ACS ACCREDITATION MANUAL

Volume 1: Accreditation Procedure

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

The Australian Computer Society (ACS) is the authority responsible for the accreditation of professional ICT education programs in Australia.

The ACS is accredited by the International Professional Practice Partnership (IFIP IP3).

The ACS is a signatory to the Seoul Accord. The Accord signatories accord mutual recognition to their respective accreditation schemes for undergraduate and postgraduate (master's level) programs for initial professional practice. The Seoul Accord Graduate Attributes have been incorporated within the ACS Core Body of Knowledge (2015, Appendix D). This mapping ensures that a program satisfying the ACS accreditation criteria will satisfy the Seoul Accord requirements and forms the substance of the ACS adherence to the Accord.

The ACS complements the role of Australia's Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) and accredits higher education programs in ICT as a discipline-specific application of the *Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards)*.

The ACS Accreditation system is specified in 3 volumes:
      Volume 1: Accreditation Procedure
      Volume 2: Accreditation Criteria
      Volume 3: Application Template

This document, *ACS Accreditation Manual: Volume 1: Accreditation Procedure*, specifies the process by which accreditation is conducted and maintained.

1.1 Terminology

For the purposes of the ACS Accreditation Manuals the following terminology is used:

AC   The Accreditation Committee of the ACS.

ACS   The Australian Computer Society.

AQF   Australian Qualifications Framework (https://www.aqf.edu.au).

Accreditation Types
                                Accreditation recognises programs that prepare graduates for professional practice in ICT. *Professional* level for initial practice, *Advanced* for a higher level of expertise and *Specialist* accreditation for expertise in a particular specialisation.
                                See Volume 2, Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 respectively.

SFIA   Skills Framework for the Information Age, current version (https://www.sfia-online.org/en)

Bloom's Taxonomy   Anderson, Lorin W (2001) A Taxonomy for Learning Teaching and *Assessment: Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* Longham.

HESF   Higher Education Standards Framework 2015 (https://www.teqsa.gov.au/higher-education-standards-framework-2015).

TEQSA   Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (https://www.teqsa.gov.au/).

IFIP IP3   International Federation of Information Processing; International Professional Practice Partnership https://www.ipthree.org

Seoul Accord   Seoul Accord http://www.seoulaccord.org establishes international standards for ICT graduate outcomes and a basis for international recognition of ACS accredited programs.

Institution   The Higher Education provider that is responsible for, or is applying for, the accreditation of an ICT program.

ICT School   That part of the Institution responsible for the education of ICT graduates.

ICT Industry Advisory Board
                                A body to provide advice on industry requirements of ICT graduates, program content, industry trends and the institutions interactions with industry.

ICT Industry Liaison
                                A role in the institution with oversight of industry interaction with a program, including organising ICT Industry Advisory Board meetings and consultations; industry projects, internships and placements; industry guest lectures, visits and so on.

Program	A structured set of subjects and/or majors leading to a recognised AQF qualification. In some institutions a program is called a course, or a degree.
Development Plan	An institution's schedule of activities and plans to address any issues that may affect ACS accreditation.
Major/ Specialisation	A structured set of subjects which address the complexities of a specific part of the ICT field.
Subject	A subject is also known as a course or unit. It is a component of a program in which a coherent body of knowledge taught and assessed as a whole. Where quantification is required, a subject is one eighth of one Equivalent Full-Time Student Load (EFTSL) being 'a measure of the study load, for a year, of a single student undertaking a course of study on a full-time basis' (https://www.teqsa.gov.au/glossary-terms).
ICT Subject	A subject which assesses knowledge from the essential or general areas of the CBoK or ICT Discipline-specific knowledge (see Accreditation Manual *Volume 2, Criterion C*).
ICT-related Subject	A mandatory subject with little or no specific ICT content may be considered ICT-related if it is necessary for the achievement of a program's ICT outcomes, for example, a subject that is clearly a prerequisite for a later mandatory ICT subject. An ICT-related subject cannot merely provide a context for ICT to be applied.

Wherever possible the ACS will use the terminology of the institution seeking accreditation, however, for consistency, the above terminology is used throughout the Accreditation Manual.

2   ACCREDITATION PURPOSE AND ORGANISATION

2.1 Purpose of Accreditation

The ACS aims to improve and develop professionalism in the ICT industry. One of the ways it does this is to assist educational institutions to produce graduates who are ready for professional practice in ICT. The accreditation requirements have been developed to specify what the features an ICT educational program would need to have to ensure such graduate outcomes. The accreditation process examines an institution's programs and where they meet the requirements issues a Certificate of Accreditation.

To be accredited, an institution's ICT programs, staff and educational activity at least meet, and preferably exceed, the accreditation criteria specified in
    ACS Accreditation Manual Volume 2: Accreditation Criteria

2.2 Accreditation Approach

The ACS aims for an authentic accreditation process, that is, one which examines the program in actual operation and how it explicitly addresses the needs of its stakeholders – students, staff, institution, industry, the ACS and so on. An aspect of responsible program design and implementation is that it both meets the needs of all stakeholders and explains how it does that. So most of what is required for accreditation should already exist. Where this is not the case, the operational systems should be updated to accreditable standard.

The Accreditation Application Template is
    ACS Accreditation Manual Volume 3: Application Template
It has been designed to indicate how the Accreditation Panel can find specific evidence in support of claims against the accreditation criteria. Wherever possible this should be achieved through online, read-only access to operational systems (such as the Learning Management System). It is here that accreditation criteria can be seen to be being met.

Privacy and confidentiality issues are critical in the professional conduct of accreditation, especially with online access to operational systems. The NHMRC has specified some advice on this (https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/about-us/resources/ethical-considerations-quality-assurance-and-evaluation-activities) and panel members and ACS staff have entered into confidentiality agreements, but the issue needs to be discussed with the case manager.

Consequently, the ACS strongly recommends that the ICT School itself generates the accreditation application and does not engage consultants or quality assurance staff in its production. Further, as ACS accreditation is ICT discipline-specific and does not duplicate institutional level TEQSA quality assessment, its focus is clearly on matters within the ICT school hence external assistance in the preparation of the application should be unnecessary.

An application is to be developed in consultation with your case manager. Much of the panel's evaluation will be conducted online before a visit to the institution. So operational systems access needs to be functional and tested with your case manager before an application being submitted. If for some reason online access is limited, the case manager will advise on what needs to be packaged up as part of the submission and what needs to be available on the visit.

2.3 Accreditation Roles

Title	Role
Director Professional Standards & Assessment Services	ACS executive with responsibility for accreditation operations and processes, implementation of standards, approval of panel and case manager allocations
Accreditation Officer	ACS staff role with responsibility for public information, operational coordination, accreditation panel formation and panel support. Provides a point of contact for the initiation phase of an accreditation.
Case Manager	Assigned by the ACS to an accreditation case or client. Provides a point of contact for the preliminary, assessment and reporting phases of an accreditation and provides ongoing advice. Agrees forms of evidence, receives applications, conducts analysis, serves as panel member and prepares reports and recommendations.
Panel Chair	Assigned by the ACS to an accreditation case. Facilitates collective panel analysis and formation of recommendations. Chairs panel meetings and accreditation visit proceedings, ensuring all panel members have equal hearing.
Panel Member	Assigned by ACS to an accreditation case. Responsible for reviewing available evidence and analysis, collectively agreeing recommendations and reviewing draft reports.
Industry Panel Member	Invited by Institution to an accreditation case. Responsible for reviewing available evidence and analysis, collectively agreeing recommendations and reviewing draft reports.
Panel Observer	Observers do not act as Panel Members. Observers may witness proceedings (except as directed by the Chair) and may inspect evidence but may not participate in interactive sessions.
Accreditation Committee	Terms of Reference are set by ACS Management Committee. Reviews accreditation reports; approves accreditation outcomes and conditions.

2.4 The ACS Accreditation Case Manager

The ACS will appoint an Accreditation Case Manager for each institution interested in accreditation. The case manager's role is to maintain an ongoing relationship with the institution and to facilitate the accreditation of its ICT programs.

The case manager can advise on the interpretation of accreditation requirements, application preparation, application evaluation and on the accreditation process but will not engage with the work of the institution such as program design, subject curriculum, assessment, staffing, facilities, etc. Advice beyond the case manager's role might be sought from the Accreditation Committee. In such cases, the Committee may appoint an experienced person to respond or may suggest persons who may be consulted directly. Provision of such advice expressly does not constitute any guarantee of ultimate accreditation. The Accreditation Committee or any of its members will not involve themselves in any way in the engagement as consultants, or actively contribute to program design.

2.5 Accreditation Documents

The *Application for Accreditation* contains a specification of how an institution and its programs address the accreditation criteria (Volume 2 of this manual). This specification is a 'living' document which will be refined during the accreditation process and which will be kept up to date as programs evolve over time.

The *Certificate of Accreditation* certifies that the programs specified in the institution's application for accreditation satisfy the accreditation criteria at the time the certificate was issued. The certificate and specification together provide a basis for discussion between an institution and the ACS, to assess the impact of program or institutional change on accreditation and to facilitate continuing program development.

Where an accreditation is granted with conditions, a conditional *Certificate of Accreditation* will be issued which will be replaced by a *Certificate of Accreditation* (unconditional) when the conditions have been met.

Where program or institutional changes occur during the accreditation period that affect any aspect covered by the certificate the institution will discuss the change with their case manager with a view to updating the certificate (see section 5 of this manual).

2.6 Timing of Accreditation Evaluation

Normally an institution and its programs are evaluated on-site on a five-year cycle. If there is found to be an elevated level of risk that key program attributes will not be sustained over a five year period, a shorter period of accreditation may be set (for example, the first accreditation of programs in a new institution may be for 2 years so triggering a review). The ACS will issue a courtesy reminder in September/October that the cycle finishes in the following year, prompting the Institution to initiate the preliminary phase of an application for re-accreditation.

Aligning ACS accreditation with internal review processes improves the efficiency and comprehensiveness of both. Where ICT programs are taught in two or more parts of an institution

there is much benefit in evaluating all programs together. More efficiencies accrue where ACS accreditation can be aligned with accreditations by other bodies, e.g. Engineers Australia, TEQSA.

Requests for extensions to current accreditations may be granted if the Institution can demonstrate exceptional circumstances such as significant organisational restructuring impacting substantially on the ICT school in question. Consideration will also be given to ongoing program delivery and accreditation compliance risk during an extension period.

During a period of accreditation, significant changes can occur in institutions and their accredited programs. The Institution is required to advise the ACS and apply for an update of the Certificate of Accreditation (see *Section 2.5*). The application may be submitted at any time, but as program accreditation is granted on a calendar-year basis, sufficient lead time needs to be allocated to allow for evaluation of the application.

2.7 Fees

There are fees associated with accreditation, which are reviewed annually. Institutions interested in accreditation should consult the fee schedule on the ACS Website.

3   ACCREDITATION PRELIMINARIES

3.1 Self-Analysis

In considering whether to apply for accreditation an institution should conduct a self-analysis.

An institution should consider the context within which each program is offered, particularly
- the orientation of the institution, its educational approach and TEQSA accreditation
- the industry sector graduates may go into and the relationship of the institution with industry
- the kind of graduates it aims to produce and actually produces
- the attributes of the student intake
- the skills of academics and the ICT educational facilities
- relevant disciplinary and professional bodies of knowledge, including that of the ACS.

It should then consider how each program specifically aligns with its context in terms of its objectives, structure, content and implementation and how that alignment is supported by the engagement of all ICT staff, ICT Industry Advisory Board and other stakeholders.

The ACS accredits programs from the perspective of the ICT Profession, which may be different from the institutional or academic perspective. The Accreditation Criteria (see Volume 2) provide a means for investigating the professional aspects of a program. The Accreditation Template (Volume 3) provides a means of documenting them. A self-analysis should use these resources and analyse each program through the lens of accreditation requirements. A simple approach to this task is to fill out a draft application and discuss with the assigned ASC Case Manager.

3.2 Development Plan

A self-analysis typically identifies general issues and opportunities for development as well as areas where accreditation criteria are not being fully met.

The institution will likely have a Development Plan in place specifying improvement to program designs and operations. This plan should be updated with activities which will improve the program with respect to accreditation criteria. Where possible, such improvements should be commenced before accreditation. The accreditation panel will take the Development Plan into consideration when determining the accreditation outcome.

3.3 Preparing an Application for Accreditation

Early in the process of self-analysis the institution should seek the advice of its case manager. The case manager can provide assistance in understanding criteria and give an opinion on the sort of evidence needed to substantiate a claim.

Before an application can be lodged with the ACS, the case manager will determine that it is, *prima facie*, an accurate representation of the institution and its programs.

An authentic evaluation of claims against the accreditation criteria will depend on the availability of educational materials, student work and documentary records. In particular, the panel will need access to:

a) Institutional Context Information:
>   Records of ICT Industry Advisory Board meetings, internal program reviews etc
>   Copies of recent internal reviews of the ICT School and programs

b) Program Information:
>   Approved program objectives, content and structure design documents
>   Current advertising material and student information

c) Subject Information:
>   For all subjects designated as meeting *Requirements B to E* of *ACS Accreditation Manual: Volume 2: Accreditation Criteria*, and for subjects that assess pre-requisite knowledge for these subjects:
>>   subject outline documents as distributed to students
>>   examples of teaching materials and resources
>>   specifications for assignments, projects and laboratory activity,
>>   examples of formative and summative assessment materials including
>>   examination papers and scripts, graded student work including assignments portfolios, project reports, laboratory reports, professional practice log books.
>>   Of particular interest are examples of assignments which achieved the lowest pass mark, and examples of assessments low, medium and high achievement.

Most, if not all, of this information is accessible online in the institution's websites and learning management system. Before an application can be lodged with the ACS the institution and case manager will agree on the forms of evidence to be provided or made available, and the means of access to direct and digital evidence. The ICT School must take timely action for legal clearance and IT access permissions as appropriate and provide digital navigation to assist discovery.

4   THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS

4.1 Submission of an Application

The formal accreditation process starts with the submission of an Application for Accreditation which has been vetted by your case manager. Email to:

> accreditation@acs.org.au

The submission must occur at least 8 weeks before the planned visit.

4.2 Determination of Accreditation Evaluation Method

The ACS will determine the appropriate method of evaluation for accreditation. Normally an on-site accreditation panel visit will be required for accreditation of an institution and its programs. Under some circumstances a desk-top/remote evaluation may be appropriate. Those circumstances may include:

> comprehensive online access to evidence (including the learning management system)
> the institution showing stability or improvement, with respect to
>> organisational structure
>> ICT staffing profile
>> ICT facilities and resources
>> input from stakeholders
> the program(s) for accreditation being currently accredited and that accreditation
>> having been updated as program developments were made during the period
>> of its accreditation
> the program(s) for accreditation are new but utilise significant aspects of currently
>> accredited programs and staff.

4.3 Selection and Approval of the Panel

An Accreditation Panel conducts an investigation and provides expert advice to the ACS in the evaluation of an institution's claims against the accreditation criteria.

A Panel will be selected by ACS such that the aggregated panel expertise profile adequately covers the range of program specialisations under review. The ACS will manage panel conflicts of interest and will allow the institution to raise reasonable objections to panel selection. A Panel will include the following roles:

- A Panel Chair with current expertise in ICT higher education and experience in accreditation
- A Case Manager with current knowledge of ICT higher education and expertise in accreditation standards and processes
- At least one Panel Member with appropriate disciplinary expertise
- At least one Panel Member with current expertise in employing ICT graduates in practice environments

The Institution is invited to nominate the Chair (or nominee) of its ICT Industry Advisory Board (or equivalent) as a full member the Panel, or an appropriate alternative member who is a stakeholder

of the Institution and who is not an academic. Such nominations should take Conflict of Interest situations into account.

The ACS will exercise discretion in the size and composition of an Accreditation Panel. Expert Panellists may be called on to provide specialism and disciplinary advice.

Panel members will enter into a confidentiality agreement.

4.4 Observers

From time to time the ACS receives requests from other national and overseas accrediting bodies, including other signatories to the Seoul Accord, wishing to have representatives observe the evaluation process. Similarly, requests may arise from the host institution, wishing to appoint an internal or external observer to the evaluation process, for example, in order to use the process as part of a wider review by the institution of its programs. Finally, the ACS may wish to appoint observers for the purpose of training in the accreditation process. All such observers are subject to approval by the host institution and/or the ACS as appropriate.

The following protocol applies for observers joining campus visit panels.

a. Observers are welcome to attend all interactive sessions the Panel has with the leadership team, staff, students and external stakeholders, as well as Panel private sessions where the Panel is viewing teaching materials and student work or formulating its findings and recommendations.

b. Observers will be asked to refrain from asking questions or participating at all in the discussion.

c. Observers are welcome to speak privately with either the Panel Chair or the Case Manager at any time if a viewpoint is to be expressed or a question or request is to be made.

d. The Panel Chair is empowered to exclude observers from any specific session on reasonable request from a Panel Member or host institution.

e. The Panel Chair may invite comments from the observers, outside the interactive sessions.

f. Observers must agree to keep all discussion and details of decision making in confidence and return and/or delete associated documentation at the conclusion of the visit. Observers may be required to sign a non-disclosure agreement.

4.5 Campus Visit

The purpose of the campus visit is the triangulation of evidence reviewed before the visit and investigating issues of concern. The key functions of the campus visit are to examine first-hand and evaluate the evidence that supports the accreditation application.

A campus visit schedule will be finalised by the Case Manager and Accreditation Officer in negotiation with the Institution.

It is expected that the accreditation panel will need to visit all locations where a program is taught and will meet with management, academics and students at each. The panel will wish to be assured that each campus offers comparable educational experiences, facilities and standards and that quality assurance mechanisms are in place to ensure the Institution maintains control of the educational program. The overriding criterion is that students have the same opportunities to achieve the program outcomes.

Where a campus is overseas:

a. The ACS will receive documentation from the Institution and will arrange an accreditation visit to the offshore location under its normal procedures. It is particularly important that the documentation be received well ahead of the proposed visit, so that any apparent difficulties can be identified in advance and the visit rescheduled if necessary.

b. The Institution concerned will be expected to reimburse the ACS for all costs associated with an offshore accreditation visit. This will also include an additional administrative fee which at present is not normally charged within Australia.

c. The ACS wishes to undertake offshore accreditation activities only where these are acceptable to relevant authorities in the host country. On receipt of a request from an Australian institution for offshore accreditation, The ACS will wish to negotiate with the host-country professional association and will not wish to undertake a visit until that association has expressed its concurrence with the arrangements. ACS preference is to conduct visits jointly with the host-country association. The Institution will be kept fully informed of such negotiations and involved to the maximum extent appropriate.

In the final meeting of the visit the Panel Chair will summarise the Panel's findings. The Panel Chair may also foreshadow the Panel recommendations to the ACS Accreditation Committee, however there may be occasions when the Panel may require further time in order to formulate even its preliminary recommendations. The Panel cannot guarantee the final decision of the Accreditation Committee.

4.6 Accreditation Panel Report and Institution Response

A Panel Report and draft Certificate of Accreditation will be created by the Case Manager, in consultation with members of the Panel and the Panel Chair. These documents will be based on the initial application as amended during the evaluation (see sample Certificate at Appendix A).

The institution will be provided with the Panel Report and draft Certificate of Accreditation showing conditions and recommendations and given opportunity to provide a response to correct any factual matters.

The ICT Industry Advisory Board should be provided with the Panel Report.

4.7 Accreditation Committee Decisions

The Accreditation Committee will consider the Panel Report and draft Certificate of Accreditation. It will make a determination for each program to:

a. Unconditionally accredit the program for a period of up to five years. A Certificate of Accreditation will be issued to the Institution, subject to approval of the CEO.

b. Conditionally accredit the program. While a conditionally accredited program is accredited, that accreditation is subject to the Institution's agreement to provide specified information or to take specified actions and report on them, within the specified timeframe for each condition. If such agreement is not honoured, or if the response is judged to be inappropriate or inadequate, ACS has the right to amend its determination on conditional accreditation. A conditional Certificate of Accreditation will be issued to the Institution, subject to approval of the CEO.

c. Delay consideration of accreditation application or suspend an existing accreditation for a specified time period until specified issues have been addressed.

d. Decline to accredit or withdraw an existing accreditation. In such case, a further application will not normally be considered within two years.

4.8 Publication of Accreditation Status

The ACS website lists all accredited programs, the level of accreditation and the accreditation finish date. Accreditation applies to all intakes of students up to and including the year of the finish date.

Educational institutions may wish to publish statements to the effect that certain of their programs are accredited by the ACS. An institution 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 when this is not the case.

4.9 Accreditation Review

The ACS may investigate information coming to its attention and may act to maintain the reputation of its accreditation system or review its accreditation of a program at any time. For example, an institution might commence teaching the program at non-accredited campus or makes changes to a program that result in an accreditation criterion no longer being met.

5 INSTITUTIONAL AND PROGRAM CHANGES AFFECTING ACCREDITATION

The Society encourages innovation in institutions and their programs. During the period of a program's accreditation developmental changes may be made in the program's objectives, structure, content, institutional context or the pathways through which it is offered Any of these changes may require an amendment to the Certificate of Accreditation.

The Terms of Accreditation in the Accreditation Certificate specify that in accepting accreditation of its programs, the institution has committed itself to maintain accreditation standards. The ACS must be notified of any institutional or program changes that affect the Certificate of Accreditation.

When changes are being considered, the institution should work with the Case Manager to determine their impact on accreditation.

5.1 Changes to an Existing Accredited Program

The Certificate of Accreditation specifies how each program meets accreditation requirements. Where changes affect the content of the Certificate of Accreditation the Institution **must** notify the Society before their implementation:

> detailing the change and the rationale for it and
> specifically addressing the accreditation requirements that may be affected by the change.

The ACS will consider the notification and, depending on the specific situation, may request further information, conduct a desk-top/remote assessment or require an on-site accreditation panel visit to be conducted before the Accreditation Committee considers the notification and makes a determination as described in Section 4.6 above.

Where an accredited program is to be withdrawn from a campus, the Institution must detail the arrangements for students currently in the program to complete their program to the accredited standard.

Where an accredited program is to be implemented on a campus that has other accredited programs, or in a fully online mode, the Institution will submit documentation addressing those aspects of *ACS Accreditation Manual: Volume 2: Accreditation Criteria* which may be affected (for example, staffing).

Where an accredited program is to be implemented on a new campus that has no other accredited programs, the Institution will submit full documentation addressing all aspects of *ACS Accreditation Manual: Volume 2: Accreditation Criteria* dealing with the *Institutional Context of ICT Program.*

5.2 Application to Accredit a New Program

Where an Institution with existing ACS accredited programs seeks accreditation for a new program the Society should be notified in writing of the proposal before commencement of the first student cohort. It is suggested that this notification be instigated before or at the time the proposal is submitted for approval though the internal institutional processes.

Application for accreditation of the new program should be made as soon as institutional approval has been granted. The application should address the requirements of

ACS Accreditation Manual: Volume 2: Accreditation Criteria.

The Accreditation Committee has the discretion to determine whether a visit is required to assess the application.

New Program Implementation Pathways

Where the new program is to be offered at the home campus, or an established regional or offshore campus with accredited professional ICT programs already in place, the requirements in *ACS Accreditation Manual: Volume 2: Accreditation Criteria* dealing with the *Institutional Context of ICT Program* will have been substantially addressed in the most recent accreditation review. However, it is necessary to respond to any requirements where circumstances are differentiated for the new program (for example, new staffing) or where specific actions to support the new program are needed (for example, industry consultation).

Where a new program is to be implemented on a new campus that has no other accredited programs, the Institution will submit full documentation addressing all aspects of *ACS Accreditation Manual: Volume 2: Accreditation Criteria.*

6   ISSUES MANAGEMENT

6.1 Appeals

Should an institution wish to appeal against the outcome of an accreditation assessment of a program, an appeal should be lodged with the ACS's Chief Executive Officer within one month after the ACS has formally advised the Institution of the accreditation outcome. The CEO may authorise an appeal committee to consider the matter which may, if appropriate, commission a further evaluation visit. Following the report of the appeal committee, a decision will be taken in accordance with current delegations of the ACS's highest-level decision-making body, and that decision is final.

Grounds for appeal are normally limited to errors of fact or breach of the Policy, Criteria and/or Procedures set down in this document.

6.2 Investigation of Concerns

If the ACS has good reason to believe that a program previously accredited no longer meets the criteria, it may notify the Institution of the reason(s) for its concern and request a formal response. If the response is not considered adequate, the ACS may appoint an evaluation panel to visit the Institution and investigate the situation. If the Panel is not satisfied, it will prepare a report recommending that accreditation be discontinued, with reasons. The ACS will forward the report to the Institution and invite further response, normally within six weeks. If the response is not satisfactory, accreditation will be discontinued by the ACS on the recommendation of the Committee.

In such a case the Institution may appeal to the ACS as outlined in the Appeals section of this document above. In considering such an appeal the ACS would not normally schedule a further visit and would confine its consideration to issues of fact and process.

APPENDIX A – SAMPLE CERTIFICATE OF ACCREDITATION

Australian Computer Society

ACS Accreditation

CERTIFICATE OF ACCREDITATION FOR ICT PROGRAMS

Faculty of Informatics
University of Central Australia

2020

Australian Computer Society Inc.
ABN 53 156 305 487
National Secretariat
Level 27, Tower One, 100 Barangaroo Avenue, Sydney NSW 2000
PO Box Q534, Queen Victoria Building, Sydney NSW 1230
T +61 2 9299 3666 | F +61 2 9299 3997
E accreditation@acs.org.au | W www.acs.org.au

1. CERTIFICATE OF ACCREDITATION

This Conditional Certificate of Accreditation is issued by the Australian Computer Society.
The programs identified below are accredited provided that the University of Central Australia (UCA) accepts the Terms of Accreditation in Section 2.
A Final Certificate of Accreditation will be issued when the conditions have been met.

Accredited Programs	Accreditation Level	Until
Bachelor of Information Technology	Professional	2021
Bachelor of Cyber Security	Professional	2024
Master of Data Science	Advanced Professional	2024

1.1 Scope of Accreditation

Each of the accredited programs was assessed against the Criteria for Accreditation specified in the ACS Accreditation Manual Volume 2. The assessment was based on the UCA response to the criteria in its Application for Accreditation. The application was subsequently modified in collaboration with the ACS Case Manager and the Accreditation Panel and now forms the agreed basis for accreditation. The document can be found at www.acs.au/accreditation/UCA.

For the purposes of the Seoul Accord biannual report only, where a program is offered offshore it will be separately listed as an "out-of-jurisdiction" and while the program is accredited by the ACS, accreditation by the Seoul Accord is not automatic.

1.2 Authorisation

This certificate is issued and authorised on behalf of the Australian Computer Society by

CEO, Australian Computer Society

15/03/2020

2. TERMS OF ACCREDITATION

Accepting accreditation entails the University of Central Australia accepting the following terms.

2.1 Commitment to Maintain Accreditation Standard

The ACS is very supportive of developments which expand the profession or improve the professionalism of graduates. See ACS Accreditation manual *Volume 1: Accreditation Introduction and Process Guidelines* for details of the process for updating accreditation.

The ACS has accredited the institution and its ICT programs with the agreed *key accreditation attributes* for the periods specified. During the period of accreditation, the University of Central Australia agrees that it will contact its ACS Accreditation Case Manager (through accreditation@acs.org.au) with the details of institutional or program developments that may affect those *key accreditation attributes*.

Continuing accreditation is predicated on these *key accreditation attributes* continuing to explicitly meet accreditation criteria. The offering of accredited programs with attributes different from those specified may cause the withdrawal of accreditation.

2.2 Commitment to Meet Specific Conditions

By 1 November 2020 UCA is demonstrate that it has met the following conditions.

Program: Bachelor of Information Technology

Condition 1 - Criteria A: Program Design
The ACS Accreditation Criteria specifies "The curriculum will comprise an integrated set of tasks and structured learning experiences that lead to the delivery of the specified ICT educational outcomes, and by implication, satisfactory attainment of the graduate attributes" (Vol 2 p10). The panel noted a lack of structural clarity that cast doubt on the capacity of programs to meet the accreditation criteria. For example, the professional role is Business Analyst, but the capstone course is an agile product development, with a programming prerequisite.

> **Condition: That the programs be developed further to meet minimum requirements for accreditation.**

2.3 Recommendations

The following recommendations are intended to assist with the processes of continuing quality improvement. These recommendations must be addressed in future applications for continuing accreditation.

It is recommended that the Faculty of Informatics:

R1   Strengthen the authenticity of the industry links in the capstone
R2   ...

VERSION HISTORY

Date	Document Version	Revision History (reason for change)	Author /Reviser
2 Oct 2013	1.0	Creation of original document	
10 Nov 2015	1.2	Minor updates	Graham Low
19 Feb 2016	2.0	Version update in alignment with CBOK release	Berny Martinez
31 Jan 2019	4.0 Pilot	Complete revision: clarified criteria, aligned with TEQSA, simplified application	Craig McDonald
29 Jan 2020	5.0	Incorporate feedback from pilot	Craig McDonald

APPROVALS

Date approved	Version:	Approved By	Date in force	Next Review Date
15 Dec 2015	1.2	Professional Standards Board	15 Dec 2015	n/a
19 Feb 2016	2.0	Professional Standards Board	19 Feb 2016	n/a
1 Feb 2019	4.0 Pilot	Rupert Grayston, Director PSAS	22 Feb 2019	n/a
29 Jan 2020	5.0	Rupert Grayston, Director PSAS	1 Feb 2020	n/a

Custodian title & e-mail address:	Rupert Grayston, Director Professional Standards & Assessment Services Rupert.Grayston@acs.org.au
Responsible Business Group:	Professional Standards & Assessment Services
Distribution:	Public document
Content Security:	N/A.