



## Expanded information required for continuing accreditation

The program's first *Inquiry Brief* contained three implicit promises for the future and these need to be addressed in the program's subsequent bid for reaccreditation. These three were: a plan to undertake continuing inquiry into the factors that might influence candidate learning and accomplishment in the program; evidence that not only did the Quality Control System work more or less as it was designed, but that it improved program quality; and that some of the categories of evidence, cited in Appendix E, that were not available or relied upon in the first *Inquiry Brief* would be used in the subsequent *Brief*.

The *Inquiry Brief* from program faculty seeking continuing accreditation will make the case for accreditation with TEAC by including all the familiar elements outlined on pages 41–69, but within that framework, the program will also need to integrate information about the three points above into its *Inquiry Brief* for re-accreditation:

1. With regard to its plan for future and on-going inquiry, the faculty can provide a separate report of how the plan turned out, or the report can be included in the *Inquiry Brief* in the Discussion section if it does not exist in a separate format. The program is not obligated to conduct the inquiry it planned in its first *Brief*, but it is obligated to have conducted some inquiry to earn a full continuing accreditation term. If the program abandoned its initial plan for inquiry, it would simply give the reasons for its going in a different direction and report the results of the inquiry it in fact undertook.
2. With regard to evidence that the activities of the Quality Control System actually improved something in the program, the faculty should report the evidence it has that it has made something better in the program. This evidence may be the same as that undertaken in Item 1 above or it may be in some other area of interest to the faculty.
3. With regard to how the evidence promised in Appendix E “for future use” has been addressed, the faculty may either include it or provide reasons for not using it.

There is always the hope and expectation that the faculty seeking reaccreditation will also have refined and enhanced the quality of the evidence it uses to make its case so that it is more persuasive and conclusive than what was submitted in the prior *Inquiry Brief*.

### Schedule for accreditation renewal

In order for accreditation status to be continuous, the anniversary date of the accreditation decision is the deadline for the **audit** of the new *Inquiry Brief*. When preparing a schedule for producing a new *Brief*, keep in mind that an *Inquiry Brief* must be declared complete and ready (“auditable”) for the audit *eight weeks* before the anticipated audit visit. A possible schedule would be:

Announcement of accreditation status	June 2009
Next audit cycle	January – May 2014
<i>Inquiry Brief</i> declared auditable	December 2013 – March 2014
<i>IB</i> due to TEAC for formative evaluation	June – August 2013

As long as the audit takes place before the date on which your accreditation status ends, that status will be extended until the Accreditation Committee meets for programs audited in your cycle, ensuring continuous accreditation for the program.

**Exercise 30: Following up on the findings (for re-accreditation):** With the key question of the internal academic audit in mind (*Did the mechanism make things better, improve quality?*), consider the case below:

**CASE:** The faculty members in a teacher education program were concerned that their admission standards, while functioning as designed, were not yielding the outcomes they should.

In their internal audit in their first *Inquiry Brief*, they had examined the relationship between GRE scores and program grade point averages and found the correlation was too low to justify the continued use of the GRE as a predictive measure of success in the program.

Subsequently, they then undertook an examination of a sample of students who had completed the program and who had the various undergraduate indices reported in the table below.

What conclusions should they come to in their second *Inquiry Brief* about how should they use the undergraduate index, if at all, in their admission procedure in their graduate program?

**Table 30: Number of master’s students above and below at graduate GPA of 3.5 as a function of various undergraduate grade point indices (2.4, 2.5, 2.75, 3.0)**

<b>Undergraduate GPA</b>	<b>Program GPA Below 3.5</b>	<b>Program GPA Above 3.5</b>	<b>Total</b>
Above 3.0	8	74	82
Below 3.0	9	28	37
Above 2.75	11	87	98
Below 2.75	6	15	21
Above 2.5	13	96	109
Below 2.5	4	6	10
Above 2.4	14	99	113
Below 2.4	3	3	6
<b>Totals</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>119</b>