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Stakeholders of Accreditation

Stakeholders and their involvement

• The public
• practitioners
• faculty
• Regulatory boards, licensure boards, certification bodies
• U.S. Department for Education (and other federal agencies)
• Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)
• Students
• Parents and families
• Employers and employees
• Patients/clients
• Consumers
• Accrediting agencies (institutional and specialized)
• Communities
• Institutional/program staff/officials
• Professional/membership association
Benefits, Challenges & Opportunities for Collaboration

1. What are some benefits and challenges to achieving greater collaboration among stakeholders within accreditation?

2. Where are opportunities for stakeholders to collaborate and with whom? Examples?
Benefits to achieving greater collaboration among stakeholders

Benefits

- Cost savings
- Efficiencies through economies of scales
- Developing a common understanding
- Adding meaning to processes
- Streamlining processes (real time data exchanges, for example)
- Buy-in from stakeholders (such as practitioners and educators)
- Building common understanding and holding each other accountable
- Sharing evidence of improved effectiveness
- Identifying and learning from best practices
- Transparency
- Mobility of students practicing across borders
- Learning from peers in the international community
- Improved performance of educational programs and accreditors
- Gaining knowledge from each other
Challenges or barriers to achieving greater collaboration among stakeholders

Challenges

• Unwillingness to give up position of authority
• Turf wars (inter-profession and across professions) and not willing to give/negotiate
• Logistically incompatible systems
• Lack of flexibility
• Different purposes, missions, or visions
• Competition
• Accreditors role and responsibilities keep expanding – pressures on accreditors to do more
• May create more work – investment in time and energy
• Identifying key players to be at the table
• Myth busting – clarity of communication
• Lack of understanding about roles, missions, etc.
Opportunities for collaboration and with whom

Opportunities / with whom?

• Dissemination of effective models
• Learning from each other about best practices
• Taking advantage of opportunities when leadership changes over time
• Research opportunities and identifying evidence-based practices
• Learning from international colleagues and colleagues in other professions
• Joint site visits and collaborations with international partners (example of the U.S. and Canada)
Achieving Collaboration

What needs to be in place to prepare stakeholders for accreditation collaboration readiness?
What needs to be in place to prepare stakeholders for accreditation collaboration readiness?

• The need to develop common understanding and buy-in from stakeholders
• Understanding their roles and how they may differ
• Orientation process (to professions, standards, policies, systems, etc.)
• Cross training
• Identification of key players and who is responsible for decision making
• Informing students/employers about the role of accreditation
• Informing students/employers about their opportunity to participate in and influence accreditation
• Finding out why stakeholders care about accreditation and why they have a vested interest in accreditation
Critical points to share with the wider audience during the report back session?

- Whose responsibility is needs assessment?
- Results of survey of specialized accreditors – there’s a lot of work being done
Survey participants

- Accreditation Commission for Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine
- Accreditation Commission for Audiology Education
- Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing
- Accreditation Commission for Midwifery Education
- Accreditation Council for Genetic Counseling
- Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education
- Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education
- Accreditation Council on Optometric Education
- Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant
- Accreditation Review Council on Education in Surgical Technology and Surgical Assisting
- American Association for Accreditation of Ambulatory Surgery Facilities
- American Library Association
- AOA Commission on Osteopathic College Accreditation
- APA Commission on Accreditation
- AVMA Council on Education
- Commission on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education
- Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education
- Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education
- Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education
- Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education
- Committee on Accreditation of Educational Programs for the Emergency Medical Services Professions
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Educational Programs
- Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology
- Council on Accreditation of Nurse Anesthesia Educational Programs
- Council on Chiropractic Education
- Council on Education for Public Health
- Council on Social Work Education
- Joint Review Committee on Educational Programs in Nuclear Medicine Technology
- Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board
- National Association for the Education of Young Children
- Planning Accreditation Board
Question 1
Who do you consider to be the stakeholders of accreditation?

- Regulatory bodies
- Licensing/certification bodies
- Employers
- Consumers/patients
- Public
- Institution/program officials
- Faculty
- Students/families
- Other

(Bar chart showing the relative importance of each stakeholder category, with the highest being 28 and the lowest being 4.)
Question 2
Does your accrediting agency engage in any notable collaborations/agreements/MOUs with other organizations/entities that may increase efficiencies (save time or cost) in accreditation?

- State agencies
- Accrediting agencies in the U.S.
- Accrediting agencies outside the U.S.
- Professional membership associations
- Other
Question 3

In the past 10 years, has your accrediting agency made any improvements/changes to reduce costs for institutions/programs under review?

- Yes: 80.6%
- No: 19.4%
Question 4

In the past 10 years, has your accrediting agency made any improvements/changes to streamline processes and/or save time for the institutions/programs under review?

- Yes: 83.9%
- No: 16.1%
Question 5
Does your accrediting agency conduct joint/collaborative site visits/evaluations with other entities?

Yes 59.4%

No 40.6%
Question 5

With what types of entities does your accrediting agency conduct joint/collaborative site visits/evaluations?

- Regulatory/state agencies
- Accrediting agencies
- Other

![Bar chart showing the distribution of types of entities involved in joint/collaborative site visits/evaluations. The chart indicates that the highest number of visits/evaluations involve "Other" entities, followed by "Accrediting agencies" and then "Regulatory/state agencies".]
Question 6

In the past 10 years, approximately how many joint/collaborative site visits/evaluations has your accrediting agency conducted with regulatory/state agencies, other accrediting agencies, or other entities?

- None: 44%
- 1-9: 37%
- 10-25: 15%
- 26-50: 4%
- More than 50: 0%