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Editorial

The new accreditation version of higher education in health care in Indonesia named the nine–criterion, or version 2.0, will be started in 2022. Indonesian Accreditation Agency for Higher Education in Health (IAAHEH) in Bahasa: Lembaga Akreditasi Perguruan Tinggi bidang kesehatan, abbreviated as LamiPTkes which its establishment was facilitated by the Directorate General of Higher Education, Ministry of Education and Culture through the Health Professional Education Quality Project (HPEQ Project) from 2009 to 2014 is the only agency responsible for the accreditation nationwide.

This agency released the new system that is internationally standardized following recommendations of the world federation for medical education (WFME), Asia–Pacific quality register (APQR), Asia Pacific Quality Network (AQPNet) in early 2021. The fundamental issues to this improvement were: 1) how can accreditation enhance the quality of health education and practice, 2) how can accreditation assure the quality of health education and practice, 3) accreditation of the life-long cycle of learning, 4) the relationship to other health professional accreditation, and 5) how can accreditation encourage interprofessional practice? The philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi inspired all: “The measure of a country's greatness should be based on how well it cares for its most vulnerable populations.” It replaces and improves the formal seven criteria – or the first version used in the accreditation five years ago. The assessment form of this new version differed from the previous one. In the former version, the institution's assessment and the training program proceed separately (form 3A for the training program and form 3B for the institution). In contrast, as in the new form, both assessments proceed simultaneously in the same form (i.e., working document). The former version assessed the document availability as a fundamental of accreditation and system audit. The assessment, which proceeds in two layers (first, adequacy of a report in the form and secondly, ground assessment), consists mainly of the required documents of conducting the program, the curriculum the Collegium set up, and the achievement. Somehow, this version did not cover the process, which was an essential step required to produce the output.

The principles of the new version were: 1) achievement of the triad education–research–community service of higher education known in Bahasa as tri dharma perguruan tinggi, which is the policy of the government written in the decision letter the Ministry of Education and Cultural of the Republic of Indonesia (updated in 2020) thus, an outcome-based accreditation, increased competitiveness, and international outlook in study programs and higher education institutions; 2) due diligence and comprehensive which includes elements of compliance with the national higher education standards (national standard set by Ministry of Education and Cultural, of the Republic of Indonesia) and higher education standards of the university; 3) covers aspects of condition, performance, and achievement of academic and non-academic quality of study programs or higher education institutions; 4) based on the availability of accurate and valid evidence (evidence-based) and traceability (traceability) of each aspect of the assessment; 5) measuring the effectiveness and consistency between the documents and the implementation of the higher education quality management system; 6) based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative assessments. This new version comprehensively assesses the input–process–output, both of institution and the training program within the same form comprises the nine criteria, i.e., 1) vision–mission–goals–strategy, 2) the governance and collaboration, 3) students, 4) human resources, 5) financial, facilities and infrastructure, 6) education, 7) research, 8) community services, and 9) output and achievement. The reports remain the same as the former version (form 3A and 3B). Form 3A attributed to working document comprises the input–process–output both of institution and training program of eight criteria (criteria #2–#9) and form 3B comprises criteria #1 and self-evaluation. Self-evaluation is an essential issue in the new version, referred to as a systematic assessment of the achievement reported in the working document, and completed with strength–weakness–opportunity–threat (SWOT) analysis as a tool to improve and achieve the goals. The motto is to put everything that has been done in the document and do everything that is documented.

Another improvement characterized superiority of the new version is data verification. For accuracy, any data filled up in the document subjected to be verified on the Ministry of Education and Cultural of the Republic of Indonesia database (in Bahasa: Pangkalan Data Pendidikan Tinggi, abbreviated as PDDikti) and the science and technology index (SINTA–Indonesia) database. These will ensure the quality of achievement with well-documented data. In the next five years of accreditation, all form 3A will be taken from these databases. Thus, the program manager does not need to fill-up the form manually during registration for accreditation purposes.

The system of accreditation for higher education in health is get improved. The system set the results as 1) excellent, 2) very good, 3) good, and 4) unaccredited, replacing the former A, B, and C categories.
To this new version, both the institution and training program were busy fixing the data accordingly and preparing for the upcoming 2020 accreditation. Of these preparations, the most portion is 70% of the institution let the Dean is quite busy while the rest 30% is the training program. The agency is aware of this issue and provides workshops, accreditation clinics, and refreshments for the assessors. There is a limitation in this new version: not assessing the core competency following the accreditation council of general medical education (ACGME) for human resources, which is internationally accepted and used as an assessment tool for professionalism when the world is en-facing the issue of globalization
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