

ENGINEERS AUSTRALIA

ACCREDITATION BOARD

ACCREDITATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT THE LEVEL OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGIST

Document No. G03ET
Title General Review Process



DOCUMENT STATUS

Revision	Prepared by	Authorised by	Issue Date
1	Associate Director – Accreditation. Professor Alan Bradley.	Chair of the Accreditation Board. Professor Robin King	February 2009

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. REQUEST FOR ACCREDITATION	3
3. SCHEDULING OF PROCESS	3
4. SUBMISSION OF INITIAL DOCUMENTATION.....	3
5. SELECTION AND APPROVAL OF THE PANEL	4
6. USE OF NON-VISITING CONSULTANTS AS PART OF THE EVALUATION PANEL	4
7. ROLE OF ENGINEERS AUSTRALIA OFFICERS	5
8. PANEL OBSERVERS	5
9. PRE-VISIT TELE-CONFERENCE	6
10. VISIT SCHEDULE	6
11. PRE-VISIT FACE TO FACE MEETING	6
12. CAMPUS VISIT	6
13. ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH CAMPUS VISIT	7
14. DRAFT REPORT AND SCHOOL RESPONSE.....	8
15. REPORT AND BOARD DECISIONS	8
16. REPORT FORMAT.....	9
17. APPEALS.....	9
18. INVESTIGATION OF CONCERNS	9
19. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST	10
20. CONFIDENTIALITY	10
21. PUBLICATION OF ACCREDITATION STATUS	10
22. REFERENCES	10

1.

INTRODUCTION

The following sequence of steps normally applies to the general review process. The review of programs at an educational institution will normally occur on a five year cycle. The periodic consideration of the full range of undergraduate engineering programs at a particular educational institution is normally undertaken on a five year cycle as a general review of programs by an evaluation panel appointed by the Accreditation Board.

2. REQUEST FOR ACCREDITATION

For programs that are already accredited, Engineers Australia will issue a reminder that re-accreditation is due in good time for the educational provider to make the necessary preparations.

In the case of new programs, major amendments to existing programs and for the introduction of alternative implementations of existing programs, such as at regional or offshore campuses, the educational institution is required to advise Engineers Australia and request accreditation. The request may be submitted at any time but it should be borne in mind that accreditation activities are scheduled on a calendar-year basis.

Further information is provided on the processes of accrediting new programs and major amendments to existing programs in Reference 1.

Further information is provided on the processes of accrediting alternative implementation pathways in Reference 2.

The following steps continue to define the processes of general review.

3. SCHEDULING OF PROCESS

Engineers Australia will negotiate with the educational institution, usually in the year prior to that of the next scheduled general review, a target date for the visit, and an agreed date for the receipt of initial documentation from the engineering school. Advice will also be given on the required number of copies of initial documentation to be submitted by the educational institution.

4. SUBMISSION OF INITIAL DOCUMENTATION

The engineering school submits comprehensive documentation addressing the accreditation criteria (Reference 3), and should be intended to provide prima facie evidence that the criteria are met. Guidelines on the preparation of documentation are contained in Reference 4. This documentation will normally be required 8 weeks prior to the scheduled visit and should be sent to:

The Accreditation Officer
Australian Engineering Accreditation Centre
Engineers Australia
Suite 206, 2nd Floor, 21 Bedford St
North Melbourne Vic 3051

Normally the number of copies of documentation will be such as to provide one copy per panel member plus one master copy for filing. Engineers Australia will dispatch copies of the submitted documentation to each of the panel members.

5. SELECTION AND APPROVAL OF THE PANEL

An evaluation panel comprising the following membership is appointed by the Accreditation Board:

- a Chair;
- a core team (including the Chair) of typically two to six members, chosen for their broad experience of engineering and their ability to evaluate the generic program outcomes and quality systems. The core team should include at least one member with extensive academic experience and one member with extensive experience of employing engineering graduates in practice situations. An effort should be made to attain reasonable gender balance.
- Engineers Australia Officers.

The composition of the evaluation panel will be such that the aggregated experience profile of members adequately covers the range of program specialisations targeted for consideration in the review process.

The educational institution will be advised of the composition of the evaluation panel prior to the visit.

6. USE OF NON-VISITING CONSULTANTS AS PART OF THE EVALUATION PANEL

On occasions it may be appropriate to include in the core team, one or more non-visiting panel members or consultants. This may occur where particular, supplementary expertise is required in a specialist field of engineering practice to provide further advice and input to the preparation and decision making processes.

Use of non-visiting consultants is most likely to occur in the evaluation of undifferentiated program offerings at a regional or offshore location. A full visiting panel will have, at some time in the recent past, as part of a general review, undertaken an evaluation of the host program offerings on the Australian home campus of the particular provider. Under these circumstances the structure and content of the undifferentiated program offerings will have been thoroughly evaluated during the home campus general review. The purpose of the visit to the regional or offshore campus is thus to verify that the same educational outcomes are being delivered for each particular program implemented in this undifferentiated sense.

The focus for such regional or offshore visits is thus on the local operating environment and the underpinning quality systems, rather than the educational design of the program itself. In such cases it is desirable for the Chair of the home campus general review panel to lead the regional or offshore visit, but involvement of the full home campus visit panel is not generally warranted. Rather it is more appropriate to use selected members of the original visit panel in a non-visiting or consultancy role, to review the submission documentation for the supplementary visit and provide any particular program specific advice to the subset of the panel undertaking the evaluation task. Where the original Chair or panel members from the previous home campus visit are unavailable, or inappropriate, then new visiting and sometimes non-visiting panel members will be recruited for the supplementary accreditation task.

A non-visiting consultant would be expected to:

- read the submission documents and educational program details appropriate to their field of technical expertise;
- highlight any particular issues to do with delivery, teaching resources, quality systems, as well as the structure and content of the programs under consideration;
- participate in any pre-visit teleconference held by the visiting team;
- contribute to the development of an issues and questions paper in preparation for the visit;
- be available to respond by teleconference or telephone, to issues the visiting panel may wish to raise during its final private session on campus, determining recommendations and formulating the visit report;
- be willing to review and comment on draft versions of the panel visit report as requested.

7. ROLE OF ENGINEERS AUSTRALIA OFFICERS

The Engineers Australia Associate Director, Accreditation, or an appointed Accreditation Visit Manager will normally participate as a member of each evaluation panel and contribute directly to the evaluation processes where the background and qualifications of the incumbent are appropriate. The Associate Director, or appointed Accreditation Visit Manager has responsibility for drafting, on behalf of the panel, the visit report and for finalising the report in collaboration with the panel Chair and all members of the panel. The Associate Director or Accreditation Officer also provides the formal interface with the educational institution and with the Accreditation Board.

The Engineers Australia Accreditation Officer is responsible for all logistics associated with the visit and may participate as a member of the visit panel, providing a secretarial function.

8. PANEL OBSERVERS

From time to time Engineers Australia receives requests from other Australian and overseas accrediting bodies, including other signatories to the Sydney Accord wishing to have observers participate in the evaluation processes of Engineers Australia accreditation panels. Similarly, requests may arise from the host educational institution, wishing to appoint an internal or external observer to the evaluation processes in order to use the process for example as part of a wider review by the educational institution of the engineering school and/or its programs. All such observers must be approved by the Accreditation Board, and also by the host educational institution.

The following protocol applies for observers joining campus visit panels.

- Observers are welcome to attend all interactive sessions the panel has with the leadership team, the staff, students and external stakeholders, as well as panel private sessions where a panel is viewing teaching materials and student work or formulating its findings and recommendations.
- During all interactive sessions, observers would be asked to refrain from ask-

ing questions or participating at all in the discussion.

- Observers are welcome to speak privately with either the panel Chair or the Associate Director Accreditation, or appointed Accreditation Visit Manager at any time, if a viewpoint is to be expressed or a question or request is to be made.
- The Panel Chair has the right to ask observers to vacate any specific session if a panel felt that this was necessary.
- Observers must agree to keep all discussion and details of decision making in confidence and return associated documentation at the conclusion of the visit.

9. PRE-VISIT TELE-CONFERENCE

The panel will normally meet by tele-conference some 4-5 weeks prior to the scheduled visit. The purpose of the tele-conference is to provide an opportunity for panel members to share their initial findings after consideration of the submitted documentation. It also enables the panel to collectively identify matters targeted for detailed investigation during the campus visit and to identify any additional data or materials that may be required in order to facilitate the evaluation process. The panel will also discuss a draft schedule for the visit proceedings.

A brief tele-conference report will normally be compiled by the Associate Director, (or appointed Accreditation Visit Manager), recording any issues of concern, key matters to be addressed during the visit and any request by the panel for additional supporting information. This report will be sent to the engineering school for advice.

10. VISIT SCHEDULE

Included with the tele-conference report will be a draft visit schedule detailing various sessions and activities proposed for the visit.

This schedule will be finalised by the Associate Director, in negotiation with the engineering school. The School will be asked to append to the final visit schedule the venue details for each session and a listing of the names, titles and affiliations of members of the senior leadership team, the academic staff and the external constituents who will be attending sessions with the panel.

A sample visit schedule and associated visit notes are provided in the Appendix.

11. PRE-VISIT FACE TO FACE MEETING

A meeting of the visiting panel will normally be held on the evening prior to the commencement of the campus visit. This meeting will enable the panel to make final preparations for the visit, to consider any additional supporting information submitted by the educational institution and to prepare strategic questions in readiness for each of the visit sessions.

12. CAMPUS VISIT

The campus visit will normally extend over two full days and involve all members of the evaluation panel. The key functions of the campus visit are as follows.

- To audit and discuss the effectiveness of the academic management system and quality assurance processes described in the initial documentation.
- To evaluate the morale and calibre of the staff and students, the educational culture and the scholarship of teaching and learning, the interaction between teaching and research and the linkages with professional engineering practice in industry.
- To evaluate the approach to educational design and review and in particular the engagement of industry and other stakeholder input to these processes.
- To evaluate and discuss formative and summative assessment processes by examining support materials, assessment tasks, sample examination scripts and examples of graded student work, moderation processes.
- To evaluate the capacity of the program to deliver appropriate enabling skills and knowledge, in depth technical competence, personal and professional skills, engineering application skills, laboratory and practical learning and exposure to professional practice within the generic attribute framework.
- To audit and discuss aspects of the operating environment described in the initial documentation – in particular the institutional support for undergraduate engineering education, the academic staff profile, physical facilities and resources, funding and student profile trends and strategic management.
- To evaluate other factors, not readily defined in the initial documentation.

At the conclusion of the visit, the panel Chair provides preliminary comments to the officer/s representing the educational institution. These will ultimately be embodied in the draft report of the evaluation panel. The panel cannot however anticipate the Board's final decision and a definite statement of findings should not be expected at this stage.

13. ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH CAMPUS VISIT

A campus visit schedule will be developed specifically for each general review. This will take account of the unique characteristics associated with an educational institution, its engineering school and programs. Most campus visits however will follow a reasonably standard pattern of activities and include interview sessions for the panel with the senior leadership team of the engineering school; with those accountable for leadership of the individual academic programs; with the academic staff teaching teams; with representatives of the student body and with external constituents including members of the industry advisory body, a representation of employers and graduates of the programs. The campus visit will also include tours of facilities including laboratories, learning resource centres, workshops and the library.

An opportunity for the visiting panel to meet briefly with the Chief Executive of the host institution (or a representative of the Chief Executive) is appropriate and frequently scheduled as part of the visit program.

For meetings with the senior leadership team, with those responsible for program leadership, with the Chief Executive and with external constituents, the panel will normally remain together as a unified team. For meetings with academic teaching staff and students and for facility inspections the panel will often subdivide into specific discipline sub groups.

The opportunity for the visiting panel to view educational materials, student work and documentary records of the educational management system and quality assurance processes is a key element of the visit.

Reference 4 provides in full detail the list of materials that should be made available for inspection during the visit. Representative examples of teaching materials, assessment instruments and graded student work are requested.

In addition, prime documentation associated with teaching and learning planning, review, management and quality improvement also should be made available. This should include records of formal meeting proceedings, follow up action records, and stakeholder interaction.

Also included should be details of stakeholder surveys and outcomes.

14. DRAFT REPORT AND SCHOOL RESPONSE

As soon as possible after the visit, and normally within 6-8 weeks, a report is drafted by the Associate Director, (or appointed Accreditation Visit Manager) in conjunction with members of the panel and the panel Chair for consideration by the Accreditation Board. The draft report will be based on the evaluation of the initial documentation, the panel's findings during the visit, and any additional documentation provided by the school and received by the panel as part of any requested post visit follow up. The report will contain the panel's recommendations to the Board and specific recommendations to the educational institution. Once the Board is satisfied with the draft it will be forwarded to the educational institution. The engineering school has 6 weeks from the date of receipt of the draft report, to provide a written response if it so wishes. The response is normally limited to correction of any errors of fact, to any matters to which a response is specifically requested, and to brief comment on any issue which the school feels the panel may have seriously misunderstood. It is not an opportunity to submit further substantial documentation unless this is requested.

15. REPORT AND BOARD DECISIONS

The report and recommendations are then finalised, noting the school's response and if necessary incorporating it in full, and forwarded for the Board's consideration at its next meeting. On the basis of the report and recommendations, for each program evaluated, the Board may decide:

- to accord or renew full accreditation for a five year period without conditions;
- to accord or renew full accreditation for five years, subject to the school's agreement to provide specified information or to take specified actions and report on them, within a specified period normally of one year. If the agreement is not honoured, or if the response is judged to be inappropriate or inadequate, the Board has the right to amend its determination on accreditation at that time and optionally require the conduct of a mid-term visit;
- to accord or renew full accreditation for a period of less than five years and to require a follow up submission and possibly a visit at the end of this period to consider on-going accreditation of the particular program;
- for a new program or a program that has been substantially revised, to accord provisional accreditation with a further review of the program to occur as soon as possible after graduation of the first sizeable intake of students;

- to suspend accreditation for a limited term and during such time the educational institution be asked to address issues of substance raised by the Board with continuing accreditation to be considered by the Board on the basis of reported outcomes;
- to decline or withdraw accreditation. In such case, a further application is not normally considered within two years.

The Board's decision, together with the final report, are then sent to the educational institution.

16. REPORT FORMAT

The draft and final report structures will be in accordance with the following general format:

- Executive Summary
- Recommendations on Accreditation
- General Information
- Account of Visit Proceedings
- Analysis Against Accreditation Criteria
- Recommendations to the Educational Institution

17. APPEALS

An educational institution or engineering school may appeal against a decision not to accredit. The appeal must be made in writing to the Chief Executive of Engineers Australia, within two weeks of receiving the decision, and must state the grounds on which it is based. Grounds for appeal are normally limited to errors of fact or breach of the Policy, Criteria and/or Procedures set down in this document.

The Council will appoint a sub-committee to consider the matter and, if appropriate, conduct a further evaluation visit. Following the report of the sub-committee, the Council's decision is final.

18. INVESTIGATION OF CONCERNS

If the Board has good reason to believe that a program previously accredited no longer meets the criteria, it may notify the engineering school of the reason/s for its concern and request a formal response. If the response is not considered adequate, the Board may appoint an evaluation panel to visit the school and investigate the situation. If the panel is not satisfied, it will prepare a report recommending that accreditation be discontinued, with reasons. The Board will forward the report to the engineering school and invite further response, normally within 6 weeks at most. If the response is not satisfactory, accreditation will be discontinued.

In such case the engineering school or host institution may appeal to the Council as outlined in the Appeals section of this document above. In considering such an appeal the Council would not normally schedule a further visit, and would confine its consideration to issues of fact and process.

19. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Membership of the Accreditation Board, the Consultative Committee, evaluation panels, and appeal committees inherently creates situations that may result in conflicts of interest or questions about the objectivity of the accreditation policy and processes. All members are expected to be constantly alert to this possibility, to disclose any real or potential conflict of interest, to withdraw from any situation or activity that may constitute such a conflict, and generally to conduct themselves in accordance with the Engineers Australia Code of Ethics.

20. CONFIDENTIALITY

Panel members, Engineers Australia Officers and members of the Accreditation Board are required to steadfastly honour the confidentiality of information gleaned from submitted documentation and through discussions with staff from educational institutions. Accreditation visit reports are confidential between Engineers Australia and the educational institution concerned, and should not be published. If a report is required to be disclosed for any reason, then it should be reproduced in full and both Engineers Australia and the institution concerned should be notified. Excerpts taken out of context are specifically not authorised.

21. PUBLICATION OF ACCREDITATION STATUS

Engineers Australia maintains a list of accredited programs, regularly updated on its website. Engineers Australia publishes a listing of accredited programs with accreditation normally accorded on a full calendar year basis. Each program is assigned a designated term of accreditation with a defined start date. The start date will normally correspond with the year in which provisional accreditation was first confirmed by the Accreditation Board. The term of accreditation will normally range from the published start date to the first intake of students for the year following the scheduled year of the next general review. This extension is provided as a safeguard against possible processing delays in concluding the general review cycle. For discontinued programs, Engineers Australia will publish a terminating year for accreditation of the program.

Educational institutions may wish to publish statements to the effect that certain of their programs are accredited by Engineers Australia. An educational provider is responsible for ensuring the accuracy of such statements and in particular, must avoid statements which might be read as implying that certain programs are accredited where this is not the case

22. REFERENCES

- 1 G04ET Introducing New Programs and Program Amendments
- 2 G05ET Alternative Implementation Pathways
- 3 G02ET Accreditation Criteria Guidelines
- 4 G06ET Preparation of Submission Documentation

APPENDIX

THIS APPENDIX PROVIDES TYPICAL GUIDELINE NOTES, NORMALLY ISSUED TO A PROVIDER FOLLOWING SUBMISSION OF ACCREDITATION DOCUMENTATION, BUT PRIOR TO THE ACCREDITATION VISIT

ACCREDITATION VISIT – GUIDELINE NOTES AND SPECIFIC REQUESTS.

These notes accompany the proposed visit schedule, prepared by Engineers Australia.

The Institution is asked to review the schedule, insert any proposed changes and to add venue details for each session.

Once the visit schedule is finalized the Institution is asked to prepare a list of names and titles of attendees for each session on a separate document to assist the panel during the visit and in preparation of its report. This should include the names of academic staff, technical and administrative support staff, students and external constituents attending designated sessions.

Additionally it is requested that name tags for academic staff, external stakeholders and panel members be provided for use during the visit.

PANEL MEMBERS

The panel composition for this accreditation visit will be provided prior to the visit.

MAIN VENUE

It would be appreciated if a dedicated venue can be assigned to the accreditation panel for the duration of the visit and that as many as possible of the interview sessions be conducted in that venue. The accreditation panel is anxious to minimise time lost in transit between scheduled sessions. It is requested that the displayed documentation and student materials be within this venue or close by and be available for the duration of the visit.

SPECIAL REQUEST – SUPPORTING EQUIPMENT

It would be appreciated if the following equipment could be made available to the panel in the home room.

- A computer with USB memory stick capability, internet access, and in particular access to the institution's website.
- Access to a printer.
- Data projector and screen in home room for use with Engineers Australia's laptop computer.

OPENING SESSION AND CONCLUDING SESSIONS WITH THE SENIOR LEADERSHIP TEAM

The visit should commence with a formal meeting between the panel and the senior leaders of the organizational entity responsible for engineering education within the Institution eg (Division/Faculty/Engineering School). Institutional attendees would most likely include the head of the engineering organizational entity eg (Pro Vice Chancellor/Dean/Head of School), appropriate Associate Deans, appropriate Heads of School / Departments, appropriate line managers.

Any other key staff that the Institution feels appropriate would be welcome at this session.

The head of the organizational entity (or nominee) may wish to open this session with a very brief overview presentation to begin the discussion process.

THIS INITIAL PRESENTATION WOULD NEED TO BE STRICTLY LIMITED TO 15 MINS ABSOLUTE MAXIMUM TO ALLOW ADEQUATE TIME FOR DISCUSSION.

The panel will follow up with questions of a strategic nature linked specifically to each of the program offerings. Specific issues of interest will include educational design, review and continuous improvement processes, educational leadership within the Schools, quality systems, research and industry interaction, industry advisory mechanisms, philosophy, objectives, targeted outcomes and structure of the programs.

An exit session on the final day of the visit with the above leadership team will provide an opportunity for the panel to present a very brief indication of its progress towards the recommendations it intends to make to the Accreditation Board. This session is for information only and is not intended to lead to discussions or questions.

MEETINGS WITH PROGRAM DIRECTORS/LEADERS / DISCIPLINE - HEADS

In these sessions the panel needs to have detailed discussions with staff members who have specific accountability for leadership of the academic teaching teams for each of the programs under discussion.

Named Program Directors/Leaders / Discipline Heads should be present at designated sessions.

MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR LEADERSHIP TEAM ABOVE SHOULD NOT NORMALLY BE IN ATTENDANCE

In tracking activities and processes against the Accreditation Criteria, the panel will be particularly interested to discuss aspects such as:

- program objectives and graduate outcome targets,
- educational design,
- quality systems,
- detailed curriculum content,
- benchmarking,
- professional practice exposure,
- industry advisory input,
- tracking generic capability development,
- setting standards of technical competence,
- business and management skills development,
- mathematics skill development,
- inclusion of sustainability awareness across programs,
- engineering design, complex problem solving and project skills development,
- student input to the processes of continuing improvement,
- quantum and quality of laboratory and practical learning.

MEETINGS WITH ACADEMIC STAFF

All full-time academic teaching staff involved in delivery of the programs, including those external to the engineering organizational entity and responsible for supporting content.

Note: PROGRAM/DISCIPLINE-HEADS/LEADERS SHOULD NOT BE IN ATTENDANCE.

Panel specialists will lead discussion on aspects of educational design, curriculum structure and content, delivery, assessment and performance evaluation as well as other aspects of quality assurance to triangulate against the accreditation criteria.

LABORATORY AND TEACHING FACILITIES INSPECTION

During the tour of facilities it is requested that key technical support staff as well as key teaching staff be available for discussion and questioning. An opportunity for the panel to meet with the Chief Librarian or nominee and to inspect learning support facilities would be appreciated.

MEETING WITH TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

An informal morning tea is requested with technical and administrative staff of the engineering organizational entity. Panel members will speak informally with staff, taking the opportunity of gaining a further perspective on broad, educational support issues.

DOCUMENTATION AND STUDENT WORK

The opportunity for the panel to view educational materials, student work and documentary records of the educational management system and quality assurance processes is a key element of the visit. **These materials should be available for the duration of the Accreditation visit**

In accordance with accreditation requirements, it is requested that representative examples of teaching materials, resources and in particular, samples of assessment materials and marked student work from a wide range of academic subjects (units / courses) across all relevant programs and year levels should be displayed.

Examples of assessed student reports and responses to key assessment tasks, particularly formal examination scripts, should represent a range of performance levels (pass to honours standard).

A generous range of final year project reports (theses) are particularly critical when considering full accreditation. The panel will also be interested in **graded** student design and project reports at all year levels.

Displayed materials should be organised clearly against the specific program (major) with the chosen academic units clearly identified. The range of displayed materials should be selected in order to comprehensively demonstrate delivery of the Stage 1 Competencies for each program (major).

The panel requests additionally, that any prime documentation associated with teaching and learning management and quality systems be made available. The panel is particularly interested in documented records of the following:

- Program leadership / management team meetings.
- Records of staff meetings, forums, retreats which address educational design and delivery matters.
- Minutes and records of organizational entities responsible for Teaching and Learning Committee, Academic / Educational Committee,
- Minutes and Records of student consultation and interaction forums that provide input to the quality improvement of educational delivery.
- Records, Outcomes and actions of stakeholder survey systems, including student surveys.
- Minutes and records of Industry consultative forums, which provide advice to educational design and delivery.
- Minutes and Records of organizational entities accountable for the continuing quality improvement of engineering education.
- Reports of formal reviews of programs or organizational entities.

STUDENTS

The panel will need to meet with representatives of enrolled students in each of the programs under consideration. Representatives of various year levels should be present but with a higher representation from the senior years. A sampling of male and female students and those from various entry pathways should be present, including a representation of in-

ternational students. Panel specialists in each field will lead discussions with student representatives. **ACADEMIC TEACHING STAFF SHOULD NOT BE IN ATTENDANCE AT THESE SESSIONS.** The focus will be on student perceptions and learning experiences and student input and involvement in the overall quality processes. A proportional representation of students is expected. For small Schools this might mean 3-4 students per year level per program. For larger Schools attendance should be limited to a maximum of 25 student representatives per scheduled student session but again assuring a balance of representation across year levels and programs.

EXTERNAL CONSTITUENCIES – INDUSTRY ADVISORS, GRADUATES AND EMPLOYERS

This meeting is to provide the panel with an opportunity to interact with industry advisors at both strategic and program specific levels. Such industry advice will typically be obtained through formal advisory committees or boards, and the panel will need to meet with representative members of these entities.

Where full accreditation is being sought, at this forum the panel also needs to meet with a representation of employers and graduates/alumni from recent years.

The purpose of the meeting is for the panel to gain an understanding of the industry perceptions and the experiences of external stakeholders..

A clear listing of the names and affiliations of external constituents is requested. Participants should be identified with name badges to help the panel in addressing individuals.

AN INFORMAL MEETING IS SUGGESTED. AND THE VENUE SHOULD BE SUITABLE FOR EFFECTIVE INFORMAL CONVERSATION.

MEETING WITH INSTITUTION'S PRESIDENT / CHIEF EXECUTIVE / VICE CHANCELLOR OR NOMINEE

The panel would appreciate an opportunity to meet with the institutional chief executive or nominee. The head of the engineering organizational entity would be welcome to accompany the panel for this meeting if desired.

The purpose of the meeting would be to explore issues of a strategic nature, academic staffing and staff development, physical resources, student profile trends, strategic planning, budget process, research and industry links, quality systems. A brief session of 20 to 30 minutes would be adequate.

GENERAL AVAILABILITY OF LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS

It is requested that key members of the senior leadership team as well as Associate Dean [Teaching and Learning], Discipline/Program Heads be available during times of private meetings of the panel, in order to respond to any specific queries or concerns that may arise.

PANEL LUNCHESES

It is requested that a light sandwich lunch be made available for the panel at the designated sessions listed on the Visit Schedule. In general panel members will work privately over lunch sessions.

SAMPLE VISIT SCHEDULE

(Following sample is for a faculty of engineering comprising 2 schools of engineering)

DAY 1 TUESDAY XX XXXS, 200X

- 9.00 – 10.30** **Opening Meeting with the Senior Leadership Team**
- Attendee list required**
- VENUE: TBC - Inc light morning tea
- 10.30 – 12.30** **Successive meetings with Program Leaders . (**
- Attendee list required**
- 12.30 – 2.00** **Panel Private Session #1 – Inc access to displayed materials**
(Opportunity for a brief meeting with the Vice Chancellor / CEO / President)
- VENUE: TBC - Inc light working lunch
- 2.00 – 3.00** **Meeting with the academic staff from various schools**
(Parallel sessions – sub-panel meetings with each of the separate schools)
- Attendee list required.**
- VENUE: TBC
- 3.00 – 5.30** **Panel Private Session #2 – Inc access to displayed materials**
- VENUE: TBC - Inc light afternoon tea
- 5.30 – 6.45** **Informal Meeting with all external constituencies**
External advisory committee members, employers and graduates as well as selected members of the senior Leadership Team.
- Attendee list and names badges required.**
- 7.00** **Panel retires to hotel for working dinner**

DAY 2 - WEDNESDAY XX XXXX, 200X

9.00 – 10.30 **Tour of Facilities including laboratories, library and any student learning support areas**

VENUE: TBC

10.30 – 11.00 **Informal Morning Tea with Technical and Administrative Staff Representatives**

VENUE: TBC – Inc light morning tea

11.00 – 12.00 **Meeting with Students**
(Parallel sessions – sub-panel meetings with students associated with the separate schools)

Attendee list - summary table indicating number of students by course/ year group and gender. PLEASE NOTE: NAMES ARE NOT REQUIRED

VENUE: TBC

12.00 – 3.00 **Panel Private Session #3 Compilation of findings**

VENUE: TBC – Inc a light working lunch

3.00 – 3.30 **Exit interview with Senior Leadership Team**

VENUE: TBC

3.30 **Panel departs**