



**Core Purposes of Accreditation – Perspectives Related to Different Roles**

	<b>Gate-keeping/ Compliance Centered</b>	<b>Improvement - Centered</b>	<b>Accountability - Centered</b>
<b>Scope of Review</b>	All standards applied	Standards presumed met; selected areas identified by institution for attention	Specific areas identified to address common policy issues
<b>Level of judgment</b>	Meets standards at least at minimum level	Institution defines level of performance	External reference points reviewed and evaluated – by commission or through comparative indicators
<b>Ownership of process</b>	Institution seeks to become a “member”; process owned by accrediting commission	Process “owned” by institutions, which approve standards, etc.	Process includes/ emphasizes public interest and demonstrates “externality”
<b>Cost - Benefit</b>	High cost, high benefit	Must be cost effective, have high value to institution	Title IV eligibility/public confidence in external review as important values even if at additional cost
<b>Stance</b>	Compliance	Collaborative	Externally valid and rigorous
<b>Peer Review</b>	Selected by commission and trained for compliance review under standards	Selected to match institution type and to address specific areas; collaborative focus to assist institution improve	Peer reviewers trained in reviewing institution against external (and comparative?) standards; involves other stakeholders in process (students, trustees, employers, etc.)
<b>Standards</b>	Comprehensive and prescriptive	Open, flexible, adaptive to institutional mission and context	Levels of institutional performance defined and clear to external audiences
<b>Public Reporting</b>	Public announcement of grant of accreditation	Reports internally circulated for improvement; action reported	Meaningful and clear public information about institutional performance and commission actions reported