations |

**New Educator Preparation Programs Sponsored by Provisionally Approved Institutions (5)**

| Program Sponsor | Credential Program |
|---|---|
| Alameda County Office of Education | Clear Administrative Services |
| Los Angeles Pacific University | Preliminary Multiple Subject |
| San Benito County Office of Education | Teacher Induction |
| University of California, Merced | Specialist Teaching: Bilingual Authorization Spanish |
| Yuba City Unified School District | Teacher Induction |

The Committee on Accreditation granted Initial Program Approval for existing Commission approved program sponsors to the following preparation programs:

**New Educator Preparation Programs Approved by COA at Existing Commission Approved Program Sponsors (20)**

| Program Sponsor | Credential Program |
|---|---|
| Biola University | Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern |

DRAFT

| Program Sponsor | Credential Program |
|---|---|
| Biola University | Preliminary Single Subject Intern |
| California Lutheran University | Bilingual Authorization: Spanish |
| California State University, Fresno | Education Specialist - Deaf and Hard of Hearing Intern |
| California State University, San Marcos | Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work |
| California State University, San Marcos | Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance |
| Contra Costa County Office of Education | Preliminary Administrative Services |
| Kings County Office of Education | Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, with Intern |
| Kings County Office of Education | Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe, with Intern |
| Kings County Office of Education | Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern |
| Los Angeles Unified School District | Preliminary Administrative Services |
| Pacific Oaks College | Bilingual Authorization: Spanish & Mandarin |
| San Diego County Office of Education | Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing Intern |
| San Diego County Office of Education | Preliminary Single Subject Intern |
| St. Mary's College of California | Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Program Intern |
| St. Mary's College of California | Bilingual Authorization: Spanish |
| University of California, Berkeley | Teacher Induction |
| University of California, Irvine | Bilingual Authorization: Spanish |
| University of San Diego | Bilingual Authorization: Spanish |
| West Covina Unified School District | Clear Administrative Services |

**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 six programs approved by the Commission in 2019-20 are included in the table below.

**New Subject Matter Programs (6)**

| Institutions | Programs |
|---|---|
| Sonoma State University | Elementary Subject Matter |
| San Jose State University | World Languages Spanish Single Subject Matter Program |
| California State University, Fullerton | Elementary Subject Matter |
| Fresno Pacific University | Elementary Subject Matter |
| University of the Pacific | Social Science Subject Matter Program |
| Biola University | Mathematics Single Subject Matter |

DRAFT

## 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 the Administrator of Accreditation. The following 10 programs became inactive in 2020-21.

**Programs Entering Inactive Status (10)**

| Institution | Programs |
|---|---|
| Baldwin Park Unified School District | Teacher Induction |
| Bard College | Preliminary Single Subject: Music |
| California State University, Los Angeles | Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist |
| California State University, Los Angeles | Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Added Authorization |
| La Sierra University | Preliminary Administrative Services |
| Point Loma Nazarene University | Teacher Induction |
| San Francisco State University | Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist |
| San Francisco State University | Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Added Authorization |
| San Jose State University | Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders |
| Tustin Unified School District | Teacher Induction |

## Reactivation of an 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 2020-21, only one program previously deemed inactive requested and received reactivation and is, once again, fully approved programs operating in California.

**Reactivation Requests (1)**

| Institution | Program |
|---|---|
| Santa Clara University | Clear Administrative Services |

## Transition of Professional Preparation Program to New Standards

In recent years, new standards were recently adopted by the Commission for both the Education Specialist credential and the Pupil Personnel Services credential. The regulatory process is underway for both of these credential areas and programs will soon be transitioning to these new standards. Additional information on these transitions will be provided in the 2021-22 COA Annual Report.

DRAFT

## 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. The program is then no longer considered a Commission-approved program and can no longer recommend for that credential area. This action removes the program from the Commission's accreditation system. Institutions withdrawing a program must not submit a program proposal for the same credential area for a time period of one year. The following 29 programs at 21 institutions were withdrawn in 2020-21 and are no longer offered at the institution.

**Withdrawn Programs of Professional Preparation (29)**

| Institution | Programs |
|---|---|
| Bard College | Preliminary Single Subject: English, Mathematics, Science, Social Science, |
| California Baptist University | Education Specialist Added Authorization: Early Childhood |
| California Lutheran University | Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Added Authorization |
| California State Polytechnic University, Pomona | Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Added Authorization |
| California State University, Fresno | Preliminary Single Subject Home Economics with Intern |
| California State University, Fullerton | School Nurse: Special Teaching Authorization in Health |
| California State University, Long Beach (2) | Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders<br>Teacher Induction |
| California State University, Los Angeles | Clear Administrative Services |
| California State University, Stanislaus | Education Specialist: Added Authorization Autism Spectrum Disorder |
| Fresno Pacific University | Induction: Clear Education Specialist |
| National University (4) | Teacher Induction<br>Education Specialist: Preliminary Language and Academic Development with Intern<br>Education Specialist: Preliminary Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing with Intern<br>Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders |
| Notre Dame De Namur University | Education Specialist: Added Authorization Autism Spectrum Disorder |
| Ontario-Montclair School District | Education Specialist Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders |

DRAFT

| Institution | Programs |
|---|---|
| Orange Unified School District | Education Specialist: Add Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder |
| San Diego Unified School District | Teacher Induction |
| San Francisco State University (2) | Preliminary Single Subject: Home Economics w/ Intern<br>Teacher Induction |
| Santa Clara University | Preliminary Single Subject: Art and Physical Education |
| Touro University (2) | Education Specialist: Added Authorization Autism Spectrum Disorder<br>Clear Induction Education Specialist |
| University of California, Los Angeles | Education Specialist: Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education |
| University of La Verne (3) | Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist<br>Specialist Teaching: Reading and Literacy Added Authorization<br>Specialist Teaching: California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) |
| Vista Unified School District | 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 (2)**

| Institution | Effective Date |
|---|---|
| San Diego Unified School District | Closed Educator Preparation in May 2021 |
| Vista Unified School District | Closed Educator Preparation in May 2021 |

**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 2020-21, institutions in two cohorts (Indigo and Yellow) submitted preconditions for review. For these two cohorts, a total of 70 institutions submitted preconditions resulting in 840 general precondition responses and 1,522 program specific precondition responses reviewed after the submission date of March 2021. The list below includes the names of institutions that submitted preconditions during this reporting period.

DRAFT

**Preconditions – Indigo Cohort Institutions**

Animo Leadership Charter High School (Green Dot Public Schools)
Azusa Pacific University
Baldwin Park Unified School District
Bard College
Brandman University
Brentwood Union School District
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
California State University, Bakersfield
California State University, Chico
California State University, Long Beach
California State University, San Marcos
Central Unified School District
High Tech High
Humboldt State University
Lancaster School District
Madera Unified School District
Mount Saint Mary's University
Pasadena Unified School District
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District
Sacramento County Office of Education
San Diego Unified School District
San Dieguito Union High School District
San Jose Unified School District
San Ramon Valley Unified School District
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District
Stockton Unified School District
Teachers College of San Joaquin
Tracy Joint Unified School District
University of Redlands
University of San Francisco
Ventura County Office of Education
Visalia Unified School District
Vista Unified School District
West Covina Unified School District
Westside Union School District

**Preconditions – Yellow Cohort Institutions**

Anaheim Elementary School District
Biola University
California State University, Northridge
California State University, Stanislaus
Capistrano Unified School District
Ceres Unified School District
Clovis Unified School District
Etiwanda School District
Fremont Union High School District
Fresno Pacific University
Greenfield Union School District
Lodi Unified School District
Loyola Marymount University
Napa County Office of Education
Ontario-Montclair School District
Panama-Buena Vista Union School District
Pomona Unified School District
Riverside Unified School District
Saddleback Valley Unified School District
San Diego Christian College
San Diego State University
San Gabriel Unified School District
Santa Clara Unified School District
Santa Clara University
Santa Cruz County Office of Education
Shasta County Office of Education
Sonoma County Office of Education
South San Francisco Unified School District
Stanislaus County Office of Education
Summit Preparatory Charter High School
Touro University California
Walnut Valley Unified School District
Western Governors University
Whittier College
William Jessup University

DRAFT

## 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 2020-21, the 34 institutions of the Violet Cohort identified in the table below responded to Common Standards and completed Program Review. As indicated in the table below, these 34 institutions offer a total of 125 programs. To provide some understanding of the scope of this work, each program is reviewed by two individuals. Reviewing 125 programs then required the effort of over 250 reviewers matched by expertise and availability.

### Violet Cohort Program Review 2020-2021

The cells in the following table that have a n/a indicate that the institution does not offer that type of program.

| Institution | Initial Teacher Prep[1] | Teacher Induction | Other Teacher Prep[2] | Prelim Admin | Admin Induction | Other Services[3] | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Antelope Valley Union High School District | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 |
| Antioch University | 2 | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 3 |
| Butte County Office of Education | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 |
| California State University, Fresno | 5 | n/a | 5 | 1 | n/a | 6 | 17 |
| California State University, Monterey Bay | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | n/a | 3 | 11 |
| Claremont Graduate University | 4 | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 5 |
| Compton Unified School District | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 |
| Cupertino Union School District | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 |
| El Dorado County Office of Education | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 |
| Escondido Union High School District | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 |

DRAFT

| Institution | Initial Teacher Prep[1] | Teacher Induction | Other Teacher Prep[2] | Prelim Admin | Admin Induction | Other Services[3] | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hebrew Union College | 1 | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 2 |
| Hope International University | 2 | n/a | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | 3 |
| Imperial County Office of Education | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 |
| Irvine Unified School District | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | 1 | n/a | 2 |
| Kern County Superintendent of Schools | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | 1 | n/a | 2 |
| La Sierra University | 2 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 2 | 4 |
| Los Banos Unified School District (5/4) | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 |
| Murrieta Valley Unified School District | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 |
| National University | 4 | n/a | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
| New Haven Unified School District | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 |
| Pacific Oaks College | 2 | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 3 |
| Palo Alto Unified School District | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 |
| Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | 1 | n/a | 2 |
| Sacramento City Unified School District | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 |
| San Francisco State University | 6 | n/a | 3 | 1 | n/a | 5 | 15 |
| San Francisco Unified School District | 2 | 1 | 1 | n/a | 1 | n/a | 5 |

DRAFT

| Institution | Initial Teacher Prep[1] | Teacher Induction | Other Teacher Prep[2] | Prelim Admin | Admin Induction | Other Services[3] | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sanger Unified School District | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 |
| Sequoia Union High School District | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 |
| University of California, Davis | 2 | n/a | 2 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 4 |
| University of California, Irvine | 2 | n/a | 2 | 1 | 1 | n/a | 6 |
| University of California, San Diego | 3 | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | 1 | 5 |
| University of Southern California (4/4) | 3 | n/a | 2 | 1 | n/a | 3 | 9 |
| Washington Unified School District | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 |
| William S. Hart Union High School District | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | 1 | n/a | 2 |
| **Total: 34** | **44** | **24** | **21** | **7** | **7** | **22** | **125** |

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

[2]***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*

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

DRAFT

## Section III: Proposed Work Plan for the Committee on Accreditation in 2021-22

The work plan for the Commission and COA for 2021-22 is summarized in this section. The accreditation responsibilities continue but not without the continuing and profound impact of the worldwide pandemic on education that persists. Although colleges, universities and schools have returned to in person learning, the pandemic continues to impact educator preparation and candidates' experiences. The challenges in the 2021-2022 academic year are similar, but different in significant ways, than the previous academic year and require additional coordination and collaboration with the field. The Commission continues to work closely with the field to identify and address the changing needs dictated by this pandemic and that may hinder prospective candidates from progressing through their preparation programs.

During this time providing as much assistance as possible to move candidates forward, to work with institutions in addressing challenges in meeting standards, and to provide support where needed to ensure that completers are well prepared to enter the workforce has been primary.

With this context in mind, the Commission moves forward with implementing its oversight responsibilities and with the accreditation system. Once again, with the safety of the reviewers and personnel within institutions as a central concern, accreditation activities for 2021-22 will be conducted virtually. Accreditation site visits and revisits, program review and Common Standards review sessions, team lead trainings and Board of Institutional Review training will all take place entirely through technology.

Among the major accreditation activities for 2021-22 will be routine accreditation activities to ensure appropriate oversight and accountability of programs, continued review and approval of new educator preparation programs, facilitating the transition of programs to new standards in Pupil Personnel Services and Education Specialist programs, putting in place continued refinement of the various aspects of accreditation such as improvement of the Accreditation Data System (ADS), revising accreditation processes as needed to respond to changes in legislation around subject matter and basic skills, and attending to the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic.

For 2021-22, 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 and, where necessary, any other laws or directives received by the Legislature and Governor regarding public meetings during the pandemic which has in recent months allows for public meetings to be held through technology. 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 as well as providing a toll free phone number for members of the public without internet or computer access to be able to join the meeting and comment. The Commission's website will

DRAFT

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 16, 2021
October 28, 2021
February 3-4, 2022
March 24-25, 2022
May 5-6, 2022
June 29-30, 2022
August 4, 2022

The Committee's agenda in 2021-22 includes a full schedule of site visits beginning in fall 2021 and continuing well into spring 2022. A hefty site visit year includes institutions in the violet cohort, revisits, and institutions in provisional status seeking full accreditation. This schedule will take place while also implementing, and refining as needed, all aspects of the accreditation system such as Program Review, Annual Data Submission, Preconditions Review, and Common Standards Review.

Continuing in 2021-22, the *PSD e-News*, Program Sponsor Alerts, and any other appropriate and applicable communications platforms will continue to be routinely used to provide consistent and accurate information to preparation programs about the accreditation system, changes in credentialing and standards, and other critical information.

*Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission.* The Committee on Accreditation will present its annual report to the Commission in December 2021. 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. At this time, this position is currently vacant. Staff will work with the Chair of the Commission to ensure that this vacancy is filled. 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.

*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. Governor Newsom suspended all accreditation fees in 2020-2021 and extended the suspension for 2021-22 in order to alleviate some of the financial burden on institutions caused by the pandemic. Commission staff will continue to work with the Office of Administrative Law to move forward the associated regulatory package regarding fees should the fees resume in the future.

DRAFT

## 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.

*Revisits –Red Cohort*
Three institutions with site visits that took place in 2020-2021 received stipulations that included a revisit. These revisits will take place in 2020-2021 and the COA will consider whether actions taken by the institution to address issues identified by site visit teams has been sufficient to warrant removal of the stipulations.

*Regularly Scheduled Site Visits – Violet Cohort*
Beginning in fall 2020, the 34 institutions in the Violet Cohort will undergo a site visit by a trained team of reviewers. The information from the Program Review and Common Standards review processes, data in the Annual Data System and the related data dashboards, as well as interviews and documentation available on an accreditation website will be used by the site visit team to inform them about the programs prior to the site.

*Site Visit for Provisional Approval*
The Commission's current initial institutional approval process requires that institutions operate their approved program on a provisional basis for two-four years. Information is gathered during this time and a focused site visit takes place in the final year of provisional approval. The Commission then acts to provide full accreditation upon a satisfactory focused visit that determines whether standards are being met. This phase of the Initial Institutional Approval process has only been in effect for the past two years. In 2021-22, four (4) institutions will undergo a site visit during their provisional period of Initial Institutional Approval in preparation for Commission consideration of full Initial Institutional Approval.

*Program Standards Review –Indigo Cohort*
Program Review submissions are required for the Indigo Cohort by October 15, 2021. The Indigo Cohort is comprised of 35 institutions offering numerous educator preparation programs that are currently in Year 5 of the seven-year accreditation cycle. These programs will be reviewed in the 2021-22 year through the Program Review process which focuses on 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 Indigo Cohort. The vast majority of these review sessions are scheduled throughout November and December 2021 and early 2022 and will take place via technology, with two BIR members working together from their respective homes or offices in order to review the documents expeditiously. Once the review session has taken place and feedback

DRAFT

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 have completed Part I of BIR training, with the site visit training being Part II of BIR training.

*Common Standards Submission and Review – Indigo Cohort*
In February 2022, the 35 institutions that are in the Indigo 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 serve as 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 the site visit.

*Preconditions Submission – Orange and Blue Cohorts*
In March 2022, the institutions in the Orange and Blue 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. It is anticipated that staff will continue to 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.

*Accreditation Framework Regulations.* A major accomplishment in 2020 was the review and adoption of a revised *Accreditation Framework*. The pandemic necessitated a shifting of staff resources toward issues related to COVID flexibilities as well as other major policy changes and thus, the work of promulgating regulations incorporating the Accreditation Framework will be undertaken in 2022.

*Review and Revise the Accreditation Handbook.* The *Accreditation Handbook* explicates the processes and procedures of the various components of the accreditation system. The COA had revised the *Accreditation Handbook in 2016* to ensure that any new or changed aspects of the accreditation system were reflected in this document. However, given that the revised Accreditation Framework has been recently adopted and refinements to the system have been implemented in recent years, a thorough review of the Accreditation Handbook is necessary.

DRAFT

## Purpose 3. Ensure Adherence to Standards

*Review and Take Action to Grant Initial Approval of New Program Sponsors (Initial Institutional Approval).* Approximately two to four Accreditation 101 sessions will be held in 2021-22 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. The exact number of sessions will be determined by demand. Commission staff and BIR members will continue to review proposals for Initial Institutional Approval as they are received.

In addition, staff is developing Accreditation 201 in order to assist programs that are in provisional status and new to the Commission's accreditation system. This session will be tailored to the programs in attendance and assist them with understanding the expectations around being an approved program sponsor and prepare them for a provisional site visit. This session will be implemented for the first time in 2022.

Additionally, the process for reviewing the institution for Initial Institutional Approval will continue. As indicated in Section II of this report, at this time there numerous institutions in various stages of the multi-step process. Some of these will require a site visit in 2021-22 as they are completing their provisional approval period. It is anticipated that there will be additional institutions seeking to begin the process throughout the year.

*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 2021-22.

The Initial Program Review (IPR) process continues to be one of the most challenging aspects of the current system. New program proposals will continue to be reviewed until a review team determines that all program standards have been aligned.

*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. 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, Survey Data, and Performance Assessment Data.* The COA will continue to support the Commission's effort to implement and, where necessary, refine the annual

survey data collection process. Continued implementation of the following surveys is planned for 2020-21:

a. Preliminary Multiple Subject Completer Survey
b. Preliminary Single Subject Completer Survey
c. Preliminary Education Specialist Completer Survey
d. Preliminary Administrative Services Completer Survey
e. Clear Administrative Services Completer Survey
f. Teacher Induction Completer Survey
g. Other Educator Survey
h. Master Teacher Survey
i. Employer Survey

Discussions with the COA, BIR, and team members about the appropriate use of that data in accreditation decisions will continue. In addition, significant work remains to be done around the annual data submission, particularly to clarify and define terms. 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.

Additionally, continued effort will be made to incorporate performance assessment data into the data dashboard that is used by the accreditation teams. Staff is currently working on incorporating the performance data into the dashboard so that all of the available Commission data is in one place for the team members during site visits and for all institutions to use for program improvement.

The Commission staff will focus efforts during 2020-21 on using these data to determine if they indicate any potential areas of concern either with an institution, a standard, or a requirement. Analyzing the data from both the surveys 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 that is completed by site visit reviewers, team leads, and institutions to assess the accreditation system. This data will be collected over the course of the year, with a review of the data taking place in the fall 2021. Improvements will be discussed and incorporated into the revised accreditation system.

*Continue Partnership with the National and Professional Accrediting Bodies.* The Commission's accreditation system will continue its partnership with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP), the two national accrediting bodies. The Commission staff will continue to work on the logistics for the first AAQEP/CTE accreditation visits scheduled for spring 2022. Commission staff will continue to work with institutions that seek to be both nationally accredited, with CAEP or AAQEP, and state

accredited to ensure that the process is as streamlined as possible.

*Monitoring the process for Programs to Transition to new Preliminary Education Specialist and Pupil Personnel Services Program Standards.*
Although the regulatory packages still need to be moved through the process for both of these credential areas, staff is working with programs to ensure they understand the changes embodied in the new standards and to prepare them for submitting required documentation demonstrating that the program is moving toward alignment of the new standards in summer/fall 2022. In October 2021, all Commission approved Education Specialist programs are submitting Plans to Transition to the new Education Specialist program standards. Numerous review sessions will be held with peer reviewers to review the submissions and to provide feedback in advance to institutions moving forward with full implementation in fall 2022. This process will take place from November through early 2022.

For PPS the implementation plan can be submitted through January 2022. Staff will review these plans as they are submitted to ensure that the proposed changes are consistent with the new standards and to help guide technical assistance efforts.

*Continue Providing Technical Assistance on Accreditation Processes.* 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. Additional technical assistance will be provided as continuing work is done on aspects of the system such as building out the 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.

*Technical Assistance on Commission Flexibilities due to COVID-19*
The Commission staff will continue to implement an extensive technical assistance schedule for 2021-2022 to support institutions with the flexibilities offered for programs and candidates in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, transitions to new program standards, and new requirements around Basic Skills and demonstration of basic skills implemented by passage of AB 130 (Chapter 44, Statutes of 2021). The schedule indicated in Section I of this report will be continued as planned throughout 2021-22.

*Next Generation of Performance Assessments.* As the development and implementation of the next generation of teaching performance assessments and administrator performance assessments continues, the COA and Commission staff will review the various implications of that work. Efforts to provide guidance for reviewers and ensure that both institutions and reviewers understand the new models and related expectations as articulated in the standards, incorporating the data into the Annual Data System, and other appropriate use for the data will be important activities in 2021-22.

*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

could have the ability to identify, for one or more programs, an area where the program has developed an exemplary practice. However, the workload of the Commission staff, particularly during the pandemic, and the challenges posed by creating such a system were primary reasons for this project not moving into implementation. Because of the continued need to address immediate and persistent needs posed by the pandemic as well as the implementation of numerous new statewide initiatives around educator preparation that will demand significant staff time and resources, implementing this effort at this time continues to not be feasible. Commission staff anticipates revisiting this topic with the Commission in late 2022.

**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

## Appendix A: 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 | Indigo | CSU San Bernardino | Green |
| CSU Channel Islands | Green | CSU San Marcos | Indigo |
| CSU Chico | Indigo | CSU Stanislaus | Yellow |
| CSU Dominguez Hills | Red | Humboldt State University | Indigo |
| CSU East Bay | Green | San Diego State University | Yellow |
| CSU Fresno – seeking AAQEP | Violet | San Francisco State University | Violet |
| CSU Fullerton- CAEP | Blue | San Jose State University | Orange |
| CSU Long Beach | 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 |
| UC Merced | Violet | | |

### Independent Institutions (50)

| 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 | Red |
| Azusa Pacific University*S - CAEP | 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 - CAEP | Indigo | Simpson University | Green |
| California Baptist University | Orange | Stanford University | Blue |
| California Lutheran University | Green | Teachers College of San Joaquin | Indigo |
| Chapman University*F - CAEP | Orange | The Master's College | Orange |
| Claremont Graduate University | Violet | Touro University | Yellow |
| Concordia University | Red | United States University | Blue |
| Dominican University of California | Blue | University of La Verne | Orange |
| Fresno Pacific University | Yellow | University of Phoenix | Orange |

DRAFT

| Institution | Cohort | Institution | Cohort |
|---|---|---|---|
| Hebrew Union College | Violet | University of Redlands | Indigo |
| High Tech High Graduate School of Education | Violet | University of San Diego*F - CAEP | Red |
| Holy Names University | Blue | University of San Francisco | Indigo |
| Hope International University | Violet | University of Southern California - CAEP | 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 - CAEP | Yellow | Westmont College | Green |
| Mills College | Green | Whittier College | Yellow |
| Mount St. Mary's College | Indigo | William Jessup University | Yellow |
| National University – Seeking AAQEP | Violet | | |
| Notre Dame de Namur University | Green | | |
| Pacific Oaks College | Violet | | |

**Other Program Sponsors (Districts/County Offices/Other) (154)**

| Institution | Cohort | Institution | Cohort |
|---|---|---|---|
| Assoc. of CA School Admin/ASCA | Orange | Mt. Diablo USD (210): 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 | Violet | Pasadena USD | Indigo |
| California School of the Deaf/Fremont | Blue | Placentia-Yorba Linda USD | Indigo |
| Campbell Union SD | Red | Placer COE | Red |
| Capistrano USD | Yellow | Pleasanton USD | Red |

DRAFT

| Institution | Cohort | Institution | Cohort |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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 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 |
| Fullerton SD | Blue | Santa Monica-Malibu USD | Indigo |
| Garden Grove USD | Green | Saugus Union SD | Green |
| Glendale USD | Blue | Sequoia Union HSD | Violet |
| Greenfield Union SD | Yellow | School for Integrated Academics and Technology/SIA Tech | Orange |
| Grossmont Union HSD | Blue | Shasta COE | Yellow |
| Hacienda La Puente USD | Green | Sonoma COE | Yellow |
| Hanford ESD | Red | Stanislaus COE | Yellow |
| Hayward USD | Orange | Stockton USD | Indigo |

DRAFT

| Institution | Cohort | Institution | Cohort |
|---|---|---|---|
| High Tech High | Indigo | Sutter County SOS | Red |
| Imperial COE | Violet | Summit Preparatory Charter HS | 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 |
| Lancaster SD | Indigo | Tulare City SD | Red |
| Las Virgenes USD | Violet | Tulare COE | Green |
| Lodi USD | Yellow | Turlock USD | Orange |
| Long Beach USD | Blue | Tustin USD | Blue |
| Los Angeles COE | Green | Vallejo City USD | Blue |
| Los Angeles USD | Red | Ventura COE | Indigo |
| Los Banos USD | Violet | Visalia 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 | | |

***The following institutions are continuing in Provisional Approval and may offer one or more programs (see*** (i.e. Institutions Seeking IIA webpage) ***for more information).***

- Alameda County Office of Education
- Alder Graduate School of Education
- Atwater Elementary School District
- Burton Elementary School District
- Fortune School of Education
- Lake County Office of Education
- Los Angeles Pacific University
- Newhall School District

DRAFT

- San Benito County Office of Education
- Santa Barbara Unified School District
- Stella Middle Charter Academy
- University of Antelope Valley
- Yuba City Unified School District

DRAFT