



Accrediting Commission for Schools

533 Airport Boulevard, Suite 200
Burlingame, California 94010
(650) 696-1060 • Fax (650) 696-1867
mail@acsasc.org • www.acsasc.org

DAVID E. BROWN, PH.D.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MARILYN S. GEORGE, Ed.D.
ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

LEE DUNCAN, Ed.D.
ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

EARCOS ACCREDITATION TERM EXPLANATION

What term best supports the school's improvement needs?

- **Six-Year Term:** A term of six years with a complete progress report on major recommendations or critical areas and a two-day on-site review by a two-member committee to be completed not later than the third year of the six-year term.

Interpretation: The school's current situation based on the accreditation term factors provides compelling evidence that the school is a trustworthy place for learning. (Refer to Reference Card #5, taking into consideration the slight variations within the EARCOS term options.) This term requires a midterm visit, in order to determine the degree to which the school is meeting identified growth targets and areas that will strengthen student achievement and the school's program. This includes the engagement of all stakeholders in the implementation and accomplishment of the action plan.

Note: Following the midterm on-site review, the review committee may recommend a reaffirmation of the original term; an additional progress report and/or visit; a shortening of the accreditation term; or denial of accreditation.

- **Three-Year Term:** A term of three years with a progress report on critical areas of follow-up and action plans, and a two-day visit as a requisite to continued accreditation.

Interpretation: The school's current situation based on the accreditation term factors provide compelling evidence that the school needs strong additional support, feedback, and encouragement in meeting identified growth targets and areas that will strengthen student achievement and the school's program. This includes the engagement of all stakeholders in the implementation and accomplishment of the action plan. (Strengthening student achievement includes the demonstration that growth targets for student learning are being met.)

Note: After the revisit occurs, the revisit committee may recommend: a term extension of three years; an additional one-year term, at which time the school would be expected to prepare a progress report and host a two-day revisit; or denial of accreditation.

- **One- or Two-Year Term:** A term of one or two years with a complete progress report and revisit to serve as a “warning” that unless prompt attention is given to the major recommendations or critical areas accreditation may be denied.

Interpretation: The school’s current situation based on the accreditation term factors provide compelling evidence that the school needs extremely strong additional support, feedback, and encouragement in meeting identified growth targets and areas that will strengthen student achievement and the school’s program. This includes the engagement of all stakeholders in the implementation and accomplishment of the action plan.

Note: After the revisit occurs, the revisit committee may recommend: an additional one or two years, ultimately bringing the term up to three years; at which time (three years following the full self-study) the school will be expected to prepare a progress report and host a two-day visit; or denial of accreditation.

- **Denial of Accreditation:** Denial of accreditation based on conditions detailed in the Visiting Committee Report.

Interpretation: The school’s current situation based on accreditation term factors provide compelling evidence that the school is unable to meet identified growth targets and areas that will strengthen student achievement and the school’s program. This includes the engagement of all stakeholders in the implementation and accomplishment of the action plan. Any other term of accreditation is impossible because the school is not a trustworthy place for learning and the school is unable to accomplish, at this point in time, the required ongoing school improvement.

Note: After denial of accreditation, a school may correct the deficiencies and request to begin the accreditation process again. Such a request would require a school to have an initial visit and follow all initial visit procedures.