



ACS ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE

**DOCUMENT 1: ADMINISTRATION GUIDELINES
ACCREDITATION MANAGEMENT MANUAL**

**AUSTRALIAN COMPUTER SOCIETY
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD**

2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACS Accreditation Committee.....	1
Document 1: Administration Guidelines.....	1
ACCREDITATION MANAGEMENT MANUAL.....	1
Australian Computer Society	1
Professional Standards Board	1
2013	1
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. ACS ACcreditation Committee.....	3
3. FEES	3
4. REQUEST FOR ACCREDITATION	3
5. SCHEDULING OF PROCESS	3
6. SUBMISSION OF INITIAL DOCUMENTATION.....	3
7. SELECTION AND APPROVAL OF THE PANEL.....	4
8. ROLE OF THE SOCIETY OFFICERS.....	4
9. PANEL OBSERVERS.....	5
10. VISIT SCHEDULE	5
11. PRE-VISIT FACE TO FACE MEETING	5
12. CAMPUS VISIT.....	6
13. ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH CAMPUS VISIT.....	6
14. DRAFT REPORT AND INSTITUTION RESPONSE.....	7
15. REPORT AND COMMITTEE DECISIONS.....	8
16. CONDITIONS OF ACCREDITATION.....	8
17. REPORT FORMAT	10
18. APPEALS.....	10
19. INVESTIGATION OF CONCERNS	10
20. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.....	11
21. CONFIDENTIALITY	11
22. PUBLICATION OF ACCREDITATION STATUS	11
APPENDIX A – VISIT NOTES AND PANEL REPORTS	12
APPENDIX B – SAMPLE SCHEDULE	16
Australian Computer Society	16
COURSE ACCREDITATION VISIT SCHEDULE	16

1. INTRODUCTION

These procedures apply to accreditations undertaken by the Australian Computer Society (ACS). The following sequence of steps normally applies to the general review process. The periodic consideration of the full range of undergraduate ICT programs at a particular institution is normally undertaken on a five year cycle as a general review of programs by an accreditation panel appointed by the Accreditation Committee.

2. ACS ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE

An Accreditation Committee has been established to direct the accreditation process by the ACS Professional Standards Board with a combination of senior academic and industry representatives.

3. FEES

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

4. REQUEST FOR ACCREDITATION

For programs that are already accredited, and are due for re-accreditation in the following year, the Society will issue a courtesy reminder to the awarding Institution in September/October that re-accreditation is due in the next year, in order that the Institution can make the necessary preparations. Requests for extensions to current accreditations will not be granted unless the Institution can demonstrate exceptional circumstances such as significant organisational restructuring which has a major impact on the ICT school making the accreditation request. In these circumstances the Institution would need to demonstrate that the relevant ICT school could continue to offer accredited program during the period of the accreditation extension.

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 Institution is required to advise the Society 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 Document 2 (Application Guidelines – Professional).

5. SCHEDULING OF PROCESS

The Society will negotiate with the Institution a target date for the visit, and an agreed date for the receipt of initial documentation.

6. SUBMISSION OF INITIAL DOCUMENTATION

The Institution submits documentation addressing the accreditation criteria to provide prima facie evidence that the criteria are met. Guidelines on the preparation of documentation are

contained in Document 2 (Application Guidelines – Professional). This documentation will normally be required 12 weeks prior to the scheduled visit and should be sent to:

ACS Accreditation
accreditation@acs.org.au
Australian Computer Society
PO Box Q534 Queen Victoria Building
Sydney NSW 1230
Australia

Applications are required in both hard copy (one copy) and electronic format. The ACS will send electronic copies of the submitted documentation to each of the Accreditation Panel members.

7. SELECTION AND APPROVAL OF THE PANEL

An Accreditation Panel will be appointed by ACS to consider the accreditation application. ACS will also appoint the Chair of the Panel. The Panel will visit the Institution in order to conduct its evaluation of the application.

At least two members will be academic appointments, and further Panel members may be appointed depending on the number and diversity of programs subject to accreditation. ACS will maintain a register of qualified academic panel members from whom the Panel members will be chosen. ACS will appoint a Panel chair from amongst those on the register who are identified as qualified to chair a panel.

The Panel will be formed giving consideration to the types of programs under review, the standing of the Institution and the location of the Institution and availability of suitable potential panel members.

The Institution will also be invited to nominate the Chair (or nominee) of its Course 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 Society branch executive will be invited to nominate a local industry/professional nominee as a full member of the Panel.

8. ROLE OF THE SOCIETY OFFICERS

ACS

The Chief Operations Officer and the Principal Advisor Professional Standards have responsibility for the overall accreditation function and provides the primary interface between the Institution and the ACS through appointed staff.

The ACS has appointed a number of Accreditation Visit Managers who work under the leadership of the Chief Operations Officer and the Principal Advisor Professional Standards and are competent in the management of the accreditation visit process.

For each accreditation visit, the ACS will assign a Visit Manager to facilitate the work of the Panel. The Visit Manager provides a resource to the Panel, and will normally also participate as a Panel member, contributing to the evaluation processes where the background and

qualifications of the incumbent are appropriate. The Visit Manager has responsibility for drafting the visit report on behalf of the Panel.

The ACS Accreditation Manager (Administration) is responsible for all logistics associated with the visit.

9. PANEL OBSERVERS

From time to time the Society receives requests from other national and overseas accrediting bodies, including other signatories to the Seoul Accord, wishing to have observers participate in 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 Society 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.

- 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.
- During all interactive sessions, observers will be asked to refrain from asking questions or participating at all in the discussion.
- Observers are welcome to speak privately with either the Panel Chair or the 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 or host organisation considers it to be necessary.
- The Panel Chair may invite comments from the observers, outside the interactive sessions.
- 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.

10. VISIT SCHEDULE

This schedule will be finalised by the Accreditation Manager in negotiation with the Institution. The Institution 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 Appendix A and Appendix B.

11. PRE-VISIT FACE TO FACE MEETING

A meeting of the full Panel will normally be held in the morning 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 required of the Institution and to prepare strategic questions in readiness for each of the visit sessions.

12. CAMPUS VISIT

The campus visit will normally extend across two days and involve all members of the Panel. The key functions of the campus visit are as follows.

- To audit and discuss aspects of the operating environment described in the initial documentation – in particular the institutional support for undergraduate ICT education, the academic staff profile, physical facilities and resources, funding and student profile trends and strategic program management.
- To audit and discuss the effectiveness of the organisational unit(s) within the Institution which deliver the ICT programs (hereafter designated “the School” or “the ICT School”) 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 ICT practice in industry.
- To evaluate the capacity of the program to deliver in depth technical competence, appropriate enabling skills and knowledge, personal and professional skills against the Core Body of Knowledge criteria and other accreditation requirements, including the standard of achievement of graduates (see Document 2: Application Guidelines – Professional).
- 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, including where applicable, the feedback given to students; marking guides and rubrics; and moderation processes.
- To evaluate any other factors not defined in the initial documentation.

At the conclusion of the visit, the Panel Chair provides preliminary comments to the officer/s representing the Institution. These will ultimately be embodied in the draft report of the evaluation Panel. The Panel cannot, however, anticipate the final decision of the Accreditation Committee and a definite statement of findings should not be expected at this stage. Whilst the Panel Chair will normally give general indications of possible outcomes of the visit, this is not obligatory, as there may be occasions when the Panel may require further time in order to formulate even its preliminary decisions and recommendations.

13. ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH CAMPUS VISIT

A campus visit schedule will be developed specifically for each accreditation. This will take account of the unique characteristics associated with an Institution and its 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 School; with those ac-

countable 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; and with representatives 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 Institution's Vice Chancellor / Chief Executive or a suitable representative is appropriate and should be scheduled as part of the visit program.

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.

Document 3 (Guidelines for Submission) 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. Examples of project work, work submitted in relation to any capstone units and examples of assessment in all units claimed to be "advanced" must be provided.

In addition, documentation associated with teaching and learning planning, review, management and quality improvement also should be made available. This should include records of formal meetings; follow up action records, and both formal and informal stakeholder interaction (for example, surveys and outcomes of surveys).

14. DRAFT REPORT AND INSTITUTION RESPONSE

As soon as possible after the visit - normally within 6-8 weeks - a report is drafted by the Accreditation Visit Manager, in conjunction with members of the Panel and the Panel Chair. 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 Accreditation Committee and specific recommendations to the Institution.

Once the panel is satisfied with the draft report, it is considered by the ACS Accreditation Committee. The Committee may choose to endorse the report subject to any changes or modifications that the Committee may require. Once any required amendments have been made by the visit manager, the report is sent to the institution who has the opportunity 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 comment briefly on any issue which the Institution feels the Panel may have seriously misunderstood.

On the basis of the report and recommendations, for each program evaluated, the Accreditation Committee 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 Institution's agreement to provide specified information or to take specified actions and report on them, within a specified period - normally one year; (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 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 following completion of the study program by the first sizeable intake of students;
- to suspend accreditation for a limited term and during such time the Institution be asked to address issues of substance raised by the Committee with continuing accreditation to be considered by the Committee on the basis of reported outcomes;
- to decline or withdraw accreditation. In such case, a further application will not normally be considered within two years.

15. REPORT AND COMMITTEE DECISIONS

The final draft report is updated by the visit manager and is subsequently reviewed by the Chair of the Accreditation Committee and the ACS Principal Advisor, Professional Standards. If necessary, they may choose to refer the report back to the full Accreditation Committee for further consideration or to transmit the decision, together with the final report, to the Society's governing body for ratification. Once ratified, it is communicated to the Institution. The Society reserves the right to reject the Accreditation Committee's decisions, in which case the Accreditation Committee will interact further with the Society in order to negotiate a final report whose decisions are such that they can be ratified by the Society.

16. CONDITIONS OF ACCREDITATION

- Unless otherwise stated, accreditation applies only to the named programs conducted at the named campuses and locations. Where a program is offered elsewhere - offshore, in other locations within Australia, by distance learning, by joint ventures or franchises, or any other variation - it will need to be the subject of a separate accreditation process to ensure that the Society's requirements for accreditation, including resourcing, are met under those arrangements. This process will be conducted as soon as practicable after the visit to the Institution's main campus. (Note that if a program is offered in several locations, and not all have been approved for accreditation, then it is necessary that the Institution's transcript clearly identifies the location where the program was undertaken.)
- Programs are accredited as structured and with the content as specified at the date of accreditation, and on the basis of the information provided by the Institution which must be current at the date of accreditation. This structure is outlined in the report of the meeting. While the Society expects and accepts some variation to occur over time (as the program develops), where a proposed program amendment involves a change to the program title or to the overall specification of educational objectives or targeted graduate outcomes then the Accreditation Committee, via the Society, should be notified in writing prior to the implementation of the change. Under such major changes the Accreditation Committee, once satisfied that the accreditation criteria continue to be met, will make a decision on whether to continue the current accreditation status or to accord provisional accreditation to an essentially new program definition.

- Programs are accredited as a whole program. The recognition of the accreditation and benefits flowing from that may not automatically extend to students who are granted advanced standing, credit(s) or exemption(s) by the Institution. A program undertaken by a student granted advanced standing, credit(s) or exemption(s) will only be regarded as the accredited program where, in the opinion of the Society, credit(s) or exemption(s) are given for equivalent units (particularly in terms of ICT content) taken at an equivalent educational level in an institution of appropriate academic standing. Documentation of the processes and criteria for awarding advanced standing must be included in the initial documentation submitted by the Institution.¹

¹ If the Institution grants advanced standing on the basis of an institutional agreement with respect to credit transfer arrangements, the Panel will assess the acceptability of that agreement. In the case of individual graduates who include credit transfer in their program that is not subject to institutional agreement, the Society will evaluate the acceptability of the credit transfer in the context within which the individual graduate is claiming to have completed an accredited program.

17. REPORT FORMAT

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

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

18. APPEALS

Should an institution disagree with the outcome of an accreditation assessment of a program, an appeal setting out the basis for the disagreement may be sent to the Society's Chief Executive Officer within one month after the Society has formally advised the Institution of the accreditation outcome. The appeal will be referred to the highest level decision making body within the Society, which will appoint a sub-committee to consider the matter which may, if appropriate, commission a further evaluation visit. Following the report of the sub-committee, a decision will be taken by the Society'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.

19. INVESTIGATION OF CONCERNS

If the Society 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 Accreditation Committee 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 Accreditation Committee 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 Society on the recommendation of the Committee.

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

20. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Because education is a competitive industry, membership of the Accreditation Committee, evaluation panels, and appeal committees inevitably 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 Society's Code of Ethics.

Similarly, the Institution subject to accreditation may advise the Society of any possible conflicts of interest.

21. CONFIDENTIALITY

Panel members, Society Officers and members of the Accreditation Committee are required to honour steadfastly the confidentiality of information gleaned from submitted documentation and through discussions with staff and students from educational institutions, and staff from the institutions' industry partners. Accreditation visit reports are confidential between the Accreditation Committee, the Society and the Institution concerned, and should not be published without the express permission of the Institution. If a report is required to be disclosed for any reason, then it should be reproduced in full and both the Society and the Institution concerned should be notified. Excerpts taken out of context are specifically not authorised.

22. PUBLICATION OF ACCREDITATION STATUS

The Society maintains lists of accredited programs, regularly updated, on its website. Each program is assigned a designated term of accreditation with a defined finish date. The term of accreditation will include all first intakes of students for 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 Society. 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.

APPENDIX A – VISIT NOTES AND PANEL REPORTS

These notes accompany the proposed visit schedule, prepared by the Accreditation Committee. The Institution is asked to review the visit schedule, insert any proposed changes and to add venue details for each session.

In addition it is requested that the Institution 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.

Name tags for staff, external stakeholders and Panel members should be provided for the days of 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.

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 website;
- access to printing facilities;
- data projector and screen in the home room for use with the Panel's laptop computer.

OPENING SESSION AND CONCLUDING SESSIONS WITH THE SENIOR LEADERSHIP TEAM

The objective of this meeting is to establish the place of the School within the Institution. The Panel will deal with issues such as leadership and management, staffing levels, research leadership, institutional level quality assurance mechanisms, especially in relation to professional/practitioner input to program design, frameworks for setting and monitoring educational outcomes and staff management and development.

Panel members will also be looking at the general educational culture at the institution level and issues of inclusiveness – gender, culture and social differences. For example, they may ask whether there is there a generic graduate attributes profile for graduates of all programs at the institution, and they may probe how program outcomes are measured against institutional objectives.

The Panel will also examine institutional requirements for program approval and any institutional mechanisms for ensuring quality of teaching and learning.

The Dean or Head of School may wish to open this session with a very brief overview presentation to begin the discussion process.

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.

A final report 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 Committee.

MEETINGS WITH PROGRAM LEADERS

In these sessions the Panel needs to have detailed discussion with those staff members (Program Leaders/Convenors), with specific accountability for leadership of the academic teaching teams for each of the programs under discussion.

Members of the senior leadership team who are not involved in direct program leadership should not be in attendance at this session.

In tracking activities and processes against the Accreditation Criteria (see Document 2); the Panel will be particularly interested to discuss aspects such as:

- program objectives and graduate outcome targets;
- educational design;
- adequacy of academic staff provision to support the maintenance of the program;
- quality systems;
- detailed curriculum content mapped against the criteria (Core Body of Knowledge and Graduate Attributes);
- benchmarking;
- industry advisory input;
- how generic capability development is tracked;
- setting standards of technical competence;
- problem solving and project skills development;
- student input to the processes of continuous improvement.

MEETINGS WITH ACADEMIC STAFF

In these sessions (there may be one or more) all full-time academic teaching staff involved in delivery of the programs, including those external to the School and responsible for supporting content, should be available for discussion. Each program will be examined in detail at this session – the Panel will examine program structure, unit content, program graduate profiles, program objectives and how quality mechanisms work at the School level.

The Panel will also talk to staff informally about research, teaching loads and resource availability.

In the case of large Schools where a number of programs are submitted for accreditation, it may suit the School to treat each program or groups of programs separately. This may also require an additional day for the visit.

A second session with teaching staff may be required after meetings with students and the examination of facilities if there are issues requiring elaboration. The Panel will notify the Institution if this is required.

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 may be required, depending upon the application and information supplied.

DOCUMENTATION AND STUDENT WORK

The opportunity for the Panel to view educational materials, student work and quality assurance processes is a key element of the visit.

These materials should be available for the duration of the Accreditation visit.

Representative examples of teaching materials, resources and, in particular, samples of the assessment materials and marked student work from units of study (i.e. subjects) across all relevant programs and year levels should be displayed. Examples of student reports and key assessment tasks, particularly formal examinations should represent a range of assessment grades.

Material should be provided in respect of all units of study that the Institution has claimed to be “advanced”, and in respect of all units claimed to be a “capstone”.

Of significant interest to the Panel are graded student project reports. Displayed materials should be organised clearly against programs with the relevant unit clearly identified. The displayed materials should be selected in order to demonstrate the delivery of the full range of graduate attributes as well as the standard of technical competence within each specific field of specialisation.

The Panel additionally requests that any prime documentation associated with teaching and learning management and quality systems be made available. All relevant examples of records of formal proceedings or actions implemented would be appreciated. In particular, records of proceedings of the following organisational entities within the School are felt to be relevant, but there may be others that are also appropriate:

- Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee;
- Student Consultative Committee/Student Forum (for each School);
- Faculty and Discipline Industry Advisory Committees (for each School);
- Course Experience Questionnaire -CEQ -trends analysis and action;
- Student Evaluation of Programs and Teaching (SEC) (SET) -outcomes analysis and action;
- Any records and follow up action from staff meetings, teaching team meetings, technical team meetings, discipline meetings, review and planning forums as appropriate.

STUDENTS AND GRADUATES

The Panel will wish to speak with current students (preferably at least one student from each year of each program, although it is conceded that this may be unwieldy in institutions with a large number of programs) and graduates. Attempts should be made by the Institution to present graduates that are currently in the work-force rather than those who have progressed to post graduate studies, although the latter are also welcomed, and are to be particularly encouraged in respect of programs that have an explicit intent to prepare for graduate research study.

The Panel will meet with the students in camera and all comments provided by the students will be treated with the strictest confidence.

Outcomes of the meeting will be provided in the final session and report in a format that does not identify any individual or sub-group of the student body.

MEETING WITH VICE-CHANCELLOR/CEO OR REPRESENTATIVE

The Panel would appreciate an opportunity to meet with the Vice-Chancellor/Chief Executive Officer or nominee. A senior School staff member would be welcome to accompany the Panel at 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, and quality systems. A brief session of 20 - 30 minutes would be adequate.

GENERAL AVAILABILITY OF LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS

It is requested that the Heads of School and Program Leaders be on call during times of private meetings of the Panel, in order to respond to any specific queries or concerns that may arise.

PANEL LUNCHESES

The Institution may determine who should lunch with the Panel – it may include staff and students or be restricted to senior staff.

It is preferred that members of any external advisory panels are invited to meet with the Panel at lunch, however, the Institution may organise a separate (possibly early evening) meeting be held with these people.

FINAL CONSULTATION

At the completion of the visit, the Panel will meet with appropriate staff members and the Head of School or equivalent staff member. At this meeting the conclusions of the Panel, normally including the interim recommendation to the Accreditation Committee, will be presented.

Discussion should encourage correction of errors of fact, and should specifically address any issues of contention and the interim recommendation. A formal decision is not announced at this time as this is for the Accreditation Committee to determine, and, as indicated earlier, the Panel may choose not to present interim recommendations in the event that the Panel members need further time to discuss these.

APPENDIX B – SAMPLE SCHEDULE

**AUSTRALIAN COMPUTER SOCIETY
COURSE ACCREDITATION VISIT SCHEDULE**

(name of University)
(name of School)
(date of visit)

Accreditation Panel

(visit manager)
(panel member)
(panel member)
(industry rep) (to be appointed by School)

Courses for Accreditation

For Professional Level –

(course 1)
(course 2)
...

Campus:

(campus to be accredited)

Pre-Visit Discussion – (two weeks prior to visit - date to be determined)			
Time tbc	Preliminary discussion	Teleconference	Panel members and University staff (if required)

Visit - (date to be determined)			
1300-1430	Panel briefing/ discussion session / peruse material provided for reference (eg project reports and examination material)	Location to be inserted by School	Panel members only (light lunch)
1430-1500	Welcome to Institution by host: Senior University representative (VC or DVC)	Location to be inserted by University	Panel members, host and liaison staff
1500-1600	Meet with Senior Faculty/School Staff (Dean, Deputy Heads, L&T Coordinator, etc)	Location to be inserted by School	Attendees to be inserted by University
1600-1700	Meet with Course Coordinators and senior staff	Location to be inserted by School	Attendees to be inserted by University
1800-1900	Meet industry reps	Location to be inserted by ACS	Panel members plus attendees to be inserted by University
1930	Panel working dinner	Location to be inserted by ACS	Panel members only

Visit - (date to be determined)			
0830-1000	Panel discussion session/ peruse material provided for reference (eg project reports and examination material)	Location to be inserted by University	Panel members only
1000-1100	Meet with teaching staff including casual teaching staff	Location to be inserted by University	Attendees to be inserted by University
1100-1130	Morning tea break and panel discussion	Location to be inserted by University	Panel members only
1130-1230	Meet with students and graduates	Location to be inserted by University	Attendees to be inserted by University
1230-1330	Lunch	Location to be inserted by University	Attendees to be inserted by University
1330-1415	Visit to computer labs and other support services including online services and teaching/learning/work spaces as relevant	Location to be inserted by University	Attendees to be inserted by University
1415-1530	Panel members convene and meet in private	Location to be inserted by University	Panel members only
1530-1600	Meet with senior School staff to report recommendations to ACS Accreditation Committee	Location to be inserted by University	Panel and senior School staff

Post Visit Discussion Session - (date to be determined – two weeks post visit)			
Time tbc	Discussion	Teleconference	Panel members only

****The ACS reserves the right to modify the schedule where it is deemed appropriate****

|

23. VERSION HISTORY

AUTHORS

Graham Low	Andrew Johnson	
------------	----------------	--

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

APPROVALS

Date approved	Version:	Approved By	Date in force	Date of Next Review
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

Custodian title & e-mail address:	
Responsible Business Group:	
Distribution:	Public document
Content Security:	N/A.