Chapter Three

Introduction
This chapter describes the processes by which an institution is granted approval to offer educator preparation programs, how those programs are approved, and how an approved program can change its status to inactive or withdrawn and what those changes mean. These topics are covered in the following three sections of this chapter:

Section A: Initial Institutional Approval
Section B: Program Approval
Section C: Program Change of Status

Section A: Initial Institutional Approval
Pursuant to Section 4 of the *Accreditation Framework,* the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) is responsible for determining the eligibility of a postsecondary education institution, local education agency (LEA), or other entity that is not currently approved to prepare educators for California's public schools. In order to be eligible to offer an educator preparation program, institutions must complete the Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) process.

The IIA process has been organized into the following five stages:
    I) Prerequisites
    II) Eligibility Requirements
    III) Common Standards, Preconditions, and Provisional Approval
    IV) Program Standards and Program Approval
    V) Provisional Site Visit and Full Approval

Action taken by the Commission, the Committee on Accreditation (COA), and/or Commission staff after completion of each stage determines if an institution is eligible to continue to the next stage of the IIA process.

More information regarding IIA can be found on the Commission's webpage.

STAGE I – Prerequisites
Prerequisite 1
Institutions interested in seeking Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) to become an approved program sponsor must identify which of the following applies to their institution:
- The institution is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges or another of the six regional accrediting associations. A copy of a letter from the accrediting association must be submitted with the IIA application as verification.
- The institution is a public school, school district, or county office of education and has received approval of sponsorship from the agency's governing board. Verification must be submitted in the form of a letter or board minutes signed by the superintendent or CEO of the agency with the IIA application.
- The institution is neither of the above and is preparing to offer STEM (Science, Technology,

Engineering and Math) programs pursuant to Education Code §44227.2. Additional requirements, as noted on the Commission's webpage, are necessary for institutions applying under this category.

Prerequisite 2

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

Required attendees include:
- Unit Head
- Directors of Proposed Program(s)
- Partner Employing Organization or Educational Entity*
- Other participants deemed necessary by the institution

*Though not required, it is strongly suggested that a representative from the partner entity attend Accreditation 101 for all preparation programs.

Accreditation 101 may be held virtually or in-person. If the training is held in-person, all travel expenses for attending Accreditation 101 are borne by the institution. Registration for Accreditation 101 sessions can be found on the Commission's website.

Following completion of the Prerequisites in Stage I, an institution is required to submit a formal application and once the application has been approved, the institution may move forward to Stage II – Eligibility Requirements.

STAGE II – Eligibility Requirements

Eligibility Requirements include twelve criteria to which prospective program sponsors must respond. An evidence guidance document containing specific evidence needed to respond to each eligibility requirement is provided on the Commission's IIA Stage II webpage. Once submitted, an institution's responses to the twelve criteria are reviewed as follows:

1. Responses to criteria 1 through 9 will be reviewed by Commission staff who will make a recommendation regarding the institution's alignment to each criteria to the Commission in an agenda item presented at one of its scheduled public meetings.
2. In that same agenda item, staff will provide the Commission with information on criteria 10, 11, and 12 from the institution's submission for the Commission's consideration but will not make a recommendation regarding alignment.
3. The Commission will review the information provided in the institution's response to each criterion and will make a determination to either grant or deny eligibility to proceed to Stage III. An institution that is denied eligibility may choose to reapply for eligibility after

addressing the Commission's questions and/or concerns.

The 12 criteria that constitute the Eligibility Requirements are listed below:

Criterion 1: Responsibility and Authority
The institution clearly identifies the lines of authority and responsibility for any and all educator preparation programs within the institution and provides assurance that only those persons(s) employed by the program sponsor will recommend individuals to the Commission for a credential or authorization.

Criterion 2: Lawful Practices
A program of professional preparation must be proposed and operated by an entity that makes all personnel decisions regarding employment, retention, or promotion of employees without unlawful discrimination. The entity must also make all decisions regarding the admission, retention, and graduation of students without unlawful discrimination.

Criterion 3: Commission Assurances and Compliance
The institution assures each of the following:
  a) That there will be compliance with all preconditions required for the initial program(s) the institution would like to propose.
  b) That all required reports to the Commission including, but not limited to data reports and accreditation documents, will be submitted by the Commission-approved entity for all educator preparation programs being offered including extension divisions.
  c) That it will cooperate in an evaluation of the program by an external team or a monitoring of the program by a Commission staff member.
  d) That the sponsor will participate fully in the Commission's accreditation system and adhere to submission timelines.
  e) That once a candidate is accepted and enrolled in the educator preparation program, the sponsor must offer the approved program, meeting the adopted standards, until the candidate:
     i. Completes the program,
     ii. Withdraws from the program,
     iii. Is dropped from the program, or
     iv. Is admitted to another approved program to complete the requirements, with minimal disruption, for the authorization in the event the program closes. In this event, an individual transition plan would need to be developed with each candidate.

Criterion 4: Requests for Data
The institution must identify a qualified officer responsible for reporting and responding to all requests from the Commission within the specified timeframes for data including, but not limited to:
  • program enrollments,
  • program completers,
  • examination results,

- state and federal reporting,
- candidate competence,
- organizational effectiveness data, and
- other data as indicated by the Commission.

Criterion 5: Grievance Process
The institution has a clearly identified process for handling all candidate grievances in a fair and timely manner. The grievance process is readily accessible for all applicants and candidates and is shared with candidates early in their enrollment in the program.

Criterion 6: Communication and Information
The institution must provide a plan for communicating and informing the public about the institution and the educator preparation programs. The plan must demonstrate that:
a) The institution will create and maintain a website that includes information about the institution and all approved educator preparation programs. The website must be easily accessible to the public and must not require login information (access codes/password) in order to obtain basic information about the institution's programs and requirements as listed in b.
b) The institution will make public information about its mission, governance and administration, admission procedures, and information about all Commission-approved educator preparation programs. Information will be made available through various means of communication, including but not limited to a website, institutional catalog, and admission materials.

Criterion 7: Student Records Management, Access, and Security
The institution must demonstrate that it will maintain and retain student records. Institutions seeking Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) will provide verification that:
a) candidates will have access to and be provided with transcripts and/or other documents for the purpose of verifying academic units and program completion,
b) all candidate records will be maintained at the main institutional site or central location (paper or digital copies), and
c) records will be kept securely in locked cabinets or on a secure server located in a room not accessible by the public.

Criterion 8: Disclosure
Institutions must disclose information regarding:
a) The proposed delivery model (e.g., online, in person, hybrid, etc.).
b) All locations of the proposed educator preparation programs including satellite campuses.
c) Any outside organizations (i.e., those individuals not formally employed by the institution seeking IIA) who will be providing any direct educational services, and what those services will be, as all or part of the proposed programs.

Criterion 9: Veracity in all Claims and Documentation Submitted
The institution and its personnel demonstrate veracity of all statements and documentation

submitted to the Commission. Evidence of a lack of veracity is cause for denial of Initial Institutional Approval (IIA).

Criterion 10: Mission and Vision
An institution's mission and vision for educator preparation is consistent with California's approach to educator preparation.

Criterion 11: History of Prior Experience and Effectiveness in Educator Preparation
Institutions seeking IIA must have sponsored an educator preparation program leading to licensure or participated as a partner in an educator preparation program and/or program focused on K-12 public education and provide history related to that experience. Commission staff will research available information about the institution relevant to the application for IIA. Institutions must submit proof of third-party notifications. Comments should be sent to Input@ctc.ca.gov.

Criterion 12: Capacity and Resources
An institution must submit a Capacity and Resources plan providing information about how it will sustain the educator preparation program(s) through a two to four-year period of Provisional Approval (if granted), at a minimum. The institution must submit a plan to teach out candidates if, for some reason, the institution is unable to continue providing educator preparation program(s).

STAGE III – Preconditions, Common Standards, and Provisional Approval
Once an institution seeking Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) receives Commission approval for eligibility following Stage II, the institution may continue in the IIA process by submitting the following for Commission approval:

Preconditions
Preconditions are requirements necessary to operate an educator preparation program leading to a credential in California. Preconditions are grounded in California Education Code, regulations, or Commission policy. An institution seeking Provisional Approval must submit responses to the following Preconditions:
- General Precondition #9, if applicable,
- Initial Program Preconditions, and
- Program-Specific Preconditions.

An institution's responses to the preconditions are reviewed by Commission staff. If staff determines that the program has demonstrated compliance with all relevant preconditions, then the preconditions will be found to be met. If staff determines the program has not demonstrated compliance with the preconditions, the proposal is returned to the institution with specific feedback regarding the lack of compliance. The institution may revise and resubmit its preconditions response(s) to demonstrate that the compliance issues have been resolved. This is an iterative process that may continue until all relevant preconditions are determined to be in compliance. Full compliance is required before Provisional Approval can be considered by the Commission.

Common Standards

Common Standards reflect aspects of program quality and effectiveness that are common across all educator preparation programs, regardless of the type of program. The institution must respond to each Common Standard by providing information and supporting documentation that is inclusive of all credential programs the institution initially proposed to offer. An institution's responses to the Common Standards are reviewed by Board of Institutional Review (BIR) members. The BIR may return comments to the institution on areas where alignment cannot be determined. The institution may revise and resubmit its responses for further review by BIR members. This iterative process may continue until all Common Standards are determined to be aligned. The responses must be determined to demonstrate alignment to the Common Standards before the institution can be brought before the Commission for consideration of Provisional Approval.

Provisional Approval

Once an institution has satisfied Stages I, II, and III of the IIA process, the institution will be brought before the Commission at one of its scheduled public meetings for consideration and determination regarding Provisional Approval. The Commission will review the information provided in the institution's Stage III responses and make a determination to either approve or deny provisional approval and grant or deny eligibility to proceed to Stage IV.

If approval is granted, a provisional timeframe will be set spanning two to four years, in accordance with the program's design. Generally, the exact timeframe allowed will be based on the length of the proposed program and the time necessary for the initial candidate cohort to complete the program, thereby allowing for data to be collected to determine the institution's effectiveness in educator preparation. If the Commission grants Provisional Approval to the institution, the program(s) the institution has proposed to offer during this period must then be approved by the COA in Stage IV. An institution that is denied provisional approval may choose to reapply after addressing the Commission's questions and/or concerns.

No additional programs can be proposed in Stage IV beyond those identified during Stage II until the institution is fully approved by the Commission at the conclusion of the IIA process in Stage V.

STAGE IV – Program Standards and Program Approval

Only those programs identified in Stage II may be proposed in Stage IV.

Program standards address aspects of program quality and effectiveness that apply to each type of educator preparation program offered by an institution. Program standards contain statements describing the nature and purpose of each standard and language that details the requirements that all approved programs must meet. Institutions in Stage IV of the IIA process must provide responses to the program standards for the proposed program(s) that the institution intends to offer. Institutions must demonstrate alignment to all applicable program standards before the program application may be considered for Initial Program Approval by the COA. The program standards submission is reviewed by a team of qualified reviewers with expertise in the specific program area. If reviewers determine that the program standards submission does not demonstrate

alignment to the standards, the submission is returned to the institution with specific feedback from the reviewers regarding the lack of alignment. The institution may revise and resubmit the responses for further review. This iterative process may continue until all program standards are determined to be aligned. During this process, representatives of the institution can obtain information and assistance from Commission staff. Once reviewers have determined that the submission demonstrates all program standards are aligned, the program is recommended to the COA for Initial Program Approval at one of its regularly scheduled meetings. The COA will review the information provided in the institution's Stage IV responses and make a determination to either approve or deny program approval and grant or deny eligibility to proceed to Stage V. An institution that is denied program approval may choose to reapply after addressing the COA's questions and/or concerns. Action by the COA is communicated to the institution in writing.

It is the Commission's expectation that the new program(s) operate in a manner that is aligned with Commission standards at all times. Furthermore, it is expected that the institution will respond to all data requests and timelines. During Provisional Approval, and prior to the provisional site visit, an institution must have an initial candidate cohort complete each approved program in order for program effectiveness data to be collected.

STAGE V – Provisional Site Visit and Full Approval
Once an institution has received both provisional institutional approval (Stage III) and program approval (Stage IV), the institution can begin admitting candidates and implementing their approved educator preparation program(s) as described during the IIA process for the provisional approval time period identified in Stage III. During this time, the institution will operate the approved program(s), recommend candidates for appropriate credentials, submit annual information to the Accreditation Data System, and obtain access to and use information in the Credential Information Guide (CIG) and Results Analyzer (if appropriate).

While the institution may make modifications to approved programs based on identified needs, those changes should be communicated to and reviewed with IIA staff to ensure continued alignment with standards.

At the end of the provisional approval timeframe granted in Stage III, the institution will host a provisional site visit. During this site visit, a team of Commission-identified reviewers will analyze data collected during the provisional time period, review submissions of and evidence for Program Review, Common Standards Review, and Preconditions, and interview program and institutional constituencies. Any expenses incurred during a provisional site visit are the responsibility of the institution. The provisional site visit will result in a report of findings, an accreditation recommendation, and the rationale for the recommendation.

This report is presented to the COA which reviews and discusses the accreditation recommendation. The COA can accept or modify the accreditation recommendation and/or any stipulations associated with the findings. Subsequently, the provisional site visit report and accreditation recommendation are moved forward to the Commission. The Commission can accept, modify, or reject the COA's recommendation. The Commission's action can be one of four

options:
1. Grant Full Approval
2. Grant Full Approval and remand the institution back to the COA to address stipulations
3. Continue Provisional Status for one year to address stipulations
4. Deny approval

Institutional representatives must be present to answer questions during both the COA and the Commission meetings at which the provisional site visit report is presented.

Once an institution is granted Full Approval by the Commission, the institution will take part in all scheduled accreditation activities as part the color cohort to which it is assigned. An official letter will be sent to notify the institution of the Commission's action.

Section B: Program Approval

According to Section Four of the *Accreditation Framework* the Committee on Accreditation (COA) is responsible for granting approval to new educator preparation programs for Commission-approved institutions. If the COA determines that a program meets all applicable standards, the COA grants initial approval to the program.

Program Approval is when institutions fully approved by the Commission are granted approval to offer new educator preparation programs. Section 4-C of the *Accreditation Framework* contains the policy for Program Approval which states, "New educator preparation program proposals by institutions that have been approved by the Commission must complete responses to 1) all relevant Preconditions established by state law and by the Commission; 2) Common Standards that address how the new program will integrate into the existing education unit structure; and 3) the appropriate set of Program Standards for the program being proposed."

The process by which program proposals are submitted and reviewed prior to being presented to the COA for action is Initial Program Review (IPR). During IPR, new program proposals for each proposed program as identified on the IPR webpage are reviewed by qualified volunteer reviewers, and as appropriate, by Commission staff with expertise in the credential area. The COA considers recommendations by the reviewers and Commission staff when deciding on the approval of each proposed program.

Program Proposal Submission

As stated in the *Accreditation Framework*, new credential program proposals by Commission-approved institutions must adhere to all applicable Preconditions. They must also align to the Common Standards and meet one of the three program standards options noted in Section Three of the *Accreditation Framework*:

> **Option One:** California Program Standards
> **Option Two:** National or Professional Program Standards
> **Option Three:** Experimental Program Standards

An institution that selects National or Professional Program Standards (Option Two) should consult the *Accreditation Handbook* chapter on National or Professional Standards for appropriate procedures. The acceptability of the standards must be approved before the institution prepares a program proposal. An institution may choose to submit a program that meets the Experimental Program Standards (Option Three). See Section Three of the *Framework* for additional information.

New credential program proposals by Commission-approved institutions must also adhere to requisite steps for the identified program:

- Institutions interested in proposing a new subject matter program must follow the process described on the New Subject Matter Program Webpage.
- Institutions interested in proposing a new educator preparation program must follow the process described on the New Educator Preparation Program webpage.

Program Proposal Review
The Commission, its staff, and the COA follow a required process for reviewing proposals from institutions intending to sponsor new educator preparation programs. During this process, there are multiple opportunities for institutional representatives to confer with staff consultants to answer questions or clarify issues that arise.

1. Review of Preconditions: Preconditions are requirements necessary to operate an educator preparation program leading to a credential in California. Preconditions are grounded in Education Code, regulations, and Commission policy. An institution's response to the Preconditions is reviewed by the Commission's professional staff. If staff determines that the program complies with the requirements of state laws, administrative regulations, and Commission policy, the program is eligible for a review of the standards by staff or a review panel. If the program does not comply with the Preconditions, the proposal is returned to the institution with specific information about the lack of compliance. The institution may resubmit Preconditions once the compliance issues have been resolved.

2. Review of Common and Program Standards: Common Standards and Program Standards address issues of program quality and effectiveness. The institution's responses to the Common Standards (full narrative or Common Standards Addendum as appropriate) and Program Standards are reviewed by qualified volunteer reviewers or by Commission staff.

Because the review process depends heavily on the participation of qualified volunteer reviewers, the review process can be quite lengthy, especially for lower-incidence programs. The Commission asks that each institution identify a minimum of one faculty member for each program it intends to offer who will be available to be trained for and participate in Initial Program Review. This enables a high number of reviewers which, in turn, helps the review process occurs as quickly as possible. It is highly recommended that institutions volunteer to review documents prior to submission of their own proposal in order to gain the most in-depth understanding of the entire IPR process.

3. COA Action If it is determined that a proposed program aligns to the standards, the program is recommended for approval by the COA at one of its regularly scheduled meetings. The action taken by the COA is communicated to the institution in writing.

If it is determined that the program does not meet the standards, the proposal is returned to the institution with an explanation of the findings. After changes have been made in the program, the proposal may be resubmitted for reconsideration.

Appeal of an Adverse Decision
There are two levels of appeal of an adverse decision. The *first appeal* is directed to the COA and is an appeal of a decision by Commission staff, or the review panel, that the preconditions, responses to the Common Standards and/or responses to the relevant program standards were not satisfied and therefore the proposal should not be forwarded to the COA for action.

If a program is not recommended for approval by the COA, the institution may submit a formal request for appeal at least thirty (30) days prior to the COA's next regularly scheduled meeting to

the Administrator of Accreditation, who will place that program on the agenda of the COA for consideration. Included in the request, the institution must provide the following information:
- The original program proposal and the rationale for the appeal of the adverse decision provided by the Commission's staff or review panel.
- Copies of any responses by the institution to requests for additional information from Commission's staff or review panel, including a copy of any resubmitted proposal (if it was resubmitted).
- A rationale for the institution's appeal request.

The COA will review the information and take action on one of the following:
- Grant program approval
- Request a new review of the institution's program proposal by a different Commission staff member and/or a different review panel
- Deny program approval

The *second appeal* is reserved for petitioning an adverse decision by the COA. This appeal is directed to the Executive Director of the Commission.

Appeals to the Executive Director will only be considered on the grounds that the decision of the COA was arbitrary, capricious, unfair, or contrary to the policies of the *Accreditation Framework* or the procedural guidelines of the COA. The appeal must be submitted within twenty (20) business days of the COA's decision to deny initial approval with appropriate evidence. Information related to the quality of the program that was not previously presented to the Commission's staff or the review panel will not be considered by the Commission. The Executive Director will determine whether the evidence submitted by the institution meets the criteria for appeal. If it does, the Executive Director will forward the appeal to the Commission. If it does not, the institution will be notified of the decision and provided with information describing why the information does not adequately meet the criteria. The institution will be given ten (10) business days to resubmit the appeal to the Executive Director.

The appeal, if forwarded to the Commission by the Executive Director, will be heard during a regularly scheduled Commission meeting. The Commission will consider the written evidence provided by the institution and the written response from the COA. In resolving the appeal, the Commission will take one of the following actions:
- Sustain the decision of the COA to deny initial approval to the program.
- Overturn the decision of the COA and grant initial approval to the program.

The Executive Director communicates the Commission's decision to the COA and the institution.

Section C: Program Change of Status

Once a program has been accredited by the COA, it will be considered an approved program. As conditions change, however, it is sometimes necessary for programs to be granted either *inactive* status or it may be *withdrawn* by the institution. Program sponsors are responsible for initiating either a status change from *approved-active* to *approved-inactive* or *withdrawn*.

The chart below illustrates the operational differences in the three possible status options followed by more specific information on each.

Program Sponsor	Active	Inactive	Withdrawn
May Accept New Candidates	Yes	No	No
May Recommend Candidates for a Credential	Yes	Only those already in the program	No
Participates in Data Reporting Requirements	Yes	Yes (if candidates enrolled during reporting period)	No
Participates in Program Review	Yes	Modified	No
Participates in Site Visit	Yes	Modified	No
How to Request Reinstatement	N/A	Letter to COA requesting reactivation	Must go through Initial Program Review Process

Active Programs

Approved Program Sponsors Authorized to Offer California Credentials

Fully approved program sponsors and approved programs participate in all activities in the accreditation cycle in accordance with their assigned cohort. The seven-year accreditation cycle entails activities that are required for ongoing accreditation of all approved programs. These include:

- Required annual data collection, analysis, and submission.
- In the first and fourth year of the accreditation cycle, fully approved program sponsors and approved programs will submit responses to preconditions.
- In the fifth year of the accreditation cycle, fully approved program sponsors will submit Program Review documentation for all approved programs and responses to the Common Standards.
- In the sixth year of the accreditation cycle, fully approved program sponsors and approved

programs will participate in site visit activities.
- In the seventh year of the accreditation cycle, fully approved program sponsors will participate in the 7th Year Follow-up activities as determined by the COA.

An active educator preparation program will be identified as such on the Commission's website.

Inactive Programs
If a program sponsor decides to declare a previously approved program as *inactive*, the following procedures must be followed:
- The program must have 15 or fewer candidates when the program sponsor requests inactive status.
- The program sponsor notifies the Administrator of Accreditation through formal documentation of its intention to declare the program inactive. The program can be deemed *inactive* when it no longer accepts new candidates; it is then only available for current candidates to complete the program.
- The documentation to the Administrator of Accreditation must include the anticipated date that the *inactive* status will begin (i.e., the date from which candidates will no longer be admitted to the program). This date must be no more than six months from the date of notification and cannot be sooner than the date of COA action.
- The program sponsor determines the date by which all enrolled candidates will finish the program, not to exceed a maximum of one year after the anticipated *inactive* date.
- Candidates already admitted to the program are notified in writing by the program sponsor that the program is being declared *inactive*.
- The program sponsor assists enrolled candidates in planning for the completion of their program. A plan regarding how current candidates will complete the program must accompany the *inactive* request.
- Following the date after which all current candidates will be able to complete the program, as determined by the institution, the program may no longer operate, and the program sponsor may no longer recommend candidates until the program is *reactivated*. The *inactive* program will not be listed on the Commission's public web page for approved programs. The program will appear as *inactive* in the Credential Information Guide (CIG).

An *inactive* program will be included in accreditation activities in a modified manner as determined by the Administrator of Accreditation. Additionally, 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 program standards under which the program was approved have been modified, or if new regulations have been added, the program sponsor must address the updated standards before the program may be *reactivated*.

An *inactive* program may remain in *inactive* status for no longer than five years, after which the program sponsor must determine whether the program should be *withdrawn* permanently or *reactivated*. If the program sponsor does not request to *reactivate* or *withdrawal the program* within the five-year limit, the COA will *withdraw* the program at its next scheduled meeting. Commission staff will notify the program sponsor at least six months prior to the automatic

withdrawal date.

Reactivating an Inactive Program
An *inactive* program cannot be *reactivated* until the COA takes action at a regularly scheduled meeting. The program sponsor seeking *reactivation* of an *inactive* program must adhere to the following procedures:
- Submit a letter requesting *reactivation* to the COA indicating the requested date of *reactivation*, why *reactivation* is being requested, and if changes have been made to the program.
- Submit all necessary supporting documentation. The type of documentation will vary depending on a number of factors including, but not limited to, the length of time the program has been *inactive*, personnel changes, and curriculum changes. The program sponsor must contact the Administrator of Accreditation to determine what documentation will be necessary.

Once all requested documentation has been reviewed and approved by Commission staff, the request for *reactivation* is placed on the COA agenda for final approval at its next regularly scheduled meeting. If approved, the *reactivated* program may, according to their approved reactivation date:
- Accept candidates to the program
- Begin operating the program
- Recommend program completers for the appropriate credential/authorization

Withdrawal of Credential Programs
A program sponsor may decide to *withdraw* a program that has been previously approved by the Commission. The *withdrawal* of a program formalizes that it is no longer part of the program sponsor's accredited program offerings and, from the Commission's perspective, no longer part of the accreditation system. Once a program is *withdrawn*, it must wait one year after the date of *withdrawal* by the COA before applying to become *reaccredited*. In order to *withdraw* a program, the following procedures must be followed:
- The program must have taught out all candidates by the effective date of program *withdrawal*.
- The program sponsor notifies the Administrator of Accreditation through formal documentation of its intention to *withdraw* the program at a date when all current candidates have completed the program.
- All candidates admitted or enrolled in the program are notified in writing by the program sponsor that the program is being *withdrawn*.
- The program sponsor determines a date by which all enrolled candidates will be able to finish the program.
- The program sponsor assists enrolled candidates in planning for the completion of their program. The institution may be required to file the list of candidates and date of their program completion with the Commission.

Once *withdrawn*, the program may no longer operate, and the program sponsor may no longer

recommend candidates for the credential/authorization.

Reaccrediting Programs that have been Withdrawn
A *withdrawn* program may operate again only when the program sponsor submits a new proposal for Initial Program Review (IPR) and is approved by the COA. Program sponsors must wait at least one year after the program has been formally *withdrawn* by the COA before requesting that the program be *reaccredited*. Under extenuating circumstances, a program sponsor may petition the COA to waive this requirement.

Closure (Discontinuation) of Credential Programs by the COA
When a program sponsor is required by the COA to *discontinue* an educator preparation program, the following procedures must be followed:
- Within 60 days of action by the COA, the program sponsor must submit a plan for program *discontinuation* for approval by the Administrator of Accreditation.
- Candidates are no longer admitted to the program once the program sponsor is required to *discontinue* the program.
- Candidates already admitted to the program are notified in writing by the program sponsor that the program is being *discontinued*. The plan submitted to the Administrator of Accreditation includes a date by which all enrolled candidates will finish the program.
- The program sponsor helps candidates plan for completion of the program by either helping them complete the program at the institution where they are currently enrolled or assisting them with transferring to another institution with an approved program in the same credential area.
- The program sponsor files the list of candidates and dates of program completion with the Commission.

An institution closed by the COA may only operate again when the program sponsor submits a new proposal for IPR and that new program is approved by the COA. The program sponsor must wait at least two years after all candidates have completed the program before requesting program approval for the credential program.

Institutional Closure due to Closure of Programs
When a program sponsor *withdraws* its last program, it loses approval as a Commission-accredited institution. If the institution determines it wishes to seek to be a Commission approved program sponsor once again, it must wait two years from the date of *closure* and must then complete all aspects of the Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) process. In specific instances, and at the request of the institution, the COA may take action to determine that an institution may remain as an approved program sponsor for a specified amount of time as defined by the COA. As an approved program sponsor, annual accreditation fees would still apply.