

Accreditation Team Report and Recommendations**Status: Approved by UAC****Document: PE-75****Version: Revision – 4****Date: 26 July 2004****1. Introduction**

The Accreditation Team report consists of elements defined in this document. A template (Appendix A and B) is provided in electronic form (UACTeamRep.doc) and should be completed using MS-Word. Instructions to Rapporteurs are *italicised*.

This form is to be used for all three types of evaluation: **Regular/Interim/Final, Provisional and Initial**. In the latter two cases the Team must evaluate the actual factor if already implemented or the plans for satisfying. The Team must chose wording to indicate whether an actual or planned aspect is evaluated.

2. Institution, Programme and Team Details

1.1	University*:		
1.2	Department*:		
1.3	Degree: Full title, including branch / option*		
	Degree Abbreviation*:		
1.4	Person responsible for Programme:		
1.5	Dates of Visit:		
1.6	Team:	Leader	
		Member	
		Member	
		Member	
1.7	Observers: Name & Affiliation		
1.8	Type of Evaluation: Regular Visit, Interim Visit / report, or Final Visit		
1.9	Date of Previous Visit:		
1.10	Decision of Previous Visit:		

* Please copy the name of the University, Department, Degree (plus branch/option) and the abbreviation exactly from the University Rule Book.

3. Report

The Team is required to report on the Programme holistically and on any issues of concern or deficiency. In the case of a Provisional or Initial Evaluation, the Team must comment on the prognosis for the Programme meeting the criteria when fully implemented.

The report should be suitable for an audience that is concerned in some way with the Programme but has not been party to the Team's deliberations. The report should cover at least the following:

- Any relevant background or contextual information
- Holistic observations on the Programme and the academic entity responsible for the Programme
- Detailed observations
- Strengths, weaknesses of the Programme and the academic entity
- Reasoning of the Team leading to the recommendation. Specific mention to be made of deficiencies and concerns
- Recommendation (using one of the standard forms in Appendix B)
- Signature of Team Leader and certification that it is the Team's agreed report
- Appendix A to be completed and attached to the report.

Appendix A: Evaluation Form

(The worksheet below is available on web as a Word file, PE75_Template)

Question 1: Programme duration, breakdown, core, specialisation and designation

Question 1.1: Does the Programme comprise not less than 560 SAQA credits?	Yes / No
<i>Insert prose statement of deficiency, concern or comment as required.</i>	

Question 1.2: Does the Programme breakdown by knowledge area conform to the minima specified in PE-61 section 310.1? (Use columns 3 & 4 in the table for reporting)			
Knowledge Area	Minimum Credits	Actual Credits	Complies?
Mathematics	56		
Basic Sciences	56		
Engineering Sciences	168		
Design and Synthesis	67		
Computing and IT	17		
Complementary studies	56		
Subtotal	420		
Discretionary	≥ 140		
Total	≥ 560		
<i>Insert prose statement of deficiency, concern or comment as required.</i>			

Question 1.3: Does the Programme have a coherent core of mathematics, basic sciences and engineering sciences?	Yes / No
<i>Insert prose statement of deficiency, concern or comment as required.</i>	

Question 1.4: Does the Programme have specialist study in as described in PE-61 section 10.2?	

Question 1.5: A designation (qualifier) consistent with the purpose and the complement of engineering sciences (See section 7 of PE-61)?	Yes / No
<i>Insert prose statement of deficiency, concern or comment as required.</i>	

Question 2: Qualification Outcomes

<p>Question 2: Does the assessment within the Programme ensure that all graduates satisfy each exit level outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using a set of assessment criteria that, taken together, demonstrate the outcome; and • At a level indicated by the range statement 	<p>Team's Evaluation</p>
<p>Exit Level Outcome</p>	
<p>2.1: Problem solving</p> <p><i>Learning outcome:</i> Demonstrate competence to identify, assess, formulate and solve <i>convergent</i> and <i>divergent</i> engineering problems creatively and innovatively.</p>	<p>See footnote¹</p>
<p>2.2: Application of scientific and engineering knowledge</p> <p><i>Learning outcome:</i> Demonstrate competence to apply knowledge of mathematics, basic science and engineering sciences from first principles to solve engineering problems.</p>	
<p>2.3: Engineering Design</p> <p><i>Learning outcome:</i> Demonstrate competence to perform creative, <i>procedural</i> and <i>non-procedural</i> design and synthesis of components, systems, engineering works, products or processes.</p>	
<p>2.4: Investigations, experiments and data analysis</p> <p><i>Learning outcome:</i> Demonstrate competence to design and conduct investigations and experiments.</p>	
<p>2.5: Engineering methods, skills and tools, including information technology</p> <p><i>Learning outcome:</i> Demonstrate competence to use appropriate engineering methods, <i>skills</i> and tools, including those based on information technology.</p>	
<p>2.6: Professional and technical communication</p> <p><i>Learning outcome:</i> Demonstrate competence to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, with engineering audiences and the community at large.</p>	
<p>2.7: Impact of Engineering activity</p> <p><i>Learning outcome:</i> Demonstrate <i>critical awareness</i> of the impact of engineering activity on the social, industrial and physical environment.</p>	
<p>2.8: Individual, Team and multi-disciplinary working</p> <p><i>Learning outcome:</i> Demonstrate competence to work effectively as an individual, in Teams and in multidisciplinary environments.</p>	
<p>2.9: Independent learning ability</p> <p><i>Learning outcome:</i> Demonstrate competence to engage in independent learning through well developed learning skills.</p>	
<p>2.10: Engineering Professionalism</p> <p><i>Learning outcome:</i> Demonstrate <i>critical awareness</i> of the need to act professionally and ethically and to exercise judgment and take responsibility within own limits of competence.</p>	
<p><i>Insert prose statement of deficiency, concern or comment as required.</i></p>	

¹ In this column insert a terse evaluation referring to both the quality and validity of the assessment and the level of acceptable performance demanded.

Question 3: Teaching and Learning effectiveness of the Programme

		Assessment
What is the Team's assessment of the effectiveness of the following aspects of the teaching and learning process?		
3.1	Teaching and learning methodology	
3.2	Appropriateness of methodology to the preparedness of the students	
3.3	Development of students toward exit level outcomes	
3.4	Fundamental and core disciplinary knowledge	
3.5	Specialist knowledge	
3.6	Formative role of assessment	
3.7	As a basis for lifelong learning	
3.8	Throughput	
Question 3: Does the Programme provide an effective teaching and learning process toward achievement of the outcomes?		
<i>Insert prose statement of deficiency, concern or comment as required.</i>		

Question 4: Sustainability of the Programme

		Assessment Effective/.../Poor
What is the Team's assessment of the following factors critical to the Programme delivering and sustaining the required outcomes?		
4.1.1	The Leadership of the Programme	
4.1.2	Qualification and professional orientation of academic staff	
4.1.3	Number of academic staff, and spread of their competence and specialities to cover the Programme	
4.1.4	Commitment of the academic staff to the Programme	
4.1.5	Commitment of service course departments and staff to the Programme	
4.1.6	Commitment of support staff to the Programme	
4.1.7	Commitment of the Faculty to the Programme	
4.1.8	Commitment of the University to the Programme	
<i>Insert prose statement of deficiency, concern or comment as required.</i>		
4.2.1	Staffing budgets and resulting packages	
4.2.2	Laboratory equipment	
4.2.3	Computing and networking	
4.2.4	Running expenses	
4.2.5	Library facilities	

4.2.6	Office, teaching and laboratory accommodation	
<i>Insert prose statement of deficiency, concern or comment as required.</i>		
4.3.1	Is the quality of the teaching, learning and assessment processes monitored and reviewed?	
4.3.2	Are the processes for curriculum review and development effective?	
4.3.3	Is the control of the Programme in the hands of the department and the engineering faculty?	
<i>Insert prose statement of deficiency, concern or comment as required.</i>		
4.4.1	Are students attuned to the outcomes focus of the Programme?	
4.4.2	Are entrants to the Programme sufficiently prepared?	
4.4.3	If underprepared students are admitted, is effective academic support provided for those students?	
4.4.4	Rate the morale of the student body and commitment to studies	
4.4.5	Do students find the environment stimulating?	
<i>Insert prose statement of deficiency, concern or comment as required.</i>		

Question 4: If the Programme is free from deficiencies under Questions 1 to 3: Is the Programme capable sustaining acceptable outcomes until the next Regular Accreditation?	Yes / No
If deficiencies are identified under Questions 1 to 3: Is the university judged to be capable of and committed to remedying the deficiencies to the required level within 1, 2, or 3 years? Can all other aspects of the Programme be sustained for the same period?	Yes: In ____ years / No Yes / No
<i>If any question is answered "No", insert the Team's reasons for the finding(s) here.</i>	

Question 5: Follow-up on previous Visit decision

Question 5.1: In the case of concerns identified at the previous Visit, have these been addressed by the University?	Yes/No
If " No ", does any previously identified concern rank as a deficiency?	Yes/No
<i>If "No", identify the unresolved concerns here and assess the consequences of lack of resolution.</i>	
Question 5.2: In the case of an interim report, Interim Visit or Final Visit, are there outstanding deficiencies from the previous Visit report?	Yes/No
<i>If "No", identify the unresolved concerns here and assess the consequences of lack of resolution.</i>	

Appendix B: Possible Recommendation Formats

The Accreditation Team recommends to the UAC that: (Choose one of the following recommendations, deleting the others.)

D1: At any type of Visit or Evaluation of an Interim Report:

If the Programme has no deficiencies:

The _____ Degree Programme be accredited until the year _____, that is until the year of next Regular Accreditation Visit.

D2(a): At a Regular Visit:

If the Programme is deficient and an Interim Visit within one, two or three years is appropriate:

The _____ Degree Programme be accredited until the year _____. Deficiencies identified in this report are to be addressed. An Interim Visit is required in year _____ to evaluate the results of actions to overcome the deficiencies.

D2(b): At a Regular Visit:

If the Programme is deficient and an interim report within one year is appropriate:

The _____ Degree Programme be accredited until the year _____. Deficiencies identified in this report are to be addressed. An interim report is required by _____ detailing actions to overcome the deficiencies and objective measures indicating success of these actions.

D3: In the case of evaluation by an Interim Report at which deficiencies persist from the previous Visit or new deficiencies appear:

The _____ Degree Programme be accredited until the year _____. Deficiencies identified in this report are to be addressed. Notice is given that Interim Visit must be initiated within _____ months.

D4: At an Interim Visit at which deficiencies persist from the previous Visit or new deficiencies appear:

The _____ Degree Programme be accredited until the year _____. Deficiencies identified in this report are to be addressed. Notice is given that Accreditation will be withdrawn if the deficiencies are not satisfactorily remedied. A Final Accreditation Visit is required not later than _____ to evaluate the results of actions to overcome the deficiencies.

D5: At a Final Visit at which deficiencies persist from the previous Visit or new deficiencies appear:

The Accreditation of the _____ Degree Programme be withdrawn with effect from _____.

D6: At any of the above Visits with current or previously declared deficiencies where there is a demonstrable lack of commitment and capacity to improve:

Accreditation be withdrawn from _____ the with immediate effect/subsequent to this year's graduating class.

D7: For a Programme not currently accredited: which is judged to be deficient:

The Degree Programme be not accredited due to the deficiencies identified in this report.

D8: For a Programme evaluated for Provisional Accreditation: which is judged to likely to receive Accreditation if implementation continues according to documented plans:

The _____ Degree Programme be provisionally accredited until the year _____. The first Regular visits must be arranged for the year after the first graduates are produced.

If there are actual or potential deficiencies that make Accreditation unlikely if implementation continues according to documented plans.

D9: Provisional Accreditation not be granted to the _____ Programme.

In the case of a Programme submitted for initial evaluation the opinion on the planned Programme is:

O1: The planned Programme for _____ as reflected in the documentation is free from deficiencies and concerns.

O2: Aspects of the planned Programme for _____ as reflected in the documentation are potentially deficient in the respects listed above.

O3: Aspects of the planned Programme for _____ as reflected in the documentation are cause for concern in the respects listed above.

Or a combination of O2 and O3.

At any type of Visit: If necessary add:

Concerns recorded in this report are to be addressed and will be reviewed at the next Accreditation Visit.

4. Revision History

Version	Date	Revision Authorised by	Nature of Revision
Rev-2 Concept-A	15 Oct 1999	UAC	Initial Synthesis of Revision 2. Applies PE-61 outcomes
Rev-2 Draft-A	18 Jan 2000	UAC	Minor corrections
Rev-2 Draft-B	18 April 2000	UAC Working group	Questions restructured from 10 to 4 in number
Rev-2 Draft-C	20 July 2000	UAC	Minor and Editorial Changes
Rev-2	11 Aug 2000	Council	Converted to PDF format with Team working copy in Word.
Rev-3 Draft-A	20 Nov 2001		Recommendations expanded Boilerplate for Q1 expanded
Rev-4	26 July 2004		Reformatted to match revised PE-61