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Quality Assurance and Strategic Planning

- Develop and implement an ongoing strategic planning process;
- Develop and implement a formal program of outcomes assessment tied to strategic planning;
- Use results of the assessment processes to evaluate the effectiveness of the Commission and make recommendations for appropriate changes, including the appropriateness of its structure;
- Monitor USDE, and other quality assurance organizations i.e. e.g. Council on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), American National Standards Institute/International Organization for Standardization (ANSI/ISO), and International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE) for trends and changes in parameters of quality assurance; and
- Monitor and make recommendations to the Commission regarding changes that may affect its operations, including expansion of scope and international issues.

Replacement of Policies and Procedures for Accreditation of Programs in Areas of Advanced Dental Education and Principles and Criteria Eligibility of Allied Dental Education Programs for Accreditation by the Commission on Dental Education with Policies and Procedures for Accreditation of Programs in a New Dental Education Area or Discipline
EOPP Pages 53-55

E. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR ACCREDITATION OF PROGRAMS IN AREAS OF ADVANCED DENTAL EDUCATION
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR ACCREDITATION OF PROGRAMS IN A NEW DENTAL EDUCATION AREA OR DISCIPLINE

In the initiation of an accreditation review process for programs in a dental education area or discipline, the Commission on Dental Accreditation seeks only to ensure the quality of the education programs in the area or discipline, for the benefit and protection of both the public and students/residents. The Commission’s accreditation process is intended to promote and monitor the continuous quality and improvement of dental education programs and does not confer dental specialty status nor endorse dental disciplines.

Items 1 through 4 listed below provide a framework for the Commission in determining whether a process of accreditation review should be initiated for the new dental education area or discipline. Each item must be addressed in a formal, written request to establish an accreditation process for programs in an area or discipline of dentistry.

1. Does the dental education area or discipline align with the accrediting agency’s mission and scope?
   Elements to be addressed:
   - Define the nationally accepted scope of the dental education area or discipline.
• List the nationally accepted educational goals and objectives of the dental education area or discipline.
• Describe how the area or discipline aligns with the Commission on Dental Accreditation’s mission and scope.
• Describe the quality of the dental education area or discipline, and need for accreditation review of the programs, as an important aspect to the health care of the general public. Include evidence that the area of knowledge is important and significant to patient care and dentistry.
• Provide evidence that the programs are academic programs sponsored by an institution accredited by an agency legally authorized to operate and recognized by the United States Department of Education or, as applicable, by an accreditation organization recognized by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), rather than a series of continuing education experiences.
• Describe the sponsoring, professional organization/association(s), if any, and (if applicable) the credentialing body, including the following information:
  o number of members;
  o names and contact information of association officers;
  o list of sponsored continuing education programs for members within the last five (5) years; and
  o for credentialing body: exam criteria; number of candidates; and pass rate for the past five (5) years.

2. Is there a sufficient body of knowledge to educate individuals in a distinct dental education area or discipline, not merely one or more techniques?

Elements to be addressed:
• Describe why this area of knowledge is a distinct dental education area or discipline, rather than a series of just one or more techniques.
• Describe how scientific dental knowledge in the education area or discipline is substantive to educating individuals in the education area or discipline.
• Document the complexity of the body of knowledge of the education area by identifying specific techniques and procedures.
• List the nationally accepted competency statements and performance measures for the dental education area.
• Identify the distinct components of biomedical, behavioral and clinical science in the dental education area or discipline.
• Provide documentation that there is a body of established, substantive, scientific dental knowledge that underlies the dental education area or discipline.
• Document that the dental education program is the equivalent of at least one twelve-month full-time academic year in length.
• Describe the current and emerging trends in the dental education area or discipline; and
• Document that dental health care professionals currently provide health care services in the identified dental education area or discipline.

3. Do a sufficient number of established programs exist and contain structured curricula, qualified faculty and enrolled individuals so that accreditation can be a viable method of quality assurance?

Elements to be addressed:
• Document that the educational program is comprised of formal curriculum at the postsecondary or postgraduate level of education leading to a bona fide educational credential (certificate or degree) that addresses the scope, depth and complexity of the higher education experience, rather
than a series of continued education courses.

- Describe the historical development and evolution of educational programs in the dental education area or discipline. Do not submit information on the history of the sponsoring organization.
- Provide a list of all the currently operational programs in the dental education area or discipline, including the following information:
  a. sponsoring institution;
  b. name and qualifications of the program director;
  c. number of full-time and part-time faculty (define part-time for each program) and list the academic credentials required for these faculty;
  d. curriculum (academic calendars, class schedules, student/resident competencies, syllabi that address scope, depth and complexity of the higher education experience, including course outlines for each course, formal approval or acknowledgment by the parent institution that the courses or curricula in the education area meet the institution’s academic requirements for advanced education);
  e. textbooks and journals, or other learning resources used within the educational program;
  f. evidence that the program is a bona fide higher education experience that addresses the scope, depth and complexity of higher education, rather than preceptorships or a series of continuing education courses;
  g. outcomes assessment methods;
  h. minimum length of the program for full-time students/residents;
  i. certificate and/or degree or other credential awarded upon completion;
  j. number of enrolled individuals per year for at least the past five (5) years; and number of graduates per year for at least the past five (5) years. If the established education programs have been in existence less than five (5) years, provide information since its founding;
  k. confirmation that the program in the education area would seek voluntary accreditation review, if available;
  l. programs’ recruitment materials (e.g. bulletin, catalogue); and
  m. evidence that the programs in the discipline are legally authorized to operate by the relevant state or government agencies.

4. Is there evidence of need and support from the public and professional communities to sustain educational programs in the discipline?

Elements to be addressed:
- Provide evidence of the ability to perform a robust, meaningful peer-reviewed accreditation process including a sufficient number of peers to conduct reviews at all levels of the Commission, as needed.
- List states where graduates of the dental education area or discipline are recognized for licensure and/or practice.
- Provide evidence of the potential for graduates to obtain employment, including the following information:
  o Employment placement rates (when available);
  o Documentation of employment/practice opportunities/settings; and
  o Evidence of career opportunities, student interest, and an appropriate patient base.

(Former Policies and Procedures for Accreditation of Programs in Areas of Advanced Dental Education and Principles and Criteria Eligibility of Allied Dental Programs for Accreditation by the Commission on Dental Accreditation)
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR ACCREDITATION OF PROGRAMS IN AREAS OF ADVANCED DENTAL EDUCATION

In the initiation of an accreditation review process for programs in a dental education area, the Commission on Dental Accreditation seeks only to ensure the quality of the education programs in the area.

The Commission’s accreditation process for programs in areas of advanced dental education does not confer dental specialty status.

Items A through E listed below provide a framework for the Commission in determining whether a process of accreditation review should be initiated for advanced dental education programs. Each must be addressed in a request to establish an accreditation process for programs in an area of advanced dental education.

A. A well-defined body of established scientific dental knowledge exists that underlies the advanced dental education area — knowledge that is in large part distinct from, or more detailed than, that of other dental education areas already in accreditation review.

Elements to be addressed:
- Definition and scope of the education area;
- Educational goals and objectives of the education area;
- Competency statements for the education area; and
- Description of how scientific dental knowledge in the education area is substantive and distinct from other education areas already under accreditation review.

B. The body of knowledge is sufficient to educate individuals in a distinct advanced dental education area, not merely one or more techniques.

Elements to be addressed:
- Identification of distinct components of biomedical, behavioral and clinical science in the advanced dental education area;
- Description of why this area of knowledge is a distinct advanced dental education area, rather than a series of just one or more techniques;
- Documentation demonstrating that the body of knowledge is unique and distinct from that in any current Commission-accredited education area; and
- Documentation of the complexity of the body of knowledge of the education area by identifying specific advanced techniques and procedures, representative samples of curricula from existing programs, textbooks and journals.

C. A sufficient number of established programs exist and contain structured curricula, qualified faculty and enrolled individuals so that accreditation can be a viable method of quality assurance.

Elements to be addressed:
- Description of the historical development and evolution of educational programs in advanced dental education
- A listing of the current operational programs in the advanced dental education discipline, identifying for each, the:
  n — sponsoring institution;
  o — name and qualifications of the program director;
  p — number of full-time and part-time faculty (define part-time for each program);
  q — curriculum (course outlines, student competencies, class schedules);
  r — outcomes assessment methods;
s.—minimum length of the program;
t.—certified and/or degree awarded upon completion;
u.—number of enrolled individuals per year for at least the past 5 years; and number of graduates per year for at least the past 5 years. If the established education programs have been in existence less than 5 years, provide information since their founding; and
v.—Documentation on how many programs in the education area would seek voluntary accreditation review, if available.

D.—The education programs are the equivalent of at least one twelve-month full-time academic year in length. The programs must be academic programs sponsored by an institution accredited by an agency recognized by the United States Department of Education or accredited by an accreditation organization recognized by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) rather than a series of continuing education experiences.

Elements to be addressed:
• Evidence of the minimum length of the program for full-time students;
• Evidence that a certificate and/or degree is awarded upon completion of the program;
• Programs’ recruitment materials (e.g. bulletin, catalogue); and

E.—Other evidence that the programs are bona fide higher education experiences, rather than a series of continuing education courses (e.g. academic calendars, schedule of classes, and syllabi that address scope, depth and complexity of the higher education experience, formal approval or acknowledgment by the parent institution that the courses or curricula in the education area meet the institution’s academic requirements for advanced education). The quality of the advanced dental educational program is important to the health care of the general public.

Elements to be addressed:
• Description of the need for accreditation review of the programs to ensure quality health care for the public;
• Description of current and emerging trends in the education area;
• Documentation that dental health care professionals currently provide health care services in the identified education area; and
• Evidence that the area of knowledge is important and significant to patient care and dentistry.

Revised: 8/18; 8/16; 8/15; 8/13; 7/07; Reaffirmed: 8/13; 8/10, 7/09; Adopted: 7/04

PRINCIPLES AND CRITERIA ELIGIBILITY OF ALLIED DENTAL PROGRAMS FOR ACCREDITATION BY THE COMMISSION ON DENTAL ACCREDITATION

In the initiation of an accreditation review process for programs in a dental education area, the Commission on Dental Accreditation seeks to ensure the quality of the education programs, for the benefit and protection of both the public and students. Items A through E listed below provide a framework for the Commission in determining whether a process of accreditation review should be initiated for new allied dental education areas or disciplines. Each must be addressed in a request to establish an accreditation process for programs in an area of allied dentistry. If the Commission determines that appropriate documentation can be provided for each criterion, then the Commission may either appoint a Workgroup made of appropriate communities of interest or task the relevant standing Review Committee to develop accreditation standards.

2.—Does the allied dental education area align with the accrediting agency’s mission and scope?

CODA’s mission is as follows: “The Commission on Dental Accreditation serves the public and
profession by developing and implementing accreditation standards that promote and monitor the continuous quality and improvement of dental education programs.” (Reaffirmed: 8/13; 07/07; Revised: CODA: 08/16; 01/01).

Elements to be addressed:
- Definition and scope of the allied dental education area.
- List the educational goals and objectives of the allied dental education area.
- Description of how the area of allied dental education aligns with the Commission on Dental Accreditation’s mission and scope.

2. Has the allied dental education area been in operation for a sufficient period of time to establish benchmarks and adequately measure performance?

Elements to be addressed:
- List the competency statements and performance measures that define competence for the discipline.
- Provide documentation that there is a body of established, substantive, scientific dental knowledge that underlies the education area.

3. Is the program part of an institution or clearly identified responsible entity encompassed under the agency’s scope, e.g., formal, postsecondary education program leading to a bona fide educational credential (certificate or degree)?

Elements to be addressed:
- A listing of the current operational programs in the allied dental education area, identifying for each, the:
  - sponsoring institution; present evidence that the sponsoring institutions are accredited by an agency recognized by the United States Department of Education.
  - documentation of the existence of an sufficient number of qualified individuals serving or available to serve as program directors;
  - documentation of the existence of a sufficient number of full-time and part-time faculty (define part-time for each program) qualified to teach in the programs;
  - documentation of existing curriculum in the area (course outlines, student competencies, class schedules);
  - evidence that the programs are bona fide higher education experiences, rather than preceptorships or a series of continuing education courses, that address scope, depth and complexity of the higher education experience;
  - outcomes assessment methods for the programs;
  - minimum length of the program;
  - certificate and/or degree or other credential awarded upon completion;
  - formal approval, authorization or acknowledgement by the parent institution that the courses or curricula in the education area meet the institution’s academic requirements for operation and awarding of the appropriate credential;
  - number of enrolled individuals per year for at least the past 5 years; and number of graduates per year for at least the past 5 years. If the established education programs have been in existence less than 5 years, provide information since their founding; and
  - documentation on how many programs in the education area would seek voluntary accreditation review, if available.

4. Is there sufficient level of activity and expertise in the discipline, including individuals with the academic or professional credentials, to establish standards and sustain a quality review process?
Elements to be addressed:
- Description of the historical development and evolution of educational programs in the area of allied dentistry.
- For each program, list the academic credentials required to be a full-time faculty and the academic credentials to be a part-time faculty member.
- For each program, list the academic and administrative credentials required to be a program director.
- Description of sponsoring professional organization/association(s), if any, and (if applicable) the credentialing body, including the following information:
  - number of members
  - names and contact information of association officers
  - organization/association bylaws
  - list of sponsored continuing education programs for members
  - for credentialing body: exam criteria; number of candidates; pass rate

5. Is there evidence of need and support from the public and professional communities to sustain educational programs in the discipline?

Elements to be addressed:
- Description of the need for accreditation review of the programs to ensure quality health care for the public, including evidence of consideration of public interests in the development and operation of the programs.
- Documentation of current and emerging trends in the education area.
- Documentation of the available programs with rationale for ability to perform a robust, meaningful peer review accreditation process.
- List of states where graduates of the allied dental education programs can be licensed and/or practice.
- Evidence that the programs in the discipline are legally authorized to operate by the relevant state or government agencies.
- Evidence that the discipline’s institutions and programs are in compliance with all applicable US Department of Education expectations including those described in the Regulations on Gainful Employment Reporting Associated with the Higher Education Opportunity Act.
- Evidence documenting (or plans to document) outcomes assessment of graduates.
- Evidence of the potential for graduates to obtain gainful employment, including:
  - Average student loan indebtedness
  - Average salary new graduates can expect to earn
  - Employment placement rates (when available)
  - Documentation of employment/practice opportunities/settings
  - Evidence from a feasibility study and/or needs assessment (where available) showing career opportunities, student interest, an appropriate patient base.

Reaffirmed: 8/13; Adopted: 8/10

Revised Self-Study General Information
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F. SELF-STUDY GENERAL INFORMATION

In preparation for a site visit, institutions are required to complete a self-study for each program being evaluated. A self-study involves an analysis of the program in terms of the accreditation standards and an assessment of the effectiveness of the entire educational program. It includes a review of the relevance of all its activities to its stated purposes and objectives and a realistic appraisal of its achievements and
deficiencies. The self-study process permits a program to measure itself qualitatively prior to evaluation by an on-site committee of peers in education and the profession. On-site evaluation assesses the degree to which the accreditation standards are met and assists the program in identifying strengths and weaknesses.

The self-study manual includes questions which require qualitative evaluation and analysis of the educational program. The intent of the self-study process is to identify program strengths and weaknesses. Latitude is permitted in interpreting questions to meet the specific needs of the program; however, Commission staff should be consulted if revisions are planned.

The sponsoring institution is required to forward a copy of the completed self-study document to each member of the visiting committee and to the Commission office no later than sixty (60) days prior to the scheduled site visit. Visiting committee members review the completed self-study documents. Any requests by committee members for additional materials relating to the on-site review are forwarded to the institution by the Commission staff, when staff attends the visit, or site visit chair staff representative. All such requests are compiled into one official communication from the Commission staff or site visit chair office to the institution. Individual site visitors may not request additional material or information directly from an institution. The institution’s response serves as an addendum to the self-study document.

Guidelines for preparing self-study documents for each discipline, including more specific information and instructions, are available upon request from the Commission office or on the Commission’s website.

Revised Policy on Third Party Comments
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POLICY ON THIRD PARTY COMMENTS

The Commission currently publishes, in its accredited lists of programs, the year of the next site visit for each program it accredits. In addition, the Commission posts its spring and fall site visit announcements on the Accreditation News Site Visit Process and Schedule area of the Commission’s website for those programs being site visited January through June or July through December in the current and next year. Special site visits and initial accreditation site visits for developing programs may be scheduled after the posting on the Commission’s website; thus, the specific dates of these site visits will may not be available for publication. Parties interested in these specific dates (should they be established) are welcomed/encouraged to contact the Commission office. The Commission will request written comments from interested parties on the CODA website.

The United States Department of Education (USDE) procedures require accrediting agencies to provide an opportunity for third-party comment, either in writing or at a public hearing (at the accrediting agencies’ discretion) with respect to institutions or programs scheduled for review. All comments must relate to accreditation standards for the discipline and required accreditation policies. In order to comply with the Department’s requirement on the use of third-party comment regarding program’s qualifications for accreditation or initial accreditation, the following procedures have been developed.

Those programs scheduled for regular review must solicit third-party comments through appropriate notification of communities of interest and the public such as faculty, students, program administrators, dental-related organizations, patients, and consumers at least ninety (90) days prior to their site visit. The notice should indicate the deadline of sixty (60) days for receipt of third-party comments in the Commission office and should stipulate that signed or unsigned comments will be accepted, that names
and/or signatures will be removed from comments prior to forwarding them to the program, and that comments must pertain only to the standards for the particular program or policies and procedures used in the Commission’s accreditation process. The announcement may include language to indicate that a copy of the appropriate accreditation standards and/or the Commission’s policy on third-party comments may be obtained by contacting the Commission at 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, IL 60611, or by calling 1/800-621-8099, extension 4653.

All comments submitted must pertain only to the standards relative to the particular program being reviewed or policies and procedures used in the accreditation process. Comments will be screened by Commission staff for relevancy. Signed or unsigned comments will be considered. For comments not relevant to these issues, the individual will be notified that the comment is not related to accreditation and, where appropriate, referred to the appropriate agency. For those individuals who are interested in submitting comments, requests may be made to the Commission office.

All relevant comments will have names and/or signatures removed and will then be referred to the program at least fifty (50) days prior to the site visit for review and response. A written response from the program should be provided to the Commission office and the visiting committee fifteen (15) days prior to the site visit. Adjustments may be necessary in the site visit schedule to allow discussion of comments with proper personnel. Negative comments received after the established deadline of sixty (60) days prior to the site visit will be handled as a complaint. Any unresolved issues related to the program’s compliance with the accreditation standards will be reviewed by the visiting committee while on-site.

Programs with the status of initial accreditation, and programs seeking initial accreditation must solicit comment through appropriate notification of communities of interest and the public such as faculty, students, program administrators, dental-related organizations, patients, and consumers utilizing the procedures noted above.

On occasion, programs may be scheduled for special focused or special comprehensive site visits and because of the urgency of the visit, solicitation of third-party comments within the ninety (90) day timeframe may not be possible. However, third party comments must be solicited at the time the program is notified of the Commission’s planned site visit, typically sixty (60) days in advance of the visit. In this case, the timeframe for solicitation of third-party comments will be shortened. The notice should indicate the deadline of thirty (30) days for receipt of third-party comments in the Commission office and should stipulate that signed or unsigned comments will be accepted, that names and/or signatures will be removed from comments prior to forwarding them to the program, and that comments must pertain only to the standards for the particular program or policies and procedures used in the Commission’s accreditation process. All relevant comments will have names and/or signatures removed and will then be referred to the program at least twenty (20) days prior to the site visit for review and response. A written response from the program should be provided to the Commission office and the visiting committee ten (10) days prior to the site visit. Adjustments may be necessary in the site visit schedule to allow discussion of comments with proper personnel. Any unresolved issues related to the program’s compliance with the accreditation standards will be reviewed by the visiting committee while on-site. Negative comments received after the established deadline of thirty (30) days prior to the site visit will be handled as a complaint.

The Commission will request written comments from interested parties on the CODA website. All comments relative to programs being visited will be due in the Commission office no later than sixty (60) days prior to each program’s site visit to allow time for the program to respond. Therefore, programs being site visited in January through June will be listed in the fall posting of the previous year and programs scheduled for a site visit from July through December will be listed in the spring posting of the
current year. Any unresolved issues related to the program’s compliance with the accreditation standards will be reviewed by the visiting committee while on site.

Those programs scheduled for review must solicit third-party comments through appropriate notification of communities of interest and the public such as faculty, students, program administrators, dental-related organizations, patients, and consumers at least ninety (90) days prior to their site visit. The notice should indicate the deadline of sixty (60) days for receipt of third-party comments in the Commission office and should stipulate that signed or unsigned comments will be accepted, that names and/or signatures will be removed from comments prior to forwarding them to the program, and that comments must pertain only to the standards for the particular program or policies and procedures used in the Commission’s accreditation process. The announcement may include language to indicate that a copy of the appropriate accreditation standards and/or the Commission’s policy on third-party comments may be obtained by contacting the Commission at 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, IL 60611, or by calling 1/800-621-8099, extension 4653.

All comments submitted must pertain only to the standards relative to the particular program being reviewed or policies and procedures used in the accreditation process. Comments will be screened by Commission staff for relevancy. Signed or unsigned comments will be considered. For comments not relevant to these issues, the individual will be notified that the comment is not related to accreditation and, where appropriate, referred to the appropriate agency. For those individuals who are interested in submitting comments, requests may be made to the Commission office.

All relevant comments will have names and/or signatures removed and will then be referred to the program at least fifty (50) days prior to the site visit for review and response. A written response from the program should be provided to the Commission office and the visiting committee fifteen (15) days prior to the site visit. Adjustments may be necessary in the site visit schedule to allow discussion of comments with proper personnel. Negative comments received after the established deadline of sixty (60) days prior to the site visit will be handled as a complaint.

Revised Policy on Special Site Visits
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5. Policy On Special Site Visits: Special site visits are conducted when it is necessary for the Commission to review information about the program that can only be obtained or documented on-site. When necessary, special site visits are conducted to ensure the quality of the educational program, but are used selectively in order to avoid perceived harassment of programs. A special site visit may be either focused, limited to specified standards, or comprehensive, covering all accreditation standards. In making recommendations to the Commission for a special site visit, the Review Committee will indicate the specific standards or required accreditation policy in question. The Commission will communicate these concerns to the program in the letter transmitting the action related to a special site visit. If a comprehensive special visit will be conducted, the program must prepare a self-study prior to the visit. If a focused visit will be conducted, the program will be required to complete some portions of the self-study and/or to develop some other materials related to the specific standards or required policies that have been identified as areas of concern. With the exception of a special site visit due to falsification of information, all costs related to special site visits are borne by the program, including an administrative special focused site visit fee. (See Invoicing Process for Special Focused Site Visits)

The Commission may conduct a special site visit for any of the following reasons:

a. Failure to document compliance: A special site visit may be directed for an accredited program
when, six (6) months prior to the time period allowed to achieve compliance through progress reports (eighteen (18) months if the program is between one and two years in length or two years if the program is at least two years in length), the program has not adequately documented compliance with the accreditation standards. The special site visit will be focused on the recommendations contained in the site visit report. Recommendations for which supplemental information or documentation is submitted after the last progress report or special site visit report is reviewed by the appropriate Review Committee or the Commission and that in the Commission’s opinion requires on-site verification, shall be considered as not met for purposes of accreditation. Following the special site visit, if compliance is not demonstrated, the Commission will withdraw the program’s accreditation unless the Commission extends the period for achieving compliance for good cause.

b. **Major change Change** within a program: A special site visit may be directed for an accredited program when a report of program major change, review of annual survey data, or information received in other ways, indicates that major changes in a program may have affected its ability to maintain compliance with the accreditation standards. The Commission may also request a special report from the involved program prior to conducting a special site visit. The Commission’s Policy on Reporting Program Changes in Accredited Programs found in Section IV.D.V.C of this manual provides details.

c. Investigating complaints: A special site visit may be directed for an accredited program to investigate a complaint raising questions about the program’s compliance with the accreditation standards. The Commission’s Policy and Procedure Regarding Investigation of Complaints Against Educational Programs found in Section V.D of this manual provides details.

d. Falsifying information: A special site visit may be directed for an accredited program to investigate the possible intentional falsification of information provided to the Commission. The Commission’s policy on Integrity found in Section I.G provides details. The cost of such a special site visit is shared by the Commission and the program.

e. Sites Where Educational Activity Occurs: The Commission’s Policy Statement on Reporting and Approval of Sites Where Educational Activity Occurs found in Section V.R provides details.

f. Other reasons: A special site visit may, on occasion, be directed for an accredited program to respond to a request to the Commission from the chief executive officer or program administrator. The Commission may also direct that a focused site visit is necessary for just cause if it determines that a program may be unable to maintain compliance with the accreditation standards.

**Invoicing Process for Special Focused Site Visits**

Invoice #1: In advance of the site visit, the program will remit payment for the Administrative Fee ($4,320 in 2018 and 2019; $5,000 in 2020) plus 75% of the remaining estimated actual expenses (calculated as an estimate, 75% of $1200 per site visitor or staff). See Program Fee Policy.

Invoice #2: Following the site visit, the program will remit payment for the remaining balance of actual expenses to the Commission.

**Revised Policy on Site Visitors**
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J. SITE VISITORS

The Commission uses site visitors with education and practice expertise in the discipline or areas being evaluated to conduct its accreditation program. Nominations for site visitors are requested from national dental and dental-related organizations representing the areas affected by the accreditation process. **Self-nominations are accepted.** Site visitors are appointed by the Commission annually and may be re-appointed.

During the term of service as a Review Committee member, these individuals should not serve as site
visitors for an actual accreditation site visit to an accredited or developing program, unless deemed necessary. Two instances when a review committee member could serve on a site visit include: 1) an inability to find a site visitor from the comprehensive site visitor list, or 2) when the review committee believes a member should attend a visit for consistency in the review process. This applies only to site visits that would be considered by the same review committee on which the site visitor is serving. Review committee members are prohibited from serving as independent consultants for mock accreditation purposes. These policies help avoid conflict of interest in the decision making process and minimize the need for recusals.

During the term of service as a commissioner, these individuals may not independently consult with a CODA-accredited program or a program applying for CODA accreditation. In addition, site visitors serving on the Commission may not serve on a site visit team during their terms.

All other active site visitors who independently consult with educational programs accredited by CODA or applying for accreditation must identify all consulting roles to the Commission and must file with the Commission a letter of conflict acknowledgement signed by themselves and the institution/program with whom they consulted. All conflict of interest policies as noted elsewhere in this document apply. Contact the CODA office for the appropriate conflict of interest declaration form.

Prior to a site visit, a list of site visitors and other participants is reviewed by the institution/program for conflict of interest or any other potential problem. The program/institution being site visited will be permitted to remove individuals from the list if a conflict of interest, as described in the Commission’s Conflict of Interest Policy, can be demonstrated. Information concerning the conflict of interest must be provided in writing clearly stating the specifics of the conflict.

Site visitors are appointed by the Chair and approved by the institution’s administration, i.e. dental school dean or program director. The visiting committee conducts the site visit and prepares the report of the site visit findings for Commission action. The size and composition of a visiting committee varies with the number and kinds of educational programs offered by the institution. All visiting committees will include at least one person who is not a member of a Review Committee of the Commission or a Commission staff member. Two dental hygiene site visitors shall be assigned to dental school-sponsored dental hygiene site visits.

When appropriate, a generalist representative from a regional accrediting agency may be invited by the chief executive officer of an institution to participate in the site visit with the Commission’s visiting committee. A generalist advises, consults and participates fully in committee activities during a site visit. The generalist’s expenses are reimbursed by the institution. The generalist can help to ensure that the overall institutional perspective is considered while the specific programs are being reviewed.

The institution is encouraged to invite the state board of dentistry to send a current member to participate in the site visit. If invited, the current member of the state board receives the same background materials as other site visit committee members and participates in all site visit conferences and executive sessions. The state board of dentistry reimburses its member for expenses incurred during the site visit.

In addition to other participants, a newly appointed site visitor and/or Commission staff member may participate on the visiting committee for training purposes. It is emphasized that site visitors are fact-finders, who report committee findings to the Commission. Only the Commission is authorized to take action affecting the accreditation status.

1. Appointments: All site visitor appointments are made annually for one year terms for a maximum of
six consecutive years. Following the maximum appointment period of six consecutive years, the site visitor may reapply for appointment after one year. In exceptional circumstances the Review Committee may recommend that the Commission alter an individual’s term limits. Site visitors assist the Commission in a number of ways, including: developing accreditation standards, serving on special committees, and serving as site visitors on visits to predoctoral, advanced dental and allied dental education programs.

The Commission reviews nominations received from its communities of interest, including discipline-specific sponsoring organizations and certifying boards. Individuals may also self-nominate. In addition to the mandatory subject expertise, the Commission always requests nominations of potentially under-represented ethnic groups and women, and makes every effort to achieve a pool of site visitors with broad geographic diversity to help reduce site visit travel expenses.

Site visitors are appointed/reappointed annually and required to sign the Commission’s Conflict of Interest Statement, the Agreement of Confidentiality, the Copyright Assignment, Licensure Attestation, and the ADA’s Professional Conduct Policy and Prohibition Against Harassment. Site visitors must also complete annual training and will receive periodic updates on the Commission’s policies and procedures related to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). The Commission office stores these forms for seven (7) years. In addition, site visitors must comply with training requirements, the ADA’s travel policy and other CODA Rules and Regulations. The Commission may remove a site visitor for failing to comply with the Commission’s policies and procedures, continued, gross or willful neglect of the duties of a site visitor, or other just cause as determined by the Commission.

Subsequent to appointment/reappointment by the Commission, site visitors receive an appointment letter explaining the process for appointment, training, and scheduling of Commission site visitors.

2. Criteria for Nomination of Site Visitors:
All site visitors are appointed for a one-year term and may be re-appointed annually for a total of six consecutive years. Appointments are made at the Winter (January/February) Commission meeting and become effective with the close of the ADA annual session in the Fall.

3. Policy Statement On Site Visitor Training: The Commission has a long history of a strong commitment to site visitor training and requires that all program evaluators receive training. Prior to participation, site visitors must demonstrate that they are knowledgeable about the Commission’s accreditation standards and its Evaluation and Operational Policies and Procedures. Initial and ongoing training takes place in several formats.

New site visitors must attend a two-day formal workshop that follows the format of an actual site visit. All new site visitors are directed to the Commission’s on-line training program and are required to successfully complete the training program and site visitor final assessment.

Site visitor update sessions take place at several dental-related meetings, such as the annual session of the American Dental Education Association (ADEA), the American Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons and the ADEA Allied Dental Program Directors’ Conference. The Commission may entertain requests from other organizations. Components from the workshop are sometimes presented at these meetings; however, the primary purpose of the update sessions is to inform site visitors about recent Commission activities, revisions to standards and newly adopted policies and procedures.

Keeping costs in mind, the Commission continually explores new methods of providing initial training to site visitors, as well as ensuring their ongoing competence and calibration. Methods being examined
include on-line materials, conference calls, broadcast e-mails and other self-instructional materials.

The Commission emphasizes its increased commitment to quality training for site visitors. While the Commission sponsors comprehensive training for new site visitors and provides updates for site visitors on a regular basis, all parent organizations are urged to provide support for training to augment the Commission’s programs. All active site visitors must complete mandatory annual web-based retraining in order to retain appointment.

7. **Role Of The Site Visitor Trainee (All Disciplines):** When a site visitor cannot attend a formal site visitor training workshop or if it is determined that additional training is warranted, s/he may be requested to attend a site visit as a trainee. The trainee is accompanied by a Commission staff member or staff representative and a comparable experienced site visitor who provide ongoing training and guidance.

The trainee must sign the Commission’s Agreement of Confidentiality prior to the site visit and must not have a conflict of interest with the institution. The site visitor trainee, if authorized to participate in the site visit by the institution, receives all self-study materials from the institution and background information from the Commission prior to the site visit.

The trainee participates during all site visit conferences and executive sessions. In the event the chair/staff representative of the site visit committee determines that a vote is necessary to make a recommendation to the Commission, the trainee will be considered a non-voting member of the site visit committee.
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78. **Role Of Observers On A Site Visit:** Commissioners, Review Committee members, and public members of the Commission or Review Committees that have not participated as a site visitor are encouraged to participate on site visits as observers in order to become familiar with the accreditation process. The observer must not have a conflict of interest with the institution. This individual must be approved to participate in the site visit by the institution, receives all self-study materials from the institution and background information from the Commission prior to the site visit. This individual participates during all site visit conferences and executive sessions as a non-voting member of the site visit committee. As a participant of the site visit, it is expected that this individual will remain with the designated site visit team members at all times during the visit. The chairperson of the site visit committee has the right to excuse and/or exclude the observer from any or all aspects of the site visit for improper and/or unprofessional behavior.

Revised Enrollment Requirements for Site Visits for Fully Developed Programs
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4. **Enrollment Requirement For Site Visits For Fully Developed Programs:** Site visit evaluations of dental, allied dental and advanced dental education programs will be conducted at the regularly established intervals, provided that students are enrolled in at least one year of the program. If no students are enrolled on the established date for the site visit, the visit will be conducted when students are enrolled, preferably in the latter part of the final year prior to graduation, latter part of the program. (Refer to the Policy on Non-enrollment of First Year Students)
G. POLICY ON FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COMMISSION REQUESTS FOR SURVEY INFORMATION

The Commission on Dental Accreditation monitors the educational programs it accredits through annual surveys. Completion of the Commission’s annual survey by each accredited program is a requirement for continued participation in the voluntary accreditation program. The Commission expects that all accredited programs will return completed surveys by the stated deadline. Administrators who anticipate difficulty in submitting completed surveys on time must submit a written request for extension prior to the date on which the survey is due. Requests for extension must specify a submission date no later than two (2) weeks thirty (30) days beyond the initial deadline date. If a program fails to submit its completed survey or request for extension by the deadline, the Commission will notify the institution that action to withdraw accreditation will be initiated at the next Commission meeting.

L. GUIDELINES FOR REQUESTING AN INCREASE IN ENROLLMENT IN A PREDOCTORAL DENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Guidelines for requesting an increase in enrollment in a predoctoral dental education program complement the Commission’s Policy on Reporting Program Change and are available upon request from the Commission Office. These Guidelines focus upon the adequacy of programmatic resources in support of additional student enrollees. Enrollment increases are tracked to ensure over time total enrollment does not exceed the resources of the program.

A program considering or planning an enrollment increase, or any other substantive change, should notify the Commission early in the program’s planning.

Approval of an increase in enrollment in predoctoral dental education programs of greater than 5% of the first year enrollment, as it was documented in the last evaluation (i.e. last site visit or prior approval of enrollment increase) by the Commission, must take place prior to the implementation of the increase must be reported to the Commission if the program’s total enrollment increases beyond the enrollment at the last site visit or prior approval of enrollment increase. Upon submission of the enrollment increase report, a substantial increase in program enrollment as determined by preliminary review by the discipline-specific Review Committee Chair will require prior approval by CODA. The proposed increase in enrollment in predoctoral dental education programs should be calculated, on a percentage basis. Calculation of the enrollment includes advanced standing, repeating/returning students and transfer students. Programs should be cognizant of the impending need for enrollment increases through short- and long-term planning and proactively request permission for the increase. The Commission will not consider retroactive requests, nor will it consider inter-cycle requests unless there are documented extenuating circumstances.