



Teacher
Education
Accreditation
Council

2009–2011

TEAC's Accreditation Process at a Glance

Steps	Program faculty actions	TEAC actions
1. Application	Program faculty prepares and submits on-line application and sends membership fee	TEAC staff consults with the institution and program faculty; TEAC accepts or rejects application (on eligibility requirements) and accepts or returns fee accordingly
2. Formative evaluation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Program faculty submits draft of the <i>Brief</i>* with checklist 2. (Optional) Workshops, coaching, and other formative evaluation services available both before and after the program submits draft 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TEAC staff reviews draft <i>Brief</i> or sections for coverage, clarity, and auditability and returns drafts for revisions and resubmission as needed 2. If appropriate, TEAC solicits outside reviews on technical matters, claims, and rationale
3. <i>Inquiry Brief</i> or <i>Inquiry Brief Proposal</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Program faculty responds to TEAC staff and reviewers' comments 2. Program submits final <i>Brief</i> with checklist 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TEAC declares <i>Brief</i> auditable 2. TEAC provides instructions for submitting hard copies of the <i>Brief</i> 3. TEAC accepts <i>Brief</i> for audit and submits it to the lead auditor for instructions to audit team
4. Call for comment	Program faculty and staff distribute call-for-comment letter to designated parties	TEAC places program on TEAC web site's "call-for-comment" page and circulates call-for-comment letter to program faculty, staff and stakeholders
5. Survey	Program sends email addresses for faculty, students & cooperating teachers	TEAC electronically surveys the faculty, students & cooperating teachers who send their responses anonymously to TEAC through a third-party vendor
6. Audit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Program faculty submits data for audit as requested 2. Program faculty responds to any clarification questions sent prior to site visit 3. Program faculty receives and hosts auditors during visit (2–4 days) 4. Program faculty responds to audit report 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TEAC schedules audit and sends <i>Guide to the Audit</i> 2. Auditors verify submitted data and formulate questions for the audit 3. Auditors complete visit to campus 4. Auditors prepare audit report and send to program faculty, TEAC, and Accreditation Panel 5. TEAC staff responds to program faculty's comments about the draft audit report 6. Final audit report prepared and distributed
7. Case analysis		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TEAC completes case analysis and sends to program 2. TEAC sends <i>Brief</i>, audit report and faculty response, and case analysis to panel members
8. Accreditation Panel	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Program head participates in meeting (optional) 2. Program faculty responds (within 2 weeks) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Panel formulates accreditation recommendation and report; TEAC sends report to program faculty; TEAC staff responds as needed 2. Call for comment announced via email and Web site
9. Accreditation Committee		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TEAC sends <i>Brief</i>, reviewers' comments, audit report, accreditation report, case analysis, and panel recommendation to Accreditation Committee for decision 2. Accreditation Committee meets; TEAC sends Accreditation Committee's decision to program
10. Acceptance or appeal	Program faculty accepts or appeals TEAC's action (within 30 days)	If the decision is to accredit and the program accepts the decision, TEAC announces the decision and schedules the annual report. If the decision is not to accredit and the program appeals, TEAC initiates its appeal process
11. Annual report	Program faculty submits annual report and fees to TEAC	TEAC reviews annual reports for as many years as required by program's status with TEAC

*TEAC uses "Brief" to refer to both the *Inquiry Brief* and the *Inquiry Brief Proposal*

About the Teacher Education Accreditation Council

The Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), founded in 1997, is dedicated to improving academic degree programs for professional educators – those who teach and lead in schools, pre-K through grade 12.

TEAC accredits undergraduate and graduate programs, including alternate route programs, based on (1) the evidence they have that they prepare competent, caring, and qualified professional educators and (2) their capacity to monitor and improve the program's quality. TEAC believes this is the soundest way to assure the public about the quality of college and university programs.

The education program, not the college, school, department or other administrative unit of the institution, receives TEAC accreditation.

TEAC's unique approach to accreditation helps programs improve and be accountable for their quality. TEAC's accreditation process starts with the evidence (quantitative and/or qualitative) the faculty truly relies on to convince itself that the graduates are competent beginning professionals. The program's examination of its program's quality results in a scholarly monograph, called an *Inquiry Brief*, that makes the case that the claims the program makes about its graduates are warranted. TEAC's academic audit verifies that the evidence cited in the *Brief* is accurate and trustworthy and that the program is following processes that produce quality.

TEAC's membership represents a broad range of higher education institutions, from small liberal arts colleges to large research universities. Affiliate membership is available to institutions that support the TEAC agenda but do not wish to pursue accreditation for any of their programs. State education agencies, professional organizations, or individuals likewise may hold affiliate membership.

As its principles and standards suggest, TEAC is an advocate for improvement based on research and confirmed scholarship. To that end, TEAC shares information about program design and effective-

ness and conducts meetings and workshops on its innovative approach to accreditation for members, state groups, and consortia.

Since 2001 TEAC has been recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), and since 2003 it has been recognized by the United States Department of Education (USDE). TEAC is a member of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditation, American Council on Education, Association of Teacher Educators, Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities, and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification.

Dues and member fees support TEAC's work. Since its founding, TEAC has also received funding from The Pew Charitable Trusts, the John M. Olin Foundation, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, an anonymous donor, The Atlantic Philanthropies, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and the William Randolph Hearst Foundations.

TEAC has its principal offices at the University of Delaware and at One Dupont Circle in Washington, DC in the suite of the Council of Independent Colleges, but it also has regional offices in Virginia, New York, and Missouri. Additional information about TEAC's accreditation activities and events is available on TEAC's website (www.teac.org).

Eligibility Requirements

Candidates for accreditation must meet the following requirements:

- The institution giving the program has regional accreditation or its equivalent.
- The program's graduates are eligible for the state's professional license in education.
- The program is committed to comply with TEAC's standards and requirements.
- The program faculty understands that TEAC may disclose the member's accreditation status.
- The program faculty will provide any information that TEAC may require.

TEAC's Goal and Accreditation Principles

To achieve TEAC program accreditation, an education faculty must make the case that its program has satisfied the following three quality principles:

Quality Principle I: Evidence of program candidate learning

The core *outcome* of the programs that TEAC accredits is evidence that the graduates are competent, caring, and qualified educators. TEAC accreditation is based on the validity of the evidence that the program faculty relies on to support its claims about its graduates' understanding of the professional education curriculum, especially their subject matter knowledge and their teaching and leadership skills.

The core *value* in TEAC accreditation is that the faculty's interpretation of the evidence upon which it relies to support its claims about its graduates is valid. This means that the faculty must document the reliability and validity of their assessments.

Quality Principle II: Evidence of faculty learning and inquiry

The core *activity* of the programs TEAC accredits is the faculty's learning and inquiry. TEAC accreditation is based in part on the faculty's system of quality control. This system is the means by which the faculty finds the evidence for *Quality Principle I*, inquires into ways to improve the program's quality, makes decisions based on evidence, and monitors and enhances the program's capacity for quality.

Quality Principle III: Evidence of institutional commitment and program capacity for quality

TEAC defines a *quality* program as one that has credible and consistent evidence that it satisfies the first two quality principles. However, TEAC also requires the program faculty members to provide evidence that their institution is committed to the program and that the program has adequate capacity for quality with regard to its curriculum, faculty, resources, facilities, publications, student support services, and policies.

TEAC's standard of quality: The quality of the case

A program meets the TEAC standard of quality when the evidence cited in the program's self-study document, the *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal*, is consistent with the claims made about student learning *and* when there is little or no credible evidence that is inconsistent with the claims. TEAC uses a system of *heuristics* to arrive at its accreditation decision and judgment about whether the program's evidence of student learning and other matters is *trustworthy* and *sufficient*.

To establish that a program meets TEAC's principles and standards, TEAC first determines whether or not the cited evidence of student learning is accurate and trustworthy. This is accomplished through the academic audit. TEAC's Accreditation Panel and Accreditation Committee then determine whether or not the evidence is sufficient to support the program faculty's claims for student learning.

The quality of evidence and the quality of the system that produced it are the two key factors in the TEAC accreditation decision.

TEAC's Philosophy of Accreditation

Four principles guide TEAC's accreditation process:

1. Improvement is a continuous process in which each step helps define the next one and moves it forward.
2. The accreditation process must be inquiry driven, starting from the faculty's questions about the program's mission and results.
3. The accreditation process includes evidence from academic audits that examine the trustworthiness of the evidence that student learning meets high expectations and that the program follows processes that produce quality.
4. The process is intended to be frugal, not burdening the program and institution with unnecessary activities or costs in paperwork, personnel, time, and money.

Throughout all stages of the accreditation process, TEAC and program faculty maintain open and frequent communication on all relevant matters.

Process Principle One: Continuous improvement to advance quality

The three TEAC quality principles – candidate learning, faculty learning, and institutional capacity – constitute a dynamic cycle in which the program formulates goals for student achievement, allocates needed resources, assesses student performance, and uses the evidence from the assessment to improve program quality.

TEAC's quality principles are complemented with an accreditation process that incorporates practices of continuous improvement. TEAC's approach to accreditation relies on the following ideas from the continuous improvement literature:

- Create constancy of purpose for improvement;
- Balance constancy of purpose and continual improvement, short- and long-term results, and knowledge and action;
- Link program improvement to student learning;
- Improve every system in the program to enhance the quality of teaching, learning, research, service activities, and outcomes;
- Eliminate misleading and superficial numerical quotas and indicators.

TEAC does not assume a single model or template for education programs. Rather, TEAC's approach reflects an understanding that continuous improvement is a process that offers many different paths to excellence in professional teacher education.

Process Principle Two: Inquiry-driven accreditation

Institutions of higher education justifiably take pride in their record of thoughtful and scholarly approaches to their work. TEAC believes that accreditation of professional teacher education programs should be grounded in exactly the same kind of scholarly inquiry.

The questions driving the inquiry should be interesting and important to the education program faculty and should address the relationship between teaching and student learning, both important indicators of quality. Rather than being designed simply to comply with the external demands of accrediting bodies and state agencies, the program faculty's questions should reflect the unique mission of the program and the goal of preparing competent, caring, qualified professional educators.

TEAC's Philosophy of Accreditation

Process Principle Three: Audits to ensure quality

An audit provides an external verification of the program's internal quality assurance mechanisms and the evidence they produce. An *academic audit* is an investigative review of the way a professional education program is producing student learning, assessing the outcomes of instruction, making improvements in the program, and gaining institutional support for the program. An academic audit does not evaluate quality itself; instead, it verifies the *processes* that are intended to produce quality. TEAC's approach to the audit emphasizes both the quality processes *and* the evidence of the student learning and accomplishment. TEAC's approach requires the program faculty to live up to its publicly proclaimed high expectations for the program and its improvement. This is accomplished when the institution and program demonstrate accountability to the public for those high expectations through the display of solid evidence of student learning.

Process Principle Four: Frugality

The accreditation process is weakened when a program faculty takes steps solely for the purpose of satisfying a requirement. The TEAC accreditation process is designed to be efficient and use the minimum resources necessary to reach timely decisions. For example:

- The process should be a part of the normal quality control system the program employs.
- The document that the program produces to provide evidence of its quality, the *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal*, is the length of a research monograph, about 50 pages. It is based primarily on existing documents, such as reports of ongoing inquiry, state program review, and institutional research and other publications. It focuses on what the program faculty wants and needs to know about the program's performance.

Overview of TEAC's Accreditation Process

Although TEAC's accreditation process assures the public of the quality of teacher education programs, TEAC's unique approach to accreditation also helps programs improve and be confident about their quality.

TEAC accreditation is based on the understanding that programs can follow many different paths in preparing competent, caring, and qualified professional educators. TEAC's accreditation process therefore starts with the questions a faculty asks about its program's quality and the evidence they currently rely on to convince themselves of the program's quality. TEAC's academic audit verifies the accuracy of the evidence that student learning meets high expectations and that the program is following processes that produce quality. TEAC accredits the program on the basis of this evidence. The quality of evidence and the quality of the system that produced it are the two key factors in the TEAC accreditation decision.

To be accredited, an eligible program submits a research monograph, called an *Inquiry Brief*, in which the faculty and administrators present the following evidence in support of their claim that their program satisfies TEAC's three quality principles and standard for capacity to offer a quality program:

- evidence of their students' learning and that their interpretation of the evidence is valid,
- evidence that the program's continuous improvement and quality control are based on information about its students' learning,
- evidence of the program's capacity for quality.

In the *Inquiry Brief*, the program faculty members document their evidence about what their graduates have learned, the validity of their assessment of that learning, and the basis on which the program faculty makes its decisions to improve its program.

Faculty members representing new programs or programs that are in the process of collecting evidence for their claims about student learning may submit an *Inquiry Brief Proposal*, in which they propose how they will show, in a subsequent *Inquiry Brief*, that their graduates are competent, qualified, and caring. They give their reasons for thinking their proposed assessments are valid, that their quality control system functions as it was designed, and that the program has the capacity for quality.

Through an academic audit, TEAC verifies the evidence presented in the *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal*. The audit takes place on campus, over two to four days. A team of two to four trained auditors verifies both the evidence presented in the *Brief* and corroborating evidence. A panel then evaluates whether or not the evidence supports the program's claim that it prepares competent, caring, and qualified educators. Finally, a committee of TEAC's board of directors reviews the entire case and makes the accreditation decision.

Throughout all stages of the accreditation process, TEAC and program faculty maintain open and frequent communication.

For easy reference, see the "TEAC Accreditation Process at a Glance," inside front cover.

TEAC's Accreditation Status Designations

When TEAC awards accreditation, it is in fact making two decisions — (1) that the program now satisfies TEAC's requirements and (2) how long into the future TEAC thinks the program will continue to meet TEAC's requirements.

TEAC's confidence is highest when no or few problems are found in a program that has already earned accreditation. In that circumstance TEAC is comfortable awarding accreditation for a ten-year period provided the annual reports are satisfactory. TEAC is comfortable in awarding accreditation for five years for a first time program's demonstration that it meets TEAC's standards. When problems are uncovered in the course of the audit and panel deliberations, TEAC's confidence in warranting the program's capacity to continue to satisfy TEAC's standards in the future is more limited. For that reason a shorter period of accreditation is justified — two years in fact.

Programs that submit an *Inquiry Brief Proposal* and satisfy TEAC's *Quality Principles II* and *III* may earn *initial accreditation*, signifying that the program has sufficient, but still incomplete, evidence upon which to award accreditation.

Guidelines for TEAC's accreditation status designations based on whether the evidence for the three *Quality Principles* is above or below TEAC's standards

1.0 Candidate Learning	2.0 Faculty Learning	3.0 Capacity & Commitment	Accreditation status designations
Above	Above	Above	Accreditation (10 years)
Above	Above	Above	Accreditation (5 years)*
Above	Below	Above	Accreditation (2 years)
Below	Above	Above	Accreditation (2 years)
Above	Above	Below	Accreditation (2 years)
IBP**	Above	Above	Initial Accreditation (5 years)
IBP**	Above	Below	Initial Accreditation (2 years)
IBP**	Below	Above	Initial Accreditation (2 years)
IBP**	Below	Below	Deny
Below	Below	Above	Deny
Below	Above	Below	Deny

* For the initial *Inquiry Brief* **For the *Inquiry Brief Proposal*

TEAC is piloting a new option for the audit of the *Inquiry Brief Proposal*, which carries forward the features of formative evaluation into the audit itself. In this new option, the auditors search on-site for evidence that will support the program's claims with the result that a firm and realistic plan for the eventual *Inquiry Brief* can be established. The details of the new option can be found on TEAC's website (www.teac.org), but the idea behind the option is that the *Inquiry Brief Proposal* is like a grant proposal to a foundation. The foundation typically shapes the proposal into a project in which the foundation has an interest in supporting. In this new option, the program and TEAC become partners in designing a plan for a successful *Inquiry Brief*.

What Is a Program?

TEAC accredits programs that prepare professional educators who will teach and lead in the nation's schools, grades pre-K–12. Further, TEAC accredits only those education programs for which there is evidence that the graduates are competent, caring, and qualified.

The *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal* is about a single program, but, in the TEAC system, a single program may include several license areas, options, and levels if they share a common logic, structure, quality control system, and similar and comparable categories of evidence. Thus, if an institution has two or more education programs, some or all of them might be submitted for accreditation within a *Brief* as a single program. In cases where the state requires that all education programs be accredited, the faculty should use the criteria below to determine whether to bundle some or all of the institution's programs as a single program for accreditation or treat them separately in the *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal*. Faculty should consider the following factors in their decision:

Program structure. Those programs that have essentially the same requirements, rationale, logic, and faculty can be presented in a single *Brief*.

Quality control system. Programs that share the same quality control system can usually be presented in a single *Brief*.

Evidence. If the evidence for the programs is comparable and can be honestly aggregated, then the programs can be presented in a single *Brief*.

Even if the programs are registered with the state separately or lead to different professional licenses, they can nevertheless be bundled as a single program for TEAC accreditation if they satisfy the conditions above. They would be treated as a single program, but one that has multiple options, areas, levels, and license outcomes.

If the institution's education programs are dissimilar in their underlying logic or in the nature of the evidence for the TEAC quality principles, the institution must submit separate *Briefs* for each distinct program.

TEAC will review for accreditation only those professional education programs for which the institution has evidence to support its claims. It is possible, therefore, that some of the institution's teacher education programs would have TEAC accreditation and others would not. Those that do not would simply remain unaccredited, and the institution would have to accept the consequences of their status. Programs that cannot provide convincing evidence should not benefit undeservedly from their association with programs that have solid evidence and have earned accreditation.

Note that TEAC's protocol agreements with most states require that the institution submit all its education programs for accreditation review. (See below, "TEAC's Relationship to States, Other Accreditors, and Professional Associations.")

TEAC's Relationship to States, Other Accreditors, and Professional Associations

States

The purposes of reviews for state program approval review and accreditation differ: the former assures the eligibility of the program's graduates for the state's license in the profession; the latter assures the quality of the program. However, in practice the reviews themselves are sufficiently similar that states and accreditors can fruitfully cooperate in the process.

TEAC has entered into agreements with states to coordinate TEAC program accreditation and state program review. For the state, the benefit of these agreements is that they allow TEAC to share with the state valuable information that would otherwise be unavailable to the state. For the program, the benefit is a marked reduction in cost and effort. For TEAC, the benefit is that accreditation is more attractive to programs when it can be integrated with the state's program approval process.

Coordination has other benefits. Most states have developed curriculum and performance-based standards for teacher education. Naturally, the states wish to see that the programs seeking TEAC accreditation meet those standards. For its part, TEAC requires that the claims a program faculty makes in its *Brief* must be consistent with the claims it makes elsewhere (for example, the program faculty cannot make one set of claims for the purpose of TEAC accreditation and another set for state program approval). Thus, TEAC expects consistency between the program's claims about *Quality Principle I* (candidate learning) and the claims that the program makes to the state and others: in these instances, the program's claims about *Quality Principle I* must incorporate the state's standards within TEAC's requirement that the program provide evidence that its graduates have learned their teaching subject matters, pedagogy, and caring teaching skills, along with the cross-cutting themes of learning how to learn, multicultural perspectives, and technology.

TEAC's agreements and review protocols with states take several forms, but most base accreditation and the state program approval on a single document: the *Brief*. Agreements typically have the following features, contingent on local needs and contexts:

- **Mandated accreditation.** A few states simply require that all professional education programs in the state be accredited by a nationally recognized accreditor, such as TEAC or NCATE; in some cases, a state accreditation agency is another option. The programs in these states have no option other than meeting the accreditor's standards. In some states, TEAC and the state have added to the accreditation process requirements that are of particular interest to the state.
- **Reliance on TEAC for program approval.** All states require program approval if the graduates are to receive a professional license. While only a few states actually require that programs be accredited, most are supportive of accreditation and freely encourage teacher education programs in the state to undertake the self-examination required by accreditation. Nearly all of the states find that the standards adopted by NCATE and TEAC align with their own views of program quality. Some states have chosen to rely on TEAC accreditation for the program review function, and their agreements with TEAC reflect that fact. TEAC's agreements with these states are usually similar to those with states that mandate accreditation, with the exception that accreditation is voluntary.
- **TEAC as consultant to the state's program approval process.** In another kind of agreement, the state fully retains its authority and independence in making the program approval decision, but uses the contents of the program's *Brief* and TEAC's audit report, case analysis, or accreditation report to corroborate and arrive at its own program approval decision. In these cases, TEAC's accreditation process assists the state in its own program approval work and simplifies that work as the documentation prepared for TEAC also serves the state's program review needs.

TEAC's Relationship to States, Other Accreditors, and Professional Associations

- **Cooperation on joint site visits.** Yet another form of agreement between TEAC and a state involves a simple understanding that to ease the burden on the program, the state and TEAC will make every effort to schedule the TEAC audit and program review visit at the same time and to use common documentation.

Other accreditors

To be eligible for TEAC accreditation, the institution that offers the education program must itself have regional accreditation or the equivalent.

Some professional education programs, whether housed in the school or college of education or another unit of the institution, are accredited by other specialized discipline- or profession-based accreditors (for example, music education, library science, and counseling). TEAC accepts the accreditation of professional education programs by other nationally recognized accreditors (that is, accreditors recognized by the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, CHEA).

This policy is of particular value to those institutions that, under state regulation, must have all the institution's professional education programs accredited. The policy is based on the fact that TEAC's accreditation is rooted in valid evidence that the program's graduates have learned what was expected of them. TEAC and all other accreditors recognized by USDE and CHEA have standards about student learning and must give weight to evidence of student learning in their accreditation decisions. It is on this basis that TEAC accepts the decisions of others as equivalent to its own for the purposes of fulfilling state requirements for accreditation. An official notice and documentation that the program was accredited will suffice for TEAC's purposes in meeting its obligations to the states.

The purpose of the policy is to make as much use as possible of the work the program has done for other specialized or profession-based accreditors. In this way, TEAC can meet its obligations to institutions that have elected TEAC for the purposes of satisfying a state's mandate that all programs that prepare professionals for work in schools be accredited, and the program does not have to duplicate its efforts.

Professional organizations

Most of the national associations and societies that support the professional activities of teachers have developed their own standards for teacher preparation in their fields. Although there are some important divergences, generally, these standards and those of the states and accreditors align.

At the current time, TEAC relies on professional societies, organizations, and unrecognized accreditors for assistance in the specification of the contents of TEAC's *Quality Principle I*, especially for those professional educators whose roles are not covered by TEAC's principles for teacher and school leaders. Programs seeking TEAC accreditation are free to adopt the standards of these societies and associations and use them in TEAC accreditation.

In practice, that means that in presenting its case for meeting *Quality Principle I*, the program faculty must incorporate these standards in the evidence that the program's graduates have learned their subject matter, pedagogy, and caring teaching skills along with the cross-cutting themes of learning to learn, multicultural perspectives, and technology.

TEAC's Accreditation Goal, Principles, and Standards

The common purpose of teacher education programs and other programs for those professionals who work in schools is to prepare *competent, caring, and qualified* educators. The faculty members seeking TEAC accreditation of their program are required to affirm this straightforward goal as the goal of their program.

The TEAC quality principles, described in detail below, are the means by which the faculty makes the case that its professional education program has succeeded in preparing competent, caring, and qualified professional educators.

The TEAC accreditation standards and principles for educational leadership programs appear on page 14.

For easy reference, see the complete TEAC Framework of Principles and Standards in outline form, inside back cover.

Eligibility requirements

To be eligible for candidate status in TEAC, the program's administrator (e.g., chair, dean, director, vice president) must attest by letter to the following:

0.1 Institutional accreditation

The institution giving the program must be accredited by one of the regional accreditation agencies, or the equivalent. TEAC's requirement for regional accreditation, or the equivalent, of the institution offering the program provides additional assurance that the institution is administratively and financially capable.

0.2 Professional licensure

The graduates of the program must have fulfilled the academic requirements for a professional license in education.

0.3 Commitment to comply with TEAC's standards

There must be a commitment to and intent to comply with TEAC's standards and requirements (fees, annual reports, etc.).

0.4 Disclosure of any actions regarding the program's accreditation status

There must be an understanding of, and agreement to, the fact that TEAC, at its discretion, may make known the nature of any action, positive or negative, regarding the program's status with TEAC.

0.5 Willingness to cooperate and provide needed information to TEAC

There must be an agreement to disclose to TEAC, at any time, all such information as TEAC may require to carry out its auditing, evaluating and accrediting functions.

1.0 Quality Principle I: Evidence of candidate learning

Programs must provide sufficient evidence that candidates have learned and understood the teacher education curriculum. This evidence is verified through audit and evaluated for its consistency and sufficiency. Each component and cross-cutting theme of *Quality Principle I* must contribute to the overall goal of producing competent, caring, and qualified teachers.

1.1 Subject matter knowledge

The program candidates must understand the subject matter they will teach.

1.2 Pedagogical knowledge

The program candidates must be able to convert their knowledge of subject matter into compelling lessons that meet the needs of a wide range of pupils and students.

1.3 Caring and effective teaching skill

The program candidates must be able to teach caringly and effectively and to act on their knowledge in a professional manner.

1.4 Cross-cutting themes

In meeting each of TEAC components 1.1–1.3, the program must demonstrate that its candidates have addressed the following three cross-cutting liberal education themes:

1.4.1 *Learning how to learn*: Candidates must demonstrate that they have learned how to learn information on their own, that they can transfer what they have learned to new situations, and that they have acquired the dispositions and skills of critical reflection that will support life-long learning in their field.

TEAC's Accreditation Goal, Principles, and Standards

1.4.2 *Multicultural perspectives and accuracy*: Candidates must demonstrate that they have learned accurate and sound information on matters of race, gender, individual differences, and ethnic and cultural perspectives.

1.4.3 *Technology*: Candidates must be able to use appropriate technology in carrying out their professional responsibilities.

1.5 Evidence of valid assessment

The program must provide evidence regarding the trustworthiness, reliability, and validity of the evidence produced from the assessment method or methods that it has adopted.

2.0 Quality Principle II: Evidence of faculty learning and inquiry

There must be a system of inquiry, review, and quality control in place through which the faculty secures evidence and informed opinion needed to improve program quality. Program faculty should be undertaking inquiry directed at the improvement of teaching and learning, and they should modify the program and practices to reflect the knowledge gained from their inquiry.

2.1. Rationale for the assessments

There must be a rationale for the program's assessment methods that explains why the faculty thinks the assessments are valid and why the criteria and standards the faculty has selected as indicating success are appropriate.

2.2. Program decisions and planning based on evidence

Where appropriate, the program must base decisions to modify its assessment systems, pedagogical approaches, and curriculum and program requirements on evidence of candidate learning.

2.3. Influential quality control system

The program must provide evidence, based on an internal audit conducted by the program faculty, that the quality control system functions as it was designed, that it promotes the faculty's continual improvement of the program, and that it yields the following additional outcomes:

2.3.1 *Curriculum*: The curriculum meets the state's program or curriculum course requirements for granting a professional license.

2.3.2 *Faculty*: The *Inquiry Brief*, as endorsed and accepted by the faculty, demonstrates the faculty's accurate and balanced understanding of the disciplines that are connected to the program.

2.3.3 *Candidates*: Admissions and mentoring policies encourage the recruitment and retention of diverse candidates with demonstrated potential as professional educators, and must respond to the nation's needs for qualified individuals to serve in high demand areas and locations.

The program must monitor the quality of the support services provided to candidates to ensure that student services contribute to candidate success in learning as required by *Quality Principle I*.

2.3.4 *Resources*: The program must have an adequate quality control system that monitors and seeks to improve the suitability and appropriateness of program facilities, supplies, and equipment and to ensure that the program has adequate financial and administrative resources.

3.0 Quality Principle III: Evidence of institutional commitment and capacity for program quality

The program faculty must make a case that overall it has the capacity to offer a quality program, and it does this by bringing forth evidence in the ways described below.

3.1 Commitment (Parity)

In assessing whether a program has demonstrated the existence of adequate and appropriate facilities, equipment and supplies, the auditors, Accreditation Panel, and Accreditation Committee consider a variety of factors, most notably whether the program's facilities, equipment, and supplies are proportionate to the overall institutional resources and whether the program's financial and administrative resources are proportionate to the overall institutional resources.

TEAC's Accreditation Goal, Principles, and Standards

3.1.1 *Curriculum*: The curriculum does not deviate from, and has parity with, the institution's overall standards and requirements for granting the academic degree.

3.1.2 *Faculty*: Faculty qualifications must be equal to or better than the statistics for the institution as a whole with regard to the attributes of the members of the faculty (e.g., proportion of terminal degree holders, alignment of degree specialization and program responsibilities, proportions and balance of the academic ranks, and diversity). See also 3.2.4.

3.1.3 *Facilities*: The facilities, equipment, and supplies allocated to the program by the institution, at a minimum, must be proportionate to the overall institutional resources. The program candidates, faculty, and staff must have equal and sufficient access to, and benefit from, the institution's facilities, equipment, and supplies.

3.1.4 *Fiscal and administrative*: The financial and administrative resources allocated to the program must, at a minimum, be proportionate to the overall allocation of financial resources to other programs at the institution and must be sufficient to support the operations of the program and to promote success in candidate learning as required by *Quality Principle I*.

3.1.5 *Candidate support*: Student support services available to candidates in the program must, at a minimum, be equal to the level of support services provided by the institution as a whole and must be sufficient to support the operations of the program.

3.1.6 *Candidate complaints*: Complaints about the program's quality must be proportionally no greater or significant than the complaints made by candidates in the institution's other programs.

3.2 Capacity (Sufficiency)

The program must show that the curriculum is adequate to support a quality program that meets the candidate learning requirements of *Quality Principle I*. The program must also demonstrate that the faculty members associated with the program are qualified for their assigned duties in the program consistent with the goal of preparing

competent, caring, and qualified educators. The program must demonstrate that the facilities provided by the institution for the program are sufficient and adequate to support a quality program. The program must have adequate and appropriate fiscal and administrative resources that are sufficient to support the mission of the program and to achieve the goal of preparing competent, caring, and qualified educators. The program must make available to candidates regular and sufficient student services such as counseling, career placement, advising, financial aid, health care, and media and technology support.

The institution that offers the program must publish in its catalog or other appropriate documents distributed to candidates accurate information that fairly describes the program, policies and procedures directly affecting admitted candidates in the program, charges and refund policies, grading policies, and the academic credentials of faculty members and administrators.

The quality of a program depends on its ability to meet the needs of its candidates. One effective way to determine if those needs are met is to encourage candidates to evaluate the program and express their concerns, grievances, and ideas about the program. The faculty is asked to provide evidence that it makes a provision for the free expression of candidate views about the program and responds to candidate feedback and complaints.

3.2.1. *Curriculum*: The curriculum must reflect an appropriate number of credits and credit hour requirements for the components of *Quality Principle I*. An academic major, or its equivalent, is necessary for subject matter knowledge (1.1) and no less than an academic minor, or its equivalent, is necessary for pedagogical knowledge and teaching skill (1.2 and 1.3).

3.2.2. *Faculty*: Faculty members must be qualified to teach the courses in the program to which they are assigned, as evidenced by advanced degrees held, scholarship, advanced study, contributions to the field, and professional experience. TEAC requires that a majority of the faculty members must hold a graduate or doctoral level degree in

TEAC's Accreditation Goal, Principles, and Standards

subjects appropriate to teach the education program of study and curricula. The program may, however, demonstrate that faculty not holding such degrees are qualified for their roles based on the other factors than those stated above.

3.2.3. Facilities: The program must demonstrate that there are appropriate and adequate budgetary and other resource allocations for program space, equipment, and supplies to promote success in candidate learning as required by *Quality Principle I*.

3.2.4. Fiscal and administrative: The financial condition of the institution that supports the program must be sound, the institution must be financially viable, and the resources available to the program must be sufficient to support the operations of the program.

The program must demonstrate that there is an appropriate level of institutional investment in and commitment to faculty development, research and scholarship, and national and regional service. Faculty workload obligations must be commensurate with the institution's expectations for promotion, tenure, and other program obligations.

3.2.5. Student support services: Student services available to candidates in the program must be sufficient to support successful completion of the program and success in candidate learning. In cases where the program does not directly provide student support services, the program must show that candidates have equal access to, and benefit from, student support services provided by the institution.

3.2.6. Policies and practices: The program must distribute an academic calendar to candidates. The academic calendar must list the beginning and end

dates of terms, holidays, and examination periods. If the program's academic calendar coincides with the institution's academic calendar, it may distribute the institution's academic calendar.

Claims made by the program in its published materials must be accurate and supported with evidence. Claims made in the *Inquiry Brief* regarding the program must be consistent with, and inclusive of, the claims made about the program that appear in the institution's catalog, mission statements, and other promotional literature.

The program must have a fair and equitable published grading policy, which may be the institution's grading policy.

The institution is required to keep a file of complaints from its candidates about the program's quality and must provide TEAC with access to all complaints regarding the program and their resolution.

3.3. State standards

When appropriate because of TEAC's protocol agreement with a state, a third component to the TEAC capacity standards (3.3) is added, with subcomponents (3.3.1, etc.) in accordance to the state's particular requirements.

Nonspecific concerns

If the *Brief* contains inaccuracies that are not clearly related to any feature of the TEAC accreditation framework, but which nevertheless speak to the overall reliability and trustworthiness of the *Brief*, the auditors will list them as nonspecific concerns about the accuracy of the *Brief*, and the tasks that probe these concerns will be counted in the overall audit opinion.

TEAC's Accreditation Goal, Principles, and Standards

The TEAC Accreditation System for Educational Leadership

Educational Leadership and Educational Administration preparation programs seeking TEAC accreditation must satisfy the same eligibility standards and *Quality Principle II* and *III* standards as teacher education programs (above) must satisfy. The educational leadership/administration requirements for *Quality Principle I*, however, differ from the teacher education requirements and are as follows:

1.0 *Quality Principle I: Evidence of candidate learning*

Programs must provide sufficient evidence that candidates have learned and understood the educational leadership curriculum. This evidence is verified through audit and evaluated for its consistency and sufficiency. Each component and cross-cutting theme of *Quality Principle I* must contribute to the overall goal of producing competent, caring, and qualified professionals.

1.1 Professional knowledge

The program faculty must provide evidence that its candidates understand organizational theory and development, human resource management, school finance and law, instructional supervision, educational policy and politics, and data analysis and interpretation.

The graduates must be prepared to create or develop (1) an ethical and productive school culture, (2) an effective instructional program, (3) a comprehensive professional staff development plan, (4) a safe and efficient learning environment, (5) a profitable collaboration with families and other community members, (6) the capacity to serve diverse community interests and needs, and (7) the ability to mobilize the community's resources in support of the school's goals.

1.2 Strategic decision-making

The program faculty must provide evidence that the candidates know how to (1) make decisions fairly, collaboratively, and informed by research evidence; (2) formulate strategy to achieve the school's goals; and (3) articulate and communicate an educational vision that is consistent with the school's mission and the nation's democratic ideals.

1.3 Caring and effective leadership skills

The program faculty must provide evidence that the candidates know how to act on their knowledge in a caring and professional manner that results in appropriate levels of achievement for all the school's pupils.

1.4 Cross-cutting themes

In meeting each of TEAC components 1.1–1.3, the program must demonstrate that its candidates have addressed the following three cross-cutting liberal education themes:

1.4.1 *Learning how to learn*: Candidates must demonstrate that they have learned how to learn information on their own, that they can transfer what they have learned to new situations, and that they have acquired the dispositions and skills of critical reflection that will support life-long learning in their field.

1.4.2 *Multicultural perspectives and accuracy*: Candidates must demonstrate that they have learned accurate and sound information on matters of race, gender, individual differences, and ethnic and cultural perspectives.

1.4.3 *Technology*: Candidates must be able to use appropriate technology in carrying out their professional responsibilities.

1.5 Evidence of valid assessment

The program must provide evidence regarding the trustworthiness, reliability, and validity of the evidence produced from the assessment method or methods that it has adopted.

Practical Matters

Our program meets TEAC's eligibility criteria. How do we join?

Complete an on-line membership application form available at www.teac.org (Membership, How to Join). A completed application includes the application form, documentation of the institution's regional accreditation, evidence that the program's graduates are eligible for state licensure, a copy of the institution's current catalog, and a check to cover the membership fee.

How much does it cost to be a member of TEAC?

In 2009, annual membership dues for the institution are \$2,720; dues are subject to annual percentage increases equal to the higher education inflation index (HEPI). Affiliate members (institutions and organizations) pay \$653 annually; they are not eligible for accreditation.

Members receive invoices for their dues by June 15. Payment is due by July 1.

For the year in which a program's *Brief* is audited, the institution pays an audit fee of \$2,000 per *Brief*. In addition, the institution is responsible for all costs related to each audit and audit team (two to four people, over two to four days): lodging (up to four nights), food, travel, and fees (\$1,500 per auditor; an honorarium of at least \$100 per day for the on-site practitioners and the cost of a substitute if the practitioner is a classroom teacher). The audit fee and related audit costs are separate from the membership dues.

How long does it take to complete TEAC accreditation?

The time it takes a program faculty to prepare an *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal* varies, depending on local circumstances such as program structure, available documentation, state context, and the institution's commitment to the process. The amount of time it takes to complete a research article or monograph is a good guide for the time needed to write a *Brief*.

Once the *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal* is accepted for audit, the process to the accreditation decision takes eight to ten months (see inside front cover for details of the accreditation process and TEAC's audit schedule, below).

Who should write the Brief and how long should it be?

The program faculty should produce the *Brief*. All faculty members of the programs represented in the *Brief* should contribute to the process, and they are required to approve the final *Brief* before it is submitted to TEAC for audit. The *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal* should run about 50 pages, exclusive of appendices.

Will TEAC give us any guidance as we prepare our Brief?

The TEAC staff's decision that a *Brief* is auditable is based on the accuracy of the checklist submitted with the *Brief*, which attests that all the required parts are in fact in the *Brief*. The authors are free to make their case in any way they find persuasive, while at the same time conforming to format requirements such as page limitations, required sections, and accuracy.

TEAC offers guidance and feedback in a variety of ways. TEAC's comprehensive *Guide to Accreditation* gives detailed instructions on writing the *Brief*, and two copies are available as part of membership in TEAC (extra copies may be purchased).

In addition, TEAC provides a staff liaison to assist the program over a period of weeks and months in the writing and editing of the *Brief*, methodological design, statistical analysis, interpretations of evidence.

Practical Matters

TEAC funds this service from the audit fees all programs pay in the year of their audits.

To further guide members in their process, TEAC offers a variety of additional formative evaluation services. Each of these services has a fee (for workshop dates, fees for all services, and ordering information, see www.teac.org):

1. Each October and March, TEAC conducts workshops for those who would like more assistance. The workbook given to participants is designed to help program faculty get started on a *Brief*; extra copies for campus colleagues are also available for purchase.
2. On request, TEAC can provide tailored workshops on-site for a program or group of programs (such as a sector- or state-based consortium).
3. TEAC can provide individual consultation for a program, in TEAC's offices.
4. In rare cases where a program requires or desires more help than the staff liaison can provide, TEAC can provide consultants on an individually negotiated cost basis.

Are the TEAC staff providing formative evaluation for the Inquiry Brief involved in the accreditation decision?

There is a “firewall” between TEAC's formative evaluation of the *Inquiry Brief* and its summative evaluation; the staff who conduct one do not conduct the other.

When will TEAC conduct the audit?

During the formative evaluation, TEAC staff review drafts of the *Brief*. When TEAC finds the *Brief* complete, it is then ready for audit, or auditable, and the program submits a final version of the *Brief*. Only after an *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal* is declared auditable will TEAC schedule an audit of the program or, if the program has a target audit date because of state requirements, confirm a scheduled audit.

TEAC audits programs only while courses are in full session, when most students and faculty on campus. Thus, TEAC has two audit periods during each academic year: from September 15 to December 15; and from January 15 to April 15. The current TEAC audit schedule, below, includes a period for formative evaluation and the timing of accreditation decision.

To allow sufficient time for both our review and any revisions you may make in your *Brief*, TEAC asks each candidate for accreditation to develop and commit to an **accreditation plan**, which you can download from the TEAC Web site and submit to TEAC. Start by using the schedule below to identify your target audit period and accreditation date. If you want to take advantage of any of the optional formative evaluation services we offer, you must submit an **initial full draft** for review **at least six months** before your audit date to allow sufficient time both for our staff to study your draft and for the program faculty to meet and address TEAC feedback and make any revisions that may be required or advisable. Whether you engage the optional formative evaluation services or not, you should plan to submit your **last revised draft** of the *Brief* **at least two months** before your target audit date for an auditability decision. If TEAC finds the *Brief* auditable, your audit date will be confirmed. If, however, the *Brief* needs more than very minor revisions, the review process will have to continue into the next audit period and you will need to schedule a new audit date.

Once accredited, what is our obligation to TEAC?

Accredited TEAC members must keep their annual dues current; submit annual reports; and stay in compliance with TEAC's eligibility requirements, quality principles, and standards of capacity. Annual reports are due on the anniversary of the accreditation decision.

Practical Matters

What kind of information can we find on TEAC's Web site, www.teac.org?

TEAC's Web site provides information on membership (how to join and participate), upcoming workshops and meetings, full details on TEAC's accreditation process, links to TEAC member institutions and their accredited program status, forms for use in the *Brief*, access to TEAC literature and related articles, and important updates to TEAC policies and the accreditation process.

TEAC audit schedule 2009–2012

Table of Due Dates

<i>Inquiry Brief declared auditable no later than</i>	<i>Audit period</i> from to		<i>Reports and responses completed by</i>	<i>Panel meeting*</i>	<i>Committee meeting*</i>
2009–2010 season					
August 1, 2009	Sept. 1, 2009	Sept. 30, 2009	Nov. 1, 2009	Nov. 2009	January 2010
September 1, 2009	Oct. 1, 2009	Nov. 30, 2009	Jan. 1, 2010	Feb. 2010	March 2010
November 1, 2009	Dec. 1, 2009	Feb. 28, 2010	April 1, 2010	May 2010	June 2010
February 1, 2010	March 1, 2010	May 31, 2010	July 1, 2010	August 2010	Sept. 2010
2010–2011 season					
August 1, 2010	Sept. 1, 2010	Nov. 30, 2010	Jan. 1, 2011	Feb. 2011	March 2011
November 1, 2010	Dec. 1, 2010	Feb. 28, 2011	April 1, 2011	May 2011	June 2011
February 1, 2011	March 1, 2011	May 31, 2011	July 1, 2011	August 2011	Sept. 2011
2011–2012 season					
August 1, 2011	Sept. 1, 2011	Nov. 30, 2011	Jan. 1, 2012	Feb. 2012	March 2012
November 1, 2011	Dec. 1, 2011	Feb. 28, 2012	April 1, 2012	May 2012	June 2012
February 1, 2012	March 1, 2012	May 31, 2012	July 1, 2012	August 2012	Sept. 2012

* The exact date for the panel and committee meetings will be scheduled at the close of each audit period.

Notes

Notes

TEAC's Accreditation Framework

TEAC's Principles and Standards

0.0 Eligibility for the program's candidate accreditation status

- 0.1 Institutional accreditation by one of the regional accreditation agencies, or the equivalent**
- 0.2 Professional licensure available to graduates**
- 0.3 Commitment to comply with TEAC's standards**
- 0.4 Disclosure of any actions regarding the program's accreditation status**
- 0.5 Willingness to cooperate and provide needed information to TEAC**

1.0 Quality Principle I: Evidence of candidate learning

- 1.1 Evidence of candidates' subject matter knowledge**
- 1.2 Evidence of candidates' pedagogical knowledge**
- 1.3 Evidence of candidates' caring and effective teaching skill**
- 1.4 Evidence of the cross-cutting liberal education themes**
 - 1.4.1 Learning how to learn
 - 1.4.2 Multicultural perspectives and accuracy
 - 1.4.3 Technology
- 1.5 Evidence of valid interpretations of the assessments**

2.0 Quality Principle II: Evidence of faculty learning and inquiry

- 2.1 Rationale for assessments**
- 2.2 Program decisions and planning based on evidence**
- 2.3 Influential quality control system**
 - 2.3.1 **Curriculum** meets professional license requirements
 - 2.3.2 **Faculty** accept TEAC goal and program's *Inquiry Brief / Inquiry Brief Proposal* and have an accurate and balanced understanding of the field
 - 2.3.3 **Candidates:** admissions policies encourage diversity and service in high-demand areas and student services contribute to candidate success in learning
 - 2.3.4 **Resources** monitored and enhanced by the program's quality control system

3.0 Quality Principle III: Evidence of institutional commitment and capacity for program quality

3.1 Commitment (parity)

- 3.1.1 **Curriculum** meets institutional standards and degree requirements
- 3.1.2 **Faculty** qualifications are equal to or better than the statistics for the institution as a whole
- 3.1.3 **Facilities** are proportionate to the overall institutional resources
- 3.1.4 **Fiscal and administrative** resources adequate to promote candidate learning as required by *Quality Principle I* and in parity with the institution
- 3.1.5 **Candidate support** equal to the level of support services provided by the institution as a whole
- 3.1.6 **Candidate complaints** proportionally no greater or significant than the complaints by candidates in the institution's other programs

3.2 Capacity (sufficiency)

- 3.2.1 **Curriculum** reflects an appropriate number of credits and credit hour requirements for the components of *Quality Principle I*
- 3.2.2 **Faculty** are qualified for their teaching assignments
- 3.2.3 **Facilities** are appropriate and adequate to promote success in candidate learning as required by *Quality Principle I*
- 3.2.4 **Fiscal and administrative:** institution is financially sound and there is an appropriate level of institutional resources for faculty development
- 3.2.5 **Candidate support** services are sufficient to support successful completion of the program
- 3.2.6 **Policies and practices** are adequate for program quality and satisfy federal requirements

State standards: When appropriate because of TEAC's protocol agreement with a state, a third component to the TEAC capacity standards (3.3) is added with subcomponents (3.3.1, etc.) in accordance to the state's particular requirements.

Teacher Education Accreditation Council

Frank B. Murray, President

frank@teac.org

Offices:

One Dupont Circle
Suite 320
Washington, DC 20036
202-466-7236
teac@teac.org

Willard Hall Education Building
Suite 101
Newark, DE 19716
302-831-0400
302-831-3013 (fax)
teac@teac.org

Membership Information:

Rebecca Pelton
Vice President for Membership
Willard Hall Education Building
Suite 101
Newark, DE 19716
302-831-6072
302-831-3013 (fax)
rebecca@teac.org

For more information about TEAC, see
www.teac.org