

**Australian and New Zealand Architecture Program
Accreditation Procedure: 2015-16 Review**

Executive Summary	3
Recommendations	5
Overview	6
Governance	8
Management Committee	10
National Visiting Panel	12
Implementation Working Group	15
Appendix A: ANZAPAP Implementation Working Group Draft Terms of Reference	17
Appendix B: Stakeholder Consultation submissions	21
Appendix C: Stakeholder Comments	22
Appendix D: Review 2015-16 Terms of Reference	29
Appendix E: Benchmarking Australia with other registration systems	31

Acronyms

AACA – Architects Accreditation Council of Australia
AAECF - Australian Architectural Education and Competency Framework
AASA – Association of Architecture Schools of Australasia
Accrediting Authorities – Australian State and Territory Architects Registration Boards and New Zealand Registered Architects Board
ADBED – Australian Deans of the Built Environment and Design
AIA – the Institute
NZRAB - New Zealand Registered Architects Board
NVP – National Visiting Panel

Executive Summary:

The primary purpose of professional accreditation is to ensure that graduates from Australian and New Zealand Master of Architecture programs are appropriately qualified and competent. State and Territory Architect Registration Boards have legislative responsibility for accrediting the Master of Architecture qualifications for the purposes of registration in Australia. The New Zealand Registered Architects Board accredits the Master of Architecture programs in New Zealand.

This review was requested by the owners of the *Australian and New Zealand Architecture Program Accreditation Procedure* (ANZAPAP) - the Architects Accreditation Council of Australia (AACCA) and the Australian Institute of Architects (Institute), and also includes representatives from the Australian Deans of the Built Environment and Design (ADBED); the Association of Architecture Schools of Australasia (AASA); and the New Zealand Registered Architects Board (NZRAB) on the Review Panel.

The Review has identified 14 recommendations to improve the management and effectiveness of the ANZAPAP and to ensure the future of the profession in Australia and New Zealand through an accreditation process that reflects international best practice.

Key recommendations include:

- New Zealand Registered Architects Board becoming a joint owner of the accreditation process with the AACCA and the Institute;
- Developing a transparent cost recovery funding model to allocate the cost of accreditation appropriately across the stakeholders;
- Restructuring the role of the Management Committee;
- Simplification of the National Visitation Panel to reduce the cost and time burden on education providers associated with the process; and
- Reviewing the existing Interim Review Panels with a view to replacing with an annual pro-forma reporting requirement for all accredited programs.

The Australian *National Standard of Competency for Architects* (the Standard) forms the basis for the accreditation of architectural education leading to registration as an architect in Australia and New Zealand.

Critical to this review is the incorporation of the work of the *Australian Architectural Education and Competency Framework* (AAECF) project to align the Standard with other mandatory government-imposed requirements for higher education.

The purpose of the accreditation procedures is to provide assurance that architecture education program outcomes meet the required components of the *National Standard of Competency for Architects*.

The recommendations have been developed with the aim of:

- Promoting consistency, transparency and ongoing quality enhancement;
- Supporting education providers to undertake ongoing improvements to programs in response to new educational developments and opportunities; and
- Benchmarking against accreditation systems in other countries.

The Terms of Reference for the Review included:

- the governance of accreditation in Australia
- the relationship between ANZAPAP and the Architects Registration Boards, as the statutory bodies responsible for the final accreditation decision.
- the quantum of funding for accreditation processes, and how this funding is split between the system's stakeholders.
- the most effective model for secretariat support to accreditation.
- the extent to which the ANZAPAP processes should deal with pedagogical issues, different cultures across schools, how students are inculcated into the culture of the discipline and the changing nature of delivery of education, including on-line program content.
- the ANZAPAP document.
- the strengths and weaknesses of ANZAPAP compared with accreditation arrangements overseas and with other professional qualifications in the Australian context.
- whether there should be any changes to the current system of accrediting the MArch qualification, and with schools nominating a benchmark academic pathway.
- any other matters that, in the view of the Review Panel, have a material impact on the effectiveness of accreditation arrangements.

The Review Panel members were nominated by key stakeholders and include Professor Michael Ostwald, The University of Newcastle; Professor Kirsten Orr, University of Tasmania; Dr Chris Landorf, The University of Queensland; Ms Sarah Briant, Quirk Architecture; Mr Kieran Wong, CODA Architects; and Mr Callum McKenzie, New Zealand Registered Architects Board. Secretariat support was provided by Ms Elisabeth Egle, AACA. See *Appendix D* for further details.

Recommendations:

- 1.0 Update the ANZAPAP to reflect the revised *Australian National Standard of Competency for Architects*.
- 2.0 Ensure the ANZAPAP reflects the Australian Architectural Education and Competency Framework.
- 3.0 ANZAPAP ownership to include the New Zealand Registered Architects Board as a joint owner of the accreditation process with the AACA and the Institute.
- 4.0 Develop a transparent ANZAPAP cost recovery funding model to allocate the cost of accreditation appropriately across the stakeholders.
- 5.0 Amend the title of the current ANZAPAP Steering Committee to ANZAPAP Management Committee and review the terms of reference, role and responsibilities.
- 6.0 Improve the annual reporting requirements to the owners of the ANZAPAP to ensure that it reflects a more comprehensive summary of all accredited programs in Australia and New Zealand.
- 7.0 Provide sufficient secretariat support arrangements to deliver the revised ANZAPAP Management Committee responsibilities and procedures.
- 8.0 Rename the National Visiting Panel to Accreditation Review Panel, and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the process and Report.
- 9.0 Establish an appeal mechanism for the *Accreditation Review Panel Report* to address procedural fairness, with Appeal Panels to be convened as required, the membership of which would include one member from relevant Accrediting Authority and two members from the Management Committee.
- 10.0 Establish briefings for educational providers in the revised ANZAPAP to communicate expectations of the visits and the assessment outcomes.
- 11.0 Investigate the authority and intent of the Preliminary Assessment Panel process in light of accessing Australian Government funding and implications for removal on new programs.
- 12.0 Change the benchmark academic pathway terminology from 5-year qualification to 10 semesters of prescribed coursework or equivalent timeframe.
- 13.0 Review the restriction on program changes occurring in advance of National Visiting Panel.
- 14.0 Review the authority and intent of Interim Review Panels and introduce an annual pro-forma reporting requirement for all accredited programs to both the

Management Committee and the Accrediting Authorities.

- 15.0 Develop specific eligibility criteria and training guidelines for Standing Panel members and appointed Panel Chairs.**
- 16.0 Establish an ANZAPAP Implementation Working Group to update the ANZAPAP document to reflect the ANZAPAP Review 2015-16 recommendations as agreed by the owners.**

Overview:

While the current ANZAPAP processes are operating satisfactorily, the Review Panel consulted with Accrediting Authorities and key stakeholders of the ANZAPAP, and identified some weaknesses and several opportunities, outlined below, for improving the efficiency of the process and maintaining quality accreditation procedures. The recommendations have focussed on key areas for improvement and the issues specifically requested in the Terms of Reference.

Strengths:

- Internationally consistent accreditation program across Australia & New Zealand;
- Well regarded internationally; and
- Articulated national standards underlying the assessment process.

Weaknesses:

- Complex and onerous visitation process;
- Inconsistency in NVP outcomes;
- Oversighting Steering Committee without policy responsibility;
- Disconnect with other mandatory federal government imposed requirements for higher education;
- Inefficiencies in NVP processes; and
- Lack of a transparent funding allocation.

Opportunities:

- Provide current Steering Committee with clear responsibility for policy and strategic oversight of all program accreditation;
- Improve alignment of the Standard with mandatory federal government imposed requirements for higher education (ie. Australian Qualification Framework and Tertiary Education Quality and Standards);
- Streamline visitation process; and
- Improve communication and transparency in the accreditation process.

Threats:

- Accreditation process doesn't reflect evolving architectural and educational practices;
- Accreditation process restricts necessary operations; and
- Accrediting Authorities lose confidence in the accreditation process.

The ANZAPAP must respond to the changing needs of the profession, the Accrediting Authorities and the relevant educational providers of programs in architecture, and reviews such as this provide the opportunity to update and renew to remain relevant.

Australia has an excellent reputation, especially among neighbouring Asian economies, for its architectural education and has received significant financial benefit (\$200 million in 2013) from overseas students studying in Australia. To maintain and ensure continuing growth and high quality graduates in the education sector, high quality education and facilities, and accreditation together with the Australian *National Standards of Competency for Architects* are critical.

The ANZAPAP Review Group undertook stakeholder consultation on this draft Report for 8 weeks from mid-April to the end of May 2016. The key stakeholders consulted include:

- State and Territory Architects Registration Boards;
- National Standing Panel members;
- The Institute;
- Australian Deans of the Built Environment and Design;
- Association of Architecture Schools of Australasia;
- New Zealand Registered Architects Board;
- New Zealand Institute of Architects;
- Student Organised Network for Architects;

Appendix B lists organisations that provided submissions on the *2015-16 ANZAPAP Review Draft Report*. Copies of the stakeholder submissions received will be made available on the AACA website. *Appendix C* provides a synopsis of stakeholder consultation comments against each recommendation.

The ANZAPAP Review Panel carefully considered stakeholders submissions and revised some recommendations where there were significant concerns, and recommendations were added where necessary to clarify specific details.

This Final Report forms the outcome of the 2015-16 ANZAPAP Review for consideration by the ANZAPAP owners. Substantial changes are recommended to improve the existing accreditation process and further details will be developed as the procedures are rewritten.

The final recommendation to establish an ANZAPAP *Implementation Working Group* will take forward the outcomes of the review.

GOVERNANCE

The *Australian National Standard of Competency for Architects*, which is owned by the AACA, is the key framework informing the ANZAPAP. The previous version of the *Australian National Standard of Competency for Architects* is referenced as a key assessment requirement for a NVP Report.

The ANZAPAP is jointly owned by the AACA and the Institute. The Institute currently manages the ANZAPAP secretariat, Steering Committee and National Visitation Panels.

Prior to 2015-16 the Institute has managed all administrative costs of the procedure, with the exception of travel disbursements, sitting fees, and the annual levy of \$2323 on education providers, which was introduced in 2007-8. There has been some disparity with only some panel members receiving sitting fees.

For 2015-16 the AACA and the Institute have agreed to share the costs of administration.

The current ANZAPAP states: "As a general principle, the cost of the accreditation procedure is to be apportioned in equal thirds between the respective architect registration boards, AIA/NZIA and the program provider."

Recommendations relating to Governance will be negotiated by the AACA/AIA Liaison Group in consultation with the Implementation Working Group.

1.0 Update the ANZAPAP to reflect the revised *Australian National Standard of Competency for Architects*.

The revised version of the *National Standard of Competency for Architects* articulates a framework for assessment at completion of Master of Architecture programs.

The revised version of the *National Standard of Competency for Architects* will be incorporated into the revised ANZAPAP procedures and form the basis for ensuring Education Providers accredited courses deliver the prescribed education outcomes.

2.0 Ensure the ANZAPAP reflects the *Australian Architectural Education and Competency Framework*.

The stakeholder consultation process identified the need for a specific recommendation to articulate the requirement for the ANZAPAP to reflect the work of the *Australian Architectural Education and Competency Framework* (AAECF).

Subject to further advice from the *Australian Deans of the Built Environment and Design*, the AAECF project recommendations will be incorporated into the ANZAPAP visitation assessment procedures, particularly the alignment between the Standard

and other mandatory federal government-imposed requirements for higher education.

3.0 ANZAPAP ownership to include the New Zealand Registered Architects Board as a joint owner of the accreditation process with the AACA and the Institute.

New Zealand Registered Architects Board currently has no governance role in the ANZAPAP and pays a nominal licence fee for its use. Under the Trans-Tasman mutual recognition agreement New Zealand and Australia have the same reciprocal rights to the mutual recognition of their respective Acts. New Zealand architects may apply for registration in Australia as long as they have current practicing registration, and vice versa.

4.0 Develop a transparent ANZAPAP cost recovery funding model to allocate the cost of accreditation appropriately across the stakeholders.

Cost recovery arrangements for administering the accreditation procedures should be transparent and reflect any revised procedures. Stakeholders, including educational providers, the Institute, Accrediting Authorities and the AACA should contribute.

In line with other professional accreditation systems, all Panel members should be paid the same sitting fee.

The revised procedures seek to reduce the cost and substantial preparation time burden on education providers associated with the accreditation process.

If the recommendations to improve the ANZAPAP are accepted and implemented, there will be increased secretariat costs in-line with new requirements such as annual reports from Programs and Management Committee quality assurance role over all accredited Programs.

The development of a transparent funding model would continue to distribution costs across stakeholders in the following way:

- 33% Education Providers (21 Institutions)
- 33% Accrediting Authorities
- 34% owners - Institute/AACA/NZRAB

The funding model would be prepared on the basis of establishing an annualised fee that covers all costs associated with the program and visiting panels regardless of the year in which an NVP occurs.

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

The current ANZAPAP Steering Committee has limited terms of reference. Although not formally expressed in the ANZAPAP procedure document, policy responsibility currently sits with the Institute Education Manager and the Institute/ AACA Liaison Committee. In addition, the policy and management reporting structure for the ANZAPAP is unclear.

5.0 Amend the title of the current ANZAPAP Steering Committee to ANZAPAP Management Committee and review the terms of reference, role and responsibilities.

Renaming the Committee and revising the Terms of Reference will provide an appropriately experienced group to:

- a) Appoint NVP Panels and Chairs;
- b) Provide policy advice on emerging issues, an example being the implications of emerging pedagogical methodologies such as on-line Master of Architecture courses and offshore delivery;
- c) Review and monitor Secretariat support;
- d) Instigate necessary measures to improve processes, including a quality assurance / benchmarking role to promote parity in NVP outcomes and consistency of quality across all the Master of Architecture programs in Australia and New Zealand; and
- e) Trigger reviews of the ANZAPAP at 5-yearly intervals or based on circumstances arising.

The Management Committee membership should include representation from all stakeholder organisations directly involved in the accreditation procedures, including the Institute, AACA, Accrediting Authorities, Association of Architecture Schools of Australasia and Australian Deans of Built Environment and Design. Membership of this Committee will be a paid appointment on a 3-year rotating basis.

6.0 Improve the annual reporting requirements to the owners of the ANZAPAP to ensure that it reflects a more comprehensive update on all accredited programs in Australia and New Zealand.

The Annual Report from the Management Committee / Secretariat to the ANZAPAP owners needs to provide a comprehensive overview of all Australian and New Zealand Master of Architecture programs as well as detailed visit outcomes and current ANZAPAP issues.

The new requirement for Annual Reports from accredited programs will provide detail for this reporting, and the new reporting requirements will be developed in consultation with Education Providers.

7.0 Provide sufficient secretariat support arrangements to deliver the revised ANZAPAP Management Committee responsibilities and procedures.

The secretariat for the ANZAPAP Management Committee and program management of the visiting panels should reside with the organisation best placed to manage the effective quality of the procedure, manage the risks associated with non-compliance of programs, and provide liability coverage for members of the Accreditation Review Panel.

Currently, the ANZAPAP AACA NVP representatives are covered by the AACA professional indemnity insurance cover provided they act in accordance with the procedures and code of conduct.

Currently the Institute Education Manager has responsibility for ANZAPAP administration and program delivery. The Institute is the peak body for the architectural profession in Australia, and works to improve our built environment by promoting quality, responsible, sustainable design.

Accrediting Authorities have a statutory responsibility through respective Architects Acts in each State and Territory in Australia and in New Zealand to ensure graduates are appropriately qualified and experienced to be registered as an Architect.

The AACA core responsibilities include representing and co-ordinating the interests of Accrediting Authorities, and maintaining the national listing of all accredited programs on its website. They are the owner of the *Australian National Standards for Competency for Architects in Australia* that is the basis for the accreditation of architectural education and all assessment procedures leading to registration as an architect in Australia and New Zealand.

The secretariat support arrangements will be determined by the owners. They need to reflect the new requirements of the recommendations and provide sufficient expertise to support the new ANZAPAP Management Committee responsibilities.

NATIONAL VISITING PANEL

Currently each National Visiting Panel (NVP) is comprised of nine members plus secretariat staff that visit a program for 3 days plus a meeting on the evening prior (along with teleconferences and other preliminary meetings prior to this). Programs must provide a detailed pre-visit Report and exhibit student work during the visit. The Panel prepares and presents the NVP Report to the Head of Program at the end of the visit, and the Head of Program has 1 week to respond in writing.

8.0 Rename the National Visiting Panel to Accreditation Review Panel, and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the process and Report.

The National Visiting Panel is central to the ANZAPAP, and the NVP Report is the basis of the advice used by the Accrediting Authorities in the accreditation of programs. To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the visit and Report drafting process, and reduce duplication of material prepared by program providers the following changes are recommended:

- A). Education providers to provide a detailed report ('School Report'), addressing the accreditation criteria, to the Secretariat a minimum of 8 weeks in advance of the visit.
- B). The relevant Accrediting Authorities are invited to make a submission, in respect of the accreditation review, to the Management Committee a minimum of 8 weeks in advance of the visit.
- C). The School Report contains examples of, or links to (by way of a hi-resolution digital portfolio), pass (threshold standard) level student work. If required additional work may be requested for the visit.

Schools may also display a physical exhibition of pass, credit and distinction level student work as the exhibition plays another role in showcasing the quality of work at the school and providing a useful forum for benchmarking.

- D). Where possible, information contained in the School Report is to coincide with standard information required by education providers other reporting requirements. In this regard, the Secretariat is to investigate options for consolidating existing education provider information (ie. The Institute 2015 Architecture Schools document) into an updatable online resource to limit the burden of reporting.
- E). The Management Committee appoints a five member Review Panel (and identifies one of these members as a chair). This panel is to review the School Report and any submission from the relevant Accrediting Authority, to identify areas of compliance and weakness and

provide the Program with a list of questions or issues prior to the visit.

- F). All five members of the Review Panel (including the Chair) will visit the education providers to follow up on specific issues identified in the School Report.
- G). The length of the review visit is to be reduced to 2 days.
- H). At the conclusion of the visit, the Review Panel will finalise the *Accreditation Review Panel Report* (renamed from the *National Visiting Panel Report*), to reflect the assessment undertaken. A copy of which will be provided to the Head of Program no later than two weeks after the visit, for comment prior to finalising.
- I). Following the Head of Program's response, the Review Panel table their recommendation to the Secretariat who in turn inform the relevant Accrediting Authority of the outcome for their decision.
- J). The Accreditation Review Panel would continue to convene confidential meetings with students and staff, as at present.

9.0 Establish an appeal mechanism for the Accreditation Review Panel Report to address procedural fairness, with Appeal Panels to be convened as required, the membership of which would include one member from relevant Accrediting Authority and two members from the Management Committee.

10.0 Establish briefings for educational providers in the revised ANZAPAP to communicate expectations of the visits and the assessment outcomes.

11.0 Investigate the authority and intent of the Preliminary Assessment Panel process in light of accessing Australian Government funding and implications for removal on new programs

Currently the Preliminary Assessment Panel report outlines whether the content, structure and resources of a proposed new program or proposed major changes to an existing program are likely to satisfy standards required by the accreditation procedure. This provides an expectation to get 'provisional' accreditation in advance, which isn't possible as programs can only be assessed on outputs of the program.

The investigation of the Preliminary Assessment Panel process will:

- consider mechanisms for appropriate guidance advice to new programs or proposed major changes to an existing program;

- consider the impact of removing the Preliminary Assessment Panel on any associated Australian Government funding opportunities which use this process;
- provide advice on whether the Preliminary Assessment Panel process should be replaced, and if so provide details on the proposed model;

12.0 Change the benchmark academic pathway terminology from 5-year qualification to 10 semesters of prescribed coursework or equivalent timeframe.

Given many education providers are moving towards offering summer and/or winter semesters to streamline the timelines on Qualifications or improve flexibility for students and employers, there needs to be a more flexible description of minimum program length. Ongoing monitoring of international terminology required to maintain currency of advice on this issue.

13.0 Review the restriction on program changes occurring in advance of National Visiting Panel.

The current ANZAPAP states that where major changes to existing programs are planned, education providers may use the Preliminary Assessment Panel process prior to the full NVP visit. Major changes are defined as a change of more than 20 percent in:

- The underpinning philosophy of the program.
- The content of the subjects within a program.
- Human, physical and financial resources.
- Any other substantial change.

The review of the Preliminary Assessment procedure will include a review of the restriction on program changes and develop acceptable processes to accommodate reasonable change and manage reporting of such by programs. Some examination of international practice on this issue may inform how this could be handled.

14.0 Review the authority and intent of Interim Review Panels and introduce an annual pro-forma reporting requirement for all accredited programs to both the Management Committee and the Accrediting Authorities.

Undertake a detailed review of the regular Interim Review Panels, and the establishment of an annual pro-forma reporting requirement for all accredited programs. The annual reporting provides a mechanism to monitor accreditation status that will provide a level of assurance that the accreditation conditions continue to be met.

This annual report would be provided to the Management Committee, and focus on responses to recommendations in the *Accreditation Review Panel Report*. The review would determine if Interim Review Panels should continue to be used but only in extraordinary circumstances.

15.0 Develop specific eligibility criteria and training guidelines for Standing Panel members and appointed Panel Chairs.

Current membership of the Standing Panel is required to be reviewed annually and includes nominees from the Institute / Accrediting Authorities / AACA and expertise in architecture and/or architectural education. The current listing has 200 members, some of which have not been involved in profession for some years.

With the reduced number of panel members attending the program visit, panel members would need to be selected for their specific expertise rather than based on organisational representation. Specific eligibility criteria would need to be developed to ensure a balance between experienced educators and industry practitioners.

To ensure Accreditation Review Panels operate smoothly all members on the Standing Panel listing should have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities as a panellist and be required to undertake appropriate training and guidance.

IMPLEMENTATION WORKING GROUP

16.0 Establish an ANZAPAP Implementation Working Group to update the ANZAPAP document to reflect the ANZAPAP Review 2015-16 recommendations as agreed by the owners.

The recommendations agreed by the ANZAPAP owners will be implemented through the establishment of an ANZAPAP Implementation Working Group.

This group will update the ANZAPAP procedures document, establish transition arrangements and manage the stakeholder consultation on the revised ANZAPAP procedures document.

Members of the ANZAPAP Implementation Working Group are to be nominated by the key stakeholder groups, and agreed by the AACA/AIA Liaison Group.

The AACA/AIA Liaison Group will handle the other necessary negotiations / agreements between organisations to progress the 2015-16 ANZAPAP Review outcomes.

APPENDIX A: ANZAPAP IMPLEMENTATION WORKING GROUP

DRAFT - Terms of Reference

An Implementation Group will be established to provide advice to the owners with regard to recommendations and to develop procedural guidance and documentation for the reporting and national visiting panels. The Implementation Group should operate for a period of time specified by the owners of the ANZAPAP.

Subject to the agreement of the ANZAPAP owners. Members of the Implementation Group should include one nominee from each of the following:

- Australian Institute of Architects
- Architects Accreditation Council of Australia
- Australian Architects Registration Boards
- Association of Heads of Schools of Architects
- Australian Deans of the Built Environment and Design (ADBED)
- New Zealand Registered Architects Board (NZRAB)

The Implementation Group will have the power to delegate beyond the group membership if necessary.

Resources to support the ANZAPAP Implementation Working Group

To be determined by the owners of the ANZAPAP.

Role of the Implementation Working Group

The ANZAPAP Implementation Working Group will:

- 1.0 further investigate specified recommendations at the direction of the owners to allow final decisions to be made;

- 2.0 identify the eligibility criteria for members of the ANZAPAP Management Committee, draft role and responsibilities for the Management Committee and

- reporting mechanisms for agreement by the owners;
- 3.0 identify eligibility criteria for members of the standing panel and related policy and procedures on managing the allocation of the panel members to NVP and training for members;
- 4.0 develop a funding model to support the procedure, consult with stakeholders on the proposed model and recommend the final model for approval by the owners;
- 5.0 develop the procedures for the Accreditation Review Panels;
- 6.0 develop the detailed document outlining the ANZAPAP and incorporating the specific recommendations – see list below.

Communication and Consultation strategy

The Implementation Work Group will consult with relevant stakeholders in the development of the final procedures. Stakeholders will be advised on further formal consultation on the final revised procedures in due course.

Transition arrangements

It is anticipated that the Implementation Work Group will have completed its work by the end of 2016, the Management Committee will be established and the revised ANZAPAP will be published. Stakeholders will be consulted on an appropriate transition to the revised procedure, but it is anticipated that for an agreed length of time Programs subject to a National Visiting Panel should have the opportunity to choose to be assessed under the terms of the current procedure or the revised procedure.

List of Recommendations – Implementation Working Group

- 1.0 Update the ANZAPAP to reflect the revised *Australian National Standard of Competency for Architects*.
- 2.0 Ensure the ANZAPAP reflects the Australian Architectural Education and Competency Framework.
- 5.0 Amend the title of the current ANZAPAP Steering Committee to ANZAPAP Management Committee and review the terms of reference, role and responsibilities.
- 6.0 Improve the annual reporting requirements to the owners of the ANZAPAP to ensure that it reflects a more comprehensive summary of all accredited programs in Australia and New Zealand.
- 8.0 Rename the National Visiting Panel to Accreditation Review Panel, and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the process and Report.
 - a) Education providers to provide a detailed report ('School Report'), addressing the accreditation criteria, to the Secretariat a minimum of 8 weeks in advance of the visit.
 - b) The relevant Accrediting Authorities are invited to make a submission, in respect of the accreditation review, to the Management Committee a minimum of 8 weeks in advance of the visit.
 - c) The School Report contains examples of, or links to (by way of a hi-resolution digital portfolio), pass (threshold standard) level student work. If required additional work may be requested for the visit.

Schools may also display physical exhibition of pass, credit and distinction level student work as the exhibition plays another role in showcasing the quality of the school.
 - d) Where possible, information contained in the School Report is to coincide with standard information required by education providers other reporting requirements. In this regard, the Secretariat is to investigate options for consolidating existing education provider information (ie. The Institute 2015 Architecture Schools document) into an updatable online resource to limit the burden of reporting.
 - e) The Management Committee appoints a five member Review Panel (and identifies one of these members as a chair). This panel is to review the School Report and any submission from the relevant Accrediting Authority, to identify areas of compliance and weakness and provide the Program with a list of questions or issues prior to the visit.

- f) All five members of the Review Panel (including the Chair) will visit the education providers to follow up on specific issues identified in the School Report.
 - g) The length of the review visit is to be reduced to 2 days.
 - h) At the conclusion of the visit, the Review Panel will finalise the Accreditation Review Panel Report (renamed from the National Visiting Panel Report), to reflect the assessment undertaken. A copy of which will be provided to the Head of Program no later than two weeks after the visit, for comment prior to finalising.
 - i) Following the Head of Program's response, the Review Panel table their recommendation to the Secretariat Management Committee, who in turn inform the relevant Accrediting Authorities of the outcome for their decision.
 - j) The Accreditation Review visit will continue to convene confidential meetings with students and staff.
- 9.0 Establish an appeal mechanism for the *Accreditation Review Panel Report* to address procedural fairness, with Appeal Panels to be convened as required, the membership of which would include one member from relevant Accrediting Authority and two members from the Management Committee.
- 10.0 Establish briefings for educational providers in the revised ANZAPAP to communicate expectations of the visits and the assessment outcomes.
- 11.0 Investigate the Preliminary Assessment Panel process in light of accessing Australian Government funding and implications for removal on new programs.
- 12.0 Change the benchmark academic pathway terminology from 5-year qualification to 10 semesters of prescribed coursework or equivalent timeframe.
- 13.0 Review the restriction on program changes occurring in advance of Accreditation Review Panel.
- 14.0 Review the existing Interim Review Panels and introduce an annual pro-forma reporting requirement for all accredited programs to both the Management Committee and the Accrediting Authorities.
- 15.0 Develop specific eligibility criteria and training guidelines for Standing Panel members and appointed Panel Chairs.

APPENDIX B : STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION SUBMISSIONS

Submissions were provided by:

Association of Architecture Schools Australasia (AASA)
AACA/AIA Liaison Group (AACA/AIA)
Architects Board of Western Australia (ABWA)
Architects Registration Board of Victoria (ARBV)
AIA ACT Chapter Education Committee (AIA ACT)
AIA National Education Committee (AIA NEC)
AIA NSW Chapter Education Committee (AIA NSW)
AIA QLD Chapter Education Committee (AIA QLD)
AIA SA Chapter Education Committee (AIA SA)
AIA WA Chapter Education Committee (AIA WA)
Australian Deans of the Built Environment and Design
(ADBED)
Board of Architects Queensland (BOAQ)
Bruce Callow, Perth WA (BC)
Chris Tucker, University of Newcastle (CT)
Denise Civil, Auckland NZ (DC)
Kate Hislop, University of Western Australia (KH)
AACA National Advisory Panel (NAP)
New South Wales Architects Registration Board (NSW
ARB)
New Zealand Registered Architects Board (NZRAB)
New Zealand Schools of Architecture (UIT, UoA, VUW)
Unitec Institute of Technology, University of Auckland
and Victoria University of Wellington
ANZAPAP Steering Committee (SC)
The Architectural Practice Board of South Australia (SM)

APPENDIX C : STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS COMMENTS

The stakeholder consultation on the *Draft ANZAPAP 2015/16 Review Report* was open for 6 weeks from 15th April 2016 until Friday 27th May 2016.

The AACA secretariat received 22 submissions commenting on the *Draft ANZAPAP 2015/16 Review Report* from the organisations listed in *Appendix A*. Detailed comments against each recommendation have been compiled for discussion at *Appendix B (previously circulated)*.

SYNOPSIS

The stakeholder consultation on the *Draft ANZAPAP 2015/16 Review Report* has been highly successful with a majority of State and Territory Registration Boards, State and Territory industry education committees, New Zealand Registered Architects Board and education institutions and Australian education institutions and organisations providing submissions.

A majority of the stakeholder submissions were highly supportive of the Review's intent to make the accreditation process more streamlined, equitable, transparent and cost effective.

There was also strong support for ANZAPAP addressing the mandatory reporting requirements of the *Australian Qualifications Framework*; and *Tertiary Education and Quality Standards*; and for further examination of how the AAECF can further the application of the *National Standard of Competency for Architects* in the ANZAPAP.

Overall the feedback from stakeholders was positive to the thrust of the recommendations and there was broad support for a majority of recommendations.

However there were a number of recommendations that a number of key stakeholders did not support fully. These relate largely to the National Visiting Panel, including size, length of visit and reporting details.

Where the recommendations were broad and further detail was yet to be determined the recommendation has remained, noting the ANZAPAP Implementation Working Group will be finalising these details and the ANZAPAP owners will be signing off the final ANZAPAP document. These recommendations include those relating to New Zealand Registration Architects Board and New Zealand educational institutions involvement and cost recovery funding model which require further discussions and negotiations with the relevant parties.

Several submissions requested further consultation on the recommendations prior to finalising. This will be handled via the

Implementation Working Group, and the ANZAPAP owners will inform stakeholders of the next opportunity to comment.

Outlined below are summary of responses to each recommendation.

1.0 Update the ANZAPAP to reflect the revised Australian National Standard of Competency for Architects.

Agreed.

Several submissions recommended the integration of the Australian Architectural Education and Competency Framework into the revised procedure. There was general agreement that the AAECF provides an effective mechanism to reflect the National Standard of Competency for Architects in the educational context.

There was also queries as to how the *National Standard of Competency for Architects* could be applied to the New Zealand context.

1.1 Update the ANZAPAP to integrate the work of the Australian Architectural Education and Competency Framework.

New recommendation as above.

Implementation Working Group to address in the revised ANZAPAP document.

2.0 ANZAPAP ownership to include the New Zealand Registered Architects Board as a joint owner of the accreditation process with the AACA and the Institute.

Agreed in principle. There was a range of comments relating to how this could work in practice, and the feasibility and equity of the NZRAB as a joint owner.

AACA / AIA Liaison Group to discuss with NZRAB.

3.0 Develop a transparent ANZAPAP cost recovery funding model to allocate the cost of accreditation appropriately across the stakeholders.

Agreed. Stakeholders acknowledge further work was required, including the implications for New Zealand if they are to become a joint owner of the ANZAPAP. Issues raised in detailed comments to be addressed in developing funding model.

AACA / AIA Liaison Group to discuss with NZRAB.

4.0 Amend the title of the current ANZAPAP Steering Committee to ANZAPAP Management Committee and review the terms of reference, role and responsibilities.

Agreed. Most of the stakeholder support the name change. Comments relevant to this recommendation

focused on the actual tasks and the membership of Management Committee.

Implementation Working Group to develop terms of reference, role, responsibilities and selection criteria for the ANZAPAP Management Committee for approval by the AIA/AACA Liaison Group.

5.0 Improve the annual reporting requirements to the owners of the ANZAPAP to ensure that it reflects a more comprehensive summary of all accredited programs in Australia and New Zealand.

Agreed. Stakeholders raised some concerns about the extent of reporting requested, asking for a balance between the burden on Universities and monitoring from the Secretariat and Management Committee.

Implementation Working Group to develop annual reporting requirements in consultation with Education Providers. (This recommendation should be considered in conjunction with recommendation 11 to introduce annual reporting requirement to replace Interim Review Panels.)

6.0 Provide sufficient secretariat support arrangements to deliver the revised ANZAPAP Management Committee responsibilities and procedures.

Agreed. Most of the submissions were silent on the location of the Secretariat. The AACA National Advisory Panel and four State and Territory Boards recommended the secretariat should be managed by the AACA as the overall accreditation responsibility lies with State jurisdictions and AACA currently has responsibility for maintaining the list of currently accredited courses. The AIA National Education Committee and all the Chapter education committees recommended the secretariat should stay with AIA given AIA's history in managing the process.

Several stakeholders raised concerns about how New Zealand arrangements would work, if they are fully integrated into the ANZAPAP.

AACA / AIA Liaison Group to determine the secretariat support arrangements to deliver the revised ANZAPAP Management Committee responsibilities and procedures.

7.0 Rename the National Visiting Panel to ~~Australasian Accreditation Review~~ ANZAPAP Visiting Panel, and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the process and Report.

Agreed. Name change supported with other suggestions include ANZAPAP Visiting Panel, or ANZAPAP Review Panel, or Accreditation Review Panel.

Modify recommendation as above. Implementation Working Group to address efficiency and effectiveness of measures for improving the process and Report, as agreed in the sub-recommendations outlined below.

- a. Education providers to provide a detailed report ('School Report'), addressing the accreditation criteria, to the ~~Management Committee~~ Secretariat three months in advance of the visit.**

Agreed.

Modify recommendation as above.

- b. The relevant Accrediting Authorities are invited to make a submission, in respect of the accreditation review, to the ~~Management Committee~~ Secretariat three months in advance of the visit.**

Agreed. Not many comments on this recommendation, and of these responses most were unclear about the purpose of a submission by Accrediting Authorities.

- c. The School Report contains examples of, or links to (by way of a hi-resolution digital portfolio), pass, credit and distinction level student work. ~~No Schools may also display physical exhibition. is to be mounted. No examples of credit and distinction level works are required.~~ If required additional work may be requested for the visit.**

Not supported. A significant number of stakeholders are concerned about excluding the credit and distinction level student work, as they consider:

- it would reduce the accreditation process to a tick box exercise; and
- assessment could become difficult without credit and distinction level work alongside for context.

Stakeholders also concerned about only requiring digital format student work due to the risks of file corruption and file sizes.

Modify recommendation as above. Implementation Working Group to draft transition requirements for hi-resolution digital portfolio as not all Educational Providers may be in current position to deliver this.

- d. Where possible, information contained in the School Report is to coincide with standard information required by education providers other reporting requirements. In this regard, the Secretariat is to investigate options for consolidating existing education provider information (ie. The Institute 2015 Architecture Schools document) into an updatable online resource to limit the burden of reporting.**

Agreed.

Implementation Working Group to investigate the feasibility and costs of developing an updatable online resource.

- e. The Management Committee appoints a six-five member Review Panel (and identifies one of these members as a chair). This panel is to review the School Report and any submission from the relevant Accrediting Authority, to identify areas of compliance and weakness and provide the Program with a list of questions or issues prior to the visit.**

Not supported. A majority of stakeholder agree to decrease the number of panel members but views on the number vary. There was consistent view from stakeholders that all panel members should attend the Education Provider visit.

Stakeholders are generally supportive of list of questions to be issued to the Education Provider prior to the visit. There was also concern about the role of the Management Committee in relation to that of the Secretariat staff in the implementation process.

Modify recommendation as above.

Implementation Working Group to identify the role and responsibilities of the Management Committee and Secretariat.

- f. ~~Three~~All five members of the Review Panel (including the Chair) will visit the education providers to follow up on specific issues identified in the School Report.**

Not supported – significant number of stakeholders think a minimum five member Review Panel is required, all of whom visit the Education Provider.

Modify recommendation as above.

- g. The length of the review visit is to be reduced to 1– 2 days.**

Not supported. A majority of stakeholders considered reducing the number of days a good initiative. Stakeholders held varying views on the length of time to complete an assessment, with suggestions from half day to three days.

Modify recommendation as above.

- h. At the conclusion of the visit, the Review Panel will finalise the Accreditation Review Panel Report (renamed from the National Visiting Panel Report), to reflect the assessment undertaken. A copy of which will be provided to the Head of Program no later than two weeks after the visit, for comment prior to finalising.**

Agreed. A very small number of stakeholders considered the Report should be completed at the visit.

Implementation Working Group to incorporate guidance on this into the procedures.

- i. Following the Head of Program's response, the Review Panel table their recommendation to the Secretariat Management Committee, who in turn inform the relevant Accrediting Authorities of the outcome for their decision.**

Agreed.

Modify recommendation as above.

Implementation Working Group to incorporate guidance on this into the procedures, noting the differing responsibilities of the secretariat to the Management Committee.

- j. Establish an appeal mechanism for the Accreditation Review Panel Report to address procedural fairness, with Appeal Panel membership to include one member from relevant Accrediting Authorities and two members from the Management Committee.**

Agreed. Implementation Working Group to develop.

- k. Establish briefings for educational providers in the revised ANZAPAP to communicate expectations of the visits and the assessment outcomes.**

Agreed. Implementation Working Group to develop.

- l. The NVP will continue to include confidential meetings with students and staff.**

Above is the proposed new recommendation by the ANZAPAP owners. A majority of stakeholders were silent on this issue, however NZRAB and NEC were supportive. New recommendation as above.

- 8.0 Remove Review the Preliminary Assessment Panel process in light of implications for removal of the process. ~~with any requested advice on new programs to be referred to the Management Committee.~~**

Not supported. While there was some support for removing the Preliminary Assessment Panel, the AIA National Education Committee and AASA are requesting further examination of the Preliminary Assessment Panel process as it is used to secure Australian Government funding for new courses.

Modify recommendation as above. Implementation Working Group to review and provide further advice.

- 9.0 Change the benchmark academic pathway terminology from 5-year qualification to 10 semesters of prescribed coursework or equivalent timeframe.**

Agreed. There were general consensus of views with the recommendation, with some also suggesting an investigation of national and international tertiary education standards and protocols on this terminology. Implementation Working Group to provide further advice.

10.0 Review the restriction on program changes occurring in advance of National Visiting Panel.

Agreed. Stakeholders suggesting the review include an examination of international practices on this issue. Implementation Working Group to review and provide further advice.

11.0 Replace Review the existing Interim Review Panels and introduce an annual pro-forma reporting requirement for all accredited programs to both the Management Committee and the Accrediting Authorities.

Not supported. A significant number of stakeholders raised concerns about removing the Interim Review Panels, although there does seem to be some misunderstanding of the role of the IRP in the current procedure. There was support for the annual reporting as long as it wasn't onerous; and there was a balance between the burden on Universities and the monitoring from the Management Committee.

Modify recommendation as above. Implementation Working Group to review and provide further advice. (This recommendation should be considered in conjunction with recommendation 5 to improve annual reporting requirement that may take the place of the IRP unless specifically requested.)

12.0 Develop specific eligibility criteria and training guidelines for Standing Panel members and appointed Panel Chairs.

Agreed. Implementation Working Group to develop.

13.0 Establish an Implementation Working Group to update the ANZAPAP document to reflect the ANZAPAP Review 2015-16 recommendations as agreed by the owners.

Agreed. Stakeholders requesting further consultation.

Implementation Working Group to provide further opportunities for stakeholders to be consulted prior to finalising revised ANZAPAP document, and information on the transition phase for the revised ANZAPAP.

ATTACHMENT D : REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE AND MEMBERSHIP

To address a number of emerging issues, a review of the accreditation of architectural education programs in Australia will be undertaken jointly by the Architects Accreditation Council of Australia (AACAA) and the Australian Institute of Architects (Institute) as owners of the Australia and New Zealand Architecture Program Accreditation Procedure (ANZAPAP).

The review will include but not be limited to the Architecture Program Accreditation Procedure document, and will also include the governance and resourcing of accreditation, and the relationship of accreditation systems to other documents such as the new National Standard of Competency for Architects and the Institute's published policy documents.

Terms of Reference

The Review is to consider and make recommendations on:

- The governance of accreditation in Australia
- The relationship between ANZAPAP and the Architects Registration Boards, as the statutory bodies responsible for the final accreditation decision.
- The quantum of funding of accreditation processes, and how this funding is split between the system's stakeholders.
- The most effective model for secretariat support to accreditation.
- The extent to which the ANZAPAP processes should deal with pedagogical issues, different cultures across schools, how students are inculcated into the culture of the discipline and the changing nature of delivery of education, including on-line program content.
- The ANZAPAP document, including but not limited to –
 - the process of NVPs and IRPs;
 - the makeup of the standing panel that provides members for NVPs & IRPs;
 - training and professional development for standing panel members;
 - the material provided to NVPs before and during the accreditation visit;
 - whether ANZAPAP can properly assess different delivery modes (e.g. online)
 - the nature of the 'Action Items' and 'Professional Advice' feedback provided to programs through the NVPs;
 - role of the Steering Committee, terms of reference and representative membership of the Steering Committee
 - the relationship of ANZAPAP to the NSCA, the Australian Architectural Education and Competency Framework (under development) and Institute policy documents including the Standards for Programs in Architecture.
- The strengths and weaknesses of ANZAPAP compared with accreditation arrangements overseas and with other professional qualifications in the Australian context (e.g. pharmacy, education).
- Whether there should be any changes to the current system of accrediting the MArch qualification, and with schools nominating a benchmark academic pathway.
- Any other matters that, in the view of the Review Panel, have a material impact on the effectiveness of accreditation arrangements.

The review will have a secretariat resourced by the joint owners of the ANZAPAP, and will be overseen by the Institute-AACA Liaison Group who will report back to their respective organisations.

The Review Panel will consist of five members consisting of:

- One member nominated by the AACA
- One member nominated by the Institute
- One member nominated by the state and territory Boards
- One architectural academic nominated jointly by the Heads of Schools of Architecture and the Deans of the Built Environment
- One member nominated by the New Zealand Registered Architects Board

The Chair of the Review Panel will be jointly agreed by the Institute and the AACA. The Review Panel will meet at least four times during the conduct of the review, two of which meetings may be by teleconference. With secretariat support, the Review Panel will develop a Discussion Paper to be provided to stakeholders in the architectural sector for comment. The paper will address issues in the accreditation of architectural education and proposed areas of reform.

Membership

Professor Michael Ostwald, University of Newcastle, Deans of Schools Nominee
Professor, Kirsten Orr, University of Tasmania, the Institute Nominee
Dr Chris Landorf, University of Queensland, Heads of Schools Nominee
Ms Sarah Briant, Quirk Architecture, Architects Registration Boards Nominee
Mr Kieran Wong, CODA Architects, AACA Nominee
Mr Callum McKenzie, Director, NZARB
Secretariat: Ms Elisabeth Egle, Deputy CEO AACA

Consultation

Members of the Review Panel must consult with the AASA (Heads of Schools), ADBED, the State and Territory Architect Registration Boards, the AACA Board and the Institute's National Education Committee. Other consultations may be organised at the Review Panel's discretion.

Timeframe for Review

August 2015	Final Terms of Reference and resources agreed between AACA and Institute
September 2015	Communication strategy with stakeholders / Review Panel members confirmed / Secretariat arrangements finalised
October 2015	First Meeting of Review Panel
November 2015	Discussion Paper issued
March 2016	Stakeholder consultations
April 2016	Draft Report released for comment
June 2016	Final report to AIA-AACA

APPENDIX E: Benchmarking Australia with other registration systems

	Architecture (Aust)	Architecture (USA)	Architecture (Canada)	Architecture (United Kingdom)	Pharmacy (Aust)	Engineering (Aust)
1. FRAMEWORK						
What body accredits university courses leading to professional registration?	The AACA, jointly with the Institute of Architects, operates the national procedure leading to accreditation by Architects' Registration Boards of programmes offered in their jurisdiction.	National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB)	Canadian Architectural Certification Board (CACB)	UK Architects Registration Board (ARB)	Australian Pharmacy Council	Engineers Australia
What formal underpinning framework(s) specifies the skills and competencies candidates must develop from their tertiary study?	The National Competency Standard for Architects	NAAB Conditions for Accreditation	CACB Conditions and Terms for Accreditation	ARB Criteria Parts 1 & 2	Accreditation Standards for Pharmacy Programs in Australia and New Zealand	Australian Engineering Stage 1 Competency Standards
Within the framework(s), how are the required professional skills and competencies expressed for university study?	The National Competency Standard for Architects (NCSA) is divided into 4 Units of Competency: Design, Documentation, Practice Management and Project Management. Within this there are 42 performance criteria candidates must be able to meet to the standard expected in professional architectural practice, 23 of which apply to degree study.	The NAAB Conditions for Accreditation specify 26 performance criteria across four realms of knowledge: (i) Critical Thinking and Representation, (ii) Building Practices, Technical Skills, and Knowledge, (iii) Integrated Architectural Solutions, and (iv) Professional Practice.	CACB specifies 31 performance criteria across four realms of knowledge: (i) Critical Thinking and Communication, (ii) Design and Technical Skills, (iii) Comprehensive Design, and (iv) Leadership and Practice.	The ARB Criteria are divided into 11 General Criteria covering both Part 1 and 2; 6 Graduate Attributes for Part 1 and 7 Graduate Attributes for Part 2. These cover design, history and theory, fine arts, environment, professional studies, project management, construction engineering, building systems, regulation and industry knowledge.	The Accreditation Standards list six Learning Domains: (i) The health care consumer, (ii) Medicines - drug action, (iii) Medicines - the drug substance, (iv) Medicines - the medicinal product, (v) Health care systems and the roles of professionals, and (vi) The wider context.	The Competency Standards include 16 elements of Competency in three subject areas: (i) Knowledge and skill base, (ii) Engineering application ability, and (iii) Personal and professional attributes. These are designed to align with other Washington Accord countries.
3. EDUCATION FORMAT						
What is the minimum length of tertiary study prior to registration?	5 years	5 years	5 years	5 years	4 years	4 years
What is the accredited professional qualification? How many universities offer this qualification?	Accredited 2-year Master of Architecture programs are offered at 19 Australian universities.	154 professional degrees accredited by NAAB at 123 institutions. Commonly 5-year BArch or 2-3 year MArch degree. There is also 1 DArch program. Pre-professional Bachelor programs are not accredited. There are also some non-accredited professional-level programs.	Accredited 5-year Bachelor of Architecture or 2-year Master of Architecture program from 13 universities. Pre-professional Bachelor programs are not accredited.	Both degree stages are accredited, i.e. 3 year Bachelor Degree (Part 1) and 2 year Master of Architecture degree (Part 2). Accredited programs are offered at 44 UK universities. There are also some non-accredited professional-level programs.	Accredited 4 year Bachelor of Pharmacy degree or 3 year Master of Pharmacy degree offered at 18 Australian universities.	Accredited 4 year Bachelor of Engineering, 2 year Master of Engineering or 5 year combined degree (e.g. BSc BE) at 35 institutions, including 33 universities, the Engineering Institute of Technology, Australian Maritime College and Australian Defence Force Academy.

4. ACCREDITATION SYSTEM						
What document underpins the accreditation of university programs?	Australia New Zealand Architecture Program Accreditation Procedure	NAAB Procedures for Accreditation	CACB Conditions and Procedures for the Certification of Educational Qualifications	ARB Procedures for the Prescription of Qualifications	APC Accreditation Quality Assurance and Monitoring Policy	Accreditation Management System for Professional Engineers
For how long are university courses accredited?	Up to 5 years	3 years for initial accreditation; 4 or 8 years for continuing accreditation.	Up to 6 years	Usually 4 years	Up to 5 years	Up to 5 years
How does a university architecture program seek accreditation?	Programs may seek accreditation at any time by writing to the Education Manager of the Institute of Architects. Existing programs will automatically be scheduled for an accreditation visit prior to the expiration of their current term.	The Institution can apply for candidature from the NAAB at any time, including completion of a "Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation". The program can seek initial accreditation of up to three years after holding Candidacy status for at least two years.	The Institution's Chief Academic Officer must notify the CACB of the intention to seek accreditation for a professional degree program and complete a "Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation". The program must maintain Candidacy status for at least two years and complete one graduating class before receiving accreditation.	An institution must notify the ARB of its intention to apply for the prescription of a qualification not less than 12 months and no longer than 18 months before the date from which prescription is to begin. The school then meets informally with the ARB to go through the prescription process.	New program should apply to the Credentialling Unit at the APC at least 30 months before taking students (cannot advertise before accreditation provided). Existing programs will automatically be scheduled for an accreditation visit prior to the expiration of their current term.	Accreditation of engineering programs is not mandatory. The Head of School may seek accreditation for a program at any time by application to Engineers Australia.
How is the accreditation process funded and supported?	The accreditation system is jointly funded by university architecture schools, the Institute of Architects and Architects Registration Boards, with secretariat provided by the Institute of Architects.	Expenses of the Site Visit are met by the program being reviewed. NAAB has a permanent Washington-based secretariat jointly funded by NCARB, the American Institute of Architects and Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture.	Expenses of the Site Visit are met by the program being reviewed. CACB has a permanent secretariat of five people jointly funded by provincial regulators and CCUSA (schools of architecture).	The accreditation ('prescription') process is funded through general ARB licensing revenue and supported by a qualifications unit of three people led by a Head of Qualifications.	Accreditation is funded on a cost-recovery basis from universities (\$17k per annum per uni) and supported by the APC Credentialling Unit.	The direct costs of accreditation are met on a cost recovery basis by the school seeking or renewing accreditation and the process is resourced through the Engineers Australia Accreditation Unit.

5. VISITING PANEL ARRANGEMENTS						
How is the visiting panel conducting the accreditation review constituted?	The nine member Visiting Panel is chosen from a standing panel, and will generally include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three members representing the relevant Architect Registration Board, two of whom must be architects. • Three members representing the Institute of Architects. • One member representing the AACA. • One academic from an architecture school other than that being visited for the NVP. • One student member from an architecture school other than that being visited. 	There are usually four core members of the Visiting Team, representing each of the AIA, AIAS, ACSA, and NCARB. There can also be an observer nominated by the school being reviewed and occasionally an observer nominated by the NAAB for training purposes. The Visiting Team is appointed by the NAAB secretariat from a standing panel nominated by one of the ACSA, AIA, NCARB, or AIAS (in some circumstances individuals may also self-nominate).	There are five core members of the Visiting Team, including two architectural educators, two registered architects and one student or recent graduate. There are also 1-2 observers, including one nominated by the school being reviewed. The Visiting Team is appointed by the CACB Board on the recommendation of the Executive Director.	The ARB has established a Prescription Committee consisting of five board members and one or more members from its Panel of Independent Advisers.	APC establishes a Site Evaluation Team (SET) with experience in the organisation and structure of undergraduate pharmacy courses and with an understanding of the current professional requirements for practice. The team includes, at a minimum, one pharmacy academic, one community pharmacist, and one hospital pharmacist, supported by two members of the APC Accreditation and Credentialing Unit.	An Evaluation Panel comprising two to four members is appointed by the Accreditation Board of Engineers Australia, supported by an Accreditation Visit Manager (Engineers Australia staff member). The panel will include at least one academic and one practising engineer. One or two observers may also be appointed, including one from the university.
Is any payment made to visiting panel members for their participation?	Members nominated by the AACA and Boards receive a daily payment, other members are reimbursed for travel costs only.	Travel costs only.	Travel costs only.	Any Advisers employed by the ARB as part of the Prescription process are paid an agreed consulting rate.	Travel costs only.	Travel costs only, but sometimes a paid consultant with specialist knowledge will be appointed as a panel member.
What documentation does the university prepare prior to the accreditation visit? How is this documentation provided?	The university prepares a background portfolio including statistical information and a mapping of program activities against the NCSA. This is provided in hard copy for panel members.	University must prepare an Architecture Program Report (APR) which is a comprehensive self-assessment describing how a program meets each of the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.	University must prepare an Architecture Program Report (APR) including how the program meets the 31 student performance criteria, a self-evaluation against other CACB requirements, general information about the program's mission, strategic plan, etc.	New and renewing institutions must complete a detailed Application for Prescription of Qualification, attaching a range of supporting documentation including mapping of program outcomes against ARB Criteria, business plans, program documents, external reports, details of staffing and physical resources, etc.	Basic report with background school data and student information.	The submission documentation provides a self-review against the accreditation criteria, including educational outcomes, provider data, educational design and review, program structure, curriculum content and delivery modes; the approach to assessment; the quality assurance systems and the overall operating environment.
What is the process followed during the accreditation visit?	The NVP meets over 3 days with school and university leadership, academics and students. It observes physical resourcing, views student exhibitions, considers curriculum content of subjects and examples of student work, and reviews other documents as needed.	Over 3 days, the visiting team reviews a display of student work representing high and low evaluation for each course, views course notes and admissions information, tours facilities, sits in on lectures, and meets with the program head, university management, faculty, students, and (optionally) alumni and members of the local profession.	Over 3-4 days, the visiting team reviews a display of student work representing high and low evaluation for each course, as well as a Faculty Exhibit, displaying the range of design and scholarly work done by faculty. The Team also tours facilities, sits in on lectures, and meets with the program head, university management, faculty, students, alumni and members of the local profession.	An accreditation visit is not usually required under the UK system - which is based on a desk review of materials provided by the institution to the Prescription Committee. However, in some circumstances one of more Independent Advisers may be appointed to conduct a physical review of the human institutional resources of an architecture program.	Conducted over several days, the SET visit discusses the program with all stakeholders involved in the delivery of the program, from academics to students to management. It further assesses the teaching resources and infrastructure of the pharmacy school, e.g. labs, libraries.	Over two days, the Evaluation Panel will review the academic management system and quality assurance processes, the educational culture, the standard of teaching and learning, the interaction between teaching and research and the linkages with professional engineering practice, examples of graded student work, and physical facilities and resources.
	ew	34		June 2016		

<p>What elements are considered by the Visiting Panel?</p>	<p>A program's student outcomes against the required elements of the National Competency Standard for Architects forms the core of the assessment, together with an assessment that the university has the physical and human resources to deliver the program on an ongoing basis. Unlike some countries, the minimum resource expectations are not specified in detail in the ANZAPAP so there is a greater expectation that professional judgement will be exercised by the panel members.</p>	<p>There are 15 criteria considered by the Visiting Team, including Learning Culture, Social Equity, Long-Range Planning, Assessment, Human Resources, Physical Resources, Financial Resources, Information Resources, Preparatory Education, Curriculum and Student Performance.</p>	<p>There are 12 criteria considered by the Visiting Team, including Public Information, Social Equity, Human Resources, Physical Resources, Information Resources, Financial Resources, Administrative Structure, Curriculum and Student Performance.</p>	<p>There are 11 criteria considered by the Prescription Committee, including assessment strategies, human resources, physical resources, institutional commitment, continual improvement processes, and internal and external audit.</p>	<p>There are 17 standards that must be met across five areas: (i) Structure and Administration, (ii) Resource Allocation and Management, (iii) Curriculum, (iv) Program Students, and (v) Quality and Risk Management.</p>	<p>Assessment of an academic program for accreditation is based on three criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the teaching and learning environment; • the structure and content of the program; and • the quality assurance framework. <p>Overall, the accreditation process is outcome focussed, i.e. graduate capabilities ideally need to be coupled to an appropriate level of attainment of the Competency Standards.</p>	
<p>To whom does the Visiting Panel submit their recommendations?</p>	<p>The Panel makes a recommendation to the Architect Registration Board in the state or territory where the university is based as to whether and for how long a program should be accredited (maximum five years), together with a list of mandatory requirements ('Action Items'). The Panel also makes non-binding recommendations ('Professional Advice') to the school to assist with continuous improvement.</p>	<p>The voting members of the Visiting Team submit a confidential recommendation to the NAAB Board, which makes the final decision on accreditation. The Team also notes any assessment criteria that have not been met, for which the university will need to submit rectification plans.</p>	<p>The voting members of the Visiting Team submit a confidential recommendation to the CACB Board, which makes the final decision on program accreditation.</p>	<p>The ARB 'prescribes' qualifications (rather than accrediting programs) under section 4(1)(a) of the Architects Act, drawing on the report of the Prescription Committee, the response of the institution, and broader sectoral consultation (including the RIA).</p>	<p>The SET submits a report to the APC Accreditation Committee - consisting of 11 industry, academic, student and community members - which makes a decision on accreditation and notifies the Pharmacy Board of Australia as the regulatory body.</p>	<p>The Evaluation Panel report is forwarded to the Accreditation Board, which makes the decision on whether, for how long, and under what conditions a program is accredited.</p>	
<p>Is there a review of university performance during the accreditation period?</p>	<p>In between accreditation visits there will generally be one or more Interim Review Panel (IRP) visits, which are 'check-ups' of how the program is progressing against any issues raised in the last accreditation round.</p>	<p>University must submit an Annual Statistical Report capturing a range of information on the institution in which an architecture program is located and on the accredited degree program itself. More detailed Interim Progress Reports are submitted after two and five years of an eight year term of accreditation.</p>	<p>Universities must provide a formal annual report (including annual statistical report) to CACB. Follow up processes, up to and including a re-accreditation process, may be initiated as needed.</p>	<p>Universities must provide a formal annual report (including report of external examiners and audits, student data and course changes) to the ARB. If at any time the ARB feels that the required standards are not being met, it may require a university to show cause why its prescription should not be revoked.</p>	<p>Universities must provide a formal report annually on staffing, student numbers, clinical placement hours and recent or anticipate curriculum changes. Follow up processes, up to and including a re-accreditation process, may be initiated as needed.</p>	<p>As part of its accreditation decision, the Accreditation Board may require follow up of corrective actions after one year and/or completion of a mid-term accreditation visit.</p>	

6. MUTUAL RECOGNITION ARRANGEMENTS AND QUALIFICATIONS ASSESSMENT						
Are there mutual recognition arrangements (MRAs) for qualifications in place with other countries?	MArch degrees from NZ, Hong Kong and Singapore are accepted for registration purposes under bilateral agreements.	46 jurisdictions accept Canadian accredited programs for initial registration purposes. Advanced standing is provided to candidates from other Canberra Accord signatory systems (Australia, NZ, Korea, China).	Canadian registering bodies accept US accredited degrees for registration purposes.	Mutual recognition is granted to qualifications within the European Economic Area (EEA) listed in Directive 2005/36/EC.	Only NZ qualifications are automatically recognised.	Washington Accord grants 'substantial equivalency' to qualifications from UK, Ireland, USA, Canada, Japan, Korea, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore NZ, Russia, South Africa, Turkey, India and Sri Lanka. Graduates with a qualification obtained after the relevant country became a full signatory do not have to complete a Competency Demonstration Report (including summary statement and three case studies) for qualification recognition.
Is there a mechanism for individuals educated in an overseas jurisdiction to seek recognition of their qualifications?	Overseas qualifications other than from from NZ/HK/Sing are assessed on a case by case basis through the two stage Overseas Qualification Assessment, including a Provisional Assessment (desk review) and Final Assessment (presentation of portfolio at interview).	45 jurisdictions accept an NCARB Education Evaluation Services for Architects evaluation of the credentials of foreign educated architects against the NCARB Education Standard.	CACB offers individual certification of overseas qualifications against the Canadian standard for candidates without Canadian or US accredited qualifications.	Candidates without a recognised qualification must sit the Part 1 and Part 2 ARB examinations (portfolio plus interview assessment), in order to be eligible for the Part 3 Professional Practice Examination.	There are two streams for overseas candidates based on whether the system in their home country is considered 'comparable' to Australia. Comparable countries are offered a fast-track to Australian registration, while additional experience and examination requirements apply to candidates from other countries.	Migrant practitioners with an engineering qualification from other countries may apply to Engineers Australia for exemption from the Australian qualification requirement for Certification as a Practicing Engineer, which may be granted in whole or in part as appropriate.

