Bringing Professional Practice into FOCUS

Catalpa Ltd.
873 Warwick Avenue
Warwick, RI 02888

401 467-5645
taw@catalpa.org
www.catalpa.org

ASSURING THE LEGITIMACY OF PRACTICE-BASED INQUIRY® VISITS:

THE PREPARATION, REVIEW AND CERTIFCIATION OF A **PRACTICE-BASED INQUIRY®** PROTOCOL

Catalpa Ltd. Guide

SEPTEMBER, 2007

Contents

PURPOSE AND USE OF THIS GUIDE

The audiences for this guide are:

- Organizations that are preparing a visit protocol for certification by Catalpa.
- Those who want to know more about the services Catalpa provides.
- Those who want to understand what distinguishes a Practice-Based Inquiry visit from other visits.

Catalpa's service for helping organizations win certification and for monitoring the rigor of the process has these components:

- Assistance in preparing a protocol
- Conducting a review of a protocol to award certification
- Monitoring and renewing certified protocols

This *guide* is consistent with the principles of PBI®. See *Fundamentals and Foundations of Practice-Based Inquiry*®. This guide cites *Fundamentals and Foundations* and expects that the reader has access to it. For further information go to *http://www.catalpa.org/res_special.cfm*.

CATALPA CERTIFICATION

Catalpa Ltd. certifies visit protocols as *Practice-Based Inquiry*® protocols. Catalpa's certification attests that the protocol is methodologically rigorous. This means, if a visit is conducted in reasonable accord with it, that the visit findings will have a strong claim for legitimacy.

Catalpa certification of a protocol is a public statement of Catalpa's judgment that:

- That the protocol meets the standards for certification and is consistent with the principles and procedures of *Practice-Based Inquiry*®.
- That, if a visit is conducted in close accord with the protocol, the agency and public can have a high level of certainty that the findings of the visit are legitimate.

A certified protocol usually implies that the agency is able to conduct and may begin to conduct PBI® visits under license from Catalpa. A license to conduct visits will assume that the agency uses a certified protocol.

Catalpa's decision to certify a protocol are based on an overall judgment about these two central points based on its understanding of PBI and its more than 12 years of experience with monitoring the legitimacy of team visits. The questions and standards that Catalpa uses in making protocol certification decisions are listed below in the next section of this *Guide.*

Catalpa's review of a protocol is iterative. If a protocol does not meet its standards, Catalpa will describe the problems and recommend possible solutions.

Certification includes a license to use **Practice-Based Inquiry®** in public descriptions of the visit. Catalpa prepares a written certification status statement that describes the terms of the certification. This statement is usually attached to the protocol.

While **Practice-Based Inquiry** has considerable flex in its structure to meet the needs of many particular situations, a protocol must conform to several important definition boundaries and process procedures. These are spelled out in *Fundamentals and Foundations of Practice-Based Inquiry®,* available from Catalpa Ltd. The Catalpa web-site, www.catalpa.org, provides additional information that should assist the protocol designer.

Catalpa Ltd. usually certifies an initial visit protocol for one year. Renewed certification is for a term of up to three years.

QUESTIONS TO DETERMINE IF A PROTOCOL MEETS CERTIFICATION STANDARDS

Catalpa considers the following questions when certifying a protocol:

BACKGROUND

1. **Does the sponsoring organization have the necessary capacity to manage a visit effectively?**

FOCUS

2. **Does it make methodological sense to use *Practice-Based Inquiry* as the research approach for this project?**

3. **Do the strengths and limitations of *Practice-Based Inquiry* match well with the purpose and questions of the inquiry?**

FOUNDATION ELEMENTS

4. **Does the protocol employ the *Foundation Elements* in a manner that ensures they are central to the inquiry?**

NECESSARY CONSTRAINTS

5. **Does the protocol specify the *Necessary Constraints* in a way that will ensure that they serve as the prerequisite boundaries for the inquiry?**

PROCEDURES FOR LEGITIMACY

6. **Does the protocol employ *Procedures for Legitimacy* to ensure legitimacy at the level specified by the expectations of the report audience and by the nature of the intended uses of the report findings?**

7. **Are the minimum requirements for *Procedures for Legitimacy* met?**

8. **Are procedures effectively set out for extending legitimacy, if required?**

STEPS FOR PREPARING A PROTOCOL FOR CERTIFICATION

The usual steps for designing a protocol and submitting it for certification are:

1. **Discuss the initial purposes, plans and steps in the design process with Catalpa Ltd.**
2. **Agree with Catalpa and other key actors in the process on roles and timelines.**
3. **Prepare a working draft, following this *Guide* and any additional specific advice or guidelines from Catalpa.**
4. **Submit working draft to Catalpa for an initial review.**
5. **Prepare final version for submission for certification.**

Catalpa will review the protocol and will reach a certification decision within 60 days. The review will be primarily carried out by Catalpa staff. A Catalpa Associate, someone who is not on the staff, will provide an external review of the protocol.

If Catalpa decides not to grant certification, it will clearly indicate what steps the agency needs to take to succeed.

OUTLINE FOR PBI® PROTOCOL

INTRODUCTION

Brief profile of the institution and the background of the inquiry project

Brief history of the connection to PBI and protocol development

Associated documents

Catalpa™ Protocol Certification Statement

PURPOSE AND CONTEXT OF THE INQUIRY PROJECT

Purpose

Link(s) to accountability/support systems

Match with Practice-Based Inquiry

Organizational support and capacity

FOCUS OF INQUIRY

Inquiry questions

Inquiry focus areas

Report outline

USE OF FOUNDATION ELEMENTS

Dynamic evidence

Professional judgment

Team deliberated consensus

USE OF NECESSARY CONSTRAINTS TO PROMOTE RIGOR

Appropriate Construction of What Conclusions Are

Criteria for Testing both the Conclusions and the Report

Intentional Visit Schedule: Design of Events and Use of Time

Purposeful Team Composition

Effective Plan for Visit Logistics

Suitable Expectations for Team and Team-Institution Dynamics

Use of Procedures to Ensure Legitimacy

A Catalpa™ certified protocol will be used.

A Catalpa™ certified chair leads the team.

Team membership is certified to meet the team composition description.

Team members have signed the Code of Conduct.

The team is trained.

The conduct of the actual visit is monitored, and the team report is endorsed.

The editing, distribution and ownership of the report are clear.

The institution can respond to and/or challenge its report.

REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES FOR EACH PROTOCOL SECTION

The question, which is at the heart of determining the legitimacy of an inquiry's findings is, "How do you know what you know?" or "How did you find what you found?" The careful, design of a protocol for conducting the inquiry provides the base for answering these questions.

Because most of the knowledge garnered from a visit is generated through social interactions, not impersonal procedures, designing and following a protocol is essential. The usual criterion for judging the success of most planned social events, such as a workshop, are not the same as those for judging an inquiry event.

Guidance is provided below for completing each section of the outline. Guidance questions for that section are indicated by italics.

INTRODUCTION

Brief profile of the institution and the background of the inquiry project

What are the purpose and the capacity of the sponsoring institution?

Why does the agency want to conduct PBI visits?

How does this project relate to the agency's previous inquiry experience?

Brief history of the connection to PBI and protocol development

How was the protocol prepared?

Include major help from outside people or agencies, including Catalpa.

Associated documents

These include documents that the team will use, such as the Code of Conduct, documents that require the agreement of the host school or other agencies where the visits will be carried out, as proposed and documents that elaborate on sections of the protocol.

Catalpa™ Protocol Certification Statement

Prepared by Catalpa, when the protocol is certified.

PURPOSE AND CONTEXT OF THE INQUIRY PROJECT

Purpose

What is the purpose of the inquiry project?

The purpose for the visit inquiry should be stated simply and clearly. This statement of purpose should directly inform much that follows, with particular attention to the inquiry questions in the next section.

A clear focus of purpose is a *Necessary Constraint* for a legitimate visit. It narrows the substance and determines much of the design of the protocol, which is particularly important for constructing the schedule. It is actively used both to train teams and to lead the visit.

If the purpose of the visit directly focuses on the central function of the institution to be visited, it usually strengthens the protocol (e.g. to assess for schools the quality of how well students are learning from what they are taught).

It is possible to write protocols that focus on issues other than the central function of an institution, but they may require additional details to ensure that the team's inquiry focus remains coherent.

The PBI visit is designed to assess actual professional practice in real time. *Practice-Based Inquiry* can be used to inquire into other organizational phenomena, but to do so may require additional attention to the question of how well does *Practice-Based Inquiry* match that task.

Link(s) to accountability/support systems

How does the inquiry project relate to larger systems of accountability or support?

Most (but not all) visit protocols are designed as part of larger systems of accountability and/or support. Provide a brief description of the system of which this inquiry project will be a part and as well as a statement of any prescribed action for the institution under study.

Will there be a prescription for what will happen to the institution because of the inquiry findings? If so, what will that be? If not, what implied implications are there for the subject institution, as a consequence of the inquiry results? For other agencies?

Examples of prescribed implications:

Whether the certifying association that conducted the visit will or will not certify a school.

Whether or not a school will receive special measures from the government based on the team report.

Explain the importance of legitimate findings for your project and the subject institutions that will be studied.

Include how important you think legitimacy is for the supporting agency and for the institutions under study.

Match with Practice-Based Inquiry

How does Practice-Based Inquiry match the purpose of the inquiry project?

Prepare a concise explanation about why you think *Practice-Based Inquiry* matches the purpose of the inquiry. Point out where you had to stretch the definitions of PBI to meet your purpose or organizational interests.

Organizational support and capacity

What is the capacity of your organization to support the management of a visit so that it is conducted in a way that reasonably follows the protocol? How will you monitor the conduct of the visit?

The ability of your agency to do a credible job of organizing and managing a PBI visit process is critical. This includes selecting team members, training teams and maintaining appropriate relationships with the visited institutions.

A well designed visit needs some monitoring and support while it is in process, but this should not be overbearing. There needs to be simple, efficient ways for the chair to solve logistical problems that come up during the visit. Briefly describe how the supporting agency will actually support and monitor the conduct of the visit.

FOCUS OF INQUIRY

The Inquiry Questions

What are the questions you want the team to write conclusions about?

The team is charged to write conclusions that answer the inquiry questions. Thus, how the inquiry questions are worded is important.

Because it relies on professional judgment, the visit is particularly well suited to handle questions pertaining to "How well do(es) _____?"[1]

For example, the three central questions in the SALT protocol are often used in other school visit protocols:

> How well do students at this school learn?
>
> How well do teachers at this school teach?
>
> How well does the school as an organization and community support good learning and teaching?

If none of the central questions for the inquiry are "How well does ___ happen in this institution?" the protocol designer should explain how *Practice-Based Inquiry* is the most effective methodology for the visit.

The Inquiry Focus Areas

What are the focus areas for this inquiry?

It is common for designers, who are steeped in the methods of social science, to believe that the visit protocol must specify what the team "should look for." That is counter to the methodology of the visit, as this reduces the team's reliance on its own professional judgment in the conduct of the inquiry.

Instead, the protocol must identify the *focus areas* of the inquiry. Focus areas indicate the arena, the place, the issue, and the organizational structure or function that the team should build its inquiry about, without introducing bias about what it should see or think about these areas. The focus areas provide real boundaries to the team's work. They become the areas of the organizations' life about which the team collects evidence. They help shape the schedule of the visit to ensure the team is able to collect the requisite evidence to address each area.

There must be a clear relationship between the focus areas and the inquiry questions. Each focus area is often a noun or noun phrase that represents each of the inquiry questions. For example the SALT visit focus areas are: "Student learning," "Teaching for learning" and "School support for learning and teaching."

While the inquiry questions usually correspond one-to-one to the focus areas, it is possible to have a more complex arrangement.

---

[1] This is a rather unusual requirement for an inquiry question. If the reader is puzzled by this, he should review the sections about professional judgment in *Foundations and Fundamentals of Practice-Based Inquiry®.*

The team can handle only a limited number of focus areas well. Three is ideal; seven is usual.

Report Outline

What is the outline of the report that the team will write?

The outline of the report must be set before the visit. This provides an essential boundary to the team's work. Include a brief description of the report and the actual proposed outline. The outline reinforces the team's focus on its task, since it represents the end result of the team's work.

The outline includes the sections for conclusions that correspond to the focus areas. Each section usually corresponds to a focus area. While more complex arrangements are possible, these should be made only if they enhance the process of the team's inquiry.

The description (and the report) must specify who will be the primary and secondary audiences, whether the report is a public document, and who will hold its copyright and distribution rights. All of these issues make a difference in how a team regards its work, as well as pose important implications for the agency that is conducting the visit and the institution that is being studied.

There should be specified procedures for editing the report. The chair is usually the only person authorized to make any changes in the text of the report conclusions after the team has disbanded. The chair's sole criterion for considering changes in text must be his or her judgment that a change clarifies the team's explicit intent.

The protocol should specify that the report will list the name and relevant organizational affiliation of all team members.

USE OF FOUNDATION ELEMENTS

The *Foundation Elements* define and distinguish a *Practice-Based Inquiry* visit. They create its unique strengths and liabilities, as a methodology, and they determine the nature of the visit findings. They are what make it possible for a visit team member to learn about a school, for a team to write what it concludes about the school and for the reader to trust those findings.

These elements are not invented constructs. Rather, they are based on careful observation of the actual conduct of hundreds of school visits within two international traditions that have existed for more than a hundred-and-twenty years.

The three fundamental and interlocking elements of a **Practice-Based Inquiry** are:

- Dynamic Evidence
- Professional Judgment
- Team-Deliberated Consensus

See *Foundations and Fundamentals* for definitions. Since these three elements work so closely together, you may organize this section by each element or you may treat them all in a unified description.

How will the visit team use the three Foundation Elements of Practice-Based Inquiry to carry out its inquiry?

How does the protocol demonstrate the importance of the Foundation Elements to what the team in fact does?

The protocol must establish that the three *Foundation Elements* are at the heart of the visit. In fact, a central criterion for the protocol is that all design elements, such as the schedule, must work to support the centrality of the *Foundation Elements* to the inquiry.

Here is an example of a design that limits the use of the *Foundation Elements*:

> At its first scheduled event, the administrative team of the visited organization conducts a show-and-tell briefing for the team. There is little time for the team to ask questions.
>
> This does not maximize the team's opportunity to form its own judgment about the institution. These types of briefings are often conducted by the institution with just the opposite intent in mind—it wants to shape the initial perceptions of the team before the team is exposed to any evidence from actual practice. Since the team has not observed the actual

practice of the school, the team has little basis for knowing whether what the administrative team has said is accurate evidence or merely spin.

In designing a protocol, one must take care not to schedule the social events and processes that might usually be expected to be part of a "visit," (including pre and post events) so that they weaken the centrality of the *Foundation Elements.*

The team must use The *Foundation Elements* in a way that is consistent with their basic definitions, relationships and necessary tensions, as specified in *Foundations and Fundamentals*.

The *Foundation Elements* make the visit different from other inquiries. Because a certain procedure works in another approach to research inquiry does not mean it will work for the visit. When a team is designing the protocol, the referent must be that which will strengthen the visit inquiry.

NECESSARY CONSTRAINTS TO PROMOTE RIGOR

Necessary Constraints are essential tools of the designer to ensure that a team will use the *Foundation Elements* in a rigorous way. They are:

Appropriate Construction of what conclusions are

Criteria for testing both conclusions and the report

Intentional visit schedule: Design of events and use of Time

Purposeful team composition

Effective plan for visit logistics

Suitable expectations for the dynamics of the team and for the dynamics between the team and the institution

Some of the *Necessary Constraints* define key working constructs. Others serve as standards for the team's decision making. Others adapt the visit processes to the particularities of each inquiry. All define boundaries for the inquiry.

Each protocol must use all six of the *Necessary Constraints* adapted to the specifics of that visit in order to make that visit as rigorous as possible.

Fundamentals and Foundations provides the definitions and procedures for each.

The design question for each constraint is the same:

How will each Necessary Constraint be defined and used in this protocol to strengthen the rigor of the inquiry?

1. APPROPRIATE CONSTRUCTION OF WHAT CONCLUSIONS ARE

Since *Practice-Based Inquiry* is a conclusion driven inquiry, a clear, practical definition of a conclusion is essential. This includes the number and length of the conclusions that will be in the final report, as well as a statement that each conclusion has met the specified tests for a conclusion.

The definition of a conclusion presented in *Fundamentals and Foundations* has proven effective and may be used as is.

2. CRITERIA FOR TESTING CONCLUSIONS AND REPORT

The protocol must include a set of tests and procedures for how the team will use the tests and when.

The designer is expected to use the tests described in *Fundamentals and Foundations.* These have been well tested in practice and have proven effective. If the protocol designer wishes to propose different tests, the rationale should be convincing and based in actual experience.

The team's training must include a section on the tests and how the team is expected to use them in making decisions about the legitimacy of a conclusion and the report.

3. INTENTIONAL VISIT SCHEDULE: DESIGN OF EVENTS AND USE OF TIME

Time is extremely limited; its wise use both fosters the rigor of the inquiry and adapts the inquiry to the purpose and nature of the organization under study. Because a team is intensely focused on one institution for only a short period of time, it is important to select and design events that use its time well.

The schedule is organized by events. An event includes team meetings, observing practice, listening at a meeting to collect evidence by asking questions of one of the organization's constituencies and the team's analysis of key documents or test scores.

Both the plan for each event and the sequence of events are important.

The schedule must include enough time for the team members to privately discuss what they think about what they are seeing. The rule of thumb is that half of the total time available for a visit is for private team deliberation.

Because the team jumps through different levels in its understanding of the visited organization, three days is usually considered the minimum time required for it to be certain about what it says about what it sees. The ideal amount of time is four or five days.

The visit occurs on consecutive days because the evidence base of the team is established in the collective memory of its members. A deviation is possible, but that needs to be explored fully and explained.

The master schedule should describe briefly what happens in each event, as well as what purpose it serves to further the inquiry.

The schedule should also include the pre- and post-visit events that involve either the institution being visited (pre-visit meetings, visit follow-up) or the team (e.g. training).

4. PURPOSEFUL TEAM COMPOSITION

The composition of team membership is important for both the actual and perceived legitimacy of a *Practice-Based Inquiry*.

The protocol must identify what available professional groups will be considered for team membership (e.g. classroom teachers, local school administrators, parents). The ideal design will emphasize including those whose practitioner experience (and thus professional judgment) is most relevant to judging the quality of practice that is under consideration. For example, if the central focus of the inquiry is on the quality of public school teaching, then the team should be dominated by public school teachers. (If this seems an unusual requirement, see the discussions of professional judgment in *Foundations and Fundamentals.)* The usual rule-of-thumb about how much professional experience is necessary to ensure reasonably mature professional judgment is five years.

Protocols that focus on questions about policy may contain an argument for using paid expert consultants, rather than practicing professionals. When the issues are controversial and it becomes more important for the report conclusions to be accepted, it may prove helpful to list known experts as team members.

> **Note**: The methodology of an inquiry investigating the possible malfeasance in past events will be different from one that is focused on making judgments about the quality of actual practice. It is possible that some of the tools of the *Practice-Based Inquiry* visit may still be helpful. Catalpa can help you sort this through.

The membership of a team usually raises practical issues for the designer, such as what the costs are and how they will be met.

How the protocol describes visit team membership should include:

- The total number of team members required. (Catalpa has good guidelines for school teams.)
- The different professional groups that team members will be drawn from; e.g. teachers, accountants, parents, legislators, journalists, emergency-room nurses.
- How team members are recruited and selected.
- Basic rules of selection, e.g. team members are from outside the umbrella of influence of the governing board of the institution; e.g., from a different public school district than that of the school being visited.
- The commitments team members will be required to make, e.g., time and training and signing the code of conduct.

The protocol states that Catalpa will certify the chair, and it will list any additional qualifications for the team members or the chair.

5. EFFECTIVE PLAN FOR VISIT LOGISTICS

To ensure that logistics for the conduct of the visit do not distract the team from using the *Foundation Elements* or from the substantive issues of the inquiry, they must be carefully planned and implemented. The protocol should include a check-list of what the organizer of the visit, the chair and the school each must do.

The team must have access to a room that is private and must have the use of an LCD projector for the full week. The room should provide adequate table space and enough room for team members to walk around during their deliberations. The room must have appropriate comfort including light, heat, food and bathrooms, as the team will work many intense hours.

Clarity about logistics includes planning for managing unexpected issues during the visit. These include the expectation that the head of the organization (or designee) and the chair of the team will meet daily to solve any visit management issues that surface.

6. SUITABLE EXPECTATIONS FOR TEAM AND TEAM-INSTITUTION DYNAMICS

School

The chair (or designee) and the staff of the host institution should meet before the visit. At this briefing meeting the chair should explain what the institution should expect during the course of the visit. This should include the code of conduct and the schedule.

Team

The training session should include a clear explanation of the team schedule. Team members should sign the code of conduct and be trained in how to relate to one another and to members of the visited organization. The training should explain that ideas about ideal group dynamics are not usually the same as the dynamics of the visit. While the team is a group, its first purpose is to seek truth, rather than seek to build an ideal group experience.

Use of Procedures to ensure legitimacy

Procedures to Ensure Legitimacy are just that. They supplement and strengthen the overall inquiry process that is built from the *Foundation Elements* within the boundaries of the *Necessary Constraints*. The addition of *Procedures to Ensure Legitimacy* strengthens the claim of legitimacy that can be made for the findings produced by the protocol inquiry.

The *Procedures* are*:*

The Protocol is Catalpa™ certified.

The chair is Catalpa™ certified.

Team membership is certified to meet the team composition description.

Team members have signed the Code of Conduct.

The team is trained.

The conduct of the actual visit is monitored, and the team report is endorsed.

The editing, ownership and distribution of the report is clear.

The institution can respond to and/or challenge its report.

The Protocol is expected to include each of these procedures at a minimum level.

In addition three of them (Monitor the conduct of the visit, Endorse visit reports and Provide host institution with a procedure to challenge the report.) may be extended to increase the level of perceived and/or actual legitimacy. The minimum and maximum conditions are described below.

The decision to extend these procedures should be based on a judgment about how high the level of legitimacy of the findings must be to meet the purpose of the inquiry. The three usual dimensions for judging that are:

- How high the stakes are for the institution being visited
- How public the final report will be
- How political the context of the agency and institution is (the greater the wariness between them, the more important it is to have a higher level of legitimacy

Extensions of these procedures will usually increase the cost of the visit. The decision to extend these procedures should become a cost-benefit analysis, based upon the proposed use of the inquiry's findings.

The protocol must show the level of legitimacy that is appropriate for that visit and then describe the procedures that the visit will use for that level.

The overall design question for this section *is:*

What is the appropriate level of legitimacy for the findings from this protocol?

The design question for each procedure is:

How is this procedure incorporated into the report?

1. Prepare a Catalpa™ certified protocol

Since the protocol you are working on is the answer to this question, you need only to assert here that you have done it.

2. Use a Catalpa™ certified chair

This straight forward requirement is described in more detail in the *Guide for Certifying Chairs.* Practice-Based Inquiry® relies on expert chairs. Catalpa certifies chairs at several levels. Who the chair is and that he(she) is certified may simply be stated in the protocol for a single visit.

3. Team membership is certified to meet the description of team composition

This straight forward requirement is met simply by stating how well the actual team composition meets the specifications for membership listed in the protocol. The *endorsement* of a report must note whether the team composition was certified to be within the set guidelines.

4. Team members have signed the Code of Conduct

This requirement is met by attaching the Code of Conduct form, signed by all team members, to the protocol. Each team member must sign the code before being seated on a team. By signing the code, each member attests at the beginning of the visit that any important connections between him and the institution that readers might perceive as unduly influencing his professional judgment have been disclosed.

5. The team is trained

All team members must receive a minimum training of at least 3 hours before sitting on a *Practice-Based Inquiry®* visit team. Team members should begin a visit with a clear understanding of the purpose of the visit, the work they must do, how the *Practice-Based Inquiry* process works, and their responsibilities, as team members.

The schedule for the visit must indicate where "mini-training" sessions of the sitting team will take place during key points of the visit. Some of those are: before the team leaves the team room to go into the institution, at a debriefing session, before the team begins to write its conclusions, and during the final review of the report.

6. The conduct of the actual visit is monitored and the team report is endorsed

7. Clarify the editing, distribution and ownership of the report.

The protocol must set out the procedures for editing the report after the team has disbanded, as well as what organization holds copyright and distribution rights to the report. While an editor familiar with the purpose of visit reports may edit the report, only the chair of that visit can change any word in the final version of the report that the whole team approved before it disbanded. The chair's only criterion is that the change will clarify the explicit intent of the team.

8. Provide host institutions with a procedure to challenge the report.

The protocol must set out a procedure so that the visited institution can respond to the report. This should not be a process of negotiation between the school and the team.

The minimal level of compliance for this procedure may be extended to increase legitimacy.

Minimum level.

The institution is asked to raise any concerns it has about factual accuracy of the report. The chair carefully considers these in deciding whether to make textual changes. The procedures should set a short time period for this.

Maximum level.

In addition to the factual review, procedures are set in place for how the school can challenge the report. If the institution believes that the school must respond further, the school may write a statement which will become a part of the final report.

CATALPA SERVICES

Catalpa Ltd. offers four services to ensure the legitimacy of the findings from practice-based inquiries:

Certifying chairs

Catalpa Ltd. certifies that, through participating in both seminars and apprenticeships, an individual chair has demonstrated the competence to lead a legitimate *Practice-Based Inquiry®* visit.

Endorsing Practice-Based Inquiry® reports

Catalpa Ltd. also endorses reports. Report endorsement depends on whether the visit that produced the report was conducted in a manner that was consistent with a certified visit protocol and that both its conclusions and the report meet the appropriate tests.

(Go to *Catalpa Services* at www.catalpa.org for more detail on services to support finding legitimacy.)

(NOT COMPLETE SEE WEB SITE.)