

## **Policy Discussion: Start Date of Provisional Period and Setting of Timeframe for Approved Institutions to Initiate/Re-Initiate Operation of Programs October 2023**

### **Overview**

This agenda item presents two topics for consideration and/or action by the Committee on Accreditation (COA). The first is approval of language specifying the start date for programs approved in Stage IV of the Initial Institutional Approval process and changes to the *Accreditation Handbook* that accompany this proposed clarification. The second is consideration of a timeframe by which approved program sponsors – whether provisionally or fully accredited – must initiate an educator preparation program and what the COA might consider appropriate action when this does not happen.

### **Part I: Specifying the start date for programs approved at the conclusion of Stage IV of the IIA process**

As staff continues to work with institutions in the Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) process, the idea has emerged that clarification of the point at which the provisional approval period begins in the IIA process would be useful for both program sponsors and staff. Although the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) grants Provisional Approval at the conclusion of Stage III and sets the provisional approval period (typically three years), the provisional approval period cannot begin until the COA grants Initial Program Approval in Stage IV. Staff is proposing edits to the *Accreditation Handbook* to reflect this clarification. Please see the underlined and highlighted text on pages 10 and 11 of this item. Additionally, language will be used in Commission and COA agenda items reflecting this clarification.

### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends approval of the updated *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter 3 for posting to the Commission's website.

### **Next Steps**

If the COA adopts the updated *Accreditation Handbook* Chapter 3 it will be posted to the Commission's website with the rest of the handbook chapters.

### **Part II: Setting of timeframe for approved institutions to initiate/re-initiate operation of programs**

At its June 2023 meeting, an institution came before the COA requesting an allowance to continue as an approved program sponsor after having withdrawn all its approved programs.

Section C of Chapter 3 of the *Accreditation Handbook* states that when a program sponsor withdraws that last of its programs, "it loses approval as a Commission-accredited institution." If such an institution subsequently wishes to seek Commission approval as a program sponsor, it must wait two years from the date of closure and must then complete all aspects of the Initial Institutional Approval process to once again become a Commission-approved program sponsor. The handbook further states: "In specific instances, and at the request of an institution whose

programs have been discontinued, the COA may take action to determine that institution may remain as an approved program sponsor for a specified amount of time as defined by the COA.”

When considering the request of the institution at the June 2023 meeting, the COA asked staff about any existing policy that would impose a timeline for institutions that remain open after having withdrawn all educator preparation programs. There currently exists no specific timeline by which an institution in such a situation might be required to submit a program proposal or be automatically moved to closed status. As it is currently written, the COA may set a timeframe on a case-by-case basis. For the institution under consideration at the June 2023 meeting, the COA determined a time period of two years was an appropriate period of time for a variety of factors, including the institution’s own assertion that it intended to consider offering educator preparation programs sooner rather than later. The institution had expected to close but, following a merger with another institution, the possibility of again offering educator preparation programs re-emerged. For this reason, the institution requested the COA consider allowing it to remain open while the institution considered possibly submitting a new program proposal. It should be noted that the merger occurred within a few months of the institution withdrawing all of its programs.

Similarly, a situation recently arose in which an institution in provisional approval status did not initiate its program following COA approval. Turnover in staffing and leadership led to confusion about whether the program could be initiated and now there has been significant turnover in key positions. The institution has recently inquired if it could be given another year in which to consider its next steps. The institution has not yet begun to offer the provisionally approved program. In this case, as part of Stage III of the Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) process, the institution was granted by the Commission a provisional period of two years to operate a program once it was approved by the COA. The institution received COA approval in August 2021 for a proposed program in Stage IV of the IIA process. The two-year provisional period has now passed, and the Accreditation Handbook does not directly address what happens if an institution’s provisional timeline expires without having begun offering a program. Lacking that clarity, it is assumed that the institution is no longer considered in provisional status and, if they desire to offer programs once again, they must start the IIA process all over again. Staff recommends that Commission policy on these instances be clarified. In so doing, the COA may want to consider adjustments to this policy to determine whether there are circumstances or policies that may be adopted to allow an institution to remain in provisional status, resubmit any proposed programs for COA approval, including resubmitting program documentation and program-specific Preconditions again for Stage IV, and/or resubmit the Preconditions and Common Standards evidence and responses for Stages II and III.

While instances such as the two described above are rare, they are clearly possible; therefore, it is reasonable that the COA might wish to set policy to guide staff, institutions, and COA members so that confusion or potential for misunderstanding might be avoided.

The current [Accreditation Framework](#) adopted by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing in June 2020 sets forth the responsibilities of the COA including, but not limited to, making

decisions about the continuing accreditation of institutions and programs and overseeing activities associated with the accreditation system. The COA, therefore, has the authority to set a policy to guide future decisions related to a period of time an institution might be permitted to remain in “open” status after withdrawing all educator preparation programs.

### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends the COA discuss whether it would like to set a time period by which an institution that has been approved to offer educator preparation programs must either initiate an approved program, apply to offer an approved program, or withdraw itself as an approved program sponsor.

Additionally, staff requests the COA consider whether institutions in Stage IV of the IIA process that do not initiate an approved program in the provisional time period set by the Commission in Stage III, that begins with COA approval at the conclusion of Stage IV, shall be allowed to resubmit programmatic documentation to offer the program or be required to withdraw as a provisionally approved institution and repeat one or more stages of the IIA process.

Staff also requests the COA consider whether a fully approved program sponsor that has withdrawn all approved programs be allowed to retain its status as an approved program sponsor. If an institution shall be allowed to retain its status as an approved program sponsor after withdrawal of all approved programs, staff requests the COA consider if it would like to set a time period by which such an institution must either submit a valid program proposal or be closed. Staff further requests the COA either affirm the current two-year period that such institutions are required to wait until reapplying to become program sponsors or suggest a different time period.

### **Next Steps**

*Potential COA Action #1:* If the COA takes action to set a time period by which an institution that has been approved to offer educator preparation programs must either initiate an approved program, apply to offer an approved program, or withdraw itself as an approved program sponsor, the language of the *Accreditation Handbook* will be updated accordingly and brought back to the COA at a future meeting for adoption.

*Potential COA Action #1a:* If the COA takes action to specify the requirements for institutions in Stage IV of the IIA process to initiate a program or programs approved by the COA, including setting a time period by which this must occur and/or requiring such institutions to withdraw as a provisionally approved institution and possibly repeat one or more stages of the IIA process, the language of the *Accreditation Handbook* will be updated accordingly and brought back to the COA at a future meeting for adoption.

*Potential COA Action #2:* If the COA takes action to allow a fully approved program sponsor that has withdrawn all approved programs to retain its status as an approved program sponsor for a time period determined by the COA, including whether such an institution must either submit a

valid program proposal or be closed, the language of the *Accreditation Handbook* will be updated accordingly and brought back to the COA at a future meeting for adoption.

*Potential COA Action #3:* Finally, if the COA takes action to modify the current two-year time period that a closed institution must wait before applying again to become program sponsors, the language of the *Accreditation Handbook* will be updated accordingly and brought back to the COA at a future meeting for adoption.

### **Questions the COA May Wish to Consider**

Staff would like to hear COA discussion on the following questions as well as any other considerations that should be made for these and other similar scenarios identified in this item.

- Does the COA wish to set a period of time to be applied to any institution that has withdrawn all programs but requests to remain as an approved program sponsor or would it prefer to consider these on a case-by-case basis?
- Should institutions that have undergone changes in institutional ownership, including acquisitions, mergers with other institutions, or similar actions, be permitted to request additional time to either propose programs for COA approval or initiate already-approved programs? This question applies to approved program sponsors that have withdrawn all approved programs as well as provisional institutions who do not initiate its approved programs.

# Appendix A

## Chapter Three of the Accreditation Handbook

### 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
- III) Provisional Approval
- IV) Initial Program Approval
- V) 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 [IIA 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 institutional 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 [IIA Stage I webpage](#).

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**

Institutions in Stage II of IIA are required to provide responses to the twelve Eligibility Criteria, two Initial Program Preconditions, and, if applicable, General Precondition #9. Evidence guidance documents are provided on the [Commission's IIA Stage II webpage](#).

### **Eligibility Criteria**

Eligibility Criteria must be met by an institution prior to moving forward to Stage III of IIA. Eligibility Criteria are grounded in California Education Code, regulations, or Commission policy. An institution in Stage II of the IIA process must submit responses to the following Eligibility Criteria:

#### **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](mailto: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).

**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 in Stage II of the IIA process must submit responses to the following Preconditions:

- General Precondition #9: Faculty and Instructional Personnel Participation, if applicable
- Initial Program Preconditions

**Stage II Conclusion: Eligibility**

Once submitted, an institution's responses to the relevant Eligibility Criteria\* and preconditions are reviewed by Commission staff. This is an iterative review process until Commission staff determines alignment to the relevant Eligibility Criteria and preconditions. If staff determines the institution has not demonstrated alignment, the submission is returned to the institution with specific feedback. The institution may revise and resubmit its responses to demonstrate alignment. Full alignment is required before Eligibility can be considered by the Commission.

Commission staff prepare an agenda item containing details relevant for Stage II approval. Institutional representatives must be present to answer questions during the Commission meeting at which the Stage II agenda item is presented.

\* *Alignment to Criteria 10-12 is determined by the Commission and not Commission staff.*

**STAGE III – 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:

**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 proposed to offer in Stage I. An institution's responses to the Common Standards are reviewed by Board of Institutional Review (BIR) members. If BIR reviewers find the responses do not demonstrate alignment, they will return the submission to the institution with comments on areas where alignment could not 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. During this process, representatives of the institution can obtain information and assistance from Commission staff. 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.

### **Stage III Conclusion: 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.

If approval is granted, a provisional timeframe will be set spanning two to four years, in accordance with the proposed program's design. Generally, the 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 collection 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 must be reviewed by the COA for Initial Program Approval in Stage IV. The Provisional Approval period would begin on the date of COA grants Initial Program Approval in Stage IV.

An institution that is denied Provisional Approval may choose to reapply after addressing the Commission's questions and/or concerns.

Commission staff prepare an agenda item containing details relevant for Stage III approval. Institutional representatives must be present to answer questions during the Commission meeting at which the Stage III agenda item is presented.

## ***STAGE IV – Initial Program Approval***

### **Program Standards**

Program standards address aspects of program quality and effectiveness that apply to each type of educator preparation program proposed 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 must respond to the program standards for each proposed program and must demonstrate alignment to all applicable program standards before the institution may be considered for Initial Program Approval by the Commission on Accreditation (COA).

The institution's 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 continues until all program standards are determined to be aligned.

### **Program-Specific Preconditions**

An institution seeking Initial Program Approval from the COA must submit responses to the preconditions specific to the program(s) being proposed. The review of preconditions follows the same process described in Stage II. Full alignment is required before Initial Program Approval can be considered by the COA.

### **Stage IV Conclusion: Initial Program Approval**

Once reviewers have determined alignment to the program standards and program-specific preconditions, Commission staff will prepare an agenda item containing details relevant for Stage IV approval. The COA will review the agenda item and institutional responses to the program standards and make a determination to either approve or deny Initial Program Approval. Action by the COA is communicated to the institution in writing. Institutional representatives must be present to answer questions during the COA meeting at which the Stage IV agenda item is presented.

If Initial Program Approval is granted, the institution moves into Stage V of the IIA process in which it may begin operating its program(s) in accordance with the provisional timeframe set by the Commission at the conclusion of Stage III. In other words, the provisional period established by the Commission begins on the date of COA approval. Within this timeframe, a provisional site visit will occur as described in Stage V below. It is the Commission's expectation that the new program(s) operate in a manner that is aligned to 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 at least one candidate cohort complete each approved program in order for program effectiveness data to be collected.

An institution that is denied Initial Program Approval may reapply after addressing the COA'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.**

### ***STAGE V – Full Approval***

Once an institution has received both Provisional Approval (Stage III) and Initial Program Approval (Stage IV), the institution can begin admitting candidates and implementing their approved educator preparation program(s). During this time, the institution will operate the approved program(s), recommend candidates for appropriate credentials, submit annual reports through the

Accreditation Data System (ADS), and obtain access to and use information in the Credential Information Guide (CIG) and, if appropriate, Results Analyzer.

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 to standards.

At the end of the Provisional Approval timeframe, the institution will host a provisional site visit. Prior to the site visit, a team comprised of BIR members will review submissions of preconditions, program standards, and Common Standards, in addition to data and evidence provided for the provisional site visit. During this site visit, the team confirms alignment with the standards by conducting interviews with relevant constituencies and continuing evidence review.

Any expenses incurred during a provisional site visit are the responsibility of the institution.

At the conclusion of the provisional site visit, the team writes a provisional site visit report providing an accreditation recommendation and findings on all standards which will be presented to the COA.

#### **Stage V Conclusion: Full Approval**

The COA reviews and discusses the report and can accept or modify the accreditation recommendation and/or any stipulations associated with the findings.

The COA can take one of two actions:

1. Retain institution in provisional status to address stipulations
2. Move institution forward to the Commission

If the COA takes action to move the institution forward, the provisional site visit report and accreditation recommendation will be presented to the Commission for consideration of the institution's Full Approval.

The Commission can accept or modify the COA's recommendation and take one of four actions:

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 Full 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 of 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

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. If the COA determines a program meets all applicable standards, it grants initial approval to the 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 [Accreditation 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 Commission-approved 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 and 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 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. Once reviewers have determined the program complies with the requirements of state laws, administrative regulations, and Commission policy, the program is eligible for a review Program Standards by staff or a review panel.

**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 provides additional reviewers which, in turn, helps the review process move 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 reviewers determine a proposed program aligns to all 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 reviewers determine the program does not meet one or more 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**

The first is an appeal of an adverse decision by Commission staff or a review panel that responses to preconditions, Common Standards and/or relevant program standards did not show alignment and therefore, the responses should not be forwarded to the COA for action. This appeal is directed to 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 is an appeal of 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 COA decision 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 approval with appropriate evidence. Information related to the quality of the program not previously presented to the Commission 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 approval to the program.
- Overturn the decision of the COA and grant 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. This seven-year accreditation cycle entails activities that are required for ongoing accreditation of all approved programs. These include:

- In each year of the accreditation cycle, fully approved program sponsors will submit required data to the Accreditation Data Dashboards.
- 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; however, 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 *withdraw 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 Commission approval as a program sponsor once again, it must wait two years from the date of institutional *closure* and must then complete all aspects of the Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) process. In specific instances, and at the request of an institution whose programs have been discontinued, the COA may take action to determine that 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.