Accreditation Management System

Procedures Manual – VET Competency Programs

AMS-MAN- 21

Version 1.0

Table of Contents

PROCEDURES MANUAL – VET Competency Programs

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this document is to articulate the accreditation procedures of Engineers Australia pertaining to the accreditation of vocational education and training (VET) programs that prepare trainees for entry to professional practice in the occupational category of Engineering Associate.

This Procedures Manual has been prepared primarily for, but not limited to, public and private Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) in the VET sector that are seeking accreditation of VET competency-based engineering programs. All stakeholders involved in accreditation are likely to have an interest in this document.

1.2 Scope

This Procedures Manual addresses VET competency-based engineering programs typically utilized in the Australian VET sector which are principally AQF6 Advanced Diploma of Engineering programs located in the occupational category of Engineering Associate.

However, the accreditation standards for programs delivered in a curriculum-based framework (in the occupational category of Engineering Associate only) offered in the Higher Education (HE) and the VET sectors are _not_ within the scope of this document.

1.3 Definitions and Acronyms

1.3.1 Definitions

Accreditation – an evaluation and review process to determine if an engineering VET program meets defined standards of quality. Within this document 'accreditation' applies to the processes used by Engineers Australia, unless otherwise specified.

Accreditation Outcome – the approved status of accreditation of a specific program

Actual Vocational Outcomes - are defined as the overarching occupational or job specific outcomes which learners actually achieve and demonstrate upon the completion of a VET competency program based on a nationally endorsed training package or VET accredited course.

Chartered – chartered status is the accreditation of an individual qualified professional based on an assessment of that person's professional competencies.

Differentiated Program – an engineering VET program that aims to deliver vocational outcomes that differ from those targeted by other programs offered from the home campus or any other campuses of a training provider. A differentiated program will normally be identified by the uniqueness of the program/award title and the specified units of competency.

Education/Training Provider (Provider) – the institution responsible for the design and delivery of an education/training program, whether in the HE or VET sector; formally identified within the VET sector as the Registered Training Organisation – definition below)

Entry to Practice VET Program – a program that is designed to deliver the initial (Stage 1) competencies expected of a graduate when first entering professional practice; entry to practice programs provide the formal learning basis for later determining an individual's Registration and Chartered status

Evaluation Panel (Panel) – a small group of experienced engineering professionals appointed to undertake the evaluation of a program against the accreditation criteria (sometimes also known as an Accreditation Panel)

Field of Engineering Practice – a scope of professional competence relating to a defined field of application in the practice of engineering

Interim Report – a response submitted by an RTO on the actions taken to address mandatory requirements set for Conditional Accreditation

General Review – an accreditation evaluation of all the accredited programs of an established RTO, normally conducted on site and scheduled on a five-year cycle

Graduate Competencies – the specified units of competency that have been assessed and actually attained by a graduate upon successful completion of a VET competency program, which can be either a nationally endorsed training package qualification or a VET accredited course

Intended Vocational Outcomes - defined as the overarching occupational or job-specific outcomes that are targeted by the RTO, under the guidance of stakeholder groups, at the start of the competency development process

Learner - a person being trained and/or assessed by an RTO for the purpose of issuing AQF certification documentation

Outcomes-based Accreditation – uses an outcomes-oriented graduate capabilities standard against which the program is considered for accreditation; it does not specify the means by which these standards are met, giving the RTO freedom in the learning and assessment design and implementation of the program

Program – a defined course of learning leading to the award of either a nationally endorsed training package qualification or a VET accredited course qualification

Provisional Accreditation – may be accorded to a program before it has been completed

by any learners; at the request of the RTO, the program will be further evaluated after completion by one or more cohorts

Quality Management – defines how an RTO meets and maintains its quality objectives

Recognised Program – a program accredited by a signatory of an International Educational Accord, and in consequence, is deemed to be substantially equivalent to Australian programs accredited for entry to the same occupational category

Registered Training Organisation – A training provider registered by the ASQA or a state or territory accrediting body to deliver training and assessment services and issue nationally recognised qualifications in accordance with the Australian Quality Training Framework or the VET Quality Framework; RTOs include TAFE institutions, community education providers, private education providers, schools, Higher Education institutions, commercial and enterprise training providers, and industry bodies

Registration – the outcome of an independent evaluation of an individual's achievement and maintenance of professional standards prescribed for membership of a community of professionals

Risk Management – considers the effect of uncertainty on the likely attainment of an organisation's objectives (compare with Quality Management)

Self-study Report – a quantitative and qualitative account submitted by an RTO in advance of the evaluation of a program that addresses how the program meets the applicable accreditation standards and criteria, and covering all applicable methods of program delivery and all possible pathways leading to the award of the qualification (also referred to as the 'Accreditation Submission')

Special Review – an accreditation evaluation that occurs outside the scheduled five-year cycle of General Review for a specific purpose, such as consideration of new programs, or consideration of programs for transition from Provisional to Full Accreditation; special reviews may be conducted without an on-campus visit

Specified Units of Competency – The units of competency selected by an RTO as targeted competency outcomes for a VET competency program from the options provided within a nationally endorsed training package qualification or a VET accredited course

Stage 1 Competency Standard – the current Engineers Australia outcomes-oriented graduate attributes standard for commencing professional practice in each occupational category

Threshold Standards – a minimum set of standards that must be met to achieve certification of some sort (accreditation in this case); they are not used to determine levels of excellence

Undifferentiated Program – a engineering VET program that is delivered by an RTO

under a common specification, (i.e. identical program/award title and specified units of competency), but which may use alternative learning experiences, assessment methods and/or delivery contexts (e.g. campus locations) Unit of Competency – the specified standards of performance required in the workplace, as defined within a nationally endorsed training package qualification or a VET accredited course

1.3.2 Acronyms

AAEE	Australasian Association for Engineering Education
AISC	Australian Industry and Skills Committee
ASQA	Australian Skills Quality Authority
AQF	Australian Qualifications Framework
AVETMISS	Australian Vocational Education and Training Management Information Statistical Standard
EA	Engineers Australia or Engineering Associate
ENAEE	European Network for Accreditation of Engineering Education
ET	Engineering Technologist
HE	Higher Education
IEA	International Engineering Alliance
PA	Professions Australia
PE	Professional Engineer
PPIR	Professional Performance, Innovation and Risk
SSR	Self-study Report
VET	Vocational Education and Training

1.4 References

1.4.1 Accreditation Management System References

[1]   AMS-POL-01 Accreditation Principles

[2]   AMS-STD-20 Accreditation Criteria – VET Competency Programs

[3]   AMS-MAN-20 Accreditation Criteria User Guide – VET Competency Programs

[4]   AMS-HBK-01 Engineering Handbook *(not yet available)*

[5]   AMS-TPL-315 VET Accreditation Submission (Self-study Report)

[6]   AMS-TPL-316 Table of VET Programs Offered for Accreditation

[7]   AMS-TPL-317 VET Admissions and Enrolments

[8]   AMS-TPL-318 VET Engineering School Teaching Staff Profile

[9]   AMS-TPL-319 VET Staff CV pro forma

1.4.2 Engineers Australia References

[10]   Engineers Australia Stage 1 Competency Standard for Engineering Associate

[11]   Engineers Australia Stage 1 Competency Standard for Engineering Technologist

[12]   Engineers Australia Stage 1 Competency Standard for Professional Engineer

[13]   Engineers Australia Code of Ethics

[14]   Professional Performance, Innovation and Risk (PPIR)

1.4.3 Other References

[15]   Universities Australia and Professions Australia: Joint Statement of Principles for Professional Accreditation, March 2016

[16]   International Engineering Alliance: Graduate Attributes and Professional Competencies, Version 3, 21 June 2013

[17]   IEA and ENAEE: Best Practice in Accreditation of Engineering Programmes: An Exemplar, April 2015

2. Accreditation Context

2.1 Australian Professional Context

Engineers Australia publishes Australian Engineering Competency Standards that define the competencies expected of engineering professionals at three stages of the professional career cycle, namely at entry-to supervised practice (Stage 1), independent practitioner (chartered engineer) (Stage 2), and executive level (Stage 3). Competency Standards are the profession's expression of the knowledge and skill base, engineering application abilities, and professional skills, values and attitudes that must be demonstrated by engineering professionals.

The Standards are defined for the occupational categories of Professional Engineer, Engineering Technologist and Engineering Associate. They are reviewed and updated on a regular basis (every five years). They are developed and maintained through regular Australia-wide consultation with industry, academic and teaching stakeholders and are benchmarked internationally. Only the Stage 1 Standard is relevant to educational and VET competency program accreditation.

The Stage 1 Competency Standard for each occupational category (Refs [10-12] and the EA website) represents the profession's expression of generic attributes that are expected of early career professionals. Each Standard contains 16 Elements of Competency, grouped under the headings of Knowledge and Skill Base, Engineering Application Ability, and Professional and Personal Attributes. Each element is expanded with a comprehensive set of attainment indicators that provide insight into the depth and breadth of ability expected. Each Stage 1 Competency Standard is compliant with the corresponding graduate attribute exemplar established by the Educational Accords operated within the International Engineering Alliance (Ref [16]), discussed below.

The EA Stage 1 Competency Standards are used in two ways:

- for assessment of the qualifications and experience of individuals without either an EA accredited qualification or a qualification recognised as equivalent under the applicable IEA Educational Accord
- as the generic statement of graduate capabilities for accredited programs designed for entry to practice in the three defined occupational categories. All the graduates of an accredited program are deemed to have attained at least threshold level competence in all the elements of competency defined in the Stage 1 Standard.

Therefore, the Stage 1 Competency Standards are applied in Engineers Australia's accreditation process as the definition of generic program targeted graduate outcomes. An RTO must demonstrate that an accredited program delivers the generic outcomes in the **specified Field of Practice or engineering discipline**. The Standards do not define learning and assessment program design or pedagogy; rather, they underpin an Outcomes-Based approach to learning and assessment design, enabling RTOs to address the current and emerging needs of globally competitive engineering practice. In the VET program context, the

elements of the appropriate Stage 1 Competency Standard, (generally the Stage 1 Competency Standard for Engineering Associates), provides a generic reference framework, informing the selection of the specified units of competency from the options provided within a nationally endorsed training package qualification or a VET accredited course. As a generic statement of graduate outcomes, each Competency Standard also satisfies the academic and learning requirements of the Australian Qualifications Framework (see section 2.3).

2.2 International Context

EA is a member of three educational accords and four professional recognition agreements of the International Engineering Alliance (IEA). The signatories of each Educational Accord mutually recognise the accreditation outcomes of the other signatory agencies. This can only be done when the accreditation standards and processes of each signatory jurisdiction are determined to be "substantially equivalent". The Accords to which Engineers Australia is a full signatory are:

- Washington Accord – at the level of Professional Engineer

- Sydney Accord – at the level of Engineering Technologist

- Dublin Accord – at the level of Engineering Associate (also known in the IEA as Technician)

Signatory status of an Accord confers certain benefits, namely international benchmarking, mutual recognition of qualifications, and graduate mobility between member countries, with many flow-on benefits. Continuing status in an Accord is subject to regular satisfactory peer-review, currently on a six-year cycle. Maintaining signatory status places some constraints on the accreditation processes operated by Engineers Australia.

2.3 Australian Vocational Education and Training Context

The aim of Australia's national VET system is to provide learners with the work-ready skills and qualifications needed to ensure that Australia's industry sectors continue to be productive and globally competitive.

The system is based on occupational skills standards, which are defined in units of competency which are specified within nationally endorsed training package qualifications or VET accredited courses (programs). These program offerings reflect nationally authorized qualifications and courses required for particular occupational categories which are aligned with the AQF and industry authorized skill sets.

In the Australian VET sector, RTOs are the designated training providers responsible for the delivery and assessment of nationally endorsed training package qualifications and VET accredited courses. Once learners have met the requirements of the training package qualification or VET accredited course, RTOs are authorized to issue the qualifications or statements of attainment for the completion of individual units of competency. Australian RTOs can offer VET qualifications ranging from Certificate 1 through to Graduate Diploma.

RTOs are not self-accrediting and are required to have their programs accredited by Commonwealth or state VET regulatory agencies detailed below, prior to the qualifications and courses being offered to learners.

A program of competency development, delivered by an RTO can be based on either:

(a) a national training package qualification endorsed by the Australian Industry and Skills Committee (AISC) in accordance with the Standards for Training Packages, or alternatively where a training package doesn't exist.

(b) a national or state VET accredited course accredited by either ASQA or the Victorian or Western Australia government VET regulators in accordance with the Standards for VET Accredited Courses

Furthermore, all RTOs are required to comply with the Standards for Registered Training Organisations and are regulated and audited by the either the Commonwealth based Australian Skills Quality Authority (ASQA) or the Victorian or Western Australian government VET regulatory authorities for qualifications and courses that only delivered within either of the above two states.

In developing and implementing competency programs and awarding qualifications, all RTOs and the above government agencies must comply with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF). The AQF is the national framework for regulated qualifications in the Australian secondary school, VET and higher education sectors. In a single document, the AQF provides learning outcome descriptors of knowledge, skills and application of knowledge and skills for each of 10 qualification levels, from certificates to doctorates.

The AQF spans the needs of the three educational sectors described above. The AQF has outcomes-based qualification descriptors which facilitates access to qualifications and pathways between the above three sectors. This enables individuals to move between the three sectors and ultimately the labour market. The AQF is intended to support individuals' lifelong learning objectives and enhance their national and international mobility. The AQF is benchmarked with other international qualification frameworks.

The AQF is a reference for professional accreditation agencies such as Engineers Australia. Accordingly, Engineers Australia has taken into account the educational levels of the AQF and has determined that the professional categories that it considers for accreditation of entry-to-practice programs which are aligned as follows:

- Professional Engineer – AQF Levels 8 and 9 (bachelor honours and master's degrees)

- Engineering Technologist – AQF Level 7 (bachelor's degree)

- Engineering Associate – AQF Level 6 (Advanced Diploma and Associate Degree)

Not all master's degree programs are eligible for accreditation; only master's degree programs that are entry-to-practice programs can be accredited (Reference [1], Section 7).

3. Basics of Accreditation

3.1 Background

Engineers Australia accredits named HE and VET engineering education programs, not generic degree or advanced diploma award titles, nor organisational entities such as universities, HE private providers, RTOs, faculties or schools. Individual engineering education programs in the HE and VET sectors are considered for accreditation at one of three occupational levels - Professional Engineer, Engineering Technologist or Engineering Associate, in accordance with the defined EA Stage 1 Competency Standard for their graduates.

EA considers programs for accreditation at the request of the Education/Training Provider offering a particular program or range of programs. EA accreditation is voluntary, not obligatory. Nevertheless, EA works with each provider to ensure that, once accredited, a program is re-evaluated on a five-year cycle.

In the VET sector, an engineering VET program is defined as a sequence of units of competency offered as either a nationally endorsed training package qualification or a VET accredited course in a specific discipline or field of specialisation, with uniquely defined vocational outcomes, and a clearly identified qualification title. A single program may incorporate different modes of learning (full-time, part-time, off-campus). A single program may have alternative pathways, including alternative campuses and articulation arrangements. In accreditation, all the implementation pathways for a particular program must be presented for evaluation. Program content is likely to be delivered by a wide variety of methods, including on-line and 'flipped classroom' (or 'blended learning') as well as by lectures, tutorial and workshops, and through laboratories, projects and case studies as well as formal and informal learning assessed via recognition of prior learning or recognition of current competencies.

EA undertakes accreditation of an RTO's programs with constructive intent and in the spirit of professional partnership. The accreditation evaluation process is one of peer-review, and encouragement of effective learning innovation that contributes to enhanced graduate performance. That said, the accreditation of engineering VET programs is governed by the Engineers Australia Accreditation Principles (AMS-POL-01) document (Reference [1]. The principles are consistent with: The Universities Australia/Professions Australia Joint Statement of Principles for Professional Accreditation (Reference [15]; the IEA Graduate Attributes and Professional Competencies (Reference [16]); and IEA/ENAEE Best Practice in Accreditation of Engineering Programmes (Reference [17]). The accreditation function is managed by the Australian Engineering Accreditation Centre, led by the National Manager Accreditation. Accreditation decisions are made by the EA Accreditation Board.

Program accreditation is a process of peer-evaluation against the EA Accreditation Criteria (Ref [2]). The criteria apply to all three qualification levels and incorporates the relevant EA Stage 1 Competency Standard. The 15 criteria against which each program is evaluated are grouped in three categories: the Competency Program (CP), the Operating Environment (CE),

and the Quality Systems (CS). In granting accreditation, each criterion must be satisfied, at least at a threshold level. Accredited programs are not ranked or merit graded. The normal period of accreditation for established programs is five years, identified by the calendar year of the commencing cohort of graduates.

The following sections provide summaries of the procedures that apply at various stages of accreditation.

3.2 General Reviews

Where possible, accreditation reviews (also known as Evaluation Reviews) are scheduled by the Accreditation Centre (in consultation with the particular RTO) so that all programs offered by the RTO are evaluated concurrently at intervals of five years. This evaluation process is referred to as a General Review. However, the RTO must formally submit a request to EA identifying the program or programs for which it is seeking accreditation.

Should EA be unable to schedule a General Review to re-evaluate established accredited programs within a five-year period, or should a school be unable to undertake a scheduled review for good reason, their existing accreditation status will normally be extended for one further calendar year. Where a program is scheduled for closure, accreditation can normally be extended from year to year for a limited time.

EA will acknowledge the accreditation request by issuing a date for submission of the mandatory Self-study Report and confirming the date of the evaluation visit. The Self-study Report provides the Evaluation Panel with the RTO's self-review against the Accreditation Criteria (Reference [2]). Guidelines for preparing the Self-study Report are detailed separately in Section 5 of this document.

The Accreditation Board appoints an independent Evaluation Panel comprising Discipline Experts to cover the programs and fields of practice to be evaluated. These panel members are senior academic and industry practitioners.

The Evaluation Panel meets by teleconference some 3-5 weeks prior to the visit to discuss its initial findings, based on the contents of the Self-study Report. The Panel provides a teleconference report for the RTO to advise on matters of concerns and to identify any additional data or information that is required. The schedule for the panel visit is confirmed after the teleconference (see Section 6).

Following the visit to the RTO, the Evaluation Panel drafts its formal Visit Report. This includes, for each program, its findings against the accreditation criteria based on the Self-study Report and the visit, and recommendations on accreditation (including any conditions), commendations, and recommendations for improvement. Prior to consideration by the Accreditation Board, a draft of the report (without recommendations) is released to the RTO for correction of any factual errors and identification of any matters of major concern. The amended report (including the panel's recommendations) is then considered by the Accreditation Board which finalises the decisions on accreditation and the final report. The term of accreditation is normally set one year later than the next planned General Review as a

safeguard against possible processing delays associated with the next review.

The range of possible accreditation outcomes is set out in Section 4.14. Where the Board sets conditions on accreditation, the report to the RTO will include mandatory requirement(s) on which action must be taken. The RTO must submit, by the specified date, an **Interim Report** on the actions taken to EA. Officers of the Accreditation Centre will then evaluate this report (consulting with the Panel, as necessary) and make recommendations to the Board to either remove the conditions or require the RTO to take further action(s) and submit a further report.

Full details of the process for a General Review are provided in Section 4 of this document. It should also be noted that Special Reviews may be scheduled for particular purposes distinct from and separate to the General Review cycle. The corresponding processes and requirements would be adapted from those for the General Review, but may, for example, not require a campus visit by a full Evaluation Panel.

3.3 Introducing New Programs

RTOs are required to advise Engineers Australia of their intention to introduce a new program. This will normally be undertaken as soon as internal institutional approval has been obtained for the program's introduction and must be provided prior to commencement of the first cohort of learners. New programs may be considered for EA accreditation in a General Review or offered for consideration in a Special Review.

Given the strong focus on graduate outcomes, a new program cannot be given full accreditation until after the emergence of the first cohort of graduates. To provide the school and its learners with reasonable reassurance, **Provisional Accreditation** may be accorded on the basis of compliance with the criteria to the extent possible at the time of the evaluation. A new program is considered for Full Accreditation when it reaches completion (i.e. graduation of its first sizeable intake of learners).

Consideration for Provisional Accreditation should normally be undertaken during the first year of operation of a new program. The EA evaluation will often require a campus visit. Documentation requirements and details of processes for the accreditation of new programs are provided in Section 7 of this document. It is important to seek Full Accreditation for a program as soon as practicable once the first representative cohort of graduates has completed the program.

For successful transition to Full Accreditation, the school must provide satisfactory documented responses to any recommendations made in the report of the Provisional Accreditation evaluation panel. The Evaluation Panel must also be able to inspect samples of learners' assessed work (such as final-year projects) and have access to a representative group of graduating or graduated learners.

At the very latest, Full Accreditation should be sought at the next scheduled General Review following the emergence of graduates.

Where evidence of compliance with the criteria is clear, Full Accreditation will be accorded

from the start date that applied for Provisional Accreditation, thus assuring the recognition of all graduates for both Engineers Australia membership and substantial equivalence in the IEA Education Accords.

3.4 Changes to Existing Programs

The terms of accreditation provide for on-going development of structure and content and the expectation of continuing improvement. It is normally be expected that such amendments lie within the framework of the programs' intended vocational outcomes (specified units of competency), approved as part of the accreditation process.

Where major amendments to an accredited program are being proposed, such as any that will result in changes to the program title or intended vocational outcomes, Engineers Australia must be notified in writing of such changes prior to their implementation.

In considering such major changes the Accreditation Board will decide whether to maintain continuing Full Accreditation or whether to consider the revised program for Provisional Accreditation. In either case, the status of accreditation will need to be re-affirmed once the first cohort of learners has graduated from the revised program. Further details on the consideration of program changes are provided in Section 7 of this document.

3.5 Alternative Modes of Learning and Implementation Pathways

Engineers Australia encourages innovative approaches to learning and assessment program design, leading to flexible learning options for learners and the provision of new engineering VET programs.

Alternative on-campus learning modes are commonly offered to learners within a single program definition and award title. Learners who are enrolled on-campus may undertake units of competency that are delivered on-line and assessed on or off campus. A single program implementation will include both core and elective units of competency, which can be delivered in sequence, concurrently or in clusters to facilitate integrative/project-based learning experiences.

In addition, learners may be admitted to a program with advanced standing on the basis of prior HE or VET studies or credit on the basis of recognition of prior learning via formal or informal learning or via recognition of current competencies.

Irrespective of the pathway taken to graduation, the named program must be designed to meet the stated objectives and deliver the same vocational outcomes. For a program to maintain ongoing accreditation, all pathways must be individually evaluated, and each pathway must meet the accreditation criteria concurrently. The accreditation processes for the alternative pathways and learning modes are thus coupled.

The cases of program implementation at multiple campuses and by external (distance) mode are discussed in the next Section 3.6: suffice it to state here that a program with the same qualification title cannot be accredited at any one location unless it is accredited for implementation at all locations.

Accreditation of alternative implementation pathways and flexibility in teaching, learning and assessment are discussed in more detail in Section 8 of this document.

3.6 Remote Campus, Distance Mode and Offshore Implementations

Some RTOs may offer engineering VET programs at Australian locations other than their home campus, at offshore locations, and in distance or on-line mode. Such program offerings may be alternative implementations of a program already established at an RTO's home campus and are thus **undifferentiated** in terms of vocational outcomes and award title. Alternatively, program offerings may be quite separate to programs offered on the home campus and are thus **fully differentiated** from the home campus programs with respect to their intended vocational outcomes and award titles.

Evaluation of programs implemented remotely from the home campus would not normally be carried out at the same time for logistical reasons. This means that accreditation reviews of alternative implementations of a particular program on separate campuses would not be synchronised. For undifferentiated programs, the implementation at each campus will require a separate General Review cycle, although the accreditation outcome at each location will be linked with the on-going accreditation of all other implementations of the program at that time. The term of accreditation at each campus will of course be limited to that for the individual review cycle set for that campus.

The implementation of engineering VET programs by external mode (distance) learning would normally be part of a General Review. Learners enrolled in this learning mode should have equivalent learning experiences to those of on-campus learners, including access to the full range of experimental and project work. The latter may require some on-campus attendance.

The IEA Education Accords now recognise accreditation of programs that are offered in differentiated or undifferentiated form by a Provider (RTO) that is headquartered in the jurisdiction of a signatory, but are delivered at a location outside of the national or territorial boundaries of that signatory. In the case of an Australian engineering school implementing a program at a location within the jurisdiction of another signatory to an IEA Accord, accreditation evaluation of the offshore offering would be initiated by Engineers Australia, but may be undertaken collaboratively with the signatory associated with the country of delivery. The offshore program implementation must satisfy the accreditation criteria of both signatories in order to be automatically recognised by the Accord. In the case of an undifferentiated program offered offshore, this implementation must be accredited by EA in order for onshore accreditation status to be maintained.

More detailed guidelines for the accreditation of remote campus, distance-based, and offshore implementations can be found in Section 8 of this document.

3.7 Articulation on the Basis of Advanced Standing

Guidelines for the accreditation of articulation pathways can also be found in Section 8 of this document. Where agreed learning credit for a particular articulation route exceeds the

equivalent of 50% of the competency program, the designated prior learning portfolio will need to be separately and formally evaluated as part of the accreditation process.

3.8 Discontinuation of Programs

Engineers Australia must be notified of any intention to discontinue an accredited program or individual implementation of a program, together with arrangements for providing ongoing delivery to currently enrolled learners. A terminating year will be determined to conclude the accreditation term. This will normally correspond with the last year of intake of learners to the program, thus covering the recognition of this final enrolled cohort.

3.9 Publication of Accreditation Status and Term

Engineers Australia publishes two lists on its website for each Educational Provider including RTOs and qualification level.

The first is a listing of currently accredited programs (designated by their qualification titles) that includes, for each program, the start date for accreditation, as accorded by the Accreditation Board. This is the calendar year of the first intake of learners to the accredited program and named qualification. The status of accreditation is identified as F (for Full Accreditation) and P (for Provisional Accreditation). The listing also states the year in which the next General Review is scheduled.

The second list is of discontinued programs. The terminating year for these is the last (most recent) year of intake of learners who may be eligible to graduate from the named program.

Where a learner is continually enrolled in a fully accredited engineering program, and where such enrolment overlaps at least partially with the published term of accreditation, once qualifying for the named award, the learner will be deemed to have graduated from the accredited program.

3.10 Publicising of Accreditation Outcomes by Education Providers

RTOs may publish statements to the effect that certain of their programs are accredited by Engineers Australia. The RTO is responsible for ensuring the accuracy of such statements, and in particular, must avoid making statements which might be read as implying that certain programs are accredited where it is not the case.

Accreditation visit reports are confidential between Engineers Australia and the RTO 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 RTO should be notified. Excerpts taken out of context are specifically not authorised.

4. Procedure for a General Review

The following sequence of steps normally applies to the General Review process. The General Review will evaluate the full range of eligible engineering programs offered by the particular RTO, normally on a five-year cycle. The General Review is undertaken by an Evaluation Panel (also known as an Accreditation Panel) appointed by the Accreditation Board.

4.1 Request for Accreditation

For an RTO that has programs that are already accredited, the EA Accreditation Centre will issue an early reminder that re-accreditation is due and request the RTO to submit a formal request for re-accreditation (see Section 4.2) and make the necessary preparations. The RTO may include new programs in their request. A template (Reference [6]) is provided for the Provider.

In the case of new programs (other than those that are included in a General Review), major amendments to existing accredited programs and for the introduction of alternative implementations of existing programs, such as at remote or offshore campuses, the RTO needs to advise Engineers Australia and request accreditation. Such requests may be submitted at any time, but it should be borne in mind that accreditation activities are scheduled on a calendar-year basis, and it may be necessary to schedule a Special Review.

4.2 Scheduling of Accreditation General Reviews

The EA Accreditation Centre commences preparation of the annual Accreditation Master Schedule not later than July of the year prior to the calendar year of review. RTOs should submit their requests for accreditation by July/August of the year before the review. The Accreditation Centre will negotiate with the RTO a target date for the evaluation visit, and an agreed date for the receipt of the Self-study Report (also referred to as an Accreditation Submission, a Self-assessment Report, or Self-evaluation Report) from the engineering school.

4.3 Submission of the Self-study Report

An RTO must submit a comprehensive document that explicitly addresses the accreditation criteria (Reference [2]) and provides *prima facie* evidence that the criteria are met. Guidelines on the preparation of the Self-study Report are contained in Section 5 of the present document. The Self-study Report is required eight weeks prior to the scheduled visit and should be provided to the Operations Manager, Accreditation. Unless specifically requested, this document must be provided in electronic format. EA will then make the Self-study Report available to each member of the Evaluation Panel.

4.4 Selection and Approval of the Evaluation Panel

The Accreditation Board appoints the Evaluation Panel, comprising the following membership:
- Chair

- Core team (including the Chair) of typically two to ten Discipline Experts as members, chosen for their broad experience of engineering and their ability to evaluate the generic program outcomes and quality systems. The core team will include at least one member with extensive academic experience and one member with extensive experience of employing engineering graduates in practice situations. The Board aims to attain reasonable gender balance.

- Engineers Australia Officer(s)

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. EA operates a Conflict of Interest Policy in its selection of Panel members, to ensure independence from the RTO under evaluation. The RTO will be advised of the composition of the Evaluation Panel prior to the visit (or desktop review if a visit is not considered necessary).

4.5 Use of Non-visiting Consultants on Evaluation Panels

On occasions EA will include in the core team, one or more non-visiting Discipline Experts 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.

A Non-visiting Consultant would be expected to:

- Read the submission documents and VET competency program details appropriate to their field of technical expertise.

- Highlight any particular issues to do with program delivery, learning and assessment resources, quality systems, as well as the structure and content of the program(s) under consideration.

- Participate in any pre-visit teleconference held by the Evaluation Panel.

- 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 Evaluation 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's visit report as requested.

The names of any non-visiting Panel members will be included in the Panel list provided to the RTO.

4.6 Roles of Engineers Australia Officers

The National Manager, Accreditation has responsibility for the overall accreditation function and provides the primary interface between the RTO and the Accreditation Board. Engineers Australia has also appointed a number of Accreditation Visit Managers, working under the leadership of the National Manager, who are competent in the management of the accreditation visit process. The National Manager may also on occasions fulfill the Visit Manager role when required. The Operations Manager, Accreditation takes responsibility for the operational implementation of visit planning and management on behalf of the National Manager.

For each accreditation visit, the Accreditation Board assigns an accreditation Visit Manager to facilitate the work of the Evaluation Panel, principally to ensure that the published accreditation principles (Reference [1]), accreditation standards and supporting user guide (References [2] and [3]) and accreditation procedures (this document) are appropriately applied. The Visit Manager also provides a resource to the Panel, and normally participates as a Panel member, and as a Discipline Expert where the background and qualifications of the incumbent are appropriate. The Visit Manager is also the point of contact for the RTO to ensure that the panel's requests for further information are met. The Visit Manager has responsibility for drafting the visit report, on behalf of the panel, but with input from panel members, and for finalising the report in collaboration with the Panel Chair and all members of the Panel.

The Accreditation Project Manager is responsible for logistics associated with the visit and may participate in the visit in support of the Evaluation Panel when required, providing a logistics support function.

4.7 Panel Observers

From time to time Engineers Australia receives requests from other Australian and overseas accrediting bodies, including other Accord signatories, wishing to have observers participate in the evaluation processes of Engineers Australia accreditation panels. Similarly, requests may arise from the host RTO, 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 RTO of the engineering school and/or its programs. All such observers must be approved by the Accreditation Board, and also by the host RTO.

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, learners and external stakeholders, as well as panel private sessions where a panel is viewing learning and assessment materials and learner work or formulating its findings and recommendations.

- During all interactive sessions, observers are asked to refrain from asking questions or participating at all in the discussion.

- Observers are welcome to speak privately with either the panel Chair, Visit Manager or National Manager, Accreditation 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.

4.8 Pre-visit Teleconference

The panel will normally meet by teleconference some 3-5 weeks prior to the scheduled visit. The purpose of this teleconference is to provide an opportunity for panel members to share their initial findings after consideration of the Self-study Report and supporting 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 the draft schedule for the visit proceedings.

A brief teleconference report will normally be compiled by the 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. The report contains a standard list of materials, including learner assessed work and minutes of relevant committees, etc., that should be available to the panel during the visit (See Section 5.4). The teleconference report will be sent by the Accreditation Centre to the engineering school for advice and for response to the request for additional information. Where possible, the additional information will be distributed to panel members prior to the visit.

4.9 Visit Schedule

Included with the teleconference report will be a draft Visit Schedule detailing various sessions and activities proposed for the visit. A typical Visit Schedule for a General Review with three program areas is provided in the Appendix of this document.

The schedule will be subsequently finalised by the Accreditation Project Manager in negotiation with the engineering school, and usually in consultation with the Visit Manager. The engineering 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 teaching staff and the external constituents who will be attending sessions with the panel.

4.10 Initial Face-to-Face Meeting of the Evaluation Panel

A private meeting of the Evaluation Panel is normally held at the start of the campus visit. This meeting includes a refresher briefing presentation to panel members by the Visit Manager and

enables the panel: to consider any additional supporting information submitted by the RTO; to finalise strategic questions for each of the visit sessions; and to start to look at learners' assessed work and other material provided.

4.11   Campus Visit

The campus visit normally extends over 2 - 3 days and involves (with the exception of non-visiting panel members) all members of the Evaluation Panel. Overall, the campus visit enables the panel to evaluate the RTO's performance against the Accreditation Criteria, for each program. The visit sessions enable staff members, learners, graduates and other key stakeholders to explain and elaborate on matters of concern (to the panel). These, together with the materials tabled and facilities viewed, provide further evidence for validation and evaluation of the claims made, against the accreditation criteria, in the Self-study Report.

More specifically, the key functions of the campus visit are to:

- Assess and discuss the effectiveness of the learning and assessment program management system and quality assurance processes described in the Self-study Report.

- Evaluate the tone and calibre of the staff, learners and graduates, the learning culture and the scholarship of teaching and learning, and the linkages with engineering industry practice.

- Evaluate the approach to learning and assessment program design and review, and in particular the engagement of industry and other stakeholder input to these processes.

- Evaluate and discuss diagnostic, formative and summative assessment processes by examining support materials, assessment tasks, sample examination scripts and examples of assessed learner work, moderation processes.

- Evaluate the capacity of the program to deliver appropriate knowledge, foundation skills, engineering application ability, in-depth technical competence, professional practice competencies, personal attributes, laboratory and practical learning and exposure to professional practice.

- Assess and discuss aspects of the operating environment described in the Self-study Report – in particular, institutional support for the VET competency programs, the teaching staff profile, physical facilities and resources, funding and learner profile trends and strategic management.

- Evaluate other factors that relate to the accreditation criteria, but are not clearly or adequately presented in the Self-study Report.

- Inform the senior officer/s representing the RTO of the Panel's principal findings. At the conclusion of the visit, the panel Chair outlines the commendations, recommendations on accreditation, and recommendations for improvement that it

intends to make to the Accreditation Board. The panel Chair explains that these points are not definitive at this stage, and that the Board will make the decisions on these recommendations and the final form of the report. The Visit Manager outlines the likely timing for completion of the draft report. This will include an opportunity for the Provider to see – and comment on – the Panel's findings in draft (see section 4.13) prior to consideration by the Accreditation Board.

4.12 Activities Associated with the Campus Visit

The campus visit schedule will be developed specifically for each General Review. This will take account of the unique characteristics associated with the RTO, its engineering school and programs.

Most campus visits will however follow a reasonably standard pattern of activities and include formal interview sessions for the full Evaluation Panel with:

- the senior leadership team of the engineering school
- the leadership teams of the individual programs (usually in broad discipline groupings)
- external constituents including members of the industry advisory body, a representation of employers and graduates of the programs.

The Evaluation Panel also welcomes the opportunity to meet briefly with the RTO's Chief Executive (or senior representative) as a scheduled part of the visit program.

For evaluation of discipline-specific programs within a multi-discipline General Review, the Panel will invariably subdivide into discipline 'sub-panels' for meetings with teaching staff and learners from all stages of the programs under consideration, and for tours of facilities including laboratories, learning studios, workshops and learning resource centres.

Where a program is under consideration for transition from Provisional Accreditation status, specific sessions may need to be arranged for sub-panels to interview a representative sample of graduates.

The Panel must be able to view learning and assessment materials, learner work and documentary records of the VET management system and quality assurance processes. If these are to be provided only in electronic form, all Panel members must be furnished with electronic access, and not rely on educational networks such as *Eduroam*.

Section 5.4 of this document details the list of materials that should be made available for inspection during the visit. Representative examples of learning materials and resources, assessment instruments and assessed learner work are requested.

In addition, prime documentation associated with teaching, learning and assessment planning, review, management and quality improvement also should be made available. Learner and graduate outcomes and perceptions survey data pertaining to the programs should also be provided, together with information on actions taken as a result of findings. There should be records of formal meeting proceedings, follow up action records, and stakeholder interaction

(including any stakeholder surveys of graduate employability, etc.)

4.13   Draft Visit Report and School Response

As soon as possible after the visit, and normally within 6 - 8 weeks, a report is drafted by the Accreditation Visit Manager, in conjunction with the Panel Chair and all members of the Panel. The draft report is based on the evaluation of the Self-study Report, 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 draft report contains the Panel's recommendations on accreditation, including any conditions and corresponding requirements on which the Provider must take action and report, and recommendations for improvement for subsequent consideration by the Education Provider.

The first draft of this report is peer-reviewed by another Visit Manager for coverage and consistency with other visit reports. After any necessary suitable revision, the National Manager, Accreditation releases the second draft – but without the recommendations – to the RTO. The RTO has two weeks from the date of receipt of the draft report, to provide a written response. This is limited to correction of any errors of fact and for 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.

4.14   Final Visit Report and Board Decisions

The draft report (including the Panel's recommendations) is then finalised by the Visit Manager, noting the RTO's response and if necessary, incorporating it in full. This is forwarded to the Board for consideration at its next meeting.

For each program evaluated, the Board may decide to:

- Accord or renew Full Accreditation for a five-year period without conditions.

- Accord or renew Full Accreditation for five years, subject to Condition(s) that are set out in the report as mandatory reporting requirement(s). In accepting this decision, the school agrees to provide specified information or to take specified actions and report on them in an Interim Report, within a specified period normally within one year. If the agreement is not honoured, or if the Interim Report 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 evaluation visit.

- 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, accord Provisional Accreditation with a further review of the program to occur as soon as possible following completion of the learning program by the first sizeable intake of

learners. Maintaining Provisional Accreditation may also be subject to Conditions and reporting requirements(s).

- Suspend accreditation for a limited term and during such time the RTO may 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.

- Decline or withdraw accreditation; in such case, a further application is not normally considered within two years.

The decision of the Accreditation Board, together with the final report, is then sent to the RTO.

The RTO may appeal against a decision not to accord accreditation. 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. The process is described further in Reference [1], Section 5.8.

5. Preparation for a General Review

The RTO must provide documentary evidence to establish its claim that each program satisfies the Accreditation Criteria (Reference [2]) and delivers graduates who meet the relevant EA Stage 1 Competency Standard (References [10 – 12]). The following advice has been prepared to assist the RTO with the preparation of the Self-study Report, and provision of the information that should be available to the Evaluation Panel not later than the commencement of the visit. This document must be read in conjunction with the Accreditation Criteria User Guide – Vocational Education and Training (Reference [3]).

5.1 Structure, Content and Standard of the Self-study Report

The Self-study Report should follow the form of the template (Reference [5]) provided on the EA Accreditation website. It will include an introductory section with primary contact information and the programs listed in the accreditation request. This should be followed by a brief report on specific actions taken in response to the recommendation for improvement stated in the previous accreditation visit report.

The bulk of the Self-study Report will be a succinct and coherent self-analysis, reporting against the accreditation criteria. Each criterion must be addressed in a definitive manner and be sufficient for the Evaluation Panel to form a reasonable judgement on attainment against each accreditation criterion. The Accreditation Criteria document (Reference [2]), suggests items of evidence for the attainment for each criterion. While each and every criterion must be addressed, it is not expected that the Self-study Report will respond in detail to every individual item of suggested evidence.

The accreditation process is fundamentally focused on the teaching, learning and assessment processes and VET management systems that are in place. Accordingly, much of the documentation and data requested should already exist preparing the Self-study Report should not require specific research. A good submission may well provide self-analysis against

the criteria for accreditation in an overview format, with pointers to attached evidence and other support material. For example, each program specification (required as part of Criterion CP1) is likely to include reference to the RTO's public statements on the program's purpose and content.

It is generally preferred that the Self-study Report is provided as a stand-alone document with supporting appendices providing the substantiating material in a systematically indexed fashion. In most cases it will be appropriate to provide the full set of documents in electronic form, rather than in hard copy; the documentation will then be shared with Panel Members using Engineers Australia's document sharing application.

In reporting against the criteria covering the '*Operating Environment'* (CE) and the '*Quality Systems'* (CQ), a single, unified faculty or school-based analysis may well be appropriate. This will be particularly so where a consistent operating management framework is maintained for all program streams. In reporting against the criteria dealing with '*Competency Programs'* (CP), there may be common management frameworks, but it will often be appropriate for the report to branch out into sub-sections that analysing each individual program (or program group) separately against each criterion in this category. Any material variations in the management systems implemented in the schools or departments in a large faculty or school should be reported.

The Panel may request further information relevant to the criteria, after the Panel Teleconference and during the visit. It will be helpful if the Self-study Report indicates, in relation to each criterion, any further evidence that may be available in addition to that provided.

The Self-study Report should be succinct and concise as effectiveness demands. Typically, addressing the criteria associated with the *Operating Environment* and *Quality Systems*, often common to all programs in an engineering school, would be expected to be in the range of 20 - 40 pages. Typically, the text would also reference the RTO's policies, procedures and other documents that may be included in Appendices, or as website links. The presentation of the program specification, mappings, learning and assessment design/plan for each individual program would be expected to be less than 15 pages in length. Unit of Competency outline documents and learning and assessment materials for each program would typically be made available electronically in Appendices to the Self-study Report and be uploaded to the EA Accreditation document sharing application.

It is essential that the Self-study Report includes unambiguous data on enrolment and graduation numbers for each program for recent years, presented as in the EA template (Reference [7]). Graduation numbers are particularly important for programs being considered for transition to Full Accreditation. In addition, the Self-study Report should include, in response to specific criteria: annual learner success and retention rates, as defined in the national AVETMISS data sets, to which RTOs routinely respond; relevant graduate perceptions and employment data; teaching staff profile and short CVs (including part-time guests from industry who make substantive contributions to the delivery of the program), in the forms

specified in References [8-9].

5.2 Initial Submission of Documentation

In addition to the Self-study Report and its Appendices, the RTO should submit:

- The RTO's Calendar or equivalent

- The Handbook, Calendar supplement, or other official publication relating to the engineering school, and containing the public statements of program details.

- Major current items of promotional literature concerning engineering programs and/or website references to these items.

Documentation should be received by the EA Accreditation Centre eight weeks prior to the scheduled for the start of the visit. The Accreditation Office will make all the documentation available to Evaluation Panel members.

5.3 Information to be available for Inspection during the Panel Visit

The Self-study Report, including its Appendices and web links, and other information outlined above should provide the Panel with a large proportion of the documentary evidence (mostly in electronic forms) required to make its judgments of the program(s) against the Accreditation Criteria.

It is helpful, nevertheless for hard copies of the following to be available at the commencement of the visit:

- Copies of all current promotional literature relevant to the programs

- A list showing the name/s of the staff member/s currently responsible for delivery of each unit of competency (including core and elective units taught from outside engineering mathematics, science and management) in each program.

- Any RTO or school annual reports

If not already supplied, the Panel should be provided with access (in hard copy or electronic form) to:

- The complete set of current approved units of competency outlines for each program, as distributed to learners.

- Learning and assessment plan utilised to manage learners' progression through each program.

- The provider's and/or engineering school's Human Resource Policy documents, including:

    o Appointment and tenure (an example of selection criteria would be welcome)

    o Promotion (an example of promotion criteria would be welcome)

  o Continuing professional development – as an engineering teacher and professional educator

  o Supervision and staff counselling

  o Appointment, training, supervision and counselling of sessional staff

  o Any merit-based reward systems

The Panel will need to be confident that the school's learner records management system is fit for purpose. The Panel would not expect access to the system but may request to see examples of examinations committee and related policies, procedures and outcomes, including qualification transcripts and statements of attainment.

The following table lists the range of materials that must be available for inspection, as requested to the school in the pre-visit teleconference report. These materials enable the Panel to more completely understand and triangulate the evidence provided in the Self-study Report and during the Panel sessions.

Material	Purpose of inspection
Records of school/program teaching team meetings, program design and review meetings, **meetings of the External Advisory Committee and any other industry advisory bodies**, Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee meetings, Quality Committee meetings, program annual review reports. (Note 1)	To track the processes of learning and assessment design, review and continuous improvement at the program and school levels.
Learner - Staff Consultative Committee meetings and other **learner feedback mechanisms**, records tracking outcomes/actions from survey feedback, including the CEI survey instrument. (Note 1)	To determine the extent of learner feedback, and how it is used, with learners as part of the continuous improvement process
The full range of **assessment instruments and representative examples of assessed learner responses** - including examinations, assignment work, tests, laboratory and practical work, projects. (Notes 2,3)	To track learner capability development (through learner work); to track the aggregation of the elements and performance criteria (through units of competency from the training package or VET accredited course).
A good representation of **major project and design reports representing the outcomes of integrated learning events is essential**. An indication of assessed performance standard should be provided for all examples of submitted work. (Notes 2,3)	To track the learners' development in group work and major project work.
A representative range of **assessed final year**	To judge the standard of capstone activities; to assist in determining that final year learners are

design/project reports (Notes 2,3)	able to undertake individual and group major project work; that they are ready for the professional workplace.
Examples of **work experience reports** and other documents that verify learners' exposure to professional practice. (Notes 2,3)	To assist in determining the learners' exposure to professional practice (throughout the program and through work placement).
Submitted **outcomes of reflective practices**, undertaken by learners. (Notes 2,3)	To determine whether the learners are able to be self-critical and have reflected on the value of their learning experiences and their future careers as Engineering Associates.

Notes:
1. For a provisional accreditation, examples in use for other programs within the school/department may be used to demonstrate the systems already in place.
2. For all displayed material it is expected that examples of learners' work will be drawn just from the most recent calendar year.
3. For a provisional accreditation, examples of learner work may be limited. For full accreditation, it is expected that this evidence will be made fully available.

Where material listed above is to be provided to the Panel electronically, it is essential that each Panel member has a dedicated log-in, so that they can use their own device, or has access to a dedicated terminal set up for their use. In either case, access to the requested information must be straightforward, reliable and user-friendly.

5.4 Document Templates

Templates supporting the Self-study Report are available on the website of the Engineers Australia Accreditation Centre.

AMS-TPL-315 VET Accreditation Submission (Self-study Report) - Reference [5]

AMS-TPL-316 Table of VET Programs Offered for Accreditation - Reference [6]

AMS-TPL-317 VET Admissions and Enrolments - Reference [7]

AMS-TPL-318 VET Engineering School Teaching Staff Profile - Reference [8]

AMS-TPL-319 VET Staff CV pro forma - Reference [9]

6. Visit Procedure

The visit procedure is managed by Engineers Australia, with key inputs from the RTO. This section elaborates on several parts of Section 4 of this document.

6.1 Visit Schedule

A draft visit schedule is prepared by Engineers Australia (see Section 4.9) in close collaboration with the RTO. An example draft schedule for a multi-program General Review is included at an Appendix to this document.

The RTO will be asked to review the draft schedule, mark any proposed changes, and add venue details for each session, and the names of participants for the principal sessions. As well as the meeting sessions, the schedule must contain a number of Panel private sessions during which materials can be inspected, Panel findings can be discussed, and preliminary recommendations can be compiled.

6.2 Main Venue

A dedicated venue ('home room') is required for the Evaluation Panel for the duration of the visit as many as possible of the interview sessions will be conducted in this venue. The Evaluation Panel will be anxious to minimise time lost in transit between scheduled sessions. It is requested that the displayed documentation and teaching, learning and assessment materials (Section 5.4) are within this venue or close by and are available for the duration of the visit.

The home room – and meeting table – and must be sufficiently large for each Panel Member to have adequate table space to spread a considerable amount of reference documentation, as well as for the school's representatives to participate in the interview sessions.

The following are requested to be made available to the Panel in the home room:

- Electronic access to RTO materials, as may be required; all panel members should be able to view the materials on their platforms, or on platforms supplied by the RTO (note that not all panel members will have access via *Eduroam*)
- Data projector and screen preferably set up for use with a computer provided by the RTO - this must be readily available for the Panel on arrival at the home room.

The Panel should also have access to a printer. Frequently, any printing required by the Panel is undertaken in a school office, with the required material being held on the Visit Manager's memory stick.

6.3 Panel Members

The panel composition is determined by the EA Accreditation Board, based on the list of programs offered for evaluation (Section 4.4). At the start of the visit the Panel has a private briefing session (Section 4.10) that invariably requires the data projector.

6.4 Opening Session with the Senior Leadership Team

The visit proper begins with a meeting with the Senior Leadership Team of the engineering school. The attendees are expected to include (allowing for appropriate provider titles):

- Head of the Engineering School

- Head of Teaching and Learning

- Quality Assurance Officer (Teaching and Learning)

- Heads of Engineering Departments

- Executive Officer and/or Business Manager

- Any other key staff that the School wishes to be included

The Panel Chair formally opens the session, and together with the Visit Manager, explains the contexts for accreditation process and visit.

The Chair then invites the Head of the Engineering School to provide a very brief overview presentation, in particular highlighting the teaching, learning and assessment approach and strategic directions of the school. **This opening presentation must be strictly limited to 15 minutes to allow adequate time for Panel questions and discussion.** Ideally, an electronic copy of the presentation should be provided to the Visit Manager prior to the completion of the visit.

The Panel will follow up with relevant questions. These are likely to be of broad coverage and strategic matters, rather than on specific program offerings. Specific issues of interest will include the teaching, learning and assessment design, resourcing/funding models in place, review and continuous improvement processes, learning and assessment program leadership within the school, quality systems, industry interaction, industry advisory mechanisms, and the broad objectives, targeted outcomes and structure of the programs.

6.5 Exit Meeting with the Senior Leadership Team

The Exit Meeting held at the conclusion of the visit is normally held with the Senior Leadership Team to 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 intended to convey information to the RTO of how the panel views progress to date and is not seen as an opportunity for further discussion and input. (See Sections 4.11 and 4.13)

6.6 Meetings with Program Leaders

In these sessions the panel has detailed discussion with those staff members (Program Leaders/Conveners), with specific accountability for leadership of the program design and implementation (including the teaching teams) for each of the programs under discussion. **Members of the Senior Leadership Team not involved in direct program leadership should not be in attendance.**

In tracking the conception and performance of the programs against the Accreditation Criteria,

the panel will be particularly interested to explore aspects such as:

- Program objectives and intended vocational outcomes Learning and assessment design
- Quality systems
- Detailed knowledge and skills content
- Benchmarking
- Professional practice exposure
- Industry advisory input
- Tracking learners' generic capability development
- Setting standards of technical competence
- Foundation skills development
- Business and management skills development
- Mathematics skill development
- Engineering design, complex problem solving and project skills development
- Learner input to the processes of continuous quality improvement
- Quantum and quality of laboratory and practical learning

6.7 Meetings with Teaching Staff

The Panel (usually as a small sub-panel of Discipline Experts) meets with all full-time teaching staff involved in delivery of each program (or program group), including those external to the School and responsible for supporting content. The **Program Leaders should not be in attendance**, unless they are undertaking significant program teaching and are not the line manager of the teaching staff.

The sub-panel members will lead discussion on aspects of the selection and packaging of the units of competency, the learning and assessment program design, knowledge and skills content, delivery, learner assessment and performance evaluation, as well as other aspects of quality assurance to triangulate against the accreditation criteria.

The Panel will not record the names of the staff attending these meetings.

6.8 Laboratory and Teaching Facilities Inspection

The Panel (usually as separate sub-panels) must be able to inspect laboratories, workshop, studio and project spaces, and other relevant learning support facilities relevant to the program or group of programs. Key technical support staff as well as key teaching staff should be available during the tour for discussion and questioning.

6.9 Meeting with Technical and Administration Staff

An informal morning or afternoon tea is requested with technical and administrative staff of the Schools. Panel members will speak informally with staff, taking the opportunity of gaining

a further perspective on broad, learning support issues.

6.10 Inspection of Learner Work and Other Documentation

In Section 5.3 it is noted that certain information is requested to be provided for inspection when the Panel is on site. The opportunity for the Panel to view learning and assessment materials, examples of assessed learner work, quality assurance processes and other documentation not included in the Self-study Report is a key element of the evaluation process during the visit and RTOs should take particular care to ensure that the information is readily available to the Panel.

6.11 Meetings with Learners

The Panel must meet with representative groups of enrolled learners in each of the programs under consideration. Learners from all stages/year levels should be present but with a higher representation of learners from the final stage/year. The meeting should comprise female and male learners as well as representation of international learners.

The sub-panel for each program group will lead the discussion. **Staff should not be in attendance at these learner sessions.** The focus of the questions will be on learner perceptions and learning experiences and learner input and involvement in the overall quality processes. It is expected that 20-25 learner representatives would attend each of the scheduled sessions. The Panel will not record the names of learners but will record the numbers in each program and year of learning.

6.12 Meetings with Graduates for Programs under Consideration for Transition to Full Accreditation (as required)

Programs under consideration for transition from Provisional Accreditation status at a General Review may have allocated time for meeting(s) of the relevant sub-panel(s) to interview a representative group(s) of recent graduates. **At least five graduates for each program should be in attendance.** The Accreditation Centre and Visit Manager will discuss with the RTO whether the timing of the visit, with respect to the availability of graduates and graduates' assessed work, allows for such a meeting. If it does take place, it is quite in order for some of the graduates to phone into a teleconference facility to respond to the sub-Panel's questions. Such teleconference sessions may be arranged to be shortly after the visit and reported within the Visit Report. (Also see Section 7.1.2.)

6.13 External Stakeholders – Advisory Committees, Graduates and Employers

This meeting is to provide the Panel with an opportunity to interact with external stakeholders and direct recent beneficiaries (graduates) of each program. The stakeholders will include program-based industry advisers to the school and for specific programs, a representation of employers and a representation of graduates/alumni from recent years. An informal meeting is suggested to maximise the exchanges between the external stakeholders and the Panel. The

meeting greatly assists the Panel to gain understanding of industry engagement with the programs and its perceptions of learners and graduates, and the experiences of recent graduates.

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. **It is requested that the venue is suitable for effective informal conversation.**

The Head of the Engineering School will normally host this session and have a **small number of his senior colleagues' present**. It is appropriate for the Head of School to invite the panel Chair to introduce the members of the Evaluation Panel, explain the context and purpose of this meeting, and thank the external stakeholders for their attendance.

6.14   Meeting with the Provider's Chief Executive Office or Representative

The panel greatly values a short meeting (of approximately 20 - 30 minutes) with the RTO's CEO or nominee, other than the Head of the Engineering School, primarily to explore issues of a strategic nature, including the positioning of engineering within the institution's profile and mission, and related matters of academic staffing and staff development, physical resources, learner profile trends, strategic planning, budget process, research and industry links and quality systems. The Head of the Engineering School may also attend the meeting if so desired by the CEO.

6.15   General Availability of Leadership Team Members

Heads of School and Program Leaders should be available during times of private meetings of the Panel, in order to respond to any specific queries or concerns that may arise.

6.16   Panel Amenity

It is requested that light sandwich lunches, tea and coffee be made available for the Panel at the designated Private Panel sessions listed on the Visit Schedule. Panel members will usually work privately over lunch and other breaks.

The Accreditation Project Officer will liaise with the RTO about local transportation options for the Panel transfers between the accommodation venue and the campus. This will be at EA's cost.

7. Introducing New Programs and Program Amendments

7.1 New Program Implementation on an Established Campus

An established school of engineering may choose to introduce a new program within the context of an existing operating framework and established quality systems already considered by Engineers Australia as part of the most recent General Review of programs. This may include operation on the RTO's home campus and other established campuses.

Where the new program is in a pioneering field of engineering, or where an established RTO is contemplating the establishment of a new engineering school, advice might be sought from the Accreditation Board. In such cases, the Board may appoint an experienced person to respond to questions or may suggest persons who may be consulted directly.

Provision of such advice expressly does not constitute any guarantee of ultimate accreditation. Further, the Board or any of its members will not involve themselves in any way in the engagement of consultants, or in any other active contribution to program design.

Where the intention is to seek accreditation for a new program, Engineers Australia should be notified in writing prior to commencement of the first learner cohort. It is suggested that this notification be instigated at the time the proposal is submitted for approval through the RTO's internal program approval processes.

Formal application for Provisional Accreditation of the new program should be made during the first year of operation. For an established RTO in 'good standing', this may coincide with a General Review. Otherwise, for a new RTO in engineering, consideration will take the form of a Special Review.

The evaluation for Provisional Accreditation is discussed further in Section 7.1.1. It should be noted that in most cases, the Evaluation Panel will make recommendations intended to assist the RTO to complete the detailed design and implementation of the whole program.

A new program cannot be considered for Full Accreditation until the first, sizeable, regular cohort of learners has graduated. The evaluation process for transition from Provisional Accreditation to Full Accreditation status is discussed in Sec 7.1.2.

7.1.1 Consideration of Provisional Accreditation

Irrespective of whether the EA evaluation is undertaken at a General or Special Review, the RTO will need to submit adequate documentation. The Self-study Report for Provisional Accreditation should be developed against the Accreditation Criteria defined in Reference [2] and follow the Guidelines provided in Reference [3].

A new RTO would need to provide a comprehensive Self-study Report covering all criteria.

The Self-study Report from an established RTO in 'good standing' (meaning that all programs offered by the school were accredited at the last General Review without significant difficulty) should not, in general, duplicate material already submitted for the most recent General

Review but may make reference to any appropriate material in these documents. In most instances the criteria dealing with the Operating Environment and the Quality Systems will have been substantially addressed in the most recent General Review submission. It is only necessary to respond to individual criterion where circumstances or issues are differentiated for the new program or where changes in the environment have occurred since the most recent General Review.

For all RTOs, to cover the Competency Program criteria, it will be necessary to develop an appropriate response addressing the specific objectives, vocational outcomes, qualification title, program structure, knowledge and skills content, implementation details and professional practice exposure issues incorporated in the new program. A clear rationale for the new program should demonstrates appropriate consultation with industry, and other research that has established projected demand for graduates.

For a new program in a well-established school in good standing, Provisional Accreditation of a new program may be considered on the basis of a Special Review, undertaken as a Desktop assessment of the Self-study Report. Otherwise, and in most cases, the Accreditation Board will require a Panel Visit to consider the new program. This would normally occur in the first year of operation, where a sizeable cohort of learners has been enrolled. The Board has discretion to determine whether and when a Visit is required.

In evaluating a new program, the Evaluation Panel will invariably make recommendations to assist the engineering school to develop and implement a program that has the potential to meet the requirements for Full Accreditation, once graduates have completed the program.

7.1.2 Transition to Full Accreditation

As noted previously a new program cannot be accorded Full Accreditation before it has been fully implemented and at least one substantive (representative) cohort of graduates has completed the program. EA should be advised in writing once this cohort enters its final year of learning. An update on the Self-study Report for Provisional Accreditation should be prepared, again responding to the accreditation criteria by addressing any changes in circumstances and the experiences and outcomes arising from the full implementation of the program. It is particularly important that the new Self-study Report reports in detail the actions taken and progress made on any recommendations in the Provisional Accreditation report provided by the previous Evaluation Panel.

The key considerations for the transition to Full Accreditation (whether undertaken during a General Review or Special Review) will be the Panel's evaluation of the RTO's Self-study Report and documented responses to recommendations made in the Provisional Accreditation, the quality of assessed learner work in the final learning year of the program, and the outcomes of discussion with graduates.

At the very latest, application Full Accreditation should be made at the next scheduled General Review following the emergence of the first graduates This would allow for a scheduled meeting for these and more recent graduates (see Section 6.12).

By agreement with the Accreditation Centre, assessment could be undertaken at the completion of the final semester of learning of the first graduating cohort, provided sufficient access can be provided to representative examples of assessed final year learner work, and also to a representative group of graduating learners.

Where consideration has to be undertaken as a Special Review the Accreditation Centre will make suitable visit arrangements. Where Full Accreditation is considered in between General Review visits and the school is in good standing, a visit by one senior Panel member (per program or program group) may be sufficient. The evaluation may be possible without a visit, providing adequate teleconference(s) can be set up with graduates.

In other cases, particularly for consideration of a set of new programs offered by a new engineering school, a Full Panel visit will be necessary.

The reported outcome of this evaluation process, like that of a General Review, will include recommendations on accreditation (including any conditions and mandatory reporting requirements), commendations, and recommendations for improvement.

7.2 New Program Implementation for a Remote or Offshore Campus

For an established offshore campus or one that is remote from the home campus, with accredited professional engineering programs already in place, the accreditation of a new program offering should follow the guidelines detailed in 7.1 above.

Where the new offering is a fresh implementation of a program already established and accredited at the home campus or at other campuses (i.e. an undifferentiated offering), then the documentation for both provisional and subsequently full accreditation may well build on documentation already submitted previously for implementations of the program elsewhere.

Where an established program on the home campus is to be newly implemented at a remote or offshore campus, or where a new program is to be introduced for the first time at a remote or offshore campus, the Accreditation Board will normally require a visit to occur for consideration of Provisional Accreditation.

Where a new remote campus or offshore operation is first being established and Provisional Accreditation is to be considered for the first program offerings, the submitted Self-study Report will need to be more comprehensive than that expected for just a new program offering within an established operating environment. The Self-study Report in this case will need to respond to all aspects of the accreditation criteria, with particular attention to the sections dealing with the quality systems and the operating environment. It is critical that the submission analyses all aspects of the development, delivery and management of the program, and in particular any differentiating features associated with the new operating environment.

7.3 Program Amendment

Engineers Australia should be informed in writing of significant changes to established, accredited programs and to the operating environment within an engineering school. The

terms of accreditation encourage ongoing development of program structures and content.

Changes to program structure and content within the existing specification of the programs' intended vocational outcomes are welcomed and expected within the accreditation cycle as part of the process of continuous quality improvement. The RTO should ensure that all changes are within the accreditation guidelines, such that the program and the engineering school as a whole continue to comply with the accreditation criteria. Engineers Australia will monitor program amendments through any written advice received from the RTO.

Formal reviews of changes will normally occur at the next scheduled General Review of programs by Engineers Australia, but in some instances a Special Review may be required.

Where a proposed program amendment involves a change to the program title, or to the overall specification of the programs' intended vocational outcomes or specified units of competency, Engineers Australia should be notified in writing prior to implementation of the change. Under such major changes, the Accreditation Board, 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.

8. Alternative Implementation Pathways

8.1 Evaluating Alternative Implementation Pathways

There are widespread demands for flexible approaches to program structural design and delivery. Firstly, it should be noted that Engineers Australia encourages innovation in program design and flexibility in teaching, learning and assessment methods that enhances the learners ability to learn. Secondly, learners' can expect to have a number of options within their program in order to enable them to achieve their vocational career objectives in engineering. Thirdly, RTOs may choose to offer an established or new program in a range of learning modes, such as full-time, part-time or external (off-campus, distance or online mode).

Introducing flexibility in teaching, learning and assessment methodologies is an intrinsic component of the program design and implementation. EA expects that all programs presented for accreditation will be learner centred and will use a wide variety of different methodologies to ensure delivery of the specified units of competency, including on-line and 'flipped classroom' (or 'blended learning') as well as by lectures, tutorial and workshops, and through laboratories, projects and case-studies as well as other forms of formal and informal learning. On-campus learners may be able to choose to complete some units of competency in external mode. For accreditation purposes, evaluation of this area of flexibility is against the *Competency Program* criteria that must be addressed for each program.

The second area of flexibility is also intrinsic to a single program design. Once learners have completed the common core units of competency, they are then able to choose elective units of competency consistent with the vocational stream they have chosen to undertake. Learners may complete the specified units of competency individually and sequentially, or concurrently or in clusters to facilitate integrative, project-based learning. For accreditation, by providing information that addresses the *Competency Program* criteria, the RTO must demonstrate to the Evaluation Panel that across these variations, the program maintains its integrity and delivers the target graduate capabilities.

The third area of flexibility is likely to be manifested by strongly different implementation pathways all within a common program definition, name and qualification title. These pathways may be distinguished by advertised learning mode (full-time, part-time, external). Each alternative pathway will normally be designed to deliver the same vocational outcomes.

For a program to maintain ongoing accreditation, all implementation pathways must be individually evaluated, and each pathway must meet the accreditation criteria concurrently. The accreditation processes for the alternative pathways are thus coupled.

Alternative implementation pathways, such as all those operated from the RTO's home campus, may be considered for accreditation simultaneously, normally at a General Review.

On the other hand, the consideration for accreditation of alternative implementation pathways may be staggered in time. This would normally be the case for example where a particular program has one implementation pathway at the home campus and an alternative

implementation pathway offered at a remote Australian campus or through an offshore partnership. This area is discussed further in the next Section 8.2.

An RTO can always choose to have alternative offerings evaluated for accreditation as separately defined (differentiated) program implementations. This most certainly will be the case where a particular award is available by two or more different program pathways and settings, involving substantially different units of competency, teaching staff, or facilities, and potentially different vocational outcomes. In these cases, it would be expected that the title of the award would be clearly differentiated on the basis of the respective program of learning followed. The accreditation processes for this program of learning would not be coupled to that on another campus.

Where the Accreditation Board has reason to believe that different pathways to a common award differ substantially in their compliance with the criteria for accreditation, it may decide to evaluate them as separate programs. This would normally be a matter for consultation with the RTO and would require discussion on clear differentiation of titles for the resulting programs and associated awards.

8.2 Offshore, Remote Campus and External Implementation Pathways

In the specific case of developing an offshore campus, remote campus or external (distance-based) offering of a program already established in a home campus setting, an RTO would need to firmly decide between the following approaches.

a) Undifferentiated case: Each offering is manifested as an alternative implementation pathway within a single program definition, and with a unified set of intended vocational outcomes. The accreditation criteria must be satisfied simultaneously for both implementations of the program through separate evaluation processes. A unified program title and award title would normally apply for all implementations of the program.

b) Differentiated case: The offshore, remote campus or external offering is identified as a separate program with unique vocational outcomes perhaps leading to a similar award as the home campus program. Each program would be independently accredited in its own right and in this case program titles and award titles would be expected to distinguish separate program implementations on the home and offshore or regional campuses.

Under normal circumstances, separate accreditation visits and unsynchronised accreditation review cycles would apply for offshore, remote campus and home campus offerings. Where the separate offerings are alternative implementations of the same program as in a) above, then confirming Full Accreditation on one campus reaffirms ongoing Full Accreditation at other campuses (up to the end of the individual accreditation cycle in each case).

The Dublin Accord in its Rules and Procedures recognises accreditation of programs that are offered in differentiated or undifferentiated form by a provider, headquartered in the jurisdiction of a signatory, but delivered at a location outside of the national or territorial

boundaries of that signatory. In the case of an Australian engineering school implementing an undifferentiated program at a location within the jurisdiction of another signatory to the Dublin Accord, accreditation of the offshore offering would be initiated by Engineers Australia, but may be undertaken collaboratively with the signatory associated with the country where the program is being delivered. In this case the offshore program implementation must satisfy the accreditation criteria of both signatories in order to be automatically recognised by the Dublin Accord. The offshore implementation of an undifferentiated program must be fully accredited by EA in order to maintain the onshore accreditation status.

Distance-based implementation pathways would normally be evaluated as part of the General Review of an RTO's home campus programs.

8.3 Articulation on the Basis of Advanced Standing

Where an RTO's admission and/or articulation rules allow learners to be granted explicit credit for prior learning for up to a maximum of up to half (50%) of a full-time equivalent engineering program, it is the responsibility of the RTO to maintain policies and practices for the formal evaluation of such prior learning on a case-by-case basis. Under such circumstances, articulation routes will not be evaluated as separate implementation pathways. The policies and practices established by the RTO for assessing prior learning will however be considered within the overall accreditation process.

In cases where specific advanced standing agreements allow transfer from other RTOs, educational institutions or learning circumstances into the engineering program, and in particular where potential learning credit exceeds the equivalent of half of the full-time learning duration, then the defined prior learning sequence will be considered as an alternative implementation pathway within the engineering program definition. Under these circumstances the full details of this implementation pathway will be subject to separate evaluation by the Accreditation Board in accordance with the accreditation criteria.

Where an Australian RTO has negotiated feeder or twinning programs with offshore institutions, and where the final half (or more) of the program duration must be completed at the Australian campus, the feeder arrangement is considered to be part of the home program. Where less than half of the full-time program duration is taken at the home campus, Engineers Australia expects to identify and accredit the feeder route as an alternative implementation pathway within the definition of the host program. In this latter case a visit to the offshore feeder institution is likely to be necessary.

Appendix Example Visit Schedule

This is a typical example, for a 4 sub-panel visit.

Engineers Australia Panel - Site Visit Schedule (Example)					
EA Panel	**Visit Manager (Teaching)**	**Panel Chair (Civil)**	**Discipline Expert (Mechatronics)**	**Discipline Expert (Electrical)**	**Discipline Expert (Mechanical)**
Day 1					
13:30	Travel from Hotel to Campus				
14:00-16:55	**PANEL BRIEFING SESSION** *with access to electronic teaching, QA materials and learner work* (includes afternoon tea) Venue:				
17:00-17:30	**MEETING WITH RTO CEO and RTO DEPUTY CEO, FACULTY HEAD OF DEPARTMENT, FACULTY HEAD OF TEACHING, LEARNING & ASSESSMENT, OTHERS AS APPROPRIATE.** Venue:				
17:30-18:30	**MEETING WITH MANAGER - VET QUALITY & POLICY, HEAD OF THE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING, SENIOR TEAM LEADERS FROM THE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING** Venue:				
18:30	**Travel to Hotel**				
19:00	**EA PANEL INFORMAL DINNER**				
Day 2					
8:30	**Travel to Campus**				
9:00-10:30	**PANEL PRIVATE SESSION** *with access to displayed teaching, QA materials and student work* (includes morning tea) Venue:				

10:30-11:30	**MEETING WITH LEARNERS** Venue:
11:30-12:30	**MEETING WITH TEACHING STAFF** Venue:
12:30-14:45	**PANEL PRIVATE SESSION** *with access to displayed teaching, QA materials and learner work* (includes lunch) Venue:
14:45-15:45	**MEETING WITH PROGRAM LEADERS** Venue:
15:45-16:45	**MEETING WITH GRADUATES** Venue:
17:30-18:30	**MEETING WITH EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS** *External Advisory Board members, employers, graduates, alumni, selected members of the Faculty and Program Leadership* (includes light refreshments and finger food) Venue:
18:45	**Travel to Hotel**
19:30	**EA PRIVATE PANEL WORKING DINNER**
Day 3	
8:00	**Travel to Campus**
08:30-09:00	**PANEL PRIVATE SESSION** *with access to displayed teaching, QA materials and learner work* (includes tea and coffee) Venue:
09:00-10:00	**TOUR OF FACILITIES**

10:00-10:45	**MEETING WITH TECHNICAL AND PROFESSIONAL STAFF** *with selected Technical and Professional staff from all Disciplines* (includes morning tea) Venue:
10:45-13:00	**PANEL PRIVATE SESSION - Compilation of Findings** *Please note Senior Management Group to be available for further discussion if required* (includes lunch) Venue:
13:00-13:30	**EXIT INTERVIEW WITH SENIOR LEADERSHIP TEAM AND PROGRAM LEADERS** Venue:

Notes: 1. DE denotes Discipline Expert
2. The session for graduates is to cover consideration of transition of a new program from Provisional to Full Accreditation.

AMS Hierarchy for this Document

POLICY	*Statement of accreditation principles*	
	AMS-POL-01	**Accreditation Principles**

STANDARDS	*Standards against which compliance is evaluated*	
	EA Stage 1	Competency Standards (see Engineers Australia website)
	AMS-STD-10	Accreditation Standard – Higher Education
	AMS-STD-20	**Accreditation Standard – VET Competency Programs**

MANUALS	*Instructions for accreditation*	
	AMS-MAN-10	Criteria User Guide – Higher Education
	AMS-MAN-11	Procedures Manual – Higher Education
	AMS-MAN-20	**Accreditation Criteria User Guide – VET Competency Programs**
This document	**AMS-MAN-21**	**Procedures Manual – VET Competency Programs**

HANDBOOK	*Contextual information on professional practice*	
	AMS-HBK-01	**Engineering Handbook** (under development)

TEMPLATES	*Documents with specified format and structure*	
	AMS-TPL-315	**VET Accreditation Submission (Self study Report)**
	AMS-TPL-316	**Table of VET Programs Offered for Accreditation**
	AMS-TPL-317	**VET Admissions and Enrolments**
	AMS-TPL-318	**VET Engineering School Teaching Staff Profile**
	AMS-TPL-319	**VET Staff CV pro forma**

PRACTICE NOTES	*Information about, and examples of, good accreditation practice*	
	Various	See website (under development)

Revision History

Date	Version	Description	Approved
12 May 2021	1.0	First release	Accreditation Board