



COMMUNIQUE NRAS REVIEW REPORT

APAC welcomes the release of the NRAS Review Report.

The Report contains a number of Recommendations about the Accreditation function under the national scheme.

APAC is concerned that the Report is critical of Accrediting agencies in number of respects, and that these criticisms are, to a significant extent, unfounded.

In particular, the financial analysis undertaken for the review (Professional Standards Authority (PSA), UK) is flawed in a number of its assertions. It is notable that the Ministerial Council has not accepted the recommendations prima facie, and has commissioned more (and presumably more robust) analysis.

Notwithstanding this, APAC costs of accreditation are extremely low by comparison with the other Councils in Australia, even when adjusted to remove an anomaly in measurement made by the PSA. This is in Table 5 – Total accreditation costs by profession;

Correction to Table 5 – Total accreditation costs by profession

The report has calculated the cost per accredited program in the same manner for all councils and this is incorrect for psychology. APAC charges cycle accreditation fees by the type of program, i.e., a psychology sequence, or professional stream, and not by individual degree title. For example, an education provider may have 5 bachelor degrees with a psychology sequence embedded; assessment of the sequence is charged once, not 5 times.

Correction;

Column - Number of accredited programs;

552 is the number of degree titles APAC accredited

195 is the number of sequences and professional streams APAC accredited

Column - Correct cost per accredited program;

\$4,214 not \$1,574

(total spent on accreditation \$821,808 / number of sequences 195)

Other recommendations refer to the need for common processes and protocols, where applicable, to be adopted by all the accrediting bodies. APAC notes that the Councils have been trying for some time to align their processes and protocols, but have been hampered by limited resources. The suggestion that AHPRA should fund this activity is most welcome.

In response to the suggestion that some Accreditation Standards are too prescriptive, APAC notes that our APAC Standards are currently under review, with the aim of adopting a more outcomes focused, less prescriptive approach, in keeping with current accepted best practice.

Professor John C. Dunn

Chair, APAC