

MANUAL FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF
PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING AND
ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY
PROGRAMMES

SIXTH EDITION

PREFACE TO SIXTH EDITION

Changes within this edition of the IPENZ Accreditation Manual reflect recent revisions to the associated Accreditation Criteria documents.

Accreditation Criteria: Initial Academic Requirements for Professional Engineers

http://www.ipenz.org.nz/IPENZ/Forms/pdfs/Initial_Academic_Policy_Prof_Eng.pdf

Accreditation Criteria: Initial Academic Requirements for Engineering Technologists

http://www.ipenz.org.nz/IPENZ/Forms/pdfs/Initial_Academic_Policy_Eng_Tech.pdf

New Zealand has been a signatory to the Washington Accord and Sydney Accord since their inception in 1988 and 2001 respectively. These agreements are based on an acceptance of the substantial equivalence of accreditation systems operated by Member jurisdictions and lead to the mutual recognition of accredited qualifications.

More recently, IPENZ became a provisional signatory to the Dublin Accord in 2006.

Each of these Accords has developed procedures for the regular review of Member countries' accreditation procedures. More recently, exemplar profiles of graduate capabilities expected to be demonstrated by the graduates of an accredited programme have been developed.

This manual, which is a living document, will be amended from time to time. These amendments will be based not only on experience of accreditation in New Zealand but also on the international experience gained by IPENZ representatives involved in the monitoring or review of the accreditation systems operating in other jurisdictions. We all learn from each other and we particularly wish to acknowledge the valuable input received from members of the Overall Review Team charged with reviewing IPENZ's accreditation standards and processes on behalf of Washington Accord and Sydney Accord signatories between 2007 and 2013.

IPENZ Standards and Accreditation Board

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. GLOSSARY OF TERMS	5
3. REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCREDITATION	8
4. PRINCIPLES OF ACCREDITATION	9
5. STANDARDS AND ACCREDITATION BOARD	10
6. THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS	10
7. TYPES OF ACCREDITATION	11
8. ACCREDITATION TEAMS	15
9. ACCREDITATION PROCEDURES	17
10. TRANSPARENCY, CONFIDENTIALITY AND PUBLICATION OF DECISIONS	20
11. TEO DOCUMENTATION – GENERAL GUIDELINES	22
12. GUIDELINES ON INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY THE TEO	22
13. SUBMISSION OF DOCUMENTATION	30
14. INFORMATION TO BE AVAILABLE FOR INSPECTION DURING VISIT	30
15. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT DURING THE VISIT	31
16. ACCREDITATION REPORTS	31
17. ACCREDITATION VISIT COSTS	33
18. REVIEW BY ACCORD BODIES	Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX ONE - TIMETABLE EXEMPLAR	35
APPENDIX TWO – GRADUATE STATISTICS	39
APPENDIX THREE - STAFF DATA SUMMARY	41
APPENDIX FOUR EXPENSE CLAIM GUIDELINES	42
APPENDIX FIVE – CONTINUOUS MONITORING PROCESS FOR ACCORD SIGNATORIES	44

1. INTRODUCTION

The Institution of Professional Engineers New Zealand (IPENZ) represents the engineering profession in New Zealand and, under the Chartered Professional Engineers Act 2002, is the Registration Authority for professional engineers in New Zealand. IPENZ therefore has the responsibility to ensure the maintenance of the academic standards underpinning the engineering profession in New Zealand through the accreditation process.

Engineering degrees and diplomas generally provide the initial academic education for prospective Members of IPENZ. IPENZ operates three competence-based Membership classes each representing an engineering occupational role:

- Professional Membership (MIPENZ) for professional engineers
- Technical Membership (TIPENZ) for engineering technologists
- Associate Membership (AIPENZ) for engineering technicians

Every prospective Member is required to provide evidence of having acquired underpinning engineering knowledge appropriate to the Membership class for which they are seeking entry.

The key objective of accreditation is to provide independent confirmation that accredited engineering programmes produce graduates who have acquired the academic capabilities expected of them by the engineering profession in New Zealand, as defined in IPENZ policy, and meet the requirements of the international Accords to which IPENZ is a signatory.

More specifically accreditation provides the following.

- Public identification of programmes that have been evaluated by IPENZ, independently of the Tertiary Education Organisation (TEO) offering the programme, as having met the stated criteria
- A statement of the standing that TEOs can offer to prospective students
- A basis for international comparability and graduate mobility
- A statement to governments and TEOs of the basic requirements of a professional engineering education and the resources reasonably needed to meet these requirements
- Consultative feedback on the design of new programmes and modes of delivery, and assistance in the promotion of innovation and good educational practice.

The engineering education accreditation standards, systems and procedures are internationally benchmarked through international agreements to which IPENZ is the New Zealand signatory. Bachelor of Engineering (BE) programmes are internationally benchmarked under the Washington Accord and Bachelor of Engineering Technology (BEngTech) degrees under the Sydney Accord to ensure New Zealand standards of engineering education are consistent with international norms.

Accreditation is a joint exercise between IPENZ and TEOs and includes industry and student involvement. The process is agreed to be mutually beneficial in that the TEOs can better relate their activities to the needs of the profession and the profession can better appreciate engineering requirements and developments in the education sector.

2. GLOSSARY OF TERMS

PROGRAMME OF STUDY/PROGRAMME

The qualification for which accreditation is being sought, which must be differentiated from non-accredited programmes on the graduation certificate.

ASSESSMENT TASKS

Assessment activities that contribute to the overall grade for a course.

BASIC SCIENCES

Fundamental knowledge about nature and its phenomena.

BROADLY DEFINED ENGINEERING PROBLEMS

Engineering problems which cannot be resolved without knowledge of technological principles and physical processes and have some or all of the following characteristics.

- Involve a variety of factors which may impose conflicting constraints.
- Can be solved by application of well-proven analysis techniques.
- Require knowledge of principles and applied procedures or methodologies.
- Belong to families of familiar problems which are solved in well-accepted ways.
- May be partially outside those encompassed by standards or codes of practice.
- Involve several groups of stakeholders with differing and occasionally conflicting needs.
- Have consequences which are important locally but may extend more widely.
- Are parts of, or systems within complex engineering problems.

BRANCH OF ENGINEERING

A generally-recognised, major subdivision of engineering such as the traditional disciplines of chemical, civil, electrical, mechanical engineering, or a cross-disciplinary field of comparable breadth including combinations of engineering fields, for example mechatronics, and the application of engineering in other fields, for example bio-medical engineering.

COMPLEX ENGINEERING PROBLEMS

Complex engineering problems are those which cannot be resolved without in-depth engineering knowledge and have some or all of the following characteristics.

- Involve wide-ranging or conflicting technical, engineering and other issues.
- Have no obvious solution and require originality in analysis.
- Involve infrequently encountered issues.
- Are outside problems encompassed by standards and codes of practice for professional engineering.

- Involve diverse groups of stakeholders with widely varying needs.
- Have significant consequences in a range of contexts.

CONSISTENT ASSESSMENT

Assessments that achieve reliable or repeatable outcomes.

COUNCIL FOR ENGINEERING TECHNICIAN AND TECHNOLOGIST EDUCATION NEW ZEALAND (CETTENZ)

Council consisting of representatives from each of the TEOs offering Bachelor of Engineering Technology or New Zealand Diploma in Engineering programmes in New Zealand.

COURSE

An individual course or paper that forms part of an accredited programme.

DIFFERENTIATED PROGRAMME

A differentiated programme is distinguished from other study modes, pathways or locations on the degree certificate.

ENGINEERING FUNDAMENTALS

A systematic formulation of engineering concepts and principles based on mathematical and basic sciences to support applications.

ENGINEERING

Engineering is characterised by the presence of most or all of the following things.

- Engineering is purposeful – it seeks to use knowledge and resources to make interventions in the natural world that meet a present or future need of people.
- Engineering is creative – it involves creativity to develop or design new or improve existing artefacts, products, processes and services.
- Engineering seeks efficiency – it is concerned with the wise use of resources.
- Engineering is predictive of the outcomes it seeks to achieve – it seeks to use mechanistic understanding of both natural and man-induced processes to develop models, that allow reliable predictions to be made of the future performance of any artefact, product, process, system or service to be made.
- Engineering uses available materials, systems and resources – it uses understanding of the properties of materials, systems and resources to ensure the artefacts, products, processes, systems or services that are created are of sufficient durability that their use can continue for suitable periods of time.
- Engineering includes risk management – it recognises limitations imposed by incomplete knowledge or understanding of systems, materials and processes and develops means to control or manage the resultant risks to levels acceptable to society at large.

ENGINEERING SCHOOL

The operational unit within a tertiary education provider that is responsible for managing an accredited engineering programme.

ENGINEERING SCIENCES

Include engineering fundamentals that have roots in the mathematical and physical sciences, and where applicable, in other natural sciences, but extend knowledge and develop models and methods in order to lead to applications and solve problems, providing the knowledge base for engineering specialisations.

ENGINEERING SPECIALISATION

A generally-recognised subdivision within a branch of engineering, for example structural and geotechnical engineering within civil engineering; the extension of engineering fundamentals to create more specialised theoretical frameworks and bodies of knowledge.

ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGIST

Engineering Technologists apply analytical skills and knowledge of technological principles and physical processes to solve broadly defined engineering problems.

FACULTY

Academic staff involved in the delivery of an accredited engineering programme.

MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

Mathematics, numerical analysis, statistics and aspects of computer science cast in an appropriate mathematical formalism.

NATURAL SCIENCES

Provide, as applicable in each engineering discipline or practice area, an understanding of the physical world including physics, mechanics, chemistry, earth sciences and the biological sciences.

NEW ZEALAND COUNCIL OF ENGINEERING DEANS

Representative council consisting of representatives from each of the TEOs offering Bachelor of Engineering or Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) programmes in New Zealand.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The systematic, accountable maintenance, improvement and broadening of knowledge and skills, and the development of personal qualities necessary for the execution of professional and technical duties throughout an engineering practitioner's career.

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS

Work in areas requiring specialist engineering knowledge – analysing, solving and managing complex engineering problems.

PROGRAMME LEADER

The staff member with overall academic responsibility for a programme.

PROJECT

A course or collection of courses which lead to a significant research output and/or engineering artefact that demonstrates the students' ability to integrate their knowledge and skills to the practical resolution of a complex engineering problem.

RESEARCH

In essence, research in engineering is research to improve the practice of engineering – it gives engineers better ways to do their job.

Engineering research seeks to advance the practice of engineering by means such as the following.

- Discovery of new materials, theoretical models and processes which can enhance the performance, quality, efficiency, cost effectiveness and life of engineering systems.
- Increasing the quality of models by which predictions are made, thereby improving process understanding.
- Investigating and defining the properties of new or existing materials, systems and resources so their use can be more appropriate and reliable to the end-user.
- Developing improved design methodologies so the resultant outcome is more efficient or reliable, or poses less risk to its end-users.
- Improving control and risk management frameworks around particular families of engineering problems.

SUBSTANTIAL EQUIVALENCE

Applied to educational programmes means that two programmes, while not meeting a single set of criteria, are both acceptable as preparing their respective graduates to enter formative development toward registration.

TARGETED GRADUATE OUTCOMES

The skills and knowledge the tertiary institution is seeking to develop in graduates from a programme.

TERTIARY EDUCATION ORGANISATION (TEO)

A New Zealand University, Polytechnic (including Institutes of Technology), Wānanga, Private Training Establishment, or Industry Training Organisation.

VALID ASSESSMENT

These are assessments that measure the learning outcome and do not require knowledge or skills that are irrelevant to what is actually being assessed.

3. REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCREDITATION

The IPENZ academic requirements for BE degrees and BEngTech degrees are outlined in separate policy documents.

IPENZ accreditations have a strong “output” focus. The TEO is expected to supply sufficient evidence of having developed a clear statement of targeted graduate outcomes for the programme demonstrating substantial equivalence to the relevant generic IPENZ Graduate Competence Profile.

http://www.ipenz.org.nz/ipenz/Education_Career/accreditation/Graduate_Competency_Profiles_Nov_2009.pdf

There is, however, a clear understanding that some “inputs” such as admission criteria, curriculum, resources (including the quality of academic staff), programme management, and quality assurance systems are significant factors in deciding whether IPENZ can be assured that the TEO can consistently and sustainably deliver graduates with the required capability profile.

With this in mind, there are three key parts to the accreditation criteria IPENZ has developed.

PART 1: THE PROGRAMME AND PROGRAMME OUTCOMES

- Graduate outcomes
- The curriculum
- Admission standards
- Assessment

PART 2: INSTITUTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE, STAFFING AND CULTURE

- Academic staff
- Technical staff
- Laboratories
- Independent study facilities
- Educational and professional culture

PART 3: MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES AND QUALITY SYSTEMS TO SUSTAIN AND ENHANCE THE PROGRAMME AND ITS DELIVERY

- Management structure
- Institutional support
- Advice from industry
- Quality processes

4. PRINCIPLES OF ACCREDITATION

IPENZ considers engineering programmes for accreditation at the request of the TEO offering the programme(s) concerned.

Programmes are not ranked or merit-graded; they are either accredited or not.

Accreditation is accorded to engineering programmes, not to Engineering Schools or providers. For a programme to be accredited, all pathways available to students for its completion must be included in the evaluation and must meet the criteria.

Accreditation is evidence based. The TEO is required to provide evidence that the graduate outcomes are being met. For full accreditation the expectation is that the evidence is actual rather than potential. Where there is only the potential for those outcomes, then the accreditation is provisional.

5. STANDARDS AND ACCREDITATION BOARD

All policies relating to IPENZ's accreditation of engineering programmes are approved by the IPENZ Standards and Accreditation Board (SAB). The SAB's policy decisions are then ratified by the IPENZ governing Board. The SAB also receives the accreditation recommendations from Accreditation Panels and makes final decisions on accrediting individual programmes. The IPENZ Governing Board is informed of the SAB's accreditation decisions.

The SAB includes the following members.

- No less than four and no more than seven members appointed by the governing Board for their knowledge of engineering education and setting of professional competence standards.
- Any IPENZ Member currently elected as Chair or Deputy Chair of an International Engineering Agreement to which IPENZ is a signatory.
- One member of the governing Board, appointed by that Board annually.
- A representative of the Competence Assessment Board- normally the Chair, if available.

Every effort is made to maintain an appropriate balance between industry and academic representation. The Secretary to the SAB is the IPENZ Director – Learning and Assessment, who has responsibility for the co-ordination of IPENZ accreditation visits.

6. THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS

The accreditation process, whether for an initial accreditation or re-accreditation, is a comprehensive assessment comprising the following.

- A review of information provided by the TEO.
- An onsite review by an accreditation panel.
- Preparation and submission of the accreditation report to the SAB.
- Decision on accreditation by the SAB.

An IPENZ accreditation team will normally visit the TEO to ensure the programme is delivering targeted graduate outcomes that are substantially equivalent to the relevant generic IPENZ Graduate Competence Profile, which remains benchmarked to the equivalent International Engineering Alliance profile. During the visit, emphasis will be placed on verifying the standards reached by the students, through detailed inspection of the applicable quality output measures. If a TEO offers the same degree in different locations then IPENZ will normally visit them all. The accreditation panel must assure itself the programme meets the IPENZ requirements regardless of where it is being delivered.

Once a programme has gained full accreditation it is normally reviewed every five years. If however, the programme undergoes substantial change or the TEO is substantially changed in some way (e.g. by a merger with another provider, or by significant restructuring relevant to the delivery of engineering programmes), IPENZ can request

that an accreditation visit be conducted earlier. The provider is expected to inform IPENZ of any substantial change to programmes or the structure of the TEO.

If a TEO offers more than one engineering programme IPENZ will co-ordinate accreditation visits so all programmes are reviewed at the same time. This has the effect of minimising costs for the provider and for IPENZ.

7. TYPES OF ACCREDITATION

TEOs can request IPENZ review programmes for full accreditation or for provisional accreditation. They can also request IPENZ provide “advice and guidance” on proposed new programmes.

7.1 FULL ACCREDITATION

Full accreditation is granted only to programmes that have produced graduates, so sufficient evidence can be gathered to assure IPENZ that graduates of the programme consistently achieve the targeted graduate outcomes for the programme and the relevant set of accreditation criteria has been met. Accreditation Panels need to be assured that the TEO has sufficient resources and strategic planning in place to assure the programme can be sustainably delivered.

7.2 PROVISIONAL ACCREDITATION

Provisional accreditation can be granted to new or revised programmes which have yet to have graduates emerge, to enable full accreditation to be considered. The accreditation procedure used will depend on whether the TEO already has programmes that have been granted full accreditation by IPENZ.

The TEOs can request IPENZ review new or revised programmes for provisional accreditation when the programme has yet to have graduates emerge to enable full accreditation to be considered.

Requests for provisional accreditation from existing providers of IPENZ accredited engineering programmes may be conducted as a desktop assessment. The Accreditation Panel will review the overall programme objectives, structure and development plans, and assess the quality of the academic staff and other resources that will support its delivery. A visit would be required only if the TEO provided insufficient evidence that the programme met the IPENZ Academic Requirements. The TEO must demonstrate that it has the following.

- Clear objectives for the programme as a whole.
- A clear outline of the structure of the programme and the courses to be offered.
- An identified programme leader to champion the more detailed course development.
- Clear plans in place for curriculum development, resourcing, staff recruitment and delivery.

New providers of engineering programmes would normally offer at least two thirds of the programme. The plan and resources must be substantially in place for offering the full programme before provisional accreditation can be considered. In all cases IPENZ would conduct an accreditation visit. Assessment of programmes offered by new providers will be rigorous and examine all institutional aspects as for full accreditation.

Provisional accreditation indicates that full accreditation is expected but not guaranteed. Provisional accreditation is granted on the basis of evidence available at the time that full accreditation criteria are capable of being met.

The follow-up Accreditation Panel to assess transition to full accreditation may consist of one person who was a member of the Panel that originally reviewed the programme or it may be a full new Panel.

Provisional accreditation will normally lapse if full accreditation is not gained within two years of students graduating in sufficient numbers to enable a meaningful assessment of graduate capabilities. If provisional accreditation lapses, then for IPENZ Membership purposes all graduates of the programme will be deemed not to have gained a qualification recognised by IPENZ. They would be eligible to apply for IPENZ Graduate Membership but their qualification would not be recognised under the Washington Accord or Sydney Accord.

The year from which graduates from the programme will automatically be recognised by IPENZ as having a recognised engineering qualification is determined at the time full accreditation is granted. When a programme moves from provisional to full accreditation, graduates will normally be considered by IPENZ as having a recognised engineering qualification if they graduated whilst the programme was provisionally accredited; that is, accreditation is retrospective.

TEOs may be required to provide a brief annual report to IPENZ on progress in respect of the IPENZ provisional Accreditation Report recommendations and requirements. IPENZ may appoint one of the Panel Members to act as a monitor. The monitor would be expected to visit the TEO annually and provide a written report to IPENZ on their findings. The TEO would be expected to meet all the direct costs associated with the Monitor's visit.

7.3 NEW PROVIDERS OF ENGINEERING EDUCATION

A key challenge for any new provider of engineering programmes is to develop and maintain the required level of engineering expertise to sustain high quality programmes. Providers seeking IPENZ accreditation for the first time can expect their application to be evaluated particularly comprehensively. This ensures this expertise is in place, and is supported by appropriate planning, management structures and levels of institutional support to foster the engineering ethos required to develop a successful Engineering School or department.

7.4 CHANGES REQUIRING REACCREDITATION

Currently accredited programmes which undergo substantial changes to structure, content, delivery, or staffing, or experience a significant decline in student numbers or institutional support arrangements may be required to undergo reaccreditation prior to their current accreditation status expiring. It is the TEO's responsibility to initially advise IPENZ of any such changes. IPENZ will then determine the accreditation status of the programme and, in conjunction with the TEO, decide if reaccreditation is required and what form the assessment should take.

Substantial changes may include some or all of the following.

- Change of qualification title.
- Changes to regulations concerning entry requirements and cross-crediting arrangements.
- Changes to the level or credits necessary to gain the qualification.

- Changes to overall programme objectives.
- Significant changes to the structure of the qualification.
- Significant changes to staffing.
- A decline in student numbers that brings the financial or academic viability of a programme into question.
- Changes to the mode of delivery.
- Programme being offered at a new site.
- Introduction of a new major or programme strand.

When accredited courses cease the TEO shall advise IPENZ who shall, after discussion with the TEO, determine the run out period of recognition for those courses.

7.5 NZQA ACCREDITATION VISITS

When reviewing proposed new engineering programmes offered outside the university sector, IPENZ will work in cooperation with the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) or its delegated agent, to minimise duplication and minimise compliance costs for the provider.

The actual accreditation process followed will be agreed in conjunction with all parties involved but would normally include an IPENZ representative appointed to the NZQA accreditation team. They will provide a separate report to IPENZ with the NZQA report as a supplement.

7.6 INTERNAL REVIEWS

Some TEOs have an internal review system requiring that each Engineering School, Department or programme be reviewed by an expert panel similar in composition to that required for IPENZ accreditation. To reduce compliance costs, IPENZ is willing to work with the TEO so IPENZ accreditation visits and internal reviews occur jointly or consecutively.

7.7 IPENZ GUIDANCE AND ADVICE REPORTS

Providers of engineering programmes can request that IPENZ provide an Advisory Panel to review new programmes or proposed programmes prior to applying for provisional accreditation. The Panel will then provide a Guidance and Advice Report indicating the readiness of the programme in question for accreditation.

Providers are expected to meet the full costs associated with Advisory Reports, and to make their own arrangements with IPENZ.

IPENZ Guidance and Advisory Reports should be taken as advisory only and cannot be taken as assurance that the programmes reviewed will necessarily be granted provisional accreditation.

Members of the Advisory Panel may not serve on the Accreditation Panel considering the programme.

7.8 IPENZ REPRESENTATION ON PROGRAMME ADVISORY BOARDS

IPENZ considers that there is value in industry advisory committees having access to the most up to date strategic thinking of the national professional body on matters affecting

engineering education, and international trends in relation to accreditation of engineering education.

To avoid perceptions of a conflict of interest with IPENZ's accreditation function, which is led by the IPENZ Director Learning Assessment, the best means to establish a communication mechanism, where an overarching school or faculty industry advisory committee exists is through the IPENZ Chief Executive.

The Chief Executive would attend meetings when he/she and the relevant Dean agree such attendance is desirable. Attendance at more than one meeting per year would not normally be expected. It would be expected that a contribution to travel costs would be made if the Chief Executive cannot undertake other IPENZ business on the same trip.

Written comments might be provided by the Chief Executive when not in attendance. In general the Chief Executive will attempt to make equivalent information available to all such committees at all providers.

Where there is not an overarching industry advisory committee but only committees which operate at lower level in regard to specific engineering disciplines or majors, the IPENZ Chief Executive would not be expected to interact with each such committee. In these cases the Dean would be expected to define an alternative mechanism to allow information from the Chief Executive to reach senior staff and advisory committee members in an effective manner.

In addition to involvement from the Chief Executive, IPENZ will be pleased to recommend individuals for Advisory Board roles who would be effective in providing input from the profession.

7.9 ENGINEERING PROGRAMMES DELIVERED OFFSHORE

7.9.1 IPENZ accredited programmes implemented offshore without differentiation in a jurisdiction, with accrediting bodies who are full signatories to an International Engineering Alliance Accord.

Accreditation of the programme's off-shore implementation will be undertaken on a collaborative basis with the relevant overseas accrediting body, initiated by the New Zealand provider. The offshore implementation must satisfy the accreditation/recognition criteria and requirements of both IPENZ and the overseas accrediting body.

7.9.2 Differentiated programmes offered within the jurisdiction of a full signatory.

Accreditation/recognition of the off-shore programme must be undertaken in consultation with IPENZ by the signatory of the jurisdiction in which the programme is delivered.

7.9.3 Undifferentiated or differentiated programmes offered within a non-Accord jurisdiction.

IPENZ must undertake the offshore programme's accreditation.

7.9.4 Accreditation of engineering programmes offered by non-Accord jurisdictions

IPENZ will consider accrediting programmes offered by providers in non-Accord jurisdictions in the following circumstances.

- The non-Accord jurisdiction is unable to support an accreditation body, and

- The non-Accord jurisdiction requests IPENZ to act on its behalf, and
- IPENZ gains approval from the majority of the Accord signatories, to accredit the engineering programmes offered by providers in the non-Accord jurisdiction.

In any such case, IPENZ will observe the sovereignty of the jurisdiction in which the programme is delivered, ensuring compliance with the statutory requirements of that jurisdiction.

8. ACCREDITATION TEAMS

Accreditation Teams are lead by an Accreditation Team Leader, coordinated by an IPENZ National Office representative (normally the Director Learning and Assessment. They are made up of Accreditation Panels, which are responsible for the review of an individual programmes or groupings of programmes.

8.1 IPENZ DIRECTOR LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT

The IPENZ Director – Learning and Assessment has overall responsibility for organising and administering the accreditation process. It is the Director’s responsibility to ensure IPENZ accreditation policies and procedures are adhered to and are interpreted consistently.

The IPENZ Director – Learning and Assessment has the following responsibilities.

- Making appointments to the accreditation team, in consultation with the TEO, Accreditation Team Leader and SAB Chair.
- Providing advice and guidance to the TEO on preparing documentation.
- Initially reviewing documentation.
- Coordinating the pre-visit teleconference.
- Producing a teleconference findings report.
- Finalising the timetable.
- Developing exemplar questions.
- Conducting an induction training session for Panel Members.

8.2 ACCREDITATION TEAM LEADER

The Accreditation Team Leader is responsible for the Accreditation Report and for leading the panel/s. This person is appointed by the Chair of the Standards and Accreditation Board with advice from the Director – Learning and Assessment. Team Leaders will normally have participated in other accreditation visits. Because of the small size of the New Zealand education system, and potential conflicts of interest, Team Leaders are normally practising engineers, not academics. They must be of high standing in their industry sector and the engineering profession as a whole.

The Accreditation Team Leader for a multi-panel visit has the following responsibilities.

- Chairing all plenary sessions involving the Accreditation Team.
- General co-ordination and problem solving during the visit, and liaison between the Accreditation Panels.

- Reviewing high-level considerations such as institutional and school governance, strategy, finance and culture.
- Liaising with the TEO's senior management personnel, such as the Dean, Vice Chancellor, or President.
- Helping Panel Leaders to produce consistent requirements and recommendations across panels and across visits.
- Providing verbal feedback of accreditation visit outcomes at the end of the visit.
- Writing the Accreditation Report Executive Summary and approving each Panel Report for submission to the SAB.
- Attending the SAB meeting where the report recommendations are considered.
- Providing IPENZ with feedback on the contributions of Panel Members to assist with future accreditation panel selection.

8.3 ACCREDITATION PANEL LEADERS

Where the accreditation team is made up of separate panels (normally to review the programmes offered by separate engineering departments) a separate Panel Leader will be appointed to each Panel.

Accreditation Panels will normally consist of senior engineering academics, industry representatives of high standing and representatives of relevant international Accord signatories. The number of members in each Accreditation Panel will depend on the number and type of engineering programmes the panel is expected to review, but each panel will always comprise at least two persons, one of whom must be an academic or have academic experience. Normally either the industry or New Zealand academic representatives, will be appointed as Panel Leader.

Accreditation Panel Leaders have the following responsibilities.

Before the accreditation visit.

- Reviewing the documentation provided by IPENZ and the TEO to identify issues that require investigation and instances where additional information is required; advising IPENZ Director – Learning and Assessment of any additional information requirements.
- Holding a pre-visit Panel teleconference to discuss concerns and confirm the need for any additional information required before or during the visit.

During the visit.

- Chairing meetings involving the Panel.
- Ensuring that all necessary information to support the Panel's findings is verified.
- Ensuring that any concerns are reported to the Accreditation Team Leader.
- Writing a draft Accreditation Report in line with the IPENZ Accreditation Report guidelines outlined in Section 12; this must be completed before the end of the accreditation visit.
- Providing verbal feedback of accreditation visit outcomes to the TEO at the end of the accreditation visit in accordance with the guidelines in Section 9.4.6.

After the visit.

- Producing a Panel Report, approved by all Panel Members, in line with a report template provided by the Director – Learning and Assessment. Reports should be submitted to IPENZ National Office within three weeks of the accreditation visit.

8.4 PANEL MEMBERS

The IPENZ Director – Learning and Assessment will appoint Panel Members in consultation with the TEO being visited, the Accreditation Team Leader and the Chair of the Standards and Accreditation Board. Panels should include at least one person who has previously participated in an IPENZ accreditation visit. Overseas representatives will be from a jurisdiction that is a full signatory to the relevant education Accord. They will be endorsed by the Accord signatory in their home jurisdiction or there will be evidence that they understand the education and accreditation standards in that jurisdiction. In normal circumstances international representatives will be senior academics responsible for delivering a similar programme.

To satisfy ongoing review requirements established by each of the Education Accords within the International Engineering Alliance, overseas Panel Members may be drawn from Overall Review Panels established under the review processes documented in Appendix 5.

No-one may serve as a Panel Leader, Panel Member or Team Leader if they have any relationship with the TEO concerned such that could influence their judgement (for example, staff or members of advisory committees).

9. ACCREDITATION PROCEDURES

The accreditation procedure for a programme or a group of programmes comprises the following steps.

9.1 REQUEST FOR ACCREDITATION

The TEO submits a request to IPENZ for a programme or programmes to be accredited. The request may be submitted at any time, but accreditation activities are scheduled on a calendar-year basis.

For a programme that is already accredited, IPENZ will issue a reminder that re-accreditation is due in good time for the TEO to make the necessary preparations.

9.2 SCHEDULING OF ACCREDITATION VISIT

IPENZ acknowledges the request and schedules a date for the accreditation visit in consultation with the TEO; fixes a date by which the TEO must submit its accreditation documentation to IPENZ; and estimates a date by which the SAB will make a decision on accreditation following consideration of the Accreditation Panel's report.

9.3 SUBMISSION OF ACCREDITATION DOCUMENTATION

The TEO submits documentation addressing the relevant Requirements for Initial Academic Education. Refer to Section 12 for further details.

9.4 INITIAL REVIEW OF DOCUMENTATION

On receipt of the documentation the IPENZ Director Learning and Assessment and Team Leader will review the adequacy of the documentation. If the documentation is

considered seriously deficient the TEO will be advised and the accreditation visit may be cancelled until adequate documentation.

9.5 REVIEW OF DOCUMENTATION BY PANEL

Panels will receive and review the documentation from the TEO no later than one month prior to the visit to enable an initial review to be undertaken.

9.6 PRE VISIT TELECONFERENCE BY PANEL

One to two weeks prior to the visit the panel will confer to discuss any preliminary conclusions and to particularly identify any additional information required from the TEO. The TEO will be advised accordingly and requested to provide a formal response, either prior to, or at the time of, the accreditation visit.

The Director Learning and Assessment will use the outcomes of the teleconference to develop a set of targeted (and generic) questions to guide the accreditation team during the visit.

9.7 ACCREDITATION VISIT TIMETABLE

The IPENZ Director – Learning and Assessment, in consultation with the Accreditation Team Leader, will finalise the accreditation visit timetable with the TEO at least two weeks before the accreditation visit. Visits will normally extend over two and a half days, but may take three or four days depending on the number of programmes being reviewed. A sample timetable is given in Appendix 1.

9.8 PANEL VISIT

9.8.1 Panel Orientation and Training

The Accreditation Team normally convenes the afternoon before they visit the education provider. Most of this session is treated as an orientation and briefing session, where Panel Members are given some training in their role, responsibilities and procedures. The objective is to ensure that accreditation teams are consistent in their standards and approach across panels and across all programmes being accredited in New Zealand.

9.8.2 Worksheets

Panel Members are expected to have reviewed all accreditation documentation before arriving at the orientation session. They should also have completed Accreditation Worksheets for each programme being reviewed by their particular Panel. At the orientation session each Panel Member will share their initial findings with the rest of their Panel.

9.9 FOCUS OF VISIT

The visit will focus principally on the following.

- Auditing quality systems and processes.
- Verifying that the stated programme objectives and graduate competency profiles are being met.
- Evaluating factors that cannot readily be described in, or verified from, documentation provided by the TEO.

During the visit, each accreditation panel will undertake the following.

- Meet with the Dean, Heads of Departments or their equivalents and representative samples of students, academic staff, technical support staff, alumni and Industry Advisory Group members. Some of the Panel Members will accompany the Accreditation Team Leader and IPENZ Director – Learning and Assessment when they meet with the Vice Chancellor or equivalent of the TEO.
- Review and discuss assessment procedures and examine representative samples of students' work, focussing particularly on the graduate capability profiles.
- Evaluate factors such as the educational/research culture in the school or TEO, the morale and calibre of the staff and students, and the general awareness of current developments in engineering education and engineering practice.
- Review physical resources, particularly laboratories and independent study facilities, including the library.
- Examine and discuss evidence of how well the quality processes are functioning.

9.10 THE EXIT MEETING

The purpose of the exit meeting is to report findings; it is not the place to conduct open or detailed discussions of any of the recommendations or requirements outlined.

The exit meeting should be confined to the issues outlined below.

- The outcome of the visit should be stated. Teams should say only what they will be recommending to the SAB, which then will make the final decision.
- Any requirements and if possible the method and timing of any follow up should be stated.
- Any recommendations should be noted.

9.11 FINAL DRAFT REPORT AND RESPONSE FROM THE TEO

As soon as possible after the visit, normally within three weeks, a draft report to the Standards and Accreditation Board is prepared and sent to the TEO.

The TEO has two weeks from the date of receipt of the report to provide a written response if it so wishes. The response is normally limited to correcting any errors of fact, but it may comment on any issue which the TEO feels the panels have misunderstood.

9.12 REPORT AND BOARD DECISIONS

The report and recommendations are then finalised, noting any response from the TEO, and forwarded for the Standards and Accreditation Board for consideration at its next meeting.

The Standards and Accreditation Board formally accepts the report and considers the recommendations outlined in it. The Team Leader is invited to attend the SAB meeting at which the visit report is considered.

For each programme evaluated, the Board may decide to undertake one of the following.

- Accord or renew full accreditation for a period of up to five years, with or without requirements to be met within a specified timeframe.
- Accord provisional accreditation, with or without requirements to be met within a specified timeframe, identifying the year from which graduates of the programme might first be recognised by IPENZ (subject to full accreditation being gained).

- Continue the review for a maximum period of 12 months.
- Decline or withdraw accreditation.

9.13 ONGOING REVIEWS

Where a decision is made to continue a review, the original Panel will continue with the review and make a final decision at the end of the 12 months (or sooner if information requested from the provider has been received before that time). The overseas Panel Members will not normally take part in any follow-up visits though they will continue to be consulted.

9.14 DECLINED OR WITHDRAWN ACCREDITATION

In cases where accreditation is declined or withdrawn, a further application would not normally be considered for two years, when a new panel would usually be formed to undertake the next review.

In making a decision to withdraw accreditation, the SAB will make a decision on the extent to which students currently enrolled on the programme can be recognised by IPENZ upon graduation.

10. TRANSPARENCY, CONFIDENTIALITY AND PUBLICATION OF DECISIONS

The accreditation process requires confidentiality in some aspects but transparency in others.

10.1 CONFIDENTIALITY

Apart from reflecting the outcome of each accreditation programme evaluation in the list of recognised degrees, IPENZ will not divulge details of investigation, documentation, correspondence and discussions between IPENZ, the accreditation team and the TEO concerned to third parties or those not involved in the accreditation process without the TEOs approval. Under the various international Accords to which IPENZ is a signatory, observers and reviewers from other Accord countries may be in attendance on panels and be required to report on the status of IPENZ accreditation procedures to their respective bodies. For this purpose they may disclose details of particular accreditations to those bodies, but only to the extent required to comment on the procedures operated by IPENZ.

10.2 LIST OF ACCREDITED PROGRAMMES

After each set of accreditation decisions is made, IPENZ updates the list of all accredited programmes on the IPENZ website. The list shows the initial and final year of accreditation. Where a programme is no longer accredited the previous period(s) of accreditation are shown. Provisionally accredited programmes are identified as such on the list.

Accreditation listings will be maintained in accordance with guidelines developed by the International Engineering Alliance.

TEOs are expected to ensure that current and prospective students are aware of the current accreditation status of their programme/s.

10.3 FEEDBACK AND VERIFICATION

To ensure fairness and adequate transparency, the following measures are taken.

- Actual or potential deficiencies, concerns, comments and constructive criticism must be raised with the Head of Department and relevant academic staff during the accreditation visit or, if identified during the compilation of the report, before the submission of the draft report.
- The draft report is sent to the TEO for correction of any factual errors.
- IPENZ will inform the TEO of the decisions by letter to the Vice Chancellor/Chief Executive, copied to the Dean of the Engineering School. A copy of the Accreditation Report will be attached to the letter.

10.4 FORMATION ASPECTS OF ACCREDITATION

While the accreditation team and IPENZ have a duty to the profession and to the public to withhold accreditation from programmes that do not satisfy IPENZ requirements, there is a complementary duty to encourage programmes that are currently deficient to improve and attain accreditation status. IPENZ therefore requires Accreditation Panels to formulate their reports in a firm but constructive way.

Accreditation reports should clearly outline “requirements” which must be met if the programme is to continue to be accredited. They should also specify any “recommendations” the TEO may wish to consider to improve the quality and relevance of their programmes. Subsequent accreditation visits will assess whether previously specified requirements or recommendations have been actioned. For further information on Accreditation Reports refer to Section 10.

10.5 APPEALS

If the TEO or Engineering School wishes to appeal against a refusal to accredit a programme, an appeal must be lodged with the Chief Executive of IPENZ within two weeks of receipt by the TEO of the accreditation decision and must state the grounds on which it is based. Grounds for the appeal are normally limited to errors of fact or breach of the policy, criteria and/or procedures set out in this Manual. The IPENZ Board shall consider the appeal and may appoint an Appeals Panel of not fewer than one experienced academic and one experienced practising engineer to investigate the appeal and advise the Board. The Board’s decision, which shall be final, shall be given within eight weeks of receipt of the appeal.

10.6 Observers

As a signatory to Washington and Sydney Accords, IPENZ is expected to have provisions in place for accreditation visits to be observed by representatives from Accord signatories from other jurisdictions. This provision is intended to maintain confidence in the accreditation systems across each Accord and to assist in the development of accreditation systems within jurisdictions seeking entry to an Accord. Observing an accreditation visit may also be beneficial for individual providers seeking to develop an accredited engineering programme.

Any requests for observer status will be subject to approval by the TEO being visited, but it is expected that permission will not be unreasonably withheld.

Observers will be required to complete a confidentiality agreement in respect of detailed visit findings and materials made available to the panel that are not in the public domain.

11. TEO DOCUMENTATION – GENERAL GUIDELINES

The purpose of the documentation is to demonstrate that the programme meets in a robust manner the criteria outlined in the relevant IPENZ Academic Requirements. The documentation must describe the following.

- The systems and resources in place to address each of the IPENZ accreditation criterion.
- The broad objectives of the programme as revealed to students.
- How the programme addresses these objectives, including the development of the relevant set of IPENZ graduate competencies.

It should not be necessary to develop extensive documentation specifically for the purpose of accreditation. The purpose of accreditation is to evaluate the systems already in place, not to require their creation. In a well-managed TEO most of the documentation requested should already exist.

A good submission is likely to comprise the following.

- General information on the provider and its programme/s.
- A coherent self review against each of the accreditation criterion.
- Supporting documentation cross referenced from the self review, likely in electronic form (but generally not as internet or intranet links) and comprising a collection of existing documentation

To avoid repetition where information is common to all (or a group of) programmes, the self review (and supporting documentation) may be separated into generic and programme specific volumes or sections.

Submissions must be comprehensive and easy to read, and exhibit a high standard of presentation.

If the initial submission is not considered to meet these guidelines the TEO may be asked to resubmit it.

12. GUIDELINES ON INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY THE TEO

This section gives detailed guidance on the type of information that must be provided by the TEO. It is not the intention of this section to be prescriptive in describing the format in which information should be produced. Wherever possible standard formats readily available in the TEO concerned should be used as long as the information is presented in a logical and coherent form. Suggestions and examples in this section as to formats should be taken as a guide not as rigid requirements.

The content is mandatory the format is not.

The information relating to the institution, school, or department level which is common to all programmes within that institution, school or department need only be presented once but must be in format accessible to all relevant panels. Information could be presented in two parts i.e. common information and programme specific information.

12.1 GENERAL INFORMATION

This should include the following.

- The name of the TEO seeking accreditation of its programme/s.

- Brief background information on the TEO, the school and the programme (and majors).
- Documentation outlining the organisational structure of the TEO, including:
 - the title of the Vice Chancellor/Chief Executive and name of incumbent
 - the name of the principal academic entity responsible for engineering education (e.g. Faculty of Engineering)
 - the title of head of the Engineering School and name of incumbent
 - the title of person at corporate level to whom the head reports and name of incumbent.
- The organisational structure of the Engineering School including titles, names of incumbents and their responsibilities.
- The title of each programme to be accredited (and majors), and abbreviation/s and brief background information on each.
- For any new programme or major, briefly explain the rationale for its introduction. As supplementary documentation it would be helpful to provide panels with any previous papers or reports on the development and introduction of the programme or major.
- A list of all education programmes (undergraduate and post-graduate) for which the Engineering School or department has principal responsibility and the qualifications it awards.
- A list of any programmes for which another entity has principal responsibility but in which the Engineering School has a significant role.
- Details of any substantial changes that have occurred since the last visit, or that are planned for the next academic year.

12.2 SELF-REVIEW AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

The TEO should provide a succinct self-review of the basis on which the TEO believes that each of the accreditation criteria have been met and the systems in place and evidence available to support this assessment

The self-review should include clear links to supporting evidential documents.

If a previous programme review by IPENZ specified any requirements and/or recommendations, the self-review should include a section referencing these and indicating the action taken. Explanations should be given if any such requirements or recommendations have not been actioned.

The self-review should address each of the accreditation criteria. The following guidance is offered in respect of some of the evidence that could be provided to address each criterion.

THE PROGRAMME

12.2.1 Programme Outcomes

The self-review should include the following.

- A description of the process through which targeted graduate outcomes are developed and reviewed.

- Reference to the clear statement of targeted graduate outcomes that each programme is seeking to develop.
- Evidence of clear benchmarking of targeted graduate outcomes to the elements of the generic IPENZ Graduate Competence Profile.
- A description of how the programme and curriculum impart each of the targeted graduate outcomes for the programme. This may include a summary contribution analysis documenting the key contribution(s) of each course.

Note: the Accreditation Panel will be looking to see that the summary analysis is reflected in course descriptors and assessment practices to provide confidence that the targeted graduate outcomes are formally and systematically developed and assessed within each programme.

- A description of all modes and all pathways by which the qualification requirements may be completed and their normal duration including:
 - attendance at multiple or alternative campuses
 - distance education or work-based learning
 - articulation from other post-secondary qualifications
 - partnering arrangements with other TEOs
 - on-campus attendance modes, full-time and part-time
 - conjoint programmes
 - accelerated pathways.
- Comment, as appropriate on how the required graduate capabilities are developed for students on any of these “alternative” pathways.

Supporting documentation should include the following.

- The course structure for each programme. This information should explain the requirements for the award of the qualification, including both mandatory and optional courses.

12.2.2 The Curriculum

The self-review should include the following.

- A description of the particular approach to addressing individual curriculum areas specified within IPENZ accreditation criteria and a summary of the key courses in each case.
- A description of the processes for ensuring that students satisfy the requirement for practical experience.

Supporting documentation should include the following.

- A copy of the programme calendar or handbook that is issued to students.
- The full course descriptor for each course including its level and prerequisites; its scope, coverage and educational objectives; and the mode/s in which it is available to students (lecture, tutorial, laboratories, problem-based or self-directed learning, individual or team project work, distance interaction etc) and evidence of clear links to the development of targeted graduate outcomes, as referenced.

12.2.3 Admission

The self-review should include the following.

- A description of general admission processes and criteria, including entry standards and processes for:
 - admitting New Zealand resident students
 - admitting international fee-paying students
 - admitting students with advanced standing
 - admitting students by transfer from other TEOs or other post-secondary programmes
 - awarding credit for prior learning.
- A summary analysis of any trends in enrolment statistics, along with information on any current limits on enrolment numbers, and any planned changes or future targets.
- Demonstration that entry criteria provide students with a reasonable chance of succeeding in the programme.
- An outline of the progression and exclusion rules for enrolled students, the options available to students who fail in their assessment, and any remedial facilities or programmes offered.
- A description of how the early stages of the programme are designed to suit candidates' backgrounds at admission.
- A description of any special pathways offered to students from particular backgrounds and any special support programmes to cater for disadvantaged or unconventional backgrounds, language difficulties or inadequate preparation in particular subject areas.
- A description of the special support services available to students, such as individual or small-group learning support systems, support for students for whom English is a second language, student counselling services etc.

Supporting documentation should include the following.

- Copies of admission policies and criteria
- Programme level admissions, enrolments and progression data for the current year and the four previous years on
 - the number of students in each year
 - the number of commencing enrolments
 - the number of continuing enrolments
 - the number of overseas fee paying students
 - the number of female students.
- Programme level data on Graduation numbers and the award of Honours as indicated in Table 1 in Appendix 2 for the current year and the four previous years.

12.2.4 Assessment

The self-review should include the following.

- A description of the approach taken to assessment of student attainment and performance with particular reference to:
 - the outcomes of the programme as a whole and their relationship to the stated objectives
 - the uses made of self, peer and mentor assessment
 - attainment of targeted graduate outcomes
 - processes for the moderation of assessment.
- A description of the criteria for the award of honours and the processes for determining honours grading.

Supporting documentation should include the following.

- Copies of assessment and moderation policies.
- Copies of assessment plans for each course (which may be part of the Course Descriptor) evidencing assessment against key learning outcomes at a course level and relevant targeted graduate outcomes for the programme as a whole.

12.2.5 Programme Resources

The self-review should include the following.

- A description of the arrangements for funding the Engineering School and/or engineering programmes.
- An indication of how resources are allocated to programmes within the Engineering School.
- A discussion of the adequacy of available resources to meet the objectives of the school and the programmes to be accredited. Comment on any recent or prospective trends in the school's financial situation and their impact on programme effectiveness. Indicate steps taken to address any perceived inadequacies.

Supporting documentation should include the following.

- A summary listing of physical resources within the Engineering School.

12.2.6 Academic Staff

The self-review should include the following.

- A description of the current academic staffing profile and evaluation of the level to which active staff are engaged with the wider engineering profession and active in supporting collegial self-regulation of the engineering profession in New Zealand (with reference to the characteristics identified in the accreditation criteria).
- A brief summary of the evidence of the professional competence and professional standing of programme leaders.
- A brief summary of the evidence of the current competence in the New Zealand context of key academic staff teaching project courses.
- A commentary on current academic staffing levels including information on

- the current and targeted student/staff ratios
- adequacy of coverage of key curriculum areas
- any current academic staff vacancies that exist
- any critical dependencies. If there are areas of weakness indicate any strategies for remedying these.
- A description of the approach to managing the contribution of any part time teaching staff.
- An indication of the proportion of teaching staff who have qualifications in education and teaching.
- A description of the Engineering School's arrangements for managing staff workloads.
- A brief summary of the School's profile in research and associated engineering activity, indicating its extent and scope, and naming principal areas of research concentration, formally-established centres and any major research collaborations with other schools, institutes or organisations.
- For any programme or pathway conducted substantially outside the Engineering School itself (for example, contracted to another provider or conducted offshore or on another campus with different staff) describe the staffing arrangements and the methods used by the Engineering School to assure itself of the competence of the staff involved.
- Comment, as appropriate, to demonstrate that no programme is critically dependent on one or two people.

Supporting documentation should include the following.

- Copies of staffing policies relating to:
 - appointment and tenure
 - promotion
 - workload allocation
 - supervision and management
 - appointment, supervision and counselling of sessional staff
 - any merit-based reward systems.
- A summary listing of all academic staff showing qualifications, professional memberships and other professional engagements and present teaching responsibilities – refer Appendix 3 – supported by copies of standard curriculum vitae
- Evidence of the application of any workload allocation model.

12.2.7 Technical staff

The self-review should include the following.

- A summary of the numbers and qualifications of technical and support staff and their main occupational role.
- A brief description of the mechanisms through which academic staff and students engage the services of technical staff.

Supporting documentation should include the following.

- Summary curriculum vitae for technical staff.

12.2.8 Laboratories

The self-review should include the following.

- A description of the laboratory space and equipment and commentary on their adequacy to meet the objectives of the school and the programme/s to be accredited.
- Describe the systems in place to ensure health and safety in laboratory spaces are in line with industry good practice.
- A description of the processes and responsibilities for purchasing and maintaining laboratory equipment, including an indication of the operating and capital budget allocations.

Supporting documentation should include the following.

- A table itemising the laboratories and equipment that are available to students and staff.
- Copies of Health and Safety policies and procedures.

12.2.9 Independent Study Facilities

The self-review should include the following.

- A description of the independent access students have to laboratories to support project /research based study.
- A description of the access students have to sufficient library and computer resources to support their learning.

Supporting documentation should include the following.

A table summarising library holdings and computing facilities available to students and staff.

12.2.10 Educational and Professional Culture

The self-review should include the following.

- A description of the student societies operating within the School and the support they receive from academic staff and management.
- A summary of the mechanisms in place to enhance teaching and learning practices.
- A summary of the processes for ensuring the involvement of academic staff in curriculum development and review.
- Information about the number of staff undertaking professional development programmes and the range of programmes that are available.

Supporting documentation should include the following.

- Copies of related teaching and learning policies and programmes.

12.2.11 Programme Management

The self-review should include:

- A description of the responsibilities (subject to institutional approval processes) for programme design, programme content, programme delivery, resource management, staff appointment and supervision, and professional activities of staff.

Supporting documentation should include the following.

- Organisational Charts to show management and quality assurance structures at both a TEO and School level.

12.2.12 Institutional Support and Leadership

The self-review should include:

- A summary of the long term plans for the development of the Engineering School and its programmes.
- Evidence of the Engineering School's engagement in long-term planning processes (for example excerpts from the Engineering School's strategic plans).

Supporting documentation should include the following.

- Copies of corporate mission statements and strategic plans.

12.2.13 Advice from Industry

The self-review should include:

- An outline of the ways the Engineering School interacts with the engineering profession to gain feedback on future needs.
- A description of the formal industry advisory structures that are in place and the way that they contribute to defining and reviewing targeted graduate outcomes against industry needs and providing feedback on the capabilities of graduates.

Supporting documentation should include the following.

- Copies of Industry Advisory Committee Terms of Reference.
- Copies of recent Industry Advisory Committee Minutes.
- Current Industry Advisory Committee Membership, showing their affiliations.

12.2.14 Quality Systems and Processes

The self-review should include the following.

- A description of the processes for maintaining standards and ensuring that graduates are produced with the required graduate competencies. These might include processes for:
 - programme planning, curriculum development and programme approval.
 - ongoing review of programmes and their delivery
 - securing and considering feedback and comment from students, graduates, employers of engineers, community representatives and any other programme stakeholders.

- A summary of the internal audit processes that are in place to ensure procedural compliance.
- A summary of approaches taken to compare or benchmark programme standards against those of other TEOs and the outcomes of recent benchmarking activities.

Supporting documentation should include copies of the following.

- Policies and procedures for programme development, approval and review.
- The latest annual programme report.
- The latest programme review reports.
- The latest student course survey results.
- Any external monitor's report.
- Any available graduate employment data, alumni surveys and employer surveys of longer-term graduate performance and development.

13. SUBMISSION OF DOCUMENTATION

The general information and self-review documentation should be provided in hard copy and should include a table of contents. The self-review should include clear cross referencing to supporting documentation, which may be provided in electronic format.

The number of copies required will depend on the number of people on the Accreditation Team. IPENZ will advise the TEO of the number of copies required and the date by which this documentation should be made available. All copies should be submitted to the IPENZ Director – Learning & Assessment, who will arrange distribution.

14. INFORMATION TO BE AVAILABLE FOR INSPECTION DURING VISIT

The following documentation should be available for inspection by the accreditation panel during their visit.

- Copies of all current promotional literature.
- A dossier of materials for all core engineering papers at each year, all final year papers and papers central to the development of engineering design and professional practice skills. The information provided should include:
 - learning and assessment guidelines presented to students, history of student feedback and other related quality assurance records
 - examples of assessment materials, including examination papers, and assignment and project specifications
 - graded examples of student work including examination scripts, assignments, project reports (particularly final year), relating to each programme and which relates to all the elements of the graduate competency profile outlined in the relevant IPENZ Academic Requirements policy. The Panel would particularly wish to see examples that had been graded at the pass/fail boundary
- records of the school's interactions with advisory groups involving employers of engineering graduates and the response to those interactions
- records associated with any strategic planning events, and with the operation of such groups as: faculty meetings, teaching and learning committees, assessment committees, examination boards, curriculum planning meetings or forums and staff/student forums

- a recent list of publications by staff of the school and examples of research and consultancy reports if not provided in standard curricula vitae.

15. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT DURING THE VISIT

Accreditation Panels will generally require access to overhead projection equipment and a printer during the visit.

Panels should also be provided with lists of attendees at each meeting and each attendee should be provided with a name badge or “table hat”.

16. ACCREDITATION REPORTS

Each Accreditation Panel is expected to produce a report. If there is more than one panel an Executive Summary, written by the Accreditation Team Leader or Director Learning and Assessment, will summarise the key findings of each panel and outline issues common to all their reports.

The report may be reviewed by the various Accord bodies to which IPENZ belongs. These bodies will generally not be familiar with the context of New Zealand engineering education. The reports should therefore include sufficient background, generally no more than a paragraph, to clarify the context of the programme.

16.1 PANEL REPORT CONTENT

Accreditation Reports need to include the following.

- Commentary on the programme, including perceived strengths and weaknesses, including supporting statistics where appropriate.
- Requirements if any. “Requirements” are defined as those aspects that must be fulfilled by the TEO if the programme is to continue to be accredited or, in the case of accreditation being denied, before the programme will be considered for accreditation in the future. The reports need to specify a time by which the Panel expects the requirements to be met. If no time frame is given requirements will be followed up on the next accreditation visit. The reasons for any requirements must be given.

Requirements should be set to address areas where a panel identifies that specific accreditation criteria are not being met and this is seen to be impacting on outcomes.

- Recommendations. “Recommendations” are defined as suggestions provided by the Panel as advice, indicating how they believe the quality and relevance of the programme could be improved. There is normally no timeframe associated with recommendations, but subsequent accreditation visits will investigate what progress has been made on them. The reason for any recommendations should be given.

Recommendations will typically be set in situations where minimum criteria are being met, but best practice is not evident, or in some cases, in situations where a panel identifies technical breaches of accreditation criteria, which are not seen to be impacting on outcomes.

- Overall recommendations to IPENZ as to whether or not the programmes evaluated should be accredited, and whether provisionally or fully.
- Any follow-up action that is recommended outside the accreditation visit framework. This might include the appointment of a monitor, or an annual report from the TEO to IPENZ about progress on requirements and recommendations etc.

Recommendations on follow up actions may include recommending that SAB impose a requirement to report on progress, actions or changes in a particular area. Typically, this would apply in situations where minimum criteria are being met, but there are risk factors that may impact on outcomes or accreditation criteria continuing to be met over time.

- A recommended time for the next accreditation visit. This may vary from one to five years depending on circumstances, for example whether the programmes in question are offered by a new or an established TEO, whether provisional accreditation or full accreditation is at issue, and the nature and extent of the requirements made in the report.

16.2 STYLE OF REPORT WRITING

Panel Reports should be concise, and are typically between six and eight A4 pages in length. Requirements and recommendations should be phrased precisely, leaving no room for interpretation and therefore confusion. The tone of the report should be formal, informative and constructive. Careful attention should be given to the way criticisms are worded, so that they are interpreted as constructive criticism.

16.3 REPORT FORMAT

Panel Reports should largely follow Part B of the relevant “IPENZ Academic Requirements” policy, and so have the following headings.

1. Background. State the purpose of the visit; list programmes being reviewed, new programmes, major changes to programmes; give brief background to the provider, school and programme.
2. Summary of Key Findings
 - a. Previous accreditation visit (if applicable). Provide a summary of actions taken to address requirements and recommendations from the previous visit and specific comment on any matters of ongoing concern.
3. Detailed Findings
 - a. The programme and programme outcomes
 - graduate outcomes
 - the curriculum
 - admission standards
 - assessment.
 - b. Institutional Infrastructure, Staffing and Culture
 - academic staff
 - technical staff
 - laboratories
 - independent study facilities
 - educational and professional culture.

c. Management structures and quality systems to sustain and enhance the programme and its delivery

- management structure
- institutional support
- advice from Industry
- quality processes.

4. Summary

5. Overall Recommendation.

State whether the programme/s should be granted accredited status, and if so for what period and any conditions.

Requirements and recommendations should be listed after the relevant section of the report and reproduced in the summary.

The IPENZ Director – Learning and Assessment will issue each Panel with an Accreditation Report template to ensure that all reports are consistent in their format.

17. ACCREDITATION VISIT COSTS

It is acknowledged that the accreditation of programmes provides a shared benefit to the TEO, Graduates and the Profession. In recognition of this the costs of accreditation are shared.

Direct costs associated with individual accreditation visits are borne by the TEO. This includes all the travel and accommodation costs associated with IPENZ accreditation visits. Panel Members are reimbursed expenses but are not paid for the hours that they give to accreditation visits. Refer to Appendix 4 for guidelines on accreditation expenses.

Observers from other signatories of the international agreements are expected to meet their own travel and accommodation costs.

IPENZ National Office will make the travel and accommodation arrangements for the accreditation team. However the TEOs, in consultation with IPENZ, may wish to make these arrangements themselves.

Given the significant benefits accruing to Graduates holding a qualification accredited to an international Accord standard, IPENZ seeks to recover a contribution from graduates indirectly. It will achieve this by invoicing qualification-granting TEOs to cover costs associated with managing the accreditation process and maintaining its standing as a signatory to the Washington Accord and Sydney Accord.

The amount to be recovered is set every three years.

An estimate of the IPENZ staffing and direct costs will be made in the year prior to the commencement of each three year period. The estimate will be made by IPENZ's Director – Learning and Assessment and the methodology will be subject to scrutiny from the NZCED and CETTENZ.

TEOs become liable to contribute once they achieve provisional accreditation to a relevant Accord standard (but the graduate number is set as zero until full accreditation is achieved).

In June each year, each TEO shall supply the number of graduates in the preceding 12 months up to 30 June.

At the same time TEOs will supply a list of academic staff who are IPENZ Members, and their equivalent fulltime status (represented as a fraction of one fulltime employee) as at 30 June.

The IPENZ Director – Learning and Assessment will develop data for the number of Accreditation Panels attributable to each provider based on the most relevant accreditation visit. This might be an upcoming scheduled visit, or a recent visit depending on the timing and circumstances. Multi-provider visits (e.g. panels for the Metro ITP BEngTech degree) will be weighted 50 per cent higher in the first three year period, this weighting subject to future review for the period commencing 2013.

In early July each year IPENZ will publish the data on panel numbers for checking, to NZCED and CETTENZ

IPENZ will determine the allocation attributable to each provider based on a 60 per cent weighting for graduate numbers and 40 per cent overall rating for number of panels.

IPENZ will determine the total IPENZ subscription income paid by the academic staff at each TEO in the present subscription year. From that IPENZ will determine a rebate which shall be the smaller of 75 per cent of the total subscription income, or a prescribed percentage of the allocation determined above.

Fees (on which GST is also payable) shall be paid prior to 30 September once IPENZ has supplied a suitable invoice. IPENZ will provide details of the calculation of rebate with the invoice.

APPENDIX ONE - TIMETABLE EXEMPLAR

A possible visit programme is given below. It is based on a visit by multiple simultaneous panels with a Team Leader.

Notes

1. There is some flexibility in the order and timing of activities but the general aim is to consider the information presented in a logical order.
2. Experience has shown that some presentations tend to repeat material already provided. Care should be taken to avoid this where practical

Two to three weeks prior to visit		
Period	Venue	Team Activity
One hour	Teleconference	Accreditation Team teleconference to identify gaps in documentation and key areas of focus for visit
Afternoon or Evening Before Visit		
Period	Venue	Team Activity
Varies	Off campus	Team introductions and training of panellists if not done previously
Four hours	Off campus	Private Plenary Team Meeting chaired by Team Leader. (Observers, if any are present)
		Private Team dinner with observers
Day One		
Period	Venue	Team Activity
Two hours	Central	Opening Session: Accreditation Team meets with senior departmental staff Introductions (15 mins) Overview presentation by Associate Dean (15

		mins) Issues from Previous Accreditation Visit (15 minutes) Key issues identified from document review (30 minutes) Programme objectives and structure
One hour	Departments	Accreditation Panels meet with relevant programme leaders Objective: opportunity for further discussion at programme level. Areas for discussion to include curriculum developments within individual degrees, coverage of IPENZ Graduate profile within curriculum, staffing, departmental research activity, and stakeholder input
One hour	Potential parallel session	Meeting with Dean and Quality Manager to consider academic quality systems
One hour (Lunch)	Central	Lunch with Programme Advisory Group members and stakeholders Objective: review level of engagement with industry and level of stakeholder support
One hour	Departments	Accreditation Panels meet with relevant academic staff Objective: Consideration of issues relating to curriculum development, teaching and learning approaches, assessment, programme objectives, IPENZ Graduate Profile, workloads, resourcing, technical support, research
1.5 hours	Departments	Accreditation Panels review samples of student work/examinations/projects Objective: Review learning outcomes against course descriptors and IPENZ Graduate Profile
One -hour	Departments	Panels meet with selection of undergraduate students
30 minutes	Central	Private session for Accreditation Team
45 minutes - early evening		Accreditation Panels meet with recent alumni/postgraduate students

Later evening	Off campus	Social function with academic representatives
Day Two		
One hour	Central	Private session for Accreditation Team Objective: consolidate initial findings Note: Programme leaders available to discuss issues arising from Day One, as required.
One hour	Departments	Panels tour facilities, focusing on laboratories and independent study facilities
One hour	Central	Accreditation Team meets with the Vice Chancellor and Dean. Objective: review matters relating to institutional strategy, governance and support
	Potential Parallel Session	Staff research/teaching and learning support initiatives
	Potential Parallel Session	Student learning support initiatives
	Potential Parallel Session	Work experience support initiatives
One hour	Departments	Accreditation Panels review student work Objective: Further opportunity to review samples of student work, examinations/projects
30 minutes	Departments	Accreditation Panels meet with technical staff Objective: Consideration of levels of administrative and technical support and associated systems
Two hours	Central	Private session for Accreditation Team Objective: consolidate findings and begin to draft report
30 minutes	Central	Exit Meeting Objective: present verbal report on findings to Senior Management

Note: the provider is expected to provide lists of names and titles/affiliations of attendees at panel sessions with academic staff, students, alumni and advisory group members. Where possible, name badges should be provided to assist with interaction.

APPENDIX TWO – GRADUATE STATISTICS

Information to be provided for each programme being accredited

Programme: (Name)		Year					Comment
	Unit	-4	-3	-2	-1 (Last year)	Current year	
No of Graduates							
First class honours	No(%)						
Second class Div 1	No(%)						
Second class Div 2	No(%)						
Other	No(%)						
Total number of graduates from programme	No(100%)						
Post graduate students							
PhD							

Masters by course work							
Masters (thesis)							
Total post graduate students							
Summary data for all programmes being accredited							
Total number of graduating students							
Name of programme 1	No						
Name of programme 2	No						
Name of programme 3	No						
Name of programme 4	No						
Etc	No						
Total	No						

APPENDIX THREE - STAFF DATA SUMMARY

This summary table should be provided and supplemented by copies of staff CVs

STAFF – MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

1	2	3	4
Name	Academic Qualifications	Membership of Professional Bodies and other examples of professional engagement	Present teaching subject and student contact hours per year
ABC	PhD, MS (Purdue) BEng (Nottingham)	FIPENZ, FASHRAE, MASME, CPEng (NZ)	M777 Thermodynamics (Tut: 48 hrs) M456 Lab Project (15 hrs) M345 Building Energy Analysis (Lect: 13 hrs) M433 Final Year Project (30 hrs)
DEF			

APPENDIX FOUR EXPENSE CLAIM GUIDELINES

TEOs seeking IPENZ accreditation of engineering programmes are expected to cover all direct costs associated with accreditation visits. The following guidelines have been developed to ensure consistency across accreditation visits regarding travel, accommodation and other general expenses.

1.1 Overseas Representatives

If a provider is seeking accreditation of more than one programme it may not be necessary to have an overseas representative on each panel. Providers, when advising IPENZ of the names of possible overseas Panel Members, should consider the travel costs of international representatives and weigh this against the advantages that an overseas representative brings to the Panel, such as the opportunity to develop international networks, and the ability to benchmark standards to an overseas TEO. Recommending overseas representatives from jurisdictions relatively close to New Zealand, such as Australia and Hong Kong, would help reduce costs.

In order for IPENZ, as the New Zealand signatory, to meet its international obligations under the Washington Accord and Sydney Accord, some of the overseas representatives will need to be approved by the Accord signatory of the country in which the overseas representative resides.

Overseas representatives, when being asked if they would agree to have their name put forward to IPENZ as a potential Panel member, should be informed that any direct costs associated with their participation in the accreditation will be reimbursed. They would, however, normally be expected to travel economy class if the flight time is less than five hours or within normal daylight hours. IPENZ can arrange travel; however, in order for the Panel Member to gain international air-points, they may wish to book their travel themselves and seek reimbursement after the accreditation visit has been held. They may then be able to use their current air-points to upgrade to business class air travel if they so wish. Overseas representatives, depending on how far they have travelled, will normally have their accommodation costs met for one day either side of the actual accreditation visit; for example, if the accreditation visit required two nights' stay, then overseas representatives would be accommodated for four nights.

1.2 Travel within New Zealand

Travel within New Zealand will be economy class. Bookings will be made at least one month in advance so that advantage can be taken of airfare discounts. If Panel Members use their own vehicle when travelling to participate in an accreditation visit, they will be reimbursed at 70 cents per kilometre.

1.3 Hotel Accommodation

IPENZ will take advice from the TEO on what hotel to use for accommodation and meals. Hotels are required to have meeting rooms large enough to accommodate the accreditation team and suitable places for individual panels to meet on occasion, particularly in the evenings. A general guideline is that hotels should be close to the TEO and should meet the standards expected of at least a three-star rating.

1.4 Meals

Morning and afternoon teas and lunches are arranged by the TEO and evening meals are normally organised by IPENZ.

The final evening meal is usually organised in conjunction with the TEO, as this is an occasion where views on engineering education and engineering professional issues are exchanged in open dialogue between senior representatives of the engineering profession and of the TEO.

1.5 General Expenses

As Panel Members are not receiving payment for their participation some minor general expenses are permitted, such as one telephone call and some mini-bar or room service meals, particularly for overseas Panel Members who may have arrived at the hotel outside of normal meal times. Alcohol, laundry and movie costs will not be reimbursed.

1.6 Costs of Extra Activities

If the TEO wishes to use local or overseas Panel Members for other contiguous reviews or activities before or after the accreditation visit the costs of doing so will be borne by the educational provider.

Any additional direct costs associated with overseas representatives reviewing IPENZ accreditation standards and procedures for International Accord purposes will be borne by IPENZ.

Costs of the attendance of Accreditation Team Leaders at the SAB meeting, when the Accreditation Reports are considered, will be borne by IPENZ

APPENDIX FIVE – CONTINUOUS MONITORING PROCESS FOR ACCORD SIGNATORIES

Procedures extracted from the consolidated Rules and Procedures of the International Educational Accords.

New Zealand has opted to use Continuous Monitoring.

1. MONITORING OF SIGNATORIES

1.1. MONITORING PROTOCOLS

1. Each of the accreditation or recognition systems for which a signatory is responsible shall be subject to comprehensive monitoring and report by representatives of the other signatories at intervals of not more than six years.
2. The Committee must establish and the secretariat publish annually, no later than 1 July, a schedule for the programme of monitoring activities, this schedule covering at least the upcoming six years.
3. Upon receipt of the schedule each signatory must immediately inform the Committee whether it wishes to be monitored by periodic monitoring or by continuous monitoring. In the event that a signatory does not select one or other procedure then the periodic monitoring procedure is assumed to have been selected.
4. The type of monitoring to be used for any individual signatory must be approved by the signatories via a suitable meeting method prior to the commencement of any monitoring actions.
5. Any signatory which effects a substantial change to its accreditation criteria, policies or procedures is obliged to report such a change to the Committee via the secretariat and thereby to provide the other signatories with the opportunity to require that the scheduled monitoring and report be brought forward.

1.2. NOMINATION OF PERSONS TO FORM TEAMS

1. Upon request from the secretariat, each signatory must provide as soon as possible one or more names of persons to form part of the panel from which Monitoring Teams may be drawn. If Continuous monitoring is used, in determining the suitability of proposed team members signatories must note that Panel Members fulfil a dual role, firstly as accreditation Panel Members and secondly as Accord monitors. This clause 3.2 1 shall not require any signatory to provide more than one such representative in any calendar year for any one Accord.

1.3. PERIODIC MONITORING

1. Each signatory to be monitored must receive a notice from the secretariat no less than six months prior to the year of the Monitoring Team activities being undertaken.
2. Three representatives from different signatories, one of whom will be designated the team leader, must be selected by the Committee to form the Monitoring Team; the secretariat must take all reasonable steps to ensure that none of the individuals selected through this process has had any substantial prior involvement in or commitment to the accreditation system being monitored.
3. The signatory responsible for the accreditation system to be monitored must be advised by the secretariat of the proposed composition of the Monitoring Team, and

invited to show cause as to why any member of the Monitoring Team is not suitable. In the event that such an objection is lodged, the secretariat must advise the Committee to take such steps as are necessary and appropriate to resolve the situation. If unable to achieve consensus, the Committee must consult all signatories before confirming the membership of the Monitoring Team.

4. The signatory whose accreditation system is to be monitored shall be invited to propose a suitable process, timetable and administrative support mechanism, for consideration by the Monitoring Team. The monitoring process must include accreditation visits to educational providers offering engineering academic programmes and to the meetings at which the outcomes of such visits are discussed and decided.
5. All discussions concerning monitoring must be held in confidence by the Monitoring Team. At the conclusion of each monitoring activity, the monitoring team must forward its report and recommendations to the secretariat as soon as reasonably practicable. A copy of that report must be furnished to each signatory through the secretariat.
6. The recommendations open to the monitoring team are as follows:
 - a. that the accreditation/recognition system in question be accepted by the other signatories, for a period of six years, as leading to outcomes substantially equivalent to the systems known to the monitoring team; or
 - b. that the accreditation/recognition system in question be accepted by the other signatories, for a period of not more than two years subject to the responsible signatory providing, within six months, a report which satisfies the other signatories that adequate steps are being taken to address the specific issues identified by the monitoring team; or
 - c. that the accreditation/recognition system in question has serious deficiencies, and the signatory be downgraded immediately to conditional status, and urgent and specific assistance be provided by the other signatories to help address the deficiencies.

1.4. CONTINUOUS MONITORING

1. At the beginning of the six year monitoring period, three representatives from different signatories, one of whom will be designated the team leader, must be selected by the Committee to form the Overall Monitoring Team (OMT). The secretariat must take all reasonable steps to ensure that none of the individuals selected through this process has had any substantial prior involvement in or commitment to the accreditation system being monitored. The secretariat will inform those signatories that they will be required to nominate persons who can fulfil dual roles as accreditation Panel Members, and as the Accord Monitoring Team.
2. If for any reason a member of the OMT should become unavailable during the monitoring period, the committee may appoint a replacement team member following consideration of nominations from the signatory who provided the initial team member.
3. The signatory responsible for the accreditation system to be monitored must be advised by the secretariat of the proposed composition of the OMT, and invited to show cause as to why any member of the OMT is not suitable. In the event that such an objection is lodged, the secretariat must advise the Committee to take such steps as are necessary and appropriate to resolve the situation. If unable to achieve consensus, the Committee must consult all signatories before confirming the membership of the OMT.

4. The signatory will provide the Committee with an overall monitoring programme for the monitoring period indicating when Accord Monitoring Team visits are likely to occur. The programme will ensure that Accord Monitoring Teams (AMT) participate in not less than three accreditation visits within the monitoring period, where possible to separate educational providers.
5. An AMT consisting of a subset of the OMT will be formed by the OMT team leader and the signatory being monitored for each designated accreditation visit. An AMT will consist of two OMT members for major accreditation or one for smaller visits. The OMT team leader will appoint one of the AMT as the AMT team leader for each monitored accreditation visit.
6. Each AMT will produce a report, a copy of which will be provided to the signatory beginning monitored, members of the OMT and the Committee.
7. Any issues or recommendations identified by one AMT will be considered by subsequent AMTs, with the signatory under review expected to provide a report on changes made between AMT visits.
8. The signatory being monitored must ensure that at least one member of the OMT, in the last two years of the six year monitoring period, meets with the accreditation/recognition agency, reviews the accreditation / recognition procedures with the agency and observes an accreditation/recognition board decision meeting.
9. All discussions concerning monitoring must be held in confidence by the OMT.
10. Prior to the end of the monitoring period the Chair of the OMT will prepare a summary report and recommendations to the secretariat. A copy of that report must be furnished to each signatory through the secretariat, no later than 90 days prior to the next biennial meeting of the Accord signatories.
11. If, after at least two AMT visits, but before the end of the monitoring period, the OMT concludes that there are substantive matters that call into question the substantial equivalence of the accreditation system of the signatory being monitored, the OMT may prepare a summary report and recommendations to the secretariat. A copy of that report must be furnished to each signatory through the secretariat for consideration at the next biennial meeting of the Accord signatories.
12. The recommendations open to the Overall Monitoring Team are as follows:
 - a. the accreditation/recognition system in question be accepted by the other signatories, for a period of six years, (as leading to outcomes substantially equivalent to the systems known to the monitoring team); or
 - b. the accreditation/recognition system in question be accepted by the other signatories, for a period of not more than two years, subject to the responsible signatory providing, within six months, a report which satisfies the other signatories that adequate steps are being taken to address the specific issues identified by the review team; or
 - c. the accreditation/recognition system in question has serious deficiencies, that the signatory revert immediately to conditional status, and that urgent and specific assistance be provided by the other signatories to help address the deficiencies.

1.5. CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND REQUESTS FOR RECONSIDERATION

1. Recommendations from monitoring activities under either Periodic monitoring or Continuous monitoring are considered by the other signatories in committee at a general meeting.

2. The signatories may resolve only one of the following:
 - a. that the accreditation/recognition system in question be accepted by the other signatories, for a period of six years; or
 - b. that the accreditation/recognition system in question be accepted by the other signatories, for a period of not more than two years, subject to the signatory in question providing, within six months, a report which satisfies the other signatories that adequate steps are being taken to address specific issues; or
 - c. that the signatory revert immediately to a non-voting conditional status for a period of no more than two years, and that specific requirements to be addressed be stated.
3. A resolution for (a) or (c) shall require support from two-thirds of the signatories, and in the absence of that majority the outcome shall be (b) in which case the specific issues to be addressed must be stated.
4. The subject signatory may, within 60 days of notification of a decision, request reconsideration of a decision imposing conditional status (c), and request independent reconsideration of its case. Requests for reconsideration must be based on one or more of the following grounds:
 - a. that there was a failure to follow these Rules, and/or
 - b. that there were substantial errors of facts in the report considered by the signatories which were likely to have affected the decision reached by the signatories, and/or
 - c. that the report considered by the signatories did not include relevant information, and had that information been placed before the signatories there was a reasonable likelihood that a different decision would have been made.
5. If reconsideration is requested, the Committee must ensure that within six months of the decision, a reconsideration panel which is established in the same manner as a monitoring team using Periodic monitoring, but has no membership in common with, the original monitoring team(s) is established and reports its outcomes.
6. Whilst reconsideration is in progress the signatory will continue to enjoy the full benefits of being a signatory.
7. The reconsideration panel shall determine the procedures and criteria under which it operates, but at all times its procedures must be consistent with these Rules and procedures as far as this is reasonably possible.
8. The full costs of any such reconsideration must be borne by the subject signatory.
9. The right to request reconsideration may be exercised only once.
10. The recommendations of a reconsideration panel must be considered by the signatories by a suitable meeting method as soon as reasonably possible, and one of the following decisions made:
 - a. the accreditation/recognition system in question be accepted by the other signatories, for a period of six years; or
 - b. the accreditation/recognition system in question be accepted by the other signatories, for a period of not more than two years, subject to the signatory concerned providing, within six months, a report which satisfies the other signatories that adequate steps are being taken to address specific issues; or
 - c. the signatory revert immediately to a non-voting conditional status for a period of no more than two years, and that specific requirements to be addressed be stated.