<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Program faculty actions</th>
<th>TEAC actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Application</td>
<td>Program faculty prepares and submits 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>2. Formative evaluation</td>
<td>1. Program faculty submits draft of the Brief* with checklist∞ 2. (Optional) Workshops, coaching and other formative evaluation services (services, available both before and after the program submits draft)</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>3. Inquiry Brief or Inquiry Brief Proposal</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 2. TEAC provides instructions for submitting hard copies of the Brief 3. TEAC accepts Brief for audit and submits it to the Accreditation Panel chair for instructions to auditors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Call for comment</td>
<td>Program faculty and staff distribute call-for-comment letter to designated parties</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>5. Audit</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 (within 2 weeks)∞</td>
<td>1. TEAC schedules audit and sends Guide to the 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 5. TEAC staff responds to program faculty’s comments about the draft audit report∞ 6. Final audit report prepared and distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Staff analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. TEAC completes staff analysis and sends to program 2. TEAC sends Brief, audit report and faculty response, and staff analysis to panel members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Accreditation Panel</td>
<td>1. Program head participates in meeting (optional) 2. Program faculty responds (within 2 weeks)∞</td>
<td>1. Panel formulates accreditation recommendation and 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>8. Accreditation Committee</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>9. Acceptance or appeal</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>10. Annual report</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
About the Teacher Education Accreditation Council

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

With its goal is to support the preparation of competent, caring, and qualified professional educators, TEAC accredits undergraduate and graduate programs for education professionals in order to assure the public about the quality of college and university programs.

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

TEAC’s unique approach to accreditation helps programs improve and be accountable for their quality. TEAC’s accreditation process starts with the faculty’s questions about the program and its performance within the context of the program’s mission. TEAC’s academic audit verifies evidence that student learning meets high expectations and that the program is following processes that produce quality.

TEAC’s membership represents a broad range of higher education institutions, from small liberal arts colleges to large research universities.

Affiliate membership is available to institutions that support the TEAC agenda but do not wish to pursue accreditation for any of their programs. State education agencies, professional organizations, or individuals likewise may hold affiliate membership.

As its principles and standards suggest, TEAC is an advocate for improvement based on research and confirmed scholarship. To that end, TEAC shares information about program design and effectiveness and conducts meetings and workshops on its innovative approach to accreditation for members, state groups, and consortia.

Founded in 1997 as a nonprofit organization, with 501(c) 3 status, TEAC is formally recognized as an accreditor by the U.S. Department of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. TEAC is also a member of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditation, the American Council on Education, Association of Teacher Educators, and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification.

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

TEAC has offices at One Dupont Circle in Washington, DC, and in Newark, Delaware.

Additional information about TEAC’s accreditation activities and events is available on TEAC’s Web site (www.teac.org).

Eligibility Requirements
Candidates for initial or continuing accreditation must meet the following requirements:

- The program is committed to TEAC’s goal and quality principles.
- The program faculty understands that TEAC may disclose the member’s accreditation status.
- The program faculty will provide any information that TEAC may require.
- The institution giving the program has regional accreditation or its equivalent.
- The program’s graduates are eligible for the state’s professional teaching license.
TEAC’s Goal and Accreditation Principles

TEAC’s goal is to support the preparation of competent, caring, qualified professional educators. Using TEAC’s quality principles and standards for capacity, an education program faculty makes the case that its program has succeeded in preparing competent, caring, and qualified professional educators.

Quality Principle I: Evidence of student learning

Student learning is the core outcome addressed by the TEAC accreditation process. TEAC accreditation is based on the evidence that the program faculty provides in support of its claims about students’ learning and understanding of the professional education curriculum, especially their subject matter knowledge and teaching skill.

Quality Principle II: Valid assessment of student learning

Valid assessment of student learning is the core value of the TEAC accreditation process. TEAC expects program faculty to provide (1) a rationale justifying that the assessment techniques it uses are reasonable and credible and (2) evidence documenting the reliability and validity of the assessments.

Quality Principle III: Institutional learning

Institutional learning is the core activity supported by the TEAC accreditation process. TEAC expects that a faculty’s decisions about its programs are based on evidence, and that the program has a quality control system that (1) yields reliable evidence about the program’s practices and results, and (2) influences policies and decision making.

Standards of Capacity for Program Quality

TEAC defines a quality program as one that has credible evidence that it satisfies the three quality principles. However, TEAC also requires the program faculty to provide evidence that it has the capacity—curriculum, faculty, resources, facilities, publications, student services, and policies—to support student learning and program quality.

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

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

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

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

Four principles guide TEAC’s accreditation process:

1. Improvement is a continuous process in which each step helps define the next one and moves it forward.

2. The accreditation process must be inquiry driven, starting from the faculty’s questions about the program’s mission and results.

3. The accreditation process includes evidence from academic audits that examine the trustworthiness of the evidence that student learning meets high expectations and that the program follows processes that produce quality.

4. The process is intended to be frugal, not burdening the program and institution with unnecessary activities or costs in paperwork, personnel, time, and money.

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

Process Principle One: Continuous Improvement to Advance Quality

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

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

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

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

Process Principle Two: Inquiry-driven Accreditation

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

The questions driving the inquiry should be interesting and important to the education program faculty and should address the relationship between teaching and student learning, both important indicators of quality. Rather than being designed simply to comply with the external demands of accrediting bodies and state agencies, the program faculty’s questions should reflect the unique mission of the program and the goal of preparing competent, caring, qualified professional educators.
Process Principle Three: Audits to Ensure Quality
An audit provides an external verification of the program's internal quality assurance mechanisms and the evidence they produce.

An academic audit is an investigative review of the way a professional education program is producing student learning, assessing the outcomes of instruction, making improvements in the program, and gaining institutional support for the program.

An academic audit does not evaluate quality itself; instead, it verifies the processes that are intended to produce quality. TEAC's approach to the audit emphasizes both the quality processes and the evidence of the student learning and accomplishment.

TEAC's approach requires the program faculty to live up to its publicly proclaimed high expectations for the program and its improvement. This is accomplished when the institution and program demonstrate accountability to the public for those high expectations through the display of solid evidence of student learning.

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

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

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

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

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

- evidence of their students’ learning
- evidence that their assessment of student learning is valid
- evidence that the program’s continuous improvement and quality control are based on information about its students’ learning
- evidence of the program’s capacity for quality

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

Faculty members representing new programs or programs that are in the process of collecting evidence for their claims about student learning may submit an Inquiry Brief Proposal, in which they propose how they will show, in a subsequent Inquiry Brief, that their graduates are competent, qualified, and caring. They provide evidence that their proposed assessments are valid, that their quality control system functions, and that the program meets TEAC’s standards for capacity to offer quality.

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

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

For easy reference, see “the TEAC accreditation process at a glance,” inside front cover.
## TEAC’s Accreditation Categories and Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Category</th>
<th>Term*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate</strong></td>
<td>Five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program is pursuing initial accreditation after having met the membership eligibility requirements</td>
<td>Five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial accreditation</strong></td>
<td>Five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program is awarded accreditation by TEAC for the first time</td>
<td>Ten years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuing accreditation</strong></td>
<td>Five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program is awarded reaccreditation by TEAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preaccreditation</strong></td>
<td>Five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Awarded on a one-time basis) Program’s <em>Inquiry Brief Proposal</em> is approved by the Accreditation Panel and Committee; or program’s <em>Inquiry Brief</em> is promising but found to be inconclusive by the Accreditation Panel and Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New program accreditation</strong></td>
<td>Five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Awarded on a one-time basis) New or revised program’s <em>Inquiry Brief Proposal</em> indicates initial accreditation is likely in the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provisional accreditation</strong></td>
<td>Two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program’s <em>Inquiry Brief</em> meets most but not all of TEAC’s quality principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denied accreditation</strong></td>
<td>Reverts to candidate status***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program’s <em>Inquiry Brief</em> or <em>Inquiry Brief Proposal</em> does not meet TEAC standards or quality principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Time before a new *Inquiry Brief* must be submitted. Term is conditional upon submission of an acceptable annual report and no adverse actions due to complaints or substantive changes.

** Candidate status is renewable only if the program continues to meet eligibility requirements and has begun the process of submitting a *Brief*.

*** Provided eligibility requirements are met. If not, the program has no accreditation status with TEAC.
What is a Program?

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

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

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

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

**Evidence.** If the program faculty can aggregate the evidence for the outcome of these programs honestly, then the programs can be presented in a single Brief.

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

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

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

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

States

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

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

Coordination has other benefits. Most states have developed curriculum and performance-based standards for teacher education. Naturally, the states wish to see that the programs seeking TEAC accreditation meet those standards. For its part, TEAC requires that the claims a program faculty makes in its Brief must be consistent with the claims it makes elsewhere (for example, the program faculty cannot make one set of claims for the purpose of TEAC accreditation and another set for state program approval). Thus, TEAC expects consistency between the program’s claims about Quality Principle 1 (student learning) and the claims that the program makes to the state and others: in these instances, the program’s claims about Quality Principle 1 must incorporate the state’s standards within TEAC’s requirement that the program provide evidence that its graduates have learned their teaching subject matters, pedagogy, and caring teaching skills, along with the cross-cutting themes of learning to learn, multicultural perspectives, and technology.

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

- **Mandated accreditation.** A few states simply require that all professional education programs in the state be accredited by a nationally recognized accreditor, such as TEAC or NCATE: in some cases, a state accreditation agency is another option. The programs in these states have no option other than meeting the accreditor’s standards. In some states, TEAC and the state have added to the accreditation process requirements that are of particular interest to the state. (TEAC’s agreement with one state, for example, requires TEAC to verify that there is evidence of mutual benefit to both the program and the public school that hosts the clinical portions of the program; TEAC otherwise has no requirements of this sort.) Although TEAC also has no requirement that the all of the institution’s education programs present themselves for accreditation (see “What is a Program?” above), most states with which TEAC has an agreement require that all of the institution’s education programs meet accreditation standards.

- **Reliance on TEAC for program approval.** All states require program approval if the graduates are to receive a professional license. While only a few states actually require that programs be accredited, most are supportive of accreditation and freely encourage teacher education programs in the state to undertake the self-examination required by accreditation. Nearly all of the states find that the standards adopted by NCATE and TEAC align with their own views of program quality. Some states have chosen to rely on TEAC accreditation for the program review function, and their agreements with TEAC reflect that fact. TEAC’s agreements with these states are usually similar to those with states that mandate accreditation, with the exception that accreditation is voluntary.
• TEAC as consultant to the state’s program approval process. In another kind of agreement, the state fully retains its authority and independence in making the program approval decision, but uses the contents of the program’s Brief and TEAC’s audit report, staff analysis, or accreditation report to corroborate and arrive at its own program approval decision. In these cases, TEAC’s accreditation process assists the state in its own program approval work and simplifies that work as the documentation prepared for TEAC also serves the state’s program review needs.

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

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

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

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

The TEAC policy applies, however, only to the initial Inquiry Brief or Inquiry Brief Proposal that a program submits to TEAC; the initial Brief will not need to address programs already accredited by another agency recognized by USDE or CHEA. For continuing accreditation, TEAC will accept the accreditation of other nationally recognized accreditors as meeting TEAC’s capacity standards (element 4.0); but, for the purpose of satisfying its quality principles and obligations to the states, TEAC will require additional evidence of student learning from these other accredited programs. The protocols for this shared evidence will be negotiated with the other accreditors over the next few years and can be expected to take one of the following two forms:

• If valid evidence of student learning is already part of the self-study examination and the self-study report submitted to the other accreditor, TEAC will accept the evidence in the report, verify it during the audit visit, and evaluate it as TEAC would any other body of evidence. No other submission to TEAC would be needed.

• If, for some reason, evidence of student learning is not part of the self-study requirements for the other accreditor, then the program would have to provide evidence of student learning to TEAC separately for verification and evaluation.
The purpose of the policy is to make as much use as possible of the work the program has done for other specialized or profession-based accreditors. In this way, TEAC can meet its obligations to institutions that have elected TEAC for the purposes of satisfying a state’s mandate that all programs that prepare professionals for work in schools be accredited, and the program does not have to duplicate its efforts.

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

At the current time, TEAC relies, at its discretion, on professional societies, organizations, and unrecognized accreditors for assistance in the specification of the contents of TEAC’s Quality Principle 1, especially for those professional educators whose roles are not covered by TEAC’s principles for teacher and school leaders. Programs seeking TEAC accreditation are free to adopt these standards and use them in TEAC accreditation.

In practice, that means that in presenting its case for meeting Quality Principle 1, the program faculty must incorporate these standards in the evidence that the program's graduates have learned their subject matter, pedagogy, and caring teaching skills along with the cross-cutting themes of learning to learn, multicultural perspectives, and technology.
TEAC’s Accreditation Goal, Principles, and Standards

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

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

See TEAC’s Web site (www.teac.org) for TEAC’s standards and principles for educational leadership programs.

For easy reference, see the complete TEAC framework of principles and standards in outline form, inside back cover.

---

**Eligibility Requirements**

To be eligible for TEAC candidate status for initial and continuing accreditation, the program must document the following:

0.1 The program is committed to TEAC’s goal and quality principles.

0.2 The program faculty understands that TEAC may disclose the member’s accreditation status.

0.3 The program faculty will provide any information that TEAC may require.

0.4 The institution giving the program has regional accreditation or its equivalent.

0.5 The program’s graduates are eligible for the state’s professional teaching license.

---

**1.0 Quality Principle 1: Evidence of student learning**

The core of TEAC accreditation is the quality of the evidence the program faculty members provide in support of their claims about their students’ learning and understanding of the teacher education curriculum.

Overall, TEAC requires evidence that the candidates can teach effectively and do what else is expected of them as professional educators.

Whatever the particular topics of the curriculum that faculty members claim their students master, TEAC requires that the program faculty members address the following general components of their program in ways that also indicate that the faculty has an accurate and balanced understanding of the academic disciplines that are connected to the program under accreditation review.

**1.1 Subject matter knowledge.** Candidates for the degree must learn and understand the subject matters they hope to teach. TEAC requires evidence that the program’s candidates acquire and understand these subject matters.

**1.2 Pedagogical knowledge.** The primary obligation of the teacher is representing the subject matter in ways that his or her students can readily learn and understand. TEAC requires evidence that the candidates for the program’s degree learn how to convert their knowledge of a subject matter into compelling lessons that meet the needs of a wide range of pupils and students.

**1.3 Caring and teaching skill.** Above all, teachers are expected to act on their knowledge in a caring and professional manner that would lead to appropriate levels of achievement for all pupils.

Caring is a particular kind of relationship between the teacher and the student that is defined by the teacher’s unconditional acceptance of the student, the teacher’s intention to address the student’s educational needs, the teacher’s competence to
meet those needs, and the student’s recognition
that the teacher cares.2

Although it recognizes that the available mea-
sures of caring are not as well developed as the
measures of student learning, TEAC requires evi-
dence that the program’s graduates are caring.

Cross-cutting dimensions of Quality Principle I.

TEAC calls special attention to the liberal arts
and general education dimensions of the teacher
education curriculum. Because these dimensions
cut across and are essential parts of each compo-

dent of Quality Principle I, the program faculty
must also address and provide evidence about
them, as they would for any other aspects of their
case for their graduates’ subject matter knowl-

dge, pedagogical knowledge, and caring teach-
ing skill.

The skills and content of a liberal arts education
(e.g., technology, learning to learn, multicultural
perspectives) are essential parts of the teacher’s
subject matter knowledge, pedagogical knowledge,
and teaching skill. Graduates who understand their
teaching subject also know and understand

- the technological dimensions of their subject;
- the qualifications that limit generalization
  owing to different cultural perspectives;
- how to fill in the gaps in their knowledge and
  apply what they have learned in college to
  new situations;
- how their subject matter fits with the rest of
  knowledge, its purpose, value, limitations.

Teachers are expected to be well-informed per-
sons even though they may never directly teach
much of the information they acquire. TEAC
requires evidence that the candidates know and
understand subject matters that they may never be
called upon to teach, but which are still associated
with and expected of educated persons and pro-

doners and educational educators in particular.

These include the oral and written rhetorical
skills, critical thinking, and qualitative and quan-

titative reasoning skills that are embedded in sub-
ject matter, pedagogy, and teaching performance.
They also include knowledge of other perspec-


tives and cultures and some of the modern tech-
nological tools of scholarship.

Learning how to learn. The liberal arts include a
set of intellectual skills, tools, and ideas that
enable students to learn on their own. In particu-
lar, the program faculty must teach the students
how to address those parts of their students’ disci-


pline that could not be taught in the program,
but which the candidates will nevertheless be
expected to know and use at some later time.

For example, the whole of a subject matter and
pedagogy cannot be covered in the teacher educa-
tion curriculum. Moreover, some of what is cov-
ered may not be true or useful later, and some of
what will be needed later would not have been
known at the time of the degree program.

TEAC requires evidence that the program’s can-
didates learn how to learn important information
on their own, that they can transfer what they
have learned to new contexts, and that they
acquire the dispositions and skills to support life-

long learning in their fields.

Multicultural perspectives and understanding.

Included in the liberal arts is the knowledge of
other cultural perspectives, practices, and tradi-
tions. TEAC requires evidence that the candidates
for the degree understand the implications of con-
irmed scholarship on gender, race, individual dif-

fences, and ethnic and cultural perspectives for
educational practice.3 For all persons, but espe-
cially for prospective teachers, the program must

1 Noddings, N. (1999). “Caring and competence.” In G. Griffin
(Ed.) The education of teachers. Chicago: University of

2 For example, the range of literary genre is extended prof-

itably beyond fiction, poetry, and drama to include journa-

les, diaries, and letters when the literary work of women is seri-

ously considered. The discipline of psychology turns out to

be very different from what is presented in the standard intro-
ductive textbook when it is qualified by the contribu-

tions of black psychologists, as Robert Guthrie observed.

[Guthrie, R. (1976). Even the rat was white. New York: Har-

per & Row].
yield an accurate and sound understanding of the educational significance of race, gender, individual differences, and ethnic and cultural perspectives.

**Technology.** Increasingly, the tools of a liberal arts education are based on technology. Programs should give special attention to ensuring that the technologies that enhance the teacher’s work and the pupil’s learning are firmly integrated into their teacher education curriculum. TEAC requires evidence that the program’s graduates acquire the basic productivity tools of the profession.

### 2.0 Quality Principle II: Valid assessment of student learning

TEAC expects program faculty to provide (1) a rationale justifying its claims that the assessment techniques it uses are reasonable and credible and (2) evidence documenting the reliability and validity of the assessments.

**Rationale.** TEAC requires the program faculty to provide this rationale because the reliability and validity of nearly all the currently available methods for assessing students’ caring and learning are flawed and compromised in one way or another.

Because no single measure can be trusted to accurately reveal student learning, the program faculty will also need to employ multiple measures and assessment methods to achieve a dependable finding about what the candidates have learned.

However the program faculty members assess what their students have learned from the teacher education program, TEAC requires the program to provide evidence that the inferences made from the assessment system meet the appropriate and accepted research standards for reliability and validity.\(^4\)

This requirement means that the faculty will need to have a way to (1) address and rule out competing and rival inferences for the evidence of student learning, and (2) establish a point at which the evidence for their inference is sufficient, clear and consistent, and below which the evidence for their inference is insufficient, flawed, or inconsistent.

**Evidence of validity.** Because the evidence currently available to support claims of student learning is largely suggestive and not particularly compelling, to satisfy TEAC’s *Quality Principle II*, the program faculty needs to have an ongoing investigation of the means by which it provides evidence for each component of *Quality Principle I*.

The program faculty’s investigation must focus on two aspects of its assessment of student learning: (1) the links with the program’s design, the program’s goal, and the faculty’s claims made in support of the program goal; and (2) the elimination of confounding factors associated with the evidence from which the faculty draws the inferences.

#### 2.1 Rationale for the links

TEAC requires that the faculty members have a rationale for their assessments that makes reasonable and credible the links between the assessments and (1) the program goal, (2) the program faculty’s claims about student learning, and (3) the program’s features.

For example, the faculty members who claim that their program prepares reflective practitioners would need to make the case that their ways of assessing reflective practice are reasonable and logical. They would need to show how their assessments are related conceptually to teacher competence and to some program requirements, and that the inferences they hope to make from their assessments could be expected to be valid.

#### 2.2 Evidence of valid assessment

To satisfy *Quality Principle II*, the faculty must satisfy itself and TEAC that its rationale and the inferences from its assessments are also credible empirically. TEAC requires empirical evidence about the trustworthiness, reliability, and validity of the assessment method, or methods, the faculty employs.

---

\(^{4}\) Grade book, computer programs, databases, spreadsheets, word processors, electronic mail, bulletin boards and networked conferences, Internet access, interactive videodiscs, and instructional software are now part of the modern teacher’s repertoire.

To continue with the example above, before the faculty members could conclude that their graduates are reflective practitioners, they would also need a way to be sure that they had ruled out some plausible alternative inferences based on the evidence from their assessments: for example, the inference that their graduates were simply following some template or formula; had guessed; had memorized or parroted their reflective responses; had copied their reflections from some source; or had fabricated the evidence of reflection.

3.0 Quality Principle III: Institutional learning

TEAC expects that a faculty’s decisions about its programs are based on evidence, and that the program has a quality control system that (1) yields reliable evidence about the program’s practices and results and (2) influences policies and decision making.

Quality Principle III addresses the ongoing research and inquiry needed to meet the other two quality principles. TEAC’s Quality Principle III presupposes a system of faculty inquiry, review, and quality control is in place: the faculty has a means to secure the evidence and informed opinion it needs to initiate or improve program quality.

Quality Principle III also encourages the program faculty to become skilled at creating knowledge for the improvement of teaching and learning and to modify the program and practices to reflect this new knowledge.

TEAC expects that the faculty will systematically and continuously improve the quality of its professional education programs and provide evidence about the following two issues in the faculty’s ongoing processes of inquiry and program improvement.

3.1 Program decisions and planning based on evidence. From time to time, a teacher education faculty will decide to modify its curricula, assessment systems, pedagogical approaches, faculty composition, and so forth. TEAC requires evidence that the information derived from faculty’s research and inquiry into Quality Principle I and Quality Principle II has a role in improving the program, and will continue to have such a role in the future.

The program faculty’s research into Quality Principles I and II entails, for example, the investigation of any local factors that are associated with, and implicated in, student learning and its assessment.

To satisfy Quality Principle III, the program faculty must be committed to consistently improving its capacity to offer quality professional education programs. Wherever possible, the program faculty should base the steps it takes to improve the program on evidence derived from its inquiry into the effects various factors have on the assessment of student learning.

3.2 Influential quality control system. The faculty must have a quality control system in place to examine and evaluate the components of the program’s capacity for quality, including its curriculum, students, faculty expertise, program and course requirements, and facilities.

TEAC requires evidence, based on an internal audit conducted by the program’s faculty, that the quality control system functions as it was designed, that it promotes the program’s continual improvement, and that it yields evidence that supports Quality Principles I and II.

Many factors may affect the quality of a program and influence the assessments of the academic accomplishments of the program’s students. TEAC requires that the faculty undertake ongoing inquiry and research into the likely factors associated with the students’ accomplishments.

TEAC expects that, over time, this inquiry will lead to a better understanding of the local factors and components of program quality that are important and would justify their continued nurture and investment.

This inquiry and the efforts to control quality should also lead to an awareness of some factors that can be treated with indifference because they have only marginal effects on program quality.
Although any number of factors and components of the program may affect program quality, TEAC requires the program faculty to address directly seven standards (4.1-4.7), each of which seems to have a plausible association with student learning and program quality.

TEAC’s seven standards for capacity are based upon the USDE’s requirement that any accrediting agency recognized by the Secretary as a reliable gatekeeper for federal funding have standards for seven dimensions of program capacity: curriculum, faculty, resources, facilities, accurate publications, student support services, and student feedback.

Although TEAC encourages programs to investigate and provide evidence of other local factors that affect capacity for quality, TEAC requires programs to provide plans to investigate, over time, and through their quality control systems, plausible links between student learning and the seven federal components of program quality.

Ultimately, the evidence for an adequate quality control system comes from the program faculty’s ongoing investigation of any plausible links between capacity and student learning. In other words, the program faculty’s quality control system should have agents that continually investigate and ask, *What about each component could be expected to facilitate student accomplishment and learning, and what evidence can we rely on to support and justify that expectation?*

### 4.0 Standards of Capacity for Program Quality

TEAC defines a *quality* program as one that has credible evidence that it satisfies the three TEAC quality principles. However, TEAC also requires the program faculty to provide evidence that it has the *capacity*—curriculum, faculty, resources, facilities, publications, student support services, and policies—to support student learning and program quality. This evidence should be independent of student learning and based on some traditional *input* features of capacity.

The faculty can make the case that the program has a sufficient capacity for quality in any way that meets scholarly standards of evidence; however, TEAC requires that the faculty cover the following basic points in making its case.

**Quality control.** The faculty must show that it monitors systematically the quality of the program and that the faculty is disposed to act to continuously improve program quality. This is just another way of saying that the faculty adheres to *Quality Principle III*. The faculty maintains a system of quality control and inquiry, verified by periodic internal audits, that (1) monitors the quality of the curriculum, faculty, facilities, resources, student support services, publications; and (2) is sensitive and responds to student comment and complaint.

**Evidence of commitment.** The faculty must also provide evidence that the institution is committed to the program. Commitment is most conveniently seen in the evidence of parity of the program within the institution. The program must at least have the *normative capacity* of the institution’s academic programs with regard to the quality of the curriculum, faculty, facilities, resources, student support services, publications, and features it shares with the institution’s other programs.

**Unique capacity.** The faculty must also address whatever unique capacity is needed for program quality in professional education.

Teacher education programs, for example, have unique features, such as student teaching and clinical courses. The institution and program must provide resources, administrative direction, and facilities for these unique and distinctive features.

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

#### 4.1 Curriculum

TEAC’s *Quality Principle I* sets out the required components of the curriculum (1.1-1.3). In addition, TEAC has three standards for the professional curriculum’s capacity for quality:
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.

4.2 Faculty. TEAC requires evidence of oversight and coordination of the curriculum of the professional teacher education program. The entity responsible for the program may be an administrative department, school, program, center, institute, or faculty group. It may be as large as the entire college or university or as small as a committee of faculty and staff who have direct authority and responsibility for those aspects of the program that pertain to TEAC’s quality principles. Because of the variety of structures among institutions, TEAC uses the term faculty to represent this entity.

TEAC’s standard for the quality of the program faculty is the presence of the following attributes in the faculty:

4.2.1 The program faculty members must approve the Inquiry Brief or Inquiry Brief Proposal and accept the preparation of competent, caring, and qualified educators as the goal for their program.

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

4.2.3 The program faculty members must be qualified to teach the courses in the program to which they are assigned, as evidenced by advanced degrees held, scholarship, contributions to the field, and professional experience. TEAC requires that a majority of the faculty members 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 The program faculty’s qualifications must be equal to or better than those of the faculty across the institution as a whole; 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).

4.3 Facilities, equipment, and supplies. The program must demonstrate that the facilities provided by the institution for the program are sufficient and adequate to support a quality program as follows:

4.3.1 The program must demonstrate that it has 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 to monitor and improve the suitability and appropriateness of program facilities, supplies and equipment.

4.3.3 The facilities, equipment, and supplies that the institution allocates to the program must, at a minimum, 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.

4.4 Fiscal and administrative. 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, as indicated by the following:

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 program must demonstrate an appropriate level of institutional investment in and commitment to faculty development, research and scholarship, and national and regional service. The program faculty’s work-load obligations must be commensurate with those the institution as a whole expects in hiring, promotion, tenure, and other employment contracts.

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 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 1.

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

4.5.1 Services available to students in the program must be sufficient to support their success in learning (Quality Principle 1) and successful completion of the program.6

4.5.2 The program must monitor the quality of the student support services to ensure that they contribute to student success in learning (Quality Principle 1).

4.5.3 Support services available to students in the program must, at a minimum, be equal to the level of student support services provided by the institution as a whole.

4.6 Recruiting and admissions practices, academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading, and advertising. The institution that offers the program must publish in its catalog, or other appropriate documents distributed to students, information that fairly and accurately 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.

As part of its audit, TEAC examines the program catalog, Web pages, or other descriptive publications (including those that contain the program’s academic calendar, a list of faculty teaching in the program, and a description of the program’s history and guiding philosophy) to ensure that they are both accurate and consistent with the claims made in the Brief.

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 or institution must distribute an academic calendar to students. The academic calendar must list the beginning and end dates of terms, holidays, and examination periods.

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 or Inquiry Brief Proposal regarding the program must be consistent with, and inclusive of, claims made about the program that appear in the institution’s catalog, mission statements, and other promotional literature.

6 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.
4.6.4 The program must have a fair, equitable, and published grading policy. (This policy may also be the institution's grading policy.)

4.7 Student feedback. The quality of a program depends upon 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 feedback about the program and responds to student views and complaints.

4.7.1 The institution is required to keep a file of student feedback and complaints about the program’s quality, and the program’s response. The program must provide TEAC with access to those records, including resolution of student grievances.

4.7.2 Complaints from students about the program’s quality must be proportionally no greater or more significant than complaints made by students in the institution’s 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.
**Practical Matters**

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

Complete a membership application form (available from the director of membership services or on the Web at www.teac.org). A completed application includes the application form, documentation of the institution’s regional accreditation, evidence that the program’s graduates are eligible for state licensure, a copy of the institution’s current catalog, and a check to cover the membership fee.

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

At the present time, annual membership dues for the institution are $2,500. Affiliate members (institutions and organizations) pay $600 annually; they are not eligible for accreditation.

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

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

**How long does it take to complete TEAC accreditation?**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In addition, TEAC provides a staff liaison to assist the program over a period of weeks and months in the writing and editing of the Brief, methodological design, statistical analysis, interpretations of evidence. TEAC funds this service from the audit fees all programs pay in the year of their audits.
To further guide members in their process, TEAC offers a variety of additional formative evaluation services. Each of these services has a fee (for workshop dates, fees for all services, and ordering information, see www.teac.org):

1. Each October and March, TEAC conducts workshops for those who would like more assistance. The workbook given to participants is designed to help program faculty get started on a Brief; extra copies for campus colleagues are also available for purchase.

2. On request, TEAC can provide tailored workshops on-site for a program or group of programs (such as a sector- or state-based consortium).

3. TEAC can provide individual consultation for a program, in TEAC’s offices.

4. In rare cases where a program requires or desires more help than the staff liaison can provide, TEAC can provide consultants on an individually negotiated cost basis.

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

There is a “firewall” between TEAC’s formative evaluation and its summative evaluation: the staff who conduct one do not conduct the other.

When will TEAC conduct the audit?

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

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

To allow sufficient time for both our review and any revisions you may make in your Brief, TEAC asks each candidate for accreditation or continuing accreditation to develop and commit to an accreditation plan, which you can download from the TEAC Web site and submit to TEAC.

Start by using the schedule below to identify your target audit period and accreditation date. If you want to take advantage of any of the optional formative evaluation services we offer, you must submit an initial full draft for review at least six months before your audit date to allow sufficient time both for our staff to study your draft and for the program faculty to meet and address TEAC feedback and make any revisions that may be required or advisable. Whether you engage the optional formative evaluation services or not, you should plan to submit your last revised draft of the Brief at least two months before your target audit date for an auditability decision. If TEAC finds the Brief auditable, your audit date will be confirmed. If, however, the Brief needs more than very minor revisions, the review process will have to continue into the next audit period and you will need to schedule a new audit date.
TEAC audit schedule 2006–2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation decision*</th>
<th>Audit period From</th>
<th>to</th>
<th>Last revised draft of the Brief** by</th>
<th>Initial full draft of the Brief*** by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2007</td>
<td>Sept. 15, 2006</td>
<td>Dec. 15, 2006</td>
<td>2 months before audit date</td>
<td>6 months before audit date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Jan. 15, 2007</td>
<td>April 15, 2007</td>
<td>2 months before audit date</td>
<td>6 months before audit date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2008</td>
<td>Sept. 15, 2007</td>
<td>Dec. 15, 2007</td>
<td>2 months before audit date</td>
<td>6 months before audit date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>Jan. 15, 2008</td>
<td>April 15, 2008</td>
<td>2 months before audit date</td>
<td>6 months before audit date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2009</td>
<td>Sept. 15, 2008</td>
<td>Dec. 15, 2008</td>
<td>2 months before audit date</td>
<td>6 months before audit date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Jan. 15, 2009</td>
<td>April 15, 2009</td>
<td>2 months before audit date</td>
<td>6 months before audit date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The exact dates for the panel and committee meetings are scheduled at the close of each audit period.
** Includes response to feedback from TEAC’s review
***Complete draft of the Brief for TEAC review for auditability

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.

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

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

TEAC’s 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.
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