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The United States is unusual in the degree of autonomy that its educational institutions exercise. Nationally administered educational programs are the rule in most countries; while "the accrediting of secondary schools and institutions for higher education in the United States is the responsibility of both state and independent cooperative agencies."¹ "Each state has the legal power to determine its own educational standards. However, independent associations of institutions, acting voluntarily and cooperatively to achieve or exceed certain minimum levels of excellence, have been a unique feature in American education"² for more than one hundred years.

The nation grew, schools increased, and educational quality began to differ, which in turn created a need for the evaluation of institutional quality. Although there are more than forty recognized accrediting agencies,³ the best known, most frequently mentioned, and pervasively influential are the six regional ones. Even these, however, are unlikely to be linked with library cooperation. A literature search under either accrediting agencies or library cooperation produces not one entry specifically identified as such or relating one to the other. Because of the impact accrediting agencies exert on the development of library programs at many levels and in various types of institutions, an examination of library cooperation would not be complete without determining what relationship exists and in what direction it may be moving. The focus of this article will be on the six regional accrediting associations and their patterns for academic institutions.
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The history of the organization of these six associations—New England Association of Schools and Colleges (est. 1835), Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (1887), North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (1895), Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (1895), Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools (1917), and Western Association of Schools and Colleges (1924)—chronicles one of the earliest and most continuous instances of inter-institutional cooperation in education. From the beginning, they have been unique in bringing together representatives from educational institutions to perform peer group evaluation. "At the first annual meeting of the North Central Association in April 1896, President James Burrill Angell of the University of Michigan, who also served as the first president of the Association, called for more cooperation between colleges and schools." Burns noted in 1971 that "Cooperation among the regions began early. For many years the National Committee of Regional Accrediting Agencies regularly brought together representatives of the regional commissions of higher education to talk about common problems and to learn from each other." In recognition of the broader need to cooperate in coordinating the activities of nongovernmental accrediting agencies, the National Commission on Accrediting was formed in 1949. From its inception, the commission had no legal authority, but expressed its influence by placing on its list no accrediting agency which it was not willing to recommend to its more than 1,400 member institutions. It cooperated with the regional associations rather than assuming authority over them, and never actually became a comprehensive supervisory association for all academic accreditation.

Recognizing the need to strengthen the values which had accrued from the somewhat unstructured sharing characteristic of the National Committee of Regional Accrediting Agencies, the six associations consolidated this relationship after World War II to form the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education (FRACHE). One of the first acts of FRACHE was to commission the Puffer report which reiterated its need "to establish and promulgate common principles and practices, and to review and coordinate the activities of the commissions of the regional associations." The most recent development in expanding the scope of cooperative coordination among all accrediting agencies was the unification early in 1975 of FRACHE and the National Commission on Accreditation, including representation from specialized agencies,
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which accredit programs of study in regionally accredited institutions and from other agencies recognized by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Given this background for the commitment to the concept of coordination and cooperation, parallel concern might be expected in the evaluation and recognition of the qualities of each institution participating in membership or petitioning for accreditation. No accrediting agency of any type seems to minimize the value of a library to the institution's educational program, and each of the regional associations gives it special attention in the evaluative structure used to assess the quality of the program. Regardless of the extensive movements in the 1960s toward library cooperation as a possible solution to almost everything from the impoverished budgets of the 1940s to the opulence of federal funds in the late 1960s, direct recognition of the interaction which libraries seem to require in the 1970s seems conspicuous by its absence.

In a tabulation of criteria used by accrediting agencies in evaluating institutions for accreditation, Herman L. Totten found that interlibrary cooperation did not appear as a consideration per se for any agency, either regional or special. Any oblique references which appear refer to interlibrary loans. General reference is also made to cooperative participation by librarians and other faculty in institution-wide educational planning. The criterion statement on the library in the August 1974 revision of the Western Association's Handbook of Accreditation is significant because of its uniqueness. It recognizes cooperative use of library resources by stating that: "while neighboring and available libraries may augment resources, no institution should rely exclusively, or even largely, on resources they do not control or to which they do not have irrevocable access."

These standards or measurements of evaluation can be judged to have affected inter-institutional development of libraries only insofar as efforts to gain and retain accreditation have produced improvements in resources, funding and staffing. Evidence of interaction among the regional associations is apparent in the similarity of language used to establish measurements for evaluating libraries for both the accrediting process and the periodic institutional self-study. Interesting differences do occur. Brief and general statements are used by the New England Association and by North Central. The Middle States Association provides a clear conceptual statement describing the interaction of library services with the instructional program of the institution. However, even this statement makes no reference to cooperation with other libraries, such as the statement...
regarding interlibrary loans in the directions for self-study of the New England Association. Only the Northwest Association makes any reference to national standards, indicating that standards of the American Library Association serve as useful guidelines. A comparison of statements and questions included in the six regional association guidelines and standards indicates strong emphasis for traditional library holdings and activities (see Table 1).

The Southern Association remains the last regional association that continues to use the term library without the addition of some instructional and support term. The other associations have recognized the changing philosophy and activity of libraries by name if not by recommendation and evaluation. Library committees are specified by the Middle States, North Central, and the Southern associations. Both the Middle States and the Southern associations consider the faculty library committee to be advisory, with liaison activity. General references to staff, collections and facilities are included by each association. The Middle States Association lists the greatest number of specific questions which could be used in assessing the value of a collection, while the Northwest Association suggests thorough documentation of quantitative and qualitative collection evaluation. The Northwest Association was the only one to recommend the use of ALA standards. The Southern Association was the only association in this comparison to recognize a need to indicate the number of students which can be seated in a library at a given time.

Most of the associations seemed to agree on the importance of usage of the library. However, none has faced the realistic problem of measuring the use of open-shelf material. Specific assignments to classes may leave materials worn from use but unstamped by circulation procedures. Service was mentioned by four associations, with only the Southern Association suggesting how service might be evaluated. All of the associations join in the final thrust of assessment with the agreement that faculty should participate in selection, weeding and collection building in general. The Western Association contends that there should be a specialized staff for the learning resources operation. Five associations mention instructional materials but do not indicate any method or criteria for evaluation. Only the Southern and Western associations mention funding for nonprint material. The Middle States and Western associations suggest a total program of support and usage. The Western Association had the most complete description of the components of a total instructional system in its specification for junior colleges, but did not mention nonprint
functions in university or college standards. Few of the associations are prepared to be accountable for audiovisual materials, nor are they ready to encourage the evaluated institution to be accountable. Since the associations recognize learning resources and other nonprint instructional activities, one would have expected more specific recommendations for the nonprint activity. It appears that resources were frequently termed "adequate" for lack of clearly defined criteria.

Certain characteristics of the accreditation process have become common to each association through the process of exchange and sharing, which has been a continuing pattern of improvement. Statements of standards or guidelines for evaluation are based on the qualitative rather than the quantitative minimum. Each institutional unit, e.g., the library, is measured to determine to what degree it effectively meets the general and educational objectives established for the institution. The evaluation is made by experienced people who can only measure the degree to which the characteristics being examined conform to good standard practice. The total evaluation process follows a normative model. Steps are generally the same for each institution applying for accreditation. The institution attempts to continue the activities which achieved accreditation. Periodic self-study, usually on a ten-year cycle, is the technique employed to accomplish this goal.

It is a point of pride among the regional accrediting associations to utilize the qualitative evaluation directed to the objectives, goal and purposes of the institution; it is a generally held concept that this provides a regional determination of adequacy for library programs which is suited to regional needs. This procedure is in contrast to the quantifying measurements which were part of the 1959 standards for college libraries developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). Interaction between representatives from the regional accrediting associations and FRACHE with the ACRL committee working to revise the 1959 college standards focused in detail on the advantages and limitations of trying to combine qualitative evaluation with quantifying measurements. Extensive discussion has led to an understanding that, while quality can be stated per se in concept, in actual practice of on-site evaluation the definitions for "enough" or "adequate to support the educational objective" were inevitably developed against the nationally accepted measurements of quantity. This tacit but generally accepted practice of evaluators provides substantiation and justification for the development of base-level measurements of quantity within national standards.
## TABLE 1
### REGIONAL ACCREDITING ASSOCIATIONS

Comparative Data for Three Titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Unit Being Compared</th>
<th>Library or Learning Resources</th>
<th>New England</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>Northwest</th>
<th>Southern</th>
<th>Western (College &amp; Univ.)</th>
<th>Number with items in common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library or committee</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections—print</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities—equipment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget—finances</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage—records</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty participation in sel., eval., and weeding</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Question—statement concerning traditional library operations

3. Question—statement concerning audiovisual and instructional support in relation to library operations

   a. Media committee
   b. Staff
   c. Collections
   d. Budget—finances
   e. Facilities—equipment

   0
   1
   5
   9
   3
4. Question—statement concerning additional duties and responsibilities
   a. Interlibrary loan  x  1
   b. Networking— x  1
      coop. activity
   c. Individualized student
   d. Instructional support  0
   e. Telecommunications  0
   f. College archives  0
   g. Oral history  0
   h. Faculty and service training  0
Southern Association's position serves as a particular example of this. Its attitude is perhaps strongest of all in refusing both the use of quantifying measurements in the regional statement and reliance on the national standards of ACRL, yet in its illustrations and interpretations of its standards for libraries it warns that institutional authorities should see the U.S. Office of Education's Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, Institutional Data, and consider the library to be in danger whenever it falls in the lowest quarter of any of the categories analyzed.22

Noticeable differences among the associations do exist in the composition of the periodic visiting committees. Committees asked to visit an institution vary in size and makeup depending on the type of institution, its objectives, educational program, and which phase of the association's schedule it is engaged in. Early in its visitation program, the Southern Association became aware that to evaluate the use of resources in the learning process requires special expertise; the evaluator must understand and measure the library program as it pervades all aspects of the institution. The Southern Association responded by including on each team a librarian charged with specific responsibility for the library. No data has been gathered on the effects this has had on the improvements and development of the library programs among the member institutions, but positively expressed member satisfaction has validated the concept. The other five associations have adopted the procedure to varying degrees. In contrast to the practice of the Southern Association, the North Central Association is noticeable for the frequency and consistency with which it fails to include librarians as members of the visiting committee.

The absence of data relating to the results of visiting committee reports in affecting the total accrediting process precludes any conclusion as to the weight attached to the committee's determination of the adequacy of library programs. Information obtained from sharing experiences with members of visiting committees in various regions indicates that judgment about library adequacy is likely to be more severe when the institution is applying for initial accreditation than when the status is being reaffirmed. It has long been a cherished concept held by librarians that the danger of loss or withholding of accreditation serves as a wedge to encourage the allocation of ever-increasing amounts of institutional funds to support library improvement; in fact the process is generally somewhat different. All of the associations provide programs of assistance to institutions applying for accreditation, and recommendations for improving the library are
likely to be made at this stage rather than allowing the library to become the focal point of denial. Once an institution is granted accreditation—unless the library falls into patterns of declining support—the responses of visiting committees often contain suggestions for development rather than recommendations for warning. This practice probably explains the fact that a number of libraries in the mid-1970s do not yet meet the minimal numerical measurements established in 1959. Developed on a normative base, the 1975 revision of the standards for college libraries adopted by the Association of College and Research Libraries of ALA at its annual conference in July should provide a pattern which can be readily adapted to regional interpretation. 23

A review of the criteria and guidelines used by the six regional associations finds little guidance for those librarians being evaluated and for those library members represented in the visiting team and assisting in the evaluation. The following should be of concern to all who participate in an accrediting endeavor: (1) Several of the associations indicate that lists of qualified persons are used to select those who are to serve on visiting teams. Should this indicate that a librarian is to be requested to evaluate the library/learning resources program for these associations? (2) What criteria does the association provide for the team member who is not a library/learning resources person but who must evaluate this type of program? (3) What criteria are used in evaluating a total instructional support program, of which the library is a part?

Several of the accrediting associations call for adequate support for the educational program, an adequate staff, and an alertness to curriculum changes and instructional needs. One association thoughtfully specified additional budgetary allotments for audiovisual materials. Adequacy is a general concept at best, and leaves much discretion in the determination of what is enough for one program and too little for another. It seems desirable that guidelines be broadened to include recommendations for a total support program and not just library operations. Until the accrediting agencies invite ACRL, the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, and other professional associations to share in the responsibility for assessing the total instructional support program, teams will continue to struggle through the evaluation of instructional media programs which include production, telecommunications and other special activities that have been ignored in accrediting guidelines. Accreditation is considered to be “an effective catalyst for
improvement and general raising of standards in institutions and their programs.” With this definition of accreditation, it is hoped that each association will give priority to the concept of a total resource program for study and inclusion in its guidelines.

Since the associations are membership organizations operated by staff responsible for implementing the policies adopted by the membership, staff members assert that they try to accomplish what the membership wishes to achieve. It is generally understood by staff representatives that the associations consider themselves not regulators but consultative leaders, assisting in the development of incentives which lead to educational improvements.

Most associations strive for a type of quality control based on experienced judgment, and while they tacitly agree that a basic core of library materials must be held in a collection, no one has recently been willing to identify this core by number, title or subject. Associations allow the existence of library cooperation for which no written documentation is presented, and interpret this with some pride as providing the flexibility for a visitation committee to examine each cooperative plan and project on its own merits. This very lack of documentation has created concern among the professional associations, especially in determining the level of excellence of a program. A redefinition of purpose for these agencies is proposed, as a period of transition is expected.

Program deficiencies, minimal resource standards accepted by regional accrediting associations, and evaluation techniques are among the problems stated by professional accrediting agencies. Other problems of concern include: (1) the need for reducing the duplication of effort by all accrediting agencies; (2) a constant review of the groups involved in the support of an accrediting operation; (3) the determination of the best specificity of an accreditation operation—whether it is an examination and accrediting of a program, an institution, or a combination of both; and (4) the “finding of ways to be reasonably explicit and definitive about all aspects of accreditation operation, including the standards to be met, and yet be universal enough in posture and practice to be able to adjust” to the many differences found throughout the nation.

Some instances have occurred, probably in each of the six associations, in which cooperation between two or more libraries has been the determining factor in the accrediting decision. Staff members are ready to state that in a review of higher education, shared use of resources may vary but the use must be contracted to ensure that
expected resources are readily accessible and will not be withdrawn without mutual knowledge and lead time for planning.26

Profiled as they are, these associations find it difficult to escape either reflecting or projecting the factors of society which challenge higher education in general and the member institutions in particular. Writing from his own self-study point of view, William Selden, then executive secretary of the National Commission on Accrediting, was an early prophet of change in 1962 as he pointed to the relative unimportance of regional accreditation.27 On the premise that the total enrollment of those few institutions which are not accredited is insignificant when compared to that of the accredited colleges and universities, and that a student's admission depends more on his scores on objective tests now than in the past, he concludes that better institutions need have little concern with the accredited status of the high school. It is a defensible position—except for those without. Timely and appropriate to the relationship between libraries and the accrediting agencies is Haywood's exploration of the third myth of accreditation, in which he somewhat explodes the idea that a major goal of an accrediting agency is to foster innovation and improvement of the existing program.28 These are both areas often cited by librarians which can affect and be affected by cooperation among libraries.

Maintaining that regional accrediting associations no longer can afford to avoid the importance of providing students with the opportunity to learn, Felix Robb proposed that FRACHE would have the power to conform standards, policies, and procedures in a way that would allow regional accrediting associations to cover all education, thereby ensuring articulation and maintaining the capability to meet any challenge.29 Inter-institutional cooperation in the mid-1960s was examined by Bunnell and Johnson to present the advantages and limitations for possible planning in the future.30 The realization that a full decade later no positive position existed regarding the potential of the movement raises the question as to whether it does reflect the intent of regional accrediting associations to allow maximum flexibility, or whether the time lag is widening the gap. Leadership of other regional groups, e.g., the Southern Regional Education Board,31 could help design the way future accreditation may be influenced by interlibrary cooperation.

Conceding that the regional accrediting associations are the composite of the institutional members and their representatives, it is unwise to neglect the leadership influence of a creative mind.
influence should be forthcoming from Kenneth Young, president of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, the latest cooperative organization formed by the merger of FRACHE and the National Commission on Accreditation. The council has on its board of representatives members of seven national associations of higher education in addition to the general public. Only a few weeks after taking office, Young candidly expressed his wish not to speak directly for the council without greater in-depth background, which was impossible to achieve in so brief a time. He did mention without enhancement some problems which he saw to be in obvious need of solutions. These problems, which seem to have direct implications for interlibrary cooperation, are: When an institution develops satellite operations outside the boundaries of its own campuses, perhaps even in another state, does or should the accreditation of the main campus carry over to the satellite operation without review or evaluation of the latter? Is the only way to provide adequate resource services for a satellite operation, in order to achieve accreditation, that of the traditional delivery format of an on-site collection? When the main campus is accredited by one regional association and the satellite operation is located within the jurisdiction of another regional association, which association does the accrediting, and what are the implications for cooperation? The direction of these questions seems to point to a high probability that the council may soon have more flexibility by design of options rather than by default.

The regional associations are working with a similar type of program by accrediting American-sponsored schools abroad. “The Middle States Association serves Europe, the Middle East, Central and Western Asia, Puerto Rico, Panama, the Canal Zone, and military-based American schools throughout the world; the Southern Association accredits schools in Mexico, Central America, South America, and countries in the Caribbean not designated to one of the other regional associations; and the Western Association covers Southeast Asia and the islands of the Pacific.” If boundaries such as these can be crossed, surely guidelines for cooperative programs can be developed.

Gordon Sweet represented the Southern Association for a number of years in which the library and the role of librarians in the academic community had priority attention. As executive director, he is well aware of various past and present library programs. His attention to future needs became evident in 1973 when he authorized and initiated a review of the ten-year-old “Standard VI—The Library,” allocating
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staff and budget to support a committee of librarians and administrators to review and update the standard where needed. Because of the joint development of this revision of the association's statement of library standard, the Southern Association may once again assume leadership among its peers in giving stated recognition to the various ways in which cooperation among libraries must become a factor in evaluating educational programs, now as well as in the future. In regard to the future challenge of relating library cooperation to the accrediting processes, Sweet stated:

The greatest cooperative venture we have experienced in our Association is the way in which we benefit from the efforts and time of librarians serving on our visiting committees. They have played a strong role in the writing of our standards, not only during the current review but also in 1963 and 1958. We expect librarians to bring to our attention the needs of libraries as they see and respond to them and we respond to librarians. We develop our programs on the assumption that the broadly developed framework is the most satisfactory approach to relate sharing of resources, staff, technology, physical facilities, whatever it may be to the objectives of the institution. We cite and endorse the leadership of librarians everywhere accreditation should go.34

These words resound with a confidence which seems to indicate that two can go anywhere together.

The most exciting look into the future is a study in its initial stages being undertaken by Norman Burns, executive director of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.35 Funded by a grant from the Danforth Foundation, and to be completed in 1976-77, the study is intended to develop improved techniques for institutional evaluation. According to Burns, the present institutional evaluation process is to examine the characteristics of the institution to determine to what extent they conform to standard practice. The study provides an opportunity to look for ways to make use of the best judgments of people—not to judge conformity to standard practices, but to tap their experience and judgment to set up techniques to assess the outputs of the institution. These techniques should be designed in ways that will allow measurement of the outputs against the desired purposes of the institution. While he spoke about the inability to deal with specifics of the nature of interlibrary cooperation until the study was well underway, his vocabulary was library-oriented and the expected results will probably be the same approaches to measurement that
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Librarians are now discussing. This study could become the foundation of much working and sharing together.

The man with a dream, perhaps the most visionary of all, is Robert Kirkwood, who has guided the changes of FRACHE in its important developmental field. Articulate and convincing, he easily stimulates and inspires his listeners to join him in moving toward his goal. Kirkwood explains that "the accrediting process is designed to promote institutional accountability to its own purpose and objectives." His words on resource sharing and accreditation may be our keynote challenge for the future:

In his list of objections to resource sharing, John Fetterman omitted the concern that many institutions have about jeopardizing their accreditation if they enter into cooperative agreements. Either this reflects a misunderstanding about the nature of accreditation, or a misuse of it. Too often, when an institution wants to preserve the status quo, it uses accreditation as an excuse to camouflage its timidity. There is no danger to an institution's accreditation when it participates in a soundly conceived sharing program.

The major measure of a good academic library is the use it gets. Where a library is truly integrated into the teaching and learning activities on any campus, there will be little need to worry about accreditation. The concern of accreditation is excellence, and, rather than being an end in itself, accreditation is a means to the end of strengthening and improving the quality of education. When resource sharing can amplify the range and dimensions of learning materials available, what could be more consistent with the purposes of accreditation?

Looking toward the 1980s, Alvin Eurich calls for a reassessment of colleges and universities and the important role of library services in 1980. Eurich considers the solution to building resources as not "more buildings, more books, and more librarians, but a change in the concept of what a library is. The library will cease to be a depository of books and become a source of information, multiplying the usability of every informational unit and extending the geographic and physical limitations of the library building." He predicts a cooperative banding together of the smaller libraries in statewide systems for centralized ordering and processing, and a reduction of the multiplication of holdings and the utilization of storage centers for little-used materials, with a greater use of microforms to increase a library's capacities. Computer sharing with a number of networking
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possibilities and utilization of telecommunications systems in instruction and media searching were part of this prediction. Added to this sense of sharing could be the awareness on the part of many librarians of the need to share personnel through programs of continuing education or specialization. Some institutions and states have shown success with many of these types of cooperative endeavors. Encouragement from the accrediting agencies could open avenues to strengthen existing programs and develop others.

Concluding observations would encourage one to join Herbert Kells in the recognition of the many problems higher education is expected to face in the next several years. Significant adjustments are expected in view of the changing demands and economic pressures. Issues of the time are predicted to include due process, public involvement, scrutiny of demographic patterns, student unrest, a leisure-stricken society, environmentalism, and consumerism—accountability. The process of institutional accreditation will be a part of the public assessment of education. New forms of self-study are evolving from the associations. Perhaps these studies will soon recognize the changes of duties reflected in total support programs and library operations, the duel roles of personnel, and budgetary problems experienced by instructional support operations, because none of the present guidelines offer support for this area. Robb mentions the non-traditional study concept, with emphasis on the individualization of this type of study. Should this program be assessed as a part of the library responsibilities in the new era of instructional services?

There is no consolation for educators in the joining of ranks and the coordinated effort now being undertaken to make accreditation more effective. John Proffitt, presenting a paper before the 66th Annual Congress on Medical Education, stated that: "Time is running out, and we are called up to chart our course for the future intelligently. A comprehensive study might well serve as a valuable chart, facilitating our ability to meet the needs of both the present and the future." His call for a national study of accreditation recommended the involvement of appropriate educational groups both within and outside of the allied health professions. This is another welcome trend to coordinated efforts. The results of accreditation are quite visible and voluntary accreditation has been shown to be a viable concept. By in-depth commitment to cooperation at every level of higher education, these associations can join together and begin a new era of evaluation.
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