

Accreditation of Architecture Programs in Australia Accreditation Resource

How to write an Action Item when a Performance Criteria is assessed as NOT MET

The Procedural guidance document [Operation of the Accreditation Review Panel](#) contains this guidance on writing Action Items:

Where a Performance Criterion is assessed as Not Met, an Action Item is required that addresses the deficiency.

Action Items should be specific, precise and achievable within the nominated timeframe, and:

- *be framed only around any failure to demonstrate threshold level of performance in respect of one or more performance criteria*
- *include a brief commentary about the deficiency*
- *clearly explain the linkage to the relevant performance criteria*
- *where relevant, make reference to the critical Knowledge Domains specified in the relevant performance criteria*
- *suggest the means by which the Provider could demonstrate rectification of the Action Item (noting that the Provider is ultimately responsible for rectification in whatever manner they deem appropriate).*
- *detail the anticipated timeframe for the Provider to rectify the Action Item.*

Provider progress against Action Items will be reviewed and assessed as part of the Provider Annual Reporting process.

These guidance notes are replicated in Part 6: Reference Notes on pages 13-15 of the [Accreditation Review Panel \(ARP\) Report Template](#).

When required, Action Items are written into this template: [Performance Criteria Not Met Template \(as part of the Accreditation Review Panel Report\)](#)

Sample Action Items are enclosed as described below:

Performance Criteria No	Required level of competency	Pages
4.3	Knowledge Acquisition (K)	2-3
5.3	Skills acquisition (S)	4-5
8.1	Application of knowledge and skills (A)	6-7

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA NOT MET



Note the Performance Criterion (number, description and required level of competency) assessed as Not Met

NSCA Performance Criterion 4.3

Application of creative imagination and aesthetic judgement to produce coherent design.

Required level of competency: APPLICATION OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (A)

Evidence

Describe all evidence that was presented to the Accreditation Review Panel, and where there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate achievement of the Performance Criterion

Performance Criterion 4.3 was advised by the Provider to be evident in the following core subject areas:

- DDDDDD Design Thesis
- DDDDDD Masters Architecture Studio X

Insufficient student exhibition material was provided for the Design Studio and Design Thesis offerings. The panel notes that Studio offerings are diverse, with some NNN available to students for Studio X and NN for the Design Thesis. Of this diverse range, the Exhibition of Student Work contained only three incomplete examples of student threshold work (graded at 50) from the DDDDDD Design Studio N and two (graded at 50) from DDDDDD Design Thesis. Only one of the exhibited works included a student booklet showing progression towards their design synthesis. None of the work exhibited was accompanied by the studio outline, physical models or student assessment feedback.

After viewing the exhibition (9.30am on Day 1 of the Site Visit), the Panel requested further samples of threshold student work to adequately inform its review. In the afternoon of Day 1, the Panel was provided with additional studio outlines together with some digital copies of an assortment of student work, including:

- Studios NNNNNNN (semester 2, 20YY)
- Studios NNNNNNN (semester 1, 20YY)
- Thesis Studio NN (semester 2, 20NN)
- Thesis studio NN (semester 2, 20NN)

The quality of the additional studio outlines provided was varied: some outlines consisted of only a single page, others did not comprehensively address the project objectives and/or the assessment requirements. Most of the digital copies of student work were not at threshold level (e.g. Semester 2, 20YY examples of student work from studio NNNNNNN were generally high passes or credit work).

The Panel is concerned at the evident lack of consistency across these studio offerings in relation to individual studio requirements.

From the threshold work that was available, the Panel finds that there is insufficient evidence that the Program equips students in the 'application of knowledge and skills' for Performance Criterion 4.3.

The Panel is particularly concerned as PC 4.3 is assessed at its highest level at the point of graduation from the Master of Architecture and is not assessed again in the Architectural Practice Examination (APE).

Action item/s

Note the Action Item/s required to remedy the deficiency in achievement of this Performance Criterion

ACTION ITEM X

Design Studios within the program must articulate and incorporate 'authentic project-based tasks that provide a practice-oriented experience' to ensure graduates can apply creative imagination and aesthetic judgement to produce coherent design, as required by Performance Criterion 4.3.

The Provider must demonstrate explicit and identifiable evidence of incorporation of Performance Criterion 4.3 through relevant assessment tasks and assessment rubrics.

It is anticipated that the Provider could evidence these changes in the course requirements within one year (ie. by end of 20YY) and provide evidence of the outcomes in threshold student work within two years (ie. by end of 2020), with progress reporting through the Provider Annual Report in 20YY, and implementation confirmed in the Provider Annual Report in 20YY.

Program Development Advice (optional)

[Empty box for Program Development Advice]

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA NOT MET



Note the Performance Criterion (number, description and required level of competency) assessed as Not Met

NSCA Performance Criteria 5.3: Documentation Detailed Design

Evaluation and integration of regulatory requirements.

Required level of competency: Skills acquisition (S).

Evidence

Describe all evidence that was presented to the Accreditation Review Panel, and where there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate achievement of the Performance Criterion

XX_S2_XXXXXXXXX Architecture Studio 2 XX
Assessment Item X: Final Project

The assignment is described as an advanced research based design project that examines socio-political, cultural, environmental and technical aspects of housing. The emphasis of the assignment is not on NCSA 5.3. The threshold level student work does not, therefore, show an adequate breadth of regulatory requirements.

YY_S1_YYYYYYYYY Built Environment Technology 3
Assessment Item Y: Assignment Y – Individual Assignment in two parts:
Y.1_Studio Participation and weekly review of progressive work
Y.2_Portfolio

Neither the learning outcomes nor the assessment criteria for the assignments include explicit reference to the evaluation and integration of regulatory requirements. While there may be an implicit requirement for students to review relevant regulations, and these issues may have been covered with students in class, there are few explicit written references other than:

The assessment criteria for Assignment F includes "Design of car park, including traffic engineering, bay and aisle size, turning corners and ease of function".
The assessment criteria for Assignment F.F includes "Gutter and downpipe calculation".
The assessment criteria for Assignment F.F includes "Design and layout of the core".
The resources identified in the project brief include reference to AS 2890.1:2004 Parking Facilities Part 1 and AS 1100.301 Technical Drawing. The NCC/BCA is not referenced.

There is some evidence of gutter and downpipe calculations in the threshold level work. A student feedback form does state that the carpark design does not meet Australian Standards. However, the work did not show evidence of NCC/BCA requirements for ambulant toilets or stairs and balustrades/handrails. The assignment requirement for drawings to conform to the AS 1100.301 Technical Drawing was also not evident in the threshold level work.

Action item/s

Note the Action Item/s required to remedy the deficiency in achievement of this Performance Criterion

Action Item x

The Provider must demonstrate explicit and identifiable evidence of NSCA 5.3 Performance Criteria Evaluation and integration of regulatory requirements through assignment work and assessment rubrics within 4 semesters (ie by end of Semester 2, 20YY).

It is anticipated that the Provider could evidence incorporation of these changes into relevant teaching and assessment materials by the end of 20YY, and evidence demonstrating knowledge through student work by the end of 20YY, with progress reporting through the Provider Annual Report in 20YY, and implementation confirmed in the Provider Annual Report in 20YY.

Program Development Advice (optional)

Empty box for Program Development Advice.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA NOT MET



Note the Performance Criterion (number, description and required level of competency) assessed as Not Met

NSCA Performance Criteria 8.1: Project Delivery Construction Stage

Selection process for appropriately qualified contractors is in accordance with procurement method and project contract.

Required level of competency: Knowledge acquisition (K).

Evidence

Describe all evidence that was presented to the Accreditation Review Panel, and where there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate achievement of the Performance Criterion

Y2_S2_NNNN_PRAC_PG Architecture Practice PG
Assessment Item C: Open Book Examination 2

The three sample examination papers did not specifically address NSCA 8.1 Selection process for appropriately qualified contractors is in accordance with procurement method and project contract.

Y3_S1_NNNN_1 Design Studio 3.1
Assessment Item D: Practice Examinations 1 and 2

The Provider Accreditation Submission notes that practice and project management is integrated into the undergraduate studios, particularly Design Studio 3.1. The unit timetable sets out the Architectural Practice lectures and examinations that occur on the same day studios take place. These open book examinations form part of the grading for the unit: A4 Intro to Practice Exam 1 (NNNNN) and Practice Exam 2 (NNNNN) with a 3.5% weighting for each exam or a total of 7% of the total mark for both exams (i.e. 50 marks from total of 350 marks).

All examinations listed as evidence against NSCA 8.1 comprise multiple choice questions. None of the questions adequately address NSCA 8.1 Selection process for appropriately qualified contractors is in accordance with procurement method and project contract in adequate breadth or depth.

The following items were provided to the Panel as additional evidence:

Y2_S2_NNNN_PRAC_PG Architecture Practice PG

Lecture 15, which sits between Examination 1 and Examination 2, is entitled "Procurement and Tendering - Additional Information" and addresses NSCA 8.1 Selection process for appropriately qualified contractors is in accordance with procurement method and project contract.

Lecture 17, which also sits between Examination 1 and Examination 2, is entitled "Risk Management and Creative Architectural Practice" and addresses NSCA 8.1 Selection process for appropriately qualified contractors is in accordance with procurement method and project contract.

However, providing evidence of lecture content alone relating to a particular Element is not sufficient demonstration of knowledge acquisition.

Action item/s

Note the Action Item/s required to remedy the deficiency in achievement of this Performance Criterion

Action Item X

The Provider must demonstrate explicit and identifiable evidence of NSCA Performance Criteria 8.1 Selection process for appropriately qualified contractors is in accordance with procurement method and project contract through assignment work and assessment rubrics within 4 semesters (ie by end of Semester 2, 20YY).

It is anticipated that the Provider could evidence incorporation of these changes into relevant teaching and assessment materials by the end of 20YY, and evidence demonstrating knowledge through student work by the end of 20YY, with progress reporting through the Provider Annual Report in 20YY, and implementation confirmed in the Provider Annual Report in 20YY.

Program Development Advice (optional)