### TEAC’s accreditation process at a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Program faculty actions</th>
<th>TEAC actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Application</strong></td>
<td>Program faculty prepares and submits eligibility application and fee</td>
<td>TEAC staff consults with the institution and program faculty; TEAC accepts or rejects application (on eligibility requirements) and accepts or returns fee accordingly∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Formative evaluation</strong></td>
<td>1. Program faculty attends TEAC workshop on writing the Inquiry Brief or Inquiry Brief Proposal (optional) 2. Program faculty submits drafts of the Brief* with checklist</td>
<td>1. TEAC staff reviews draft Brief* 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∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Inquiry Brief or Inquiry Brief Proposal</strong></td>
<td>1. Program faculty responds to TEAC staff and reviewers’ comments∞ 2. Program submits final Brief with checklist</td>
<td>1. TEAC declares Brief auditable and instructs program to submit final version of Brief 2. TEAC accepts Brief for audit and submits it to the Accreditation Panel chair for instructions to auditors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Call for comment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>TEAC places program on TEAC Web site’s call-for-comment page and circulates call-for-comment letter to program faculty and staff∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Audit</strong></td>
<td>1. Program faculty submits data for audit as requested 2. Program faculty receives and hosts auditors during visit (2-4 days) 3. Program faculty responds to audit report (2 weeks)∞</td>
<td>1. TEAC schedules audit∞ 2. Panel chair formulates questions and instructions for auditors; auditors verify submitted data 3. Auditors complete visit to campus 4. Auditors prepare audit report and send to program faculty, TEAC, and Accreditation Panel chair 5. TEAC staff responds to program faculty’s comments about the draft audit report ∞ Final audit report prepared and distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Staff analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. TEAC sends Brief, audit report, and faculty response to panel members; panel members complete worksheets 2. TEAC completes staff analysis and sends to program and panel∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Accreditation Panel</strong></td>
<td>1. Program head attends meeting (optional) 2. Program faculty responds (within 2 weeks)∞</td>
<td>1. Panel meets and formulates accreditation report; TEAC sends report to program faculty; TEAC staff responds as needed∞ 2. Call for comment announced via e-mail and Web site∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Accreditation Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. TEAC sends Brief, reviewers’ comments, audit report, accreditation report, staff analysis, and panel recommendation to Accreditation Committee for decision 2. Accreditation Committee meets; TEAC sends Accreditation Committee’s decision to program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Acceptance or appeal</strong></td>
<td>Program faculty accepts or appeals TEAC’s action within 30 days∞</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Annual report</strong></td>
<td>Program faculty submits annual report and fees to TEAC∞</td>
<td>TEAC reviews annual reports for as many years as required by program’s status with TEAC∞</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ← and → signify program faculty/TEAC staff interaction; ∞ signifies the process continues until there is consensus among the parties.

*TEAC uses “Brief” to refer to both the Inquiry Brief and the Inquiry Brief Proposal*
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Using this Guide to the TEAC Audit

**What is the purpose of this guide?**
This guide to the TEAC audit is primarily for the faculty, staff, and administrators of TEAC member programs preparing for the audit of their Inquiry Brief or Inquiry Brief Proposal. It is designed for use in preparing for the audits that are part of both initial and continuing accreditation. It is a companion to the comprehensive Guide to TEAC Accreditation, and it complements the Handbook for TEAC Auditors.

We believe that throughout all the steps of the accreditation process, TEAC and program faculty should maintain open and frequent communication. Maintaining communication is especially important during the audit process, as is understanding the process and the responsibilities of each party involved.

For this reason, our goal in writing the guide was to make each step of the process clear and to make the audit process itself transparent.

**What is in this guide?**
The guide has two main parts. In the first part of the guide, we describe the TEAC audit in detail. After outlining the particular responsibilities of the program, TEAC staff, and the auditors, we explain each phase of the audit. In this section we address a frequent question from members, “What do the auditors do?” Part one closes with an explanation of the audit report and the program’s response to it, including samples of the documents the auditors use in conducting the audit and arriving at the audit opinion.

The second part of the guide covers practical matters such as schedule and costs. In a Q&A format, this section addresses the most frequent questions we get from members about to enter the audit process. At the close of this section, you will find a checklist to assist you in preparing for the audit.

**Who should use this guide?**
Program personnel should understand the TEAC audit process before entering into it. Because the TEAC audit involves the full program, we encourage everyone in the program who is responsible for some or all parts of the audit to read and use this guide.

We suggest that those responsible for the TEAC audit provide information about TEAC, its standards and principles, the accreditation process, and the philosophy of accreditation to those who will participate in the audit but who were not directly involved in developing the Inquiry Brief or Inquiry Brief Proposal. This information is available on TEAC’s Web site (www.teac.org) and in the TEAC booklet, available by request.
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Overview of the TEAC audit

One defining feature of the TEAC accreditation process is the academic audit: a team of auditors visits a campus to examine and verify on site the evidence that supports the claims made in the professional education program’s Inquiry Brief or the Inquiry Brief Proposal.

Once the program’s Brief has been accepted as auditable, TEAC staff and the program faculty schedule and plan the audit. (See the TEAC audit schedule in Part Two of this guide, practical matters.)

TEAC will assign a team of auditors. Once selected, the audit team members insure that there are no undeclared conflicts of interest surrounding their participation in the audit. In this initial period of planning for the auditors’ visit, program faculty members have an opportunity to review the resumes of the members of the audit team to identify any potential conflicts of interest that may exist. TEAC staff and program faculty will negotiate claims of conflicts of interests.

The team of two to four TEAC-trained auditors visits the campus for two to four days. In some cases, the visit may be extended and the team enlarged if the audit challenge is especially complex or broad. The visiting team includes a local practitioner in the field of the program, selected by the program faculty, and, in states where TEAC has a formal protocol agreement, state education representatives.

Scope of the audit
The audit process does not address the basic accreditation question of whether or not the evidence is compelling, persuasive, sufficient, or convincing. Instead, with the exception of the case for institutional commitment, the audit determines only whether the descriptions and characterizations of evidence in the Brief are accurate. The auditors’ question is no more or no less than the following: Are the statements in the Brief accurate? Is the evidence in the Brief trustworthy? Through the audit, TEAC verifies the data behind the claims the faculty makes in the Brief.

To determine whether or not the evidence in the Brief is trustworthy, the auditors need access to the raw data of the Brief. The faculty should be prepared to show the TEAC auditors the data that are portrayed in the Brief. Because the TEAC auditors will try to verify as much of the Brief as can be practically managed from the TEAC’s offices, the faculty may be asked to send the supporting source data to TEAC before the audit. By its very nature, a substantial portion of the audit, however, must be conducted on site.

Audit of the Inquiry Brief
The main purpose of the audit of an Inquiry Brief is to verify the evidence the program faculty have cited in support of their claims that the program meets TEAC’s three quality principles and seven capacity standards. The auditors select samples of evidence that they predict will reveal and represent the totality of the evidence the program faculty have presented in the Inquiry Brief. The auditors are free to search for
additional evidence in the process of the audit and these discoveries may support, strengthen, or weaken the verification of the evidence behind the program faculty’s claims with regard to the quality principles and the capacity standards.

**Audit of the Inquiry Brief Proposal**

The main purpose of the audit of an Inquiry Brief Proposal is to verify the text and evidence the program faculty members have cited with respect to the rationale, Quality Principle III, and the evidence of institutional commitment to the program and the other requirements of 4.1–4.7. As with the audit of the Inquiry Brief, the auditors select samples of evidence that they predict will reveal and represent the totality of the evidence the program faculty have presented in the Inquiry Brief Proposal. In the process of the audit, the auditors are free to search for additional evidence; these discoveries may support, strengthen, or weaken the verification of the evidence, or proposed evidence, for the program faculty’s claims that the program meets TEAC’s quality principles and the capacity standards.

In designing and conducting the audit, TEAC staff and auditors use as a guide the general instructions laid out in TEAC’s annotated template of principles and standards, which is presented in the appendix.

**Audit tasks**

The audit is a series of tasks, each assigned to an aspect of the Brief that is also associated with one of the principles or standards of the TEAC system.

There are three kinds of audit tasks: (1) those the auditors create for the verification of a particular Brief; (2) those the Accreditation Panel director requests or creates for the Brief; and (3) tasks that are common to all audits, which the TEAC staff has created. These latter audit tasks, called standard audit tasks, typically target the subcomponents of the program’s capacity for quality (4.0).
Responsibilities: program, TEAC, and auditors

The program faculty and TEAC staff members share responsibilities for supporting the work of the auditors both before and during their visit, and the auditors have very specific responsibilities before, during, and after their time on site.

The program’s responsibilities

Costs
In addition to the audit fee ($1,000 per Brief), the institution defrays the expenses (travel, meals, and lodging) incurred by auditors, pays the auditors’ fees ($1,500 per auditor), an honorarium of $100 per day for the on-site practitioner who is a member of the audit visit team and the cost of a substitute if the practitioner is a classroom teacher], and covers any other administrative or secretarial costs related to the auditors’ execution of their on-site responsibilities.

Logistical arrangements
The program faculty is responsible for the logistical aspects of the audit visit, outlined below. TEAC requests that the program designate an audit coordinator to communicate directly with TEAC and make all arrangements. The program’s audit coordinator will:

- Arrange for lodging, meals, transportation; handle all expenses. Lodging must have convenient Internet/Ethernet access. Lodging must be as convenient to campus as possible. Lodging should not be lavish: it should be of the same standard used for visiting faculty or as program faculty are expected to use when traveling.

- Arrange for a local practitioner in the area of the program (for example, classroom teacher, principal, or counselor) to be part of the visiting team. Insure there is no conflict of interest and put TEAC and the practitioner in contact. Arrange to cover the cost of a substitute if the practitioner is a classroom teacher.

- Develop a schedule for the auditors and arrange for a working/meeting room so that the team can make the best use of its time on site; prepare a written schedule for the audit visit that includes times and locations for all activities, including time to work alone as a team and time for looking at facilities. (TEAC suggests that the program coordinator designate a conference room for the auditors to work in. The auditors should be able to review all documentation and meet with program and campus representatives here.)

- Coordinate with state education representatives who are participating in the audit; arrange for lodging, transportation as appropriate.
• Send any materials the auditors may request before the visit (for example, the auditors may request catalogs or brochures, copies of policies, documentation of state program approval).

• Ensure that the program’s responses to any pre-audit tasks (questions about parts of the Brief that the auditors find unclear or ambiguous) are sent to TEAC before the audit visit.

• Support the purpose of the audit. The purpose of the audit visit is to verify or corroborate what is in the Brief. The auditors’ time should be focused on this work. Every event in the visit is part of the audit. TEAC asks that the program make the most of the auditors’ time on campus: please do not schedule receptions or entertainment, provide gifts, or schedule social events.

• Schedule all interviews and meetings in advance of the visit. The auditors will need to visit at least two classrooms; interview a sample of the senior administrators, including a group of chairs of other professional schools or departments; interview a sample of the program’s students; interview and consult with the program’s regular and adjunct faculty. Interviews should be held in the auditors’ designated conference room to minimize travel time around campus. Communicate the purpose of the audit to all involved; share the audit schedule with them and keep them abreast of any changes to the schedule.

• Distribute to all specified parties a letter from TEAC’s president, soliciting comments about the program from all the parties with a stake in the program, as described in the letter.

• Assemble all information, documentation, and other evidence necessary for the auditors. As a general rule, the auditors will need to be able to examine anything the program relied on the preparation of the Brief. Whatever the authors of the Brief had in hand and used to support a point in the Brief, whatever they quoted from, whatever they used to crosscheck or to corroborate a point, etc., should be available for the auditors to also check and verify. The auditors will need all documentation the program faculty used to develop and write the Brief: files, data, references, program and institution materials, and all documentation related to the internal audit. These should be available to the auditors in the auditors’ working room.

• Arrange for administrative support such as access to telephones, a fax machine, computers, photocopiers, and secretarial services. Plan for someone to be available to the auditors during their visit.

• If requested, provide materials to TEAC after the audit.

• Respond to the audit report.
TEAC’s responsibilities

Communication
Throughout the audit process, TEAC staff facilitates communication between the program and the auditors.

Before the audit visit, TEAC staff does the following:

- Schedule the audit; assign auditors; share auditors’ cv’s with the program for review.
- Post the call for comment on TEAC’s Web site. Prepare and send a letter, soliciting comments, for the program to distribute.
- Communicate with the audit coordinator to assure that all logistical arrangements have been made satisfactorily.
- Communicate with the auditors to discuss logistical arrangements, the visit schedule, the ethical obligations of auditors, and other audit policies and concerns. Provide training to the program’s designated local practitioner in preparation for the on-site portion of the audit.
- Prepare, with the auditors and the chair of the Accreditation Panel, the initial audit tasks, with reference to any matters in the Brief that seem of particular interest or show signs of being problematic.
- Send any pre-audit tasks to the program for response.
- Review the auditors’ summary of the case and send it to the program for review and approval.
- Communicate with the program’s audit coordinator about the schedule and details of the auditors’ time on site, pre-audit tasks, and any other audit policies or concerns.

After the audit, TEAC staff sends the audit report to the program for review.

Auditors’ responsibilities
TEAC auditors have five interrelated responsibilities:

Understand
At the outset of the audit, the auditors must understand the local contexts about which the Brief is written. This understanding helps build a sense of rapport and confidence
among the parties, thereby avoiding the tense and confrontational relationship that sometimes characterizes audits in other circumstances.

TEAC auditors base their judgments solely on the evidence and not on preconceived ideas or biases, no matter what their source. The auditors therefore make every effort to fully understand the contexts in which they are operating and to treat all persons they meet with respect and comity.

Verify
The text of the Brief and the selected evidence are the targets of the audit.

The auditors verify the text of the Brief, and they do this by examining the referents of the text to be sure that the text is accurate with respect to language, data, and evidence. The auditors examine and probe the accuracy of the language of selected formal statements of the program’s goals, claims, rationale, and the program’s quality control system. These probes are meant to verify that the language is precise, trustworthy, and means exactly what it seems to say.

The auditors also verify evidence dealing with all elements of the accreditation system and their components, but principally with the evidence pertaining to the quality principles, the capacity components for program quality (reported in Appendix B of the Brief), and the internal audit report (reported in Appendix A of the Brief).

Corroborate
Sometimes the verification purposes of the audit lead the auditors to examine evidence that was not cited in the Brief but nevertheless has a direct bearing on their verification of the evidence and the precision of the language in the Brief. The auditors, in fact, sometimes seek evidence that was not in the Brief to corroborate, reinforce, or disconfirm the evidence that is in the Brief.

Judge
The auditors come to a conclusion about whether any errors found in the Brief mean that the target was not in fact verified.

To do this, the auditors distinguish between errors in the Brief that are of no significance or consequence to the meaning of the text and errors that change the meaning of the text and make a difference in the verification of the target.

In addition to verifying the evidence in the Brief, the auditors also make a determination of whether the evidence is sufficient to support the claim that the institution is committed to the program.

Represent TEAC
Auditors represent TEAC as an organization and as the embodiment of a new idea about specialized accreditation in higher education. As such, the TEAC auditors an-
answer questions, grant interviews, and present TEAC positions in informal and formal occasions. They are sensitive to campus culture.

It is expected that during the visit to the campus, auditors may, at the discretion of the program faculty, meet with campus leaders to exchange greetings, to answer any questions about TEAC and the TEAC processes, and to corroborate evidence and argument found in the Brief. The training program that TEAC provides for auditors prepares them to answer questions that can be anticipated and gives them procedures for responding to questions that have not been anticipated and which challenge the auditors’ knowledge.

In all exchanges, it is important that the auditors acknowledge their own limited roles, and that the campus representatives respect the limits of the auditors’ roles. With the exception of the evidence about institutional commitment, auditors do not make evaluative decisions about accreditation, nor should they be asked to. Also, they are not on campus to suggest how programs might be improved, to commend the program, or to offer personal positions about accreditation issues in higher education.
What should the program faculty, staff, and students expect from TEAC auditors?

These nine qualities describe what program faculty, staff, and students should expect from all TEAC auditors:

1. **TEAC auditors maintain confidentiality during and after audits.** Auditors do not discuss or share their knowledge of programs or institutions, faculty, staff, and students except as required to fulfill their responsibilities to TEAC.

Auditors should not discuss at one institution the auditing experiences they underwent at another institution. There is a *need to know* criterion about shared information from site to site, and interpreting the *need to know* should be done as cautiously and conservatively as possible. (See principle 9, below.)

2. **TEAC auditors commit fully to the process of the audit.** The auditors are prepared to participate in all activities related to the audit (pre-audit, on-site and post-visit work). While on site, they maintain focus and are not distracted from the work at hand by making and receiving calls, faxes, and other messages. They arrange their personal and professional schedules accordingly.

3. **TEAC auditors disclose any conflict of interest.** Auditors should not audit programs at institutions where there is an appearance of a conflict of interest. For example:

   • The auditor worked at the institution at some previous time
   • The auditor applied for a position at the institution at some previous time
   • The auditor was involved in a professional or personal conflict or collaboration with a member of the institution’s faculty at some previous time
   • The auditor is a candidate or will soon be a candidate for a position at the institution.

None of these conditions will necessarily disqualify an auditor from serving as an auditor of a program at an institution. However, in these cases and other similar ones, the auditor alone cannot decide whether a conflict of interest exists. The decision must be made by TEAC and by the institution after consultation. Because TEAC staff will not be able to know if these or similar conditions exist, it is incumbent upon the auditor to bring them to the attention of TEAC staff.

4. **TEAC auditors are sensitive to privacy issues.** If faculty members or their faculty representatives show reluctance to share data that are requested, then TEAC auditors should be sensitive to their feelings and stop asking for them. If the data are central to the auditing process, the auditors will contact TEAC for direction in these mat-
ters. Privacy issues are very important to faculty and to TEAC, and care is needed to respect them and seek other ways to verify the evidence in the Brief.

5. **TEAC auditors do not evaluate the program or offer judgments to the program faculty or institutional representatives.** At no time should auditors characterize the data they are reviewing in terms of whether or not they provide support for the faculty claims (except data about institutional commitment). It is important that TEAC auditors stay in role on this question—speaking and reporting only to whether the evidence in the Brief is accurate and fairly represented.

6. **TEAC auditors are not coaches or consultants.** Auditors should not advance suggestions about how programs can be improved, how Briefs might be improved, or how the program’s chances for accreditation can be improved. Auditors are not to diagnose weaknesses in education programs, nor volunteer advice on these matters.

7. **TEAC auditors characterize TEAC policies with great care.** It is useful for auditors to always qualify their interpretations or cite the language in one of the TEAC publications that officially addresses the questions posed to them. In case of doubt, the inquirers should call the TEAC office for official interpretations of TEAC policies.

8. **TEAC auditors maintain a professional distance between themselves and the program faculty.** Every event during the visit is part of the audit. Auditors are constantly on the alert for information that corroborates or disconfirms the information in the Brief. They make the best use of their time and avoid any conflict of interest. Although sharing rides or meals with faculty and administrators during the audit sessions should be avoided if at all possible, meals are sometimes an efficient and effective way to convene a group; in such instances, the auditors should use the occasion to verify targets of interest. The issue is maintaining an optimum professional distance. Auditors should not be cold, aloof, or unfriendly.

9. **TEAC auditors are discrete.** Auditors share information and perceptions with discipline and care. Wherever auditors travel, whether to large cities or remote rural areas, they will find that the community represented by the institution is well represented in airports, restaurants, and public transportation. Although auditors might feel safe in off-campus sites to characterize, for example, an exchange with a faculty member, or to portray a data set advanced to support a claim, such activity is extremely unwise.
Pre-visit audit activities

Summarizing the case
The auditors begin the audit process preparing a summary of the case. The summary explicates the case the program has made to support its claims: it tells the program’s story. The purpose of the summary is at least threefold: (1) to convey to the authors (and to others) the auditors’ interest in fully understanding the Brief’s meanings and contexts; (2) to facilitate the construction of the final audit strategy; and (3) to provide the members of the Accreditation Panel and Accreditation Committee with an accurate summary of the case the Brief makes.

The auditors use these five guidelines in preparing the summary of the case:

1. In their own words, the auditors restate all the claims advanced in the Brief related to TEAC’s Quality Principle I, the evidence related to the reliability and validity of the measures used to assess the claims (Quality Principle II), and the standards of capacity for program quality.

2. The auditors summarize the results, linking particular findings to claims, including any summative judgments the faculty members make about their claims (e.g., our students have mastered their teaching subjects because they meet a 3.0 grade index in their major and meet the state’s Praxis II examination standard).

3. In a separate section of the summary, the auditors write out the principal results of the program’s internal audit and the findings reported in Appendix B (e.g. all students in the sample who were admitted to student teaching met the committee’s GPI standard).

4. Finally, because the auditors are telling the program’s story, they do not comment about aspects of the case for accreditation that they may think are weak or problematic. Nor do they make the case stronger than the program faculty made it. The summary is about the program’s case, not the case the auditors would have made.

The lead auditor prepares the initial draft of the summary of the case; other members of the team review it, and once the team accepts the summary, TEAC sends it to the program head.

Determining the audit tasks
Pre-visit audit tasks. After their summary of the Brief, the auditors propose audit tasks and review audit tasks proposed by TEAC staff and the Accreditation Panel. Some audit tasks can be conducted in the TEAC offices (for example, review of the course catalog and program requirements). TEAC will make every effort to review ap-
propriate data prior to the visit to make more efficient use of their on-site time. TEAC and the program faculty will then determine what evidence the program must make available to the auditors on site, the interviews that need to be scheduled, and the observations that are required.

Clarification. Also before the audit visit, the auditors ask the authors and endorsers of the Brief to clarify any language used in the Brief that may be unclear to the auditors. This effort is critical because it is essential that the program faculty believe that the auditors understand the Brief. TEAC believes that this feature of the audit process helps to build the rapport between the audit team members and the program faculty that comes when one party feels the other party understands its positions.

The auditors sample from a pool of statements in the text that are unclear to them and ask the program faculty to put in writing their explanation and clarification of the text. The auditors also probe assertions made in the Brief to determine if the referents exist and mean exactly what they seem to mean. The purpose of these probes is to verify that the match between the referent and the language in the Brief is accurate and precise. The auditors can verify the program’s assertions only if the language is clear and precise.

The audit tasks focused on language are designed to clarify text that is ambiguous or that, when explained, may be particularly revealing of the program faculty members’ thinking about matters related to the quality principles and capacity standards. Through this process, the auditors provide the Accreditation Panel members with a basis for determining the degree to which the language and evidence in the Brief mean exactly what they seem to.

Initial audit tasks. The last step before the auditors go on site is to develop the tasks that the auditors will use on campus. TEAC staff and the auditors create a set of initial audit tasks that are directed at the parts of the Brief that are relevant for one or another of the TEAC principles and standards. They are called initial tasks because the auditors may also employ follow-up tasks and new tasks that they create during the audit or that they draw from the larger set of potential audit tasks TEAC has created. Before and during the audit visit, TEAC auditors also draw from the standard audit tasks; these tasks, constructed without reference to a particular Brief, are instructions to the auditors to guide the formulation of the tasks that are tailored to a particular Brief.

[SIDEBAR]
An audit task is composed of a target and a probe. The audit task is constructed by selecting some aspect of the Brief text (the target) and probing it.
The following are examples of possible audit tasks (targets and probes):

1. Checking records, such as minutes of meetings or memos on file of faculty actions in making program decisions in approving the Brief, and similar group decisions.

2. Reviewing notes taken of interviews with focus groups and with students at their exit from the program from which summaries are prepared or generalizations included in the Brief are induced.

3. Inspecting the responses received from stakeholders who are surveyed in the self-study process when the responses are summarized in tables or in narrative and included in the Brief.

4. Re-computing percentages, means, and standard deviations reported in the Brief from the original raw data taken from institutional files, state reports, or other sources.

5. Using institutional records to re-compute the means and standard deviations of grade point averages reported in the Brief.

6. Tracing the sources of claims having to do with budget allocations, space allocations, and similar matters with institutional officials (e.g., provosts, bursars, or vice presidents).

7. Re-applying the coding schemes used to draw inferences from qualitative data to see if the results can be reproduced.

8. Interviewing faculty or staff who applied the coding schemes to qualitative data to learn how well they were trained, how their reliability was checked, and the depth of their understanding of the process.

9. Re-computing correlations and other statistics that were used to support claims of reliability and validity using, when appropriate, the faculty’s statistical packages.

10. Checking reports concerning the reliability of multiple observers by inspecting the raw reports and re-computing the appropriate coefficients.

11. Touring the campus to verify evidence about claims concerning services available to program candidates, the availability of computers, faculty office space, and other capacity-related issues.

12. Checking brochures, catalogs, and local Web sites to make sure the information found in the Brief is consistent with the information found in these sources.

13. Examining both the data (video tapes, transcripts, field notes) and the procedures for coding the data if the faculty's claims are supported by qualitative analyses of interviews with informants.

14. Examining data sets (also institutional reports where those same data are provided) to verify evidence present in comparisons of funds, space, full-time faculty equivalent per student enrollment of the target program with other programs on campus.

15. Interviewing faculty who participated in the deliberations leading to program change, examining minutes of meetings, and inspecting the copies of proposals that were taken to the faculty or administration for action to determine if the Brief claims that changes were made in the program after considering data generated by the quality control system.

16. Targeting text to see if there is in fact a referent for the language, particularly if the language is educational jargon or is unqualified.

17. Interviewing faculty who conducted the internal audit probes and asking that their efforts be described to discern how familiar faculty members were with the internal audit and its purposes, findings, and recommendations.

18. Interviewing students who were the focus of the internal audit probes to ascertain that the characterizations found in the internal audit report in Appendix A about these students are accurate.

19. Interviewing faculty members who were the focus of an internal audit probe to ascertain that the characterizations of those faculty members found in the internal audit is accurate.

20. Examining files and archives describing actions taken by the faculty to improve the program to document the accuracy of the characterizations of these actions in the Brief.
Of course, situations will vary from site to site. Claims and the sources of data for claims that have not been anticipated may arise, and auditors may need to consider additional kinds of probes to use in their efforts to determine if the statements and evidence found in the Brief are accurate.

TEAC prescribes the following additional features for some of the audit tasks. In one way or another, the audit tasks must cover each of the following conditions:

- The auditors must observe a session of at least two regularly scheduled courses that the program offers.
- The auditors must interview the students in the program’s sample for its internal audit or for the evidence for Quality Principle I.
- The auditors must interview a sample of cooperating teachers.
- The auditors must select four facilities cited in the Brief and tour each to verify their existence and similarity to their description in the Brief.
- The auditors must verify the program’s plan to investigate, or its investigation of, a link between student learning and any program factor.
- The auditors must interview members of the administration to verify their commitment to the program, their allocation of resources to the program, and their qualifications for their positions.
- The auditors must verify that the call for comment from third parties was distributed to the parties required by TEAC policy.
- On the program’s assessments, the auditors must verify that the rating forms and instruments exist and that any raters were trained.

The auditors must note any discrepancies between characterizations of the institution described in the Brief and the experience of the site visit, particularly facts at variance with what is reported in Appendix E of the Brief.
On-site audit activities

The auditors’ on-site verification process entails the review of relevant documents and interviews with representatives of the institution, faculty, staff, and students associated with the program. This phase of the audit includes a local practitioner who works as part of the audit team, and, in states where TEAC has a formal protocol, one or more state education representatives.

First on-site session: review of the pre-audit tasks

Understanding the local context. During the first meeting with program faculty, after the introductions are complete, the discussion focuses on the summary of the case prepared by the TEAC staff and auditors and sent to the program faculty before the audit visit.

The auditors seek the program faculty’s reaction to the summary of the case: Does it hit the mark? Is it complete? Has it distorted any elements of the Brief? The auditors should receive feedback from the faculty without argument or debate. When the auditors write their report, they will also amend the summary, based on these comments from the program faculty.

Having determined that the auditors understood the Brief at a level acceptable to the program faculty, the auditors move to clarifying their own understanding, or misunderstanding, of the Brief. At this point in the first meeting, the auditors and program staff discuss any items from the Brief that they had flagged for clarification. At the close of this first meeting, the auditors also probe the precision of language in the Brief that they suspect is unclear to the faculty.

Subsequent on-site audit sessions

From this point, the auditors focus specifically on the tasks they have chosen to verify the evidence the program faculty has cited in support of its claims with respect to the quality principles and capacity standards. The auditors divide some tasks among themselves. They complete other tasks, such as interviewing students, administrators, and faculty or observing classes, together as a full team.

While the auditors are on site, they use the evenings and team meals as opportunities for debriefing and occasionally as opportunities to interview people with limited availability, such as cooperating teachers. The auditors make mid-course corrections in the audit tasks, modify the agenda and schedule as needed, develop new audit trails, and review preliminary impressions and observations.

Throughout the entire visit, the auditors are alert and sensitive to unobtrusive information that may have a bearing on the verification and corroboration of targets in the Brief.
**Auditors verify the evidence related to specific claims.** The Brief includes the evidence the faculty uses to support its claims related to the program’s goal of preparing competent, qualified, and caring professionals as well as to support the claim that the institution has the capacity to offer a quality program. The auditors do not judge whether the claims are true or even credible. The auditors do not judge, for example, whether or not the program’s graduates understand pedagogy. They judge only whether or not the evidence is what is reported in the Brief. For example, if the program faculty relies on a mean score on a standardized test to advance and support its claim that the program’s graduates understand pedagogy, the auditors will check to see if, in fact, the score the program’s graduates earned on the test is as the program faculty reports in the Brief.

**Auditors look for corroborating evidence.** Throughout the audit the auditors are alert to the discovery of evidence that was not cited in the Brief but has a direct bearing (positive or negative) on the verification of the evidence and the precision of the language in the Brief. The auditors are charged with assuring the Accreditation Panel that there is evidence behind the claims made in the Brief. There are two kinds of errors the auditors need to avoid: (1) false positive errors (concluding the evidence is present and accurate when it is not); and (2) false negative errors (concluding there is no evidence for a claim when in fact there is).¹

**Auditors evaluate errors.** The auditors must determine whether any errors they find in the Brief are trivial or are of some consequence to the meaning of the text. When a misstatement is trivial and of no consequence, the targeted text is not misleading in spite of the error and the statement means more or less the same thing with the error as without the error.

For example, if the auditors had recalculated a mean and found it was 3.16 instead of the 3.06 reported in a table or in some text, it is probably the case that the targeted text would have the same meaning whether the mean is one or the other value. If the faculty claimed they are constructivists and it turns out in response to the auditors’ probe that they meant only that they are Piagetians, the statement is still acceptably accurate.

The errors, or misstatements, that are of consequence are those that alter the meaning of a targeted statement in the Brief in such a way that the statement is not verified. If the Brief asserts, for example, that the faculty endorsed the Brief at a particular faculty meeting, but the minutes of the meeting do not report the action, or a sample of faculty do not recall the endorsement or is unfamiliar with the contents of the Brief, the misstatement is of consequence and may signify to the panel that one part of the standard for faculty qualification in the TEAC system could not be confirmed (e.g., 4.2.1). The evidence claimed for the endorsement,

---
¹ False negative errors are somewhat less likely than false positive errors as the former would surely be noted in the program faculty’s response to the audit report while the latter might not be mentioned.
in other words, cannot be relied upon. If the recalculated mean (to take the example above) differed by more than 25 percent of the standard deviation from the reported mean, the misstatement of the mean is of consequence and the auditors would conclude that the reported and misstated mean was not confirmed and verified.
Final on-site session
In its final on-site session, the audit team considers the findings from each audit task and formulates its audit opinions. The team also analyzes the evidence about institutional commitment and determines whether or not the evidence is sufficient to support the conclusion that the institution is committed to the program. The team uses the session to start planning the audit report.

The auditors must come to a conclusion about whether or not the evidence advanced by the faculty in support of the TEAC quality principles, the capacity components, and internal audit was in fact verified. The auditors also must make a separate determination of whether the evidence of institutional commitment is sufficient to support the claim that the institution is committed to the program.

In their audit report, the auditors give one of the following four judgments (audit opinions) about the overall trustworthiness of the Brief and about each element (1.0–4.0) and the seven components of 4.0:

- **Clean opinion**: An element is assigned a clean opinion when the evidence in the Brief that bears on it is found to be trustworthy.

- **Qualified opinion**: An element is assigned a qualified opinion when some of the evidence in the Brief that bears on it has significant errors, but overall the evidence for the element is found to be trustworthy.

- **Adverse opinion**: An element is assigned an adverse opinion when a significant portion of evidence in the Brief that bears on it cannot be confirmed and verified.

- **Disclaimer opinion**: An element is assigned a disclaimer opinion when it is not possible to verify a significant portion of the evidence in the Brief that pertains to an element owing to missing data, limited access to information and informants, or evidence that the findings in the Brief are not genuine.

*(See the section immediately following, post-visit activities, for a complete description of the audit report and the auditors’ process of determining the audit opinion.)*
Post-visit audit activities

Summary: Immediately after the visit, the auditors prepare the audit report, which is submitted to TEAC and the program faculty within two weeks of the visit.² TEAC sends the first draft to the program for review. With TEAC staff, the auditors respond to any comments from the program faculty, negotiate points raised by the faculty, and finalize the audit report. The auditors might meet in person, if convenient, or communicate by phone or electronically. Finally, the lead auditor, as a non-voting member of the Accreditation Panel, participates in the panel meeting devoted to the program’s Brief.

Audit report
In the audit report, the auditors give their opinion about the accuracy of the evidence in the Brief. With one exception, the auditors do not comment on the implication the evidence holds for the accreditation decision. They do make a recommendation about whether the evidence of institutional commitment to the program is sufficient, but otherwise they restrict their comments to whether or not the evidence in the Brief was verified, verified with inconsequential errors, or not verified.

The audit report includes four major sections:

Section 1: Abstract. The first part of this section contains the final version of the summary of the case. The second part gives the auditors’ overall opinion about the trustworthiness of the Brief coupled with a summary of the principal findings of the audit. The auditors’ judgment about the level of institutional commitment to the program is also included in the abstract.

Section 2: Method. This section briefly describes the character and method of the audit: what the auditors did, with whom they met, what they examined, and the schedule of the audit. The section includes audit map (described below).

Section 3: Findings. The third part is a full report of the findings from the auditors’ probes into the evidence included in the Brief related to each of the TEAC quality principles and standards of capacity. It states the audit tasks, describes the auditors’ actions, describes the results of the probe, gives the auditors’ findings related to each task, and provides the auditors’ judgment about whether or not the target was verified.

Section 4: Judgments. The fourth section of the report contains the auditors’ judgments, given as audit opinions, about whether or not the evidence advanced by the faculty in support of each element was verified. If a sufficient number of

² Occasionally, the program faculty submits information needed for some audit tasks’ findings after the audit visit: in these instances, the audit report is sent two weeks after the faculty’s final submission.
the probes confirm, or fail to confirm or verify the evidence, the report explains
the findings and reasoning behind the auditors’ opinions. Finally, the auditors
make a determination of whether the evidence of institutional commitment is suf-
ficient to support the claim that the institution is committed to the program.

The audit report also includes an **audit map** and a table displaying the **audit
findings and audit opinion**. (See a description and samples of these audit
documents below.)

Program’s response to the audit report
The program faculty must respond within **two weeks** of receiving the draft audit
report.

The program faculty should correct any factual errors made by the auditors (the
program faculty simply points out the errors). Factual errors are instances where
the auditors misinterpreted the evidence they analyzed, overlooked evidence that
was in fact presented to them, misunderstood what was in fact stated in the Brief,
made an error in their own calculations and analysis, or made errors in reporting
their findings or reasons for their conclusions and recommendations.

The faculty members are also free to raise questions about any matter in the au-
dit report that is unclear.

At this time, the program may formally respond in writing to the findings of the
audit; however, the program faculty cannot make or offer any corrections or
changes to the Brief or the facts of the program.

Before making comments about the initial draft of the audit report, the program
faculty should thoughtfully consider the following points:

- Because the audit report does not address the quality of the program or the
  meaning of the findings, there is no need for the program faculty to address
  these issues. In fact, the degree to which the program faculty’s responses are
  more coherent and persuasive than the language in the Brief is also the de-
gree to which the language in the Brief is less trustworthy, reliable, and accu-
rate, and the more likely that the audit task in question must be scored as un-
verified because there is now more evidence that is significantly at variance
with what was written in the Brief.

- Sometimes, in the course of the audit, the auditors uncover better evidence
  than that in the Brief. If this new evidence indicates that the evidence in the
  Brief is inaccurate, the auditors cannot verify the evidence in the Brief.

- The audit opinion, like the audit report itself, is *not* an opinion about the qual-
  ity of the program or the degree to which the evidence in the Brief satisfies
TEAC’s quality principles and capacity standards. It is solely an opinion about whether the Brief is accurate as written. The issue in the audit is only whether or not what is in the Brief is accurate, not whether it could be made, or was made, more accurate by additional work on the part of the program faculty or the TEAC auditors during or after the audit. The faculty should resist the temptation to challenge an audit finding or opinion by pointing out that the program can now report better evidence, that it has taken corrective actions, that it has adopted new policies, that it has set things right, that were the audit done again, the findings would now need to different, and so forth.

The program faculty may provide this kind of information to TEAC, but it can have no bearing on the audit opinion or findings of the audit report. The Accreditation Panel, however, considers the full spectrum of evidence and gives positive weight to audit findings in tasks scored as not verified owing to better evidence or more compelling explanations of the quality of the program.

Final audit report
After the program faculty submits its response to the initial draft of the audit report, the auditors correct any factual errors in their findings and consider and negotiate any other responses with the program faculty. The auditors submit a final audit report to the TEAC staff, program faculty, and Accreditation Panel, which includes the program faculty’s responses and the auditors’ evaluation of the program faculty’s responses.

Once accepted by the program faculty and the TEAC staff, the audit report becomes part of the record submitted first to the TEAC Accreditation Panel and then to the Accreditation Committee. Each body considers the report in its respective deliberations and in support of the recommendations and decisions concerning the Brief and the appropriate accreditation decision.
The audit map and audit strategy

The audit map, presented in the audit report, is a table that lists by number all the audit tasks and their functions in the audit. The main purpose of the audit map is to display the fact that the auditors addressed all aspects of the TEAC system and that they employed a variety of tasks in accordance with TEAC’s criteria for selection of targets and probes.

Using a the criteria described in the annotated template (presented at the end of this section), the TEAC staff and the auditors select a number of targets in the Brief, which are related to elements in the TEAC system and which the auditors and staff feel may be particularly revealing about the accuracy in the totality of the evidence in the Brief. The staff and auditors craft tasks that are designed to verify these targets. In addition, other audit tasks and follow-up audit tasks are created on site during the course of the audit.

The audit map represents the general strategy of the audit. It is organized according to the elements and components of the TEAC quality principles and standards of capacity: these are the purpose or goal of each audit task.

The map lists each audit task by number and the role the auditors thought the task would play in the audit. The same audit task may have more than one role and address more than one aspect of the TEAC quality principles and standards.

The rows of the audit map table hold a minimum of 30 targets, one for each element, component, and subcomponent of the TEAC’s principles and standards (see inside back cover).

The columns of the map table ensure that the auditors employ a wide range of tasks. TEAC requires auditors to examine some kinds of evidence with more than one task to insure confident verification. In practice, this means that the typical audit contains about 100 tasks.

Some tasks are meant to simply clarify the text and are about targets in the Brief that are unclear to the auditors. Some tasks are about targets that the auditors suspect are unclear to the authors of the Brief (these are called precision tasks). Most tasks are straightforward and direct attempts to confirm or verify a target. A few tasks require the auditors to examine the primary source of the evidence cited in the Brief (raw data, survey forms, evaluated student work, memoranda, committee minutes, budgets, etc.). A few tasks are designed to check the internal consistency of the evidence against other related evidence in the Brief, and a small number of tasks are designed to corroborate or disconfirm a target by searching out new evidence elsewhere.
Audit map

Sample audit tasks numbers by functions and the TEAC elements and components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAC SYSTEM</th>
<th>FUNCTIONS OF AUDIT TASKS</th>
<th>Clarify</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Primary source</th>
<th>Verify or confirm</th>
<th>Internally consistent</th>
<th>Corroborate/disconfirm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 QUALITY PRINCIPLE I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Subject matter</td>
<td></td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20, 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 QUALITY PRINCIPLE II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Rationale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Validity evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>55, 62, 63</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23, 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 QUALITY PRINCIPLE III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Quality control system</td>
<td></td>
<td>41, 44, 58,</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 STANDARDS FOR CAPACITY FOR PROGRAM QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1 QP I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2 State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.3 Parity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1 IB &amp; Goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 Accurate understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>3, 4, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3 Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4 Parity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAC System</td>
<td>Clarify</td>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>Primary source</td>
<td>Verify or confirm</td>
<td>Internally consistent</td>
<td>Corroborate/disconfirm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1 Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53, 54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2 QCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3 Parity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Fiscal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1 Sound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2 Faculty development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.3 QCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.4 Parity &amp; sufficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Student support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1 Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2 QCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.3 Parity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.1 Admission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.2 Calendar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.3 Accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.4 Fair grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.1 Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.2 Parity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonspecific Concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 State standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audit findings and opinion table
The audit report also contains another table, the audit finding and opinion table. This table forms the basis of the auditors’ audit opinions.

The table lists the number of tasks that were verified, the number not verified, and the number containing errors (whether insignificant or consequential) for each element and component of TEAC’s quality principles and standards.

In making their audit opinion, the auditors are guided by the following considerations:

- An element (1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0), or a component of 4.0 (4.1, 4.2, etc.), receives a clean opinion if at least 90 percent of its targets are confirmed.

- An element or component is given a qualified opinion when at least 75 percent, but less than 90 percent, of its targets are confirmed. An element that would otherwise receive a clean opinion is also given a qualified opinion if more than 25 percent of the targets reveal misstatements, either trivial or consequential.

- If more than 75 percent of the targets cannot be verified, the element or component receives an adverse opinion.

- If more than 75 percent of the audit tasks cannot be performed, the element or component receives a disclaimer opinion.

These are guidelines, or heuristics, not strict rules. A simple counting of outcomes of probes may be misleading with regard to the trustworthiness of the Brief. Some audit tasks may be more revealing than others.

For example, some audit tasks may have targeted only minor points, and some may be merely following up on other audit tasks on a single point. Others may probe significant targets in the case. The guidelines may prove unreliable in cases where the number of audit tasks is small.

The audit team knows not to treat the heuristic as a rule that can be mechanically applied. If the findings suggest anomalies that make the heuristic unworkable, the auditors rely on their good judgment, explaining in their audit report the difficulties they experienced and the reasons for their opinions. The auditors are instructed to be alert to any event that is at variance with how the program is represented in the Brief. Thus, the auditors’ final opinions may depart from the percentage guidelines above. In those cases, the auditors provide a full justification for their opinion.
Table: Audit findings and audit opinions for the *Brief*

The total numbers of targets (column 1), the total numbers of verified targets, including those with trivial errors (in column 2), the numbers of targets with errors of any kind (trivial or consequential in column 3), the percent of verified targets (column 4), the percent of targets with errors of any sort (column 5), and the audit opinion: clean, qualified, adverse or disclaimer (column 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAC element</th>
<th>1. Number of targets</th>
<th>2. Number of verified targets</th>
<th>3. Number of targets with errors</th>
<th>2/1 %</th>
<th>3/1 %</th>
<th>Audit opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall totals*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonspecific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Total number of targets may be less than the sum of the targets in each part as audit tasks may address more than one element or component.
TEAC’s quality principles and standards of capacity: annotated template for TEAC auditors

Note: TEAC auditors use this document, a list of TEAC’s principles and standards, annotated with a description of how the auditors verify the program’s evidence for each, as a guide to designing and conducting the audit.

0.0 ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR MEMBERSHIP AND CANDIDATE STATUS

Overview. To be eligible for membership in TEAC and hold candidate status in TEAC the program unit’s administrator (e.g., chair, dean, director, vice president) must attest to the following:

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

0.2 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.

0.3 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.

0.4 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 of the institution offering the program provides additional assurance that the institution is administratively and financially capable.

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

1.0 QUALITY PRINCIPLE I: EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING

Overview. 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.

Program content and outcomes
1.1 Subject matter knowledge. The program candidates must learn and 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 **Teaching skill.** The program candidates must be able to teach caringly and effectively and to act on their knowledge in a professional manner.

**Cross-cutting liberal education program content themes**

In meeting each of TEAC components 1.1–1.3, the program must demonstrate that its candidates have oral and written rhetorical skills, critical thinking skills, and qualitative and quantitative reasoning skills. For each component of element 1.0, the program must also address three cross-cutting liberal education themes:

- **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 that will support lifelong learning in their field.

- **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.

- **Technology.** Candidates must be able to use classroom technology (e.g., grade book computer programs, databases, spreadsheets, word processors, e-mail, bulletin boards and networked conferences, Internet access, interactive videodiscs and instructional software).

*Student learning is the foundation of the TEAC accreditation process. At the core of student learning is the curriculum of the program. TEAC requires that curriculum must include subject matter courses that constitute an academic major or its appropriate equivalent. It also requires the equivalent of an academic minor of pedagogical courses, which cover the topics of methods of teaching, evaluation of student learning, and lesson and unit planning, and courses which provide opportunities for clinical practice. These are only examples of the types of courses that the program is expected to offer. The program may offer evidence of other courses whose content also meets this standard. In assessing whether an institution has met Quality Principle I, auditors will verify evidence through such tasks as reviewing syllabi and course catalogs and observing classes in the required subject areas.*

2.0 **QUALITY PRINCIPLE II: VALID ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING**

**Overview.** The program must employ multiple measures and assessment methods that converge on a dependable finding about the candidates’ accomplishments with regard to Quality Principle I. TEAC describes nearly 20 categories of evidence that a program could use in support of its claims with regard to Quality Principle I and the program must report and consider all that are available to it. In doing so, the inferences made from the assessment system must meet the appropriate and accepted research standards for reliability and validity.

**Assessment methods**

2.1 **Rationale for the assessments.** There must be a rationale for the program’s assessment methods that shows the links between the assessment and (1) the program’s goals, (2) the claims made about student learning, and (3) the program’s requirements.

2.2 **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.

*Many categories of evidence pertaining to student learning are described in TEAC’s accreditation manual. A program is required to present evidence in each of these categories, provided that such evidence is available to the institution. If the program does not...*
present such information as part of its Brief, the auditors must verify that such information was not available. Although the presumption is that the program will submit such evidence, a failure to present convincing evidence in any category (i.e., evidence that does meet the 75 percent heuristic) can be overcome by presenting evidence in other areas that demonstrate student learning. The program must submit evidence of the reliability and validity of evidence it submits to support its claims of student learning.

3.0 QUALITY PRINCIPLE III: INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING

Overview. 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.

Inquiry and program improvement processes
3.1 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 student learning.

3.2 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 and that it promotes the program's continual improvement.

4.0 CAPACITY FOR PROGRAM QUALITY

Overview. 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.

4.1 CURRICULUM

Overview. The program must show that the curriculum is adequate to support a quality program that meets the student learning requirements of Quality Principle I.

Curriculum attributes
4.1.1 Reflects 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).

4.1.2 Meets the state's program or curriculum course requirements for granting a professional license.

4.1.3 Does not deviate from, and has parity with, the institution's overall standards and requirements for granting the academic degree.

The primary curriculum requirements are set forth in Quality Principle I. The program must be able to demonstrate that the curriculum contains a variety of levels of courses and that it meets the requirements of the state and conforms to institutional norms. In assessing whether these requirements are met, the auditors will review syllabi, course catalogs, applicable state requirements (as provided by the program) and will examine the overall institutional criteria for granting a degree at the levels offered by the program.

4.2 FACULTY

Overview. The program must 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.
Faculty qualifications

4.2.1 Faculty members must accept the Brief and that the preparation of competent, caring, and qualified educators is their own goal for the program.

4.2.2 The Brief must demonstrate the faculty’s accurate and balanced understanding of the disciplines that are connected to the program.

4.2.3 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 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 stated above.

4.2.4 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 4.4.4.

The program must present evidence that it meets each of the four requirements outlined above. A primary means of demonstrating compliance with these requirements is through the summary of faculty qualifications provided in Appendix C of the Brief. The auditors also will verify faculty teaching and examine faculty handbooks, tenure and promotion policies. Programs should note that although faculty workload, tenure and promotion policies are reviewed as part of Capacity for Program Quality 4.4, such matters directly relate to the quality of faculty and also will be considered by the auditors, the Accreditation Panel, and the Accreditation Committee in assessing whether a program has established compliance with Capacity for Program Quality 4.2.

4.3 FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

Overview. The program must demonstrate that the facilities provided by the institution for the program are sufficient and adequate to support a quality program.

Adequate facilities, equipment and supplies

4.3.1 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 student learning as required by Quality Principle I.

4.3.2 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.

4.3.3 The facilities, equipment, and supplies allocated to the program by the institution, at a minimum, must be proportionate to the overall institutional resources and must be sufficient to support the operations of the program. The program students, faculty, and staff must have equal and sufficient access to, and benefit from, the institution’s facilities, equipment, and supplies.

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. Factors such as the number of students and the types of courses offered also will influence
whether the facilities, equipment and supplies meet TEAC standards. The auditors will closely examine the facilities to ensure that there are an appropriate number of classrooms, space for faculty and other educational resources necessary for delivery of the program. The auditors also will review any plans or internal assessments prepared by the program that address the issues of facilities, equipment and supplies.

**4.4 FISCAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY**

**Overview.** 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.

*Financial viability and administrative capacity*

4.4.1 The financial condition of the institution that supports the program must be sound, and the institution must be financially viable.

4.4.2 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 student learning as required by *Quality Principle I*.

4.4.3 The program must have a sufficient quality monitoring and control system to ensure that the program has adequate financial and administrative resources.

4.4.4 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.

In assessing whether the administrative and financial resources allocated to the program are appropriate, the auditors, Accreditation Panel, and Accreditation Committee will focus on the issue of whether the program’s financial and administrative resources are proportionate to the overall institutional resources. The auditors, panel, and committee will also review the budget for the program as well as financial information relating to the overall institution. In addition, the auditors, panel, and committee will review the qualifications and workload of the program’s administrators. The adequacy of administrative and financial resources will depend, in large part, upon the size and scope of the program and will vary among programs.

**4.5 STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES**

**Overview.** The program must make available to students regular and sufficient student services such as counseling, career placement, advising, financial aid, health care, and media and technology support.

*Adequate student support services*

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

4.5.2 The program must monitor the quality of the support services provided to students to ensure that student services contribute to student success in learning as required by *Quality Principle I*. 
4.5.3 Student support services available to students 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.

*Because TEAC accredited programs are one component of the overall institution, TEAC recognizes that in most cases, the institution and not the program itself is responsible for the delivery of student services. Even so, the program must ensure that student services are made available to its students and that those services contribute to success in student learning.*

4.6 RECRUITING AND ADMISSIONS PRACTICES, ACADEMIC CALENDARS, CATALOGS, PUBLICATIONS, GRADING, AND ADVERTISING

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

4.6.1 Admissions and mentoring policies must encourage the recruitment and retention of diverse students with demonstrated potential as professional educators, and must respond to the nation’s need for qualified individuals to serve in high demand areas and locations.

4.6.2 The program must distribute an academic calendar to students. 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.

4.6.3 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.

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

*In order to verify compliance with this standard, the auditors will review the program catalog, Web pages, or other descriptive publications (including those that contain the program’s academic calendar, a listing of faculty that teach in the program and a description of the program’s history and guiding philosophy).*

4.7 STUDENT FEEDBACK

**Overview.** The quality of a program depends on its ability to meet the needs of its students. One effective way to determine if those needs are met is to encourage students 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 student views about the program and responds to student feedback and complaints.

4.7.1 The institution is required to keep a file of complaints from its students about the program’s quality and must provide TEAC with access to all complaints regarding the program and their resolution.
4.7.2 Complaints about the program’s quality must be proportionally no greater or
significant than the complaints made by students in the institution’s other pro-
grams.

In order to verify compliance with this standard, the auditors will identify the program’s
procedures for dealing with student complaints, verify that there is a program record file
of student complaints and their resolution, verify that the policy for administering student
course evaluations was followed, verify parity across the institution regarding policies for
soliciting and responding to feedback, and verify parity across the institution regarding
amount and significance of complaints.

STATE STANDARDS
When appropriate because of TEAC’s protocol agreement with a state, an eighth compo-
nent to the TEAC capacity standards (4.8) is added, with subcomponents (4.8.1, 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 trust-
worthiness of the Brief, the auditors will list them as nonspecific concerns about the accu-
rracy of the Brief, and the tasks that probe these concerns will be counted in the overall
audit opinion.

The auditors are to be alert to errors in the Brief which may be indications of a
carelessness, over-claiming, imprecision, and the like, which could call into question
the accuracy of parts of the Brief that were not sampled in the audit strategy.
Part Two: Practical Matters

Q & A
Checklist: Preparing for the Audit
Q & A

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.

Because TEAC audits programs only while courses are in full session, with most students and faculty on campus, there are two audit periods during each academic year: from September 15 to December 15; and from January 15 to April 15. The table below presents the schedule of actions from the time a Brief is declared auditable through the decision about the program’s accreditation.

TEAC audit schedule 2005–2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inquiry Brief declared auditable no later than</th>
<th>Audit period</th>
<th>Reports and responses completed by</th>
<th>Panel meeting*</th>
<th>Committee meeting*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 1, 2005</td>
<td>September 15, 2005 to December 15, 2005</td>
<td>February 2, 2006</td>
<td>late March July 2006</td>
<td>late April 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1, 2008</td>
<td>September 15, 2008 to December 15, 2008</td>
<td>February 2, 2009</td>
<td>late March July 2009</td>
<td>late April 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Will the audit take place over the weekend?
Because the audit must take place at a time when the auditors have access to faculty, staff, students, and facilities, the audit is usually scheduled over consecutive weekdays. However, the auditors might work on a weekend day: if the audit begins on a Monday, the team members would travel on Saturday or Sunday and work together before arriving on campus; the audit might end on a Friday afternoon, but the team would spend part of Friday evening and Saturday in their
post-visit activities. The program must make sure that the auditors have accommodations if they will be arriving or leaving during the weekend.

**Who are the TEAC auditors? What do they do while they are on our campus?**

TEAC auditors are faculty and administrators from colleges and universities; they are staff from state education agencies; and they are practitioners in the K-12 schools; they are TEAC staff members. All TEAC auditors are trained by TEAC for this work. TEAC provides special training for the practitioners and others who are members of the on-site audit team. Each audit team meets before the audit for a review session on the TEAC principles and audit process.

The auditors visit the campus to examine and verify on site the evidence that supports the claims made in the professional education program’s Inquiry Brief or the Inquiry Brief Proposal. They determine if the descriptions and characterizations of evidence in the Brief are accurate. Based on the evidence, they also make a judgment about the institution’s commitment to the program.

**How much does the TEAC audit cost?**

Currently, for the year in which a program’s Brief is audited, the institution pays an audit fee of $1,000 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 (three nights), food, travel, and fees ($1,500 per auditor; an honorarium of $100 per day for the on-site practitioner who is a member of the audit visit team 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, which are, at present, $2,000 per year, per institution.

**Who arranges travel and lodging for the auditors?**

TEAC makes the travel arrangements for the auditors and bills the program for reimbursement after the audit. The program arranges and pays for local lodging for the audit team and for any state education representative who may participate in the audit.

**Our audit is complete. When will we know the audit opinion?**

Within two weeks of the audit, the auditors send their audit report to the program, TEAC, and TEAC’s Accreditation Panel. The program then has two weeks to respond to the report. The report then becomes part of the materials reviewed for the accreditation decision.

**When will we know the accreditation decision?**

Once the audit is complete, the process to the accreditation decision four to eight months (see inside front cover for details of the accreditation process and TEAC’s audit schedule, above).
**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.
## Checklist: preparing for the TEAC audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>We have . . .</th>
<th>Done!</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Been notified by TEAC that our <em>Brief</em> is auditable, and we have sent to TEAC multiple copies of the final <em>Brief</em>, with signed cover checklist, as instructed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Submitted copy of the final, auditable <em>Brief</em> to state DOE, as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Designated an audit coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>With TEAC, scheduled the audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Coordinated audit information with state DOE representative, as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Selected a local practitioner to be part of the audit visit; provided TEAC with the practitioner’s cv and contact information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Received auditors’ cv’s from TEAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Reviewed auditors’ cv’s and responded to TEAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Received from TEAC the call-for-comment letter/e-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Distributed the call-for-comment letter/e-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Made hotel reservations and local travel arrangements for the auditors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Given TEAC the information about hotel and local travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Drafted a schedule for the audit visit and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Arranged for space for the auditors to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Reviewed audit schedule with TEAC and made changes as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Established final, agreed-upon schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Shared final, agreed-upon audit schedule with all those involved; scheduled interviews; communicated clearly dates, times, and place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Assembled for the auditors all documentation and other evidence used to develop and write the <em>Brief</em>, including files, data, references, program and institution material, documentation for the internal audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Arranged for audit coordinator to be available while auditors are on site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Arranged for administrative support for the auditors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Shared TEAC brochures or other materials with on campus who will be part of the audit but who are not familiar with TEAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Sent to TEAC any materials requested before the visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Sent to TEAC the program’s responses to any pre-audit tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Received from TEAC the auditors’ summary of the case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Reviewed the summary of the case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Responded to the summary of the case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Confirmed the details of the auditors’ travel, lodging, and on-campus schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Reminded all involved with the audit about their role and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Had audit visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Have sent any requested material to TEAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Received the audit report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Responded to the audit report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Arranged to attend the Accreditation Panel meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Received an invoice from TEAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Paid our audit costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEAC’s accreditation principles and standards

0.0 Requirements for candidate status
0.1 Commitment to comply with TEAC's standards for the preparation of competent, caring, and qualified educators
0.2 Agreement to disclose the program’s accreditation status
0.3 Willingness to cooperate and provide information to TEAC
0.4 Regional accreditation or equivalent
0.5 Graduates’ eligibility for a professional license

1.0 Quality Principle I: Evidence of student learning
1.1 Evidence of students’ subject matter knowledge
1.2 Evidence of students’ pedagogical knowledge
1.3 Evidence of students’ caring and teaching skill

Each component of element 1.0 includes three cross-cutting liberal education themes: learning how to learn, multicultural perspectives and accuracy, and technology.

2.0 Quality Principle II: Valid assessment of student learning
2.1 Statements explaining links between assessments and the program goal, claims, and requirements
2.2 Evidence of valid interpretations on the assessments

3.0 Quality Principle III: Institutional learning
3.1 The program faculty’s decisions and planning are based on evidence of student learning
3.2 The program has an influential quality control system

4.0 Standards of Capacity for Program Quality

4.1 Curriculum
4.1.1 Quality Principle I components
4.1.2 Professional license requirements
4.1.3 Institutional degree requirements

4.2 Program faculty
4.2.1 Accept TEAC goal and program’s Inquiry Brief/Inquiry Brief Proposal
4.2.2 Have an accurate and balanced understanding of the field
4.2.3 Are qualified for their teaching assignments
4.2.4 Have parity with their counterparts across the institution

4.3 Facilities, equipment, and supplies
4.3.1 Program has adequate resources for Quality Principle I outcomes
4.3.2 Program has a quality control system that monitors and enhances resources
4.3.3 The program has parity with the rest of the institution regarding its facilities

4.4 Fiscal and administrative capacity
4.4.1 Evidence that the institution is financially sound
4.4.2 Evidence of adequate resources for faculty development
4.4.3 Quality control system that monitors financial and administrative resources
4.4.4 Evidence of adequate resources for Quality Principle I outcomes and parity with the institution

4.5 Student support services
4.5.1 The program has adequate student support services for Quality Principle I outcomes
4.5.2 The program has a quality control system that monitors student support services
4.5.3 There is parity with institutional student support service

4.6 Recruiting and admissions practices, academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading, and advertising
4.6.1 Admissions: policies encourage diversity and service in high-demand areas
4.6.2 The academic calendar is accurate and complete
4.6.3 Advertising is accurate and consistent with information and claims in Inquiry Brief or Inquiry Brief Proposal
4.6.4 The program promotes fair grading policies

4.7 Student feedback
4.7.1 Evidence that student opinion and complaints are sought and resolved
4.7.2 Evidence of parity with respect to complaints in other programs

State standards: When appropriate because of TEAC's protocol agreement with a state, an eighth component to the TEAC capacity standards (4.8) is added, with subcomponents (4.8.1, etc.) in accordance to the state’s particular requirements.