

GUIDANCE: PROVIDER ACCREDITATION SUBMISSION...

OVERVIEW

In advance of the Accreditation Site Visit, the Provider is required to prepare a comprehensive submission addressing the specified reporting items outlined in this document. This Provider Accreditation Submission (the 'Submission') represents a thorough self-assessment prepared by the Provider against the accreditation requirements. The information and evidence contained in the Provider Accreditation Submission is integral to the assessment process.

The Submission is reviewed extensively by the Accreditation Review Panel in advance of the Accreditation Site Visit and represents a critical step towards achieving initial or maintaining accreditation.

Details such as the agenda for the visit, map of the campus / facilities and similar administrative requirements in support of the Accreditation Site Visit will be sought separately in advance of the Visit by the Secretariat.

SUBMISSION CONTENTS AND STRUCTURE

There are four parts to the Submission. Parts I, II and III are largely text-based. They provide, respectively, basic information about the program, its context and content. Where appropriate, providers are encouraged to use reporting information already collected within the program for other purposes and hyperlink to information already available. Part IV is a digital evidence portfolio that provides evidence mapped to the 37 Performance Criteria.

In addition to contextual information regarding the Provider and the Program, the Submission should provide a description of the Provider's view of the relationship of the performance criteria to the broader program objectives.

The table at the end of this document notes the required information and structure for the Submission.

DIGITAL EVIDENCE PORTFOLIO

The unit material and evidence of assessment provided through the Digital Evidence Portfolio should clearly identify where in a program the 37 Performance Criteria from the National Standard of Competency for Architects have been met, and whether at Knowledge, Skill or Application level.

The Provider Accreditation Submission must include a table identifying the assessments where the material for all 37 Performance Criteria has been covered.

This should be from the subjects/units where the Performance Criterion is assessed at its final level or in its most advanced form, which could potentially be at any stage in the 10 semester program. Successful completion of relevant assessments for these units should attest that the student has achieved the competency outlined in the relevant Performance Criteria.

For each subject/unit where the Performance Criterion is assessed at its final level or in its most advanced form, the Provider should provide:

- i. a subject/unit outline identifying where the Performance Criteria is taught as a core component
- ii. where Performance Criteria are assessed in that subject/unit
- iii. how Performance Criteria are assessed, i.e. against what template/criteria/rubric
- iv. an indication of the distribution of student grades across the group
- v. completed assessment sheets, student feedback or assessment rubrics for each example.

The Digital Evidence Portfolio should be arranged in order of the 37 Performance Criteria, with a consistently labelled set of PDFs (sample assessments, feedback sheets, etc.) nested in a folder for each Performance Criteria. A template master table must be completed showing the assessment(s) that relate to each Performance Criteria.

Evidence of student work to support the program mapping is not required with the Provider Accreditation Submission. Evidence of student work to support the program mapping is to be provided as part of the Exhibition of Student Work as part of the Accreditation Site Visit.

The final assessed student work must be from the most recent iteration of individual subjects / units that have been delivered by the Provider within the program being assessed in the full two year teaching period prior to the conduct of the Accreditation Review Panel.

SUBMISSION FORMAT

The Submission is to be provided in digital format only.

The contents of Parts I, II, III and the Overview Statement from Part IV should be provided as a single PDF document. Other than the Overview Statement, Part IV is a digital evidence portfolio. The portfolio should be arranged in order of the 37 Performance Criteria, with a consistently labeled set of PDFs nested in a folder for each Performance Criteria.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE SUBMISSION

The Submission is to be made available to all Panel Members and the Secretariat via some form of digital document sharing software (such as Dropbox, Google Drive or Hightail).

By no later than 12 weeks in advance of the Accreditation Site Visit, the Secretariat will advise the Program Provider of email addresses for all Panel Members to facilitate the Provider's distribution of their Submission directly to each Panel Member and to the Secretariat.

Once the Submission has been shared electronically with the Panel members and the Secretariat, the Provider is not to make changes to the Submission.

TIMEFRAMES FOR SUBMISSION

The Program Provider must ensure that their Submission has been shared electronically with the Panel Members and the Secretariat no later than ten weeks prior to the commencement of the Accreditation Site Visit.

REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Following review of the Provider Accreditation Submission by both the Secretariat and the Panel, the Provider may be asked to provide a Supplementary Report that addresses specific omissions, queries or other issues identified by the Accreditation Review Panel. Any request for a Supplementary Report will be communicated to the Provider minimum of five weeks prior to the commencement of the Accreditation Site Visit. The Supplementary Report will normally be required to be provided by the Provider to the Secretariat a minimum of two weeks in advance of the commencement of the Accreditation Site Visit.

Where a Supplementary Report has been requested, the additional information must be provided in a separate Supplementary Report. A new or revised Provider Accreditation Submission will not be accepted.

LATE OR INCOMPLETE SUBMISSIONS

If a Submission is incomplete or not submitted in accordance with the published timeframe the Secretariat may give notice to the Head of Program that the Accreditation Site Visit cannot proceed.

In these circumstances, after consultation with the Accreditation Management Committee, the Architect Registration Board will then decide whether accreditation should be withdrawn and under what circumstances the Program Provider may recommence the accreditation process.

| PART I | Program Information | Maximum Length |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| a. General | Name of institution being reviewed Name of program being accredited Academic unit (faculty, school and/or college) responsible for the program Location of offering Head of architecture unit (discipline, department, school or group) Head of the academic program/s (coordinator, manager, or leader of professional degree) | 1 page |
| b. Criteria for determining eligibility for entry to Masters program | Provide description of the policy. Head of architecture unit (discipline, department, school or group) responsible for policy and individual determinations Head of the academic program/s (coordinator, manager, or leader of professional degree) responsible. Describe and provide relevant Policies related to articulation agreements and advanced standing. | 1 page |
| c. Evidence Listing | Detail any supporting evidence providing as an enclosure to Part I. Ensure cross-reference to which Section it is relevant to. | As required |
| PART II | Program Context | Maximum Length |
| a. Introduction | Background or context for the Accreditation Review Panel. Timeline of past accreditation visits. | 1 page (approx. 500 words) |
| b. Institutional Background | Relevant aspects of the history of the institution and recent (since last Accreditation Panel) developments. | 1 page (approx. 500 words) |
| c. Institutional Structure | Presentation of the management structure of the institution, identifying the location/position of the architecture program and staff. Graphical representation should be provided. | 1 page (approx. 500 words) + images/diagrams if needed. |
| d. Program History | Relevant aspects of the history of the program focusing on recent developments since last Accreditation Review Panel. | 3 pages (approx. 1500 words) |
| e. Program Changes | Describe changes in program structure, ideology, pedagogy, staffing and resources since last Accreditation Review Panel. Describe current strategic plan or other relevant initiatives and associated proposed changes being considered for implementation over the next 5 years. | 3 pages (approx. 1500 words) |
| f. Program Staff | Overview of the staffing profile and allocation relationship to program content. Provide a list of all continuing staff and links to their online profiles. | 2 pages |
| g. Action Items from last accreditation report | Describe progress against all action items from last accreditation report. Provide evidence to support progress. Refer to details provided in Provider Annual Reports (if relevant). | As required |

| PART II | Program Context | Maximum Length |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| h. Program Resources | Provide information about dedicated spaces (studios, workshops, etc.), facilities and equipment relevant to architectural student outcomes. | 3 pages (approx. 1500 words) + images if needed. |
| i. Additional Information | Only required if there is critical information about the program that cannot be included elsewhere in Part II. | 2 pages (approx. 1000 words) + images if needed. |
| j. Evidence Listing | Detail any supporting evidence providing as an enclosure to Part II. Ensure cross-reference to relevant Section. | As required |
| PART III | Program Content | Maximum Length |
| a. Program Structure | High level list or mapping of compulsory or core subjects/units and elective subjects/units by year | As required |
| b. Program Content | Description of subject/units, including subject/unit description, coordinator, contact hours (lectures and tutorials), class sizes and staff/student ratios. Ensure details are provided if the subject/unit is delivered by staff outside of the School of Architecture | 1 page per subject/unit |
| c. Program Mapping overview | Description of the Program Provider's view of the relationship of the performance criteria to the broader subject/unit objectives. | 2 pages (approx. 1000 words) |
| d. Program Mapping to National Standard of Competency Performance Criteria | Identify assessments where each performance criteria is assessed at the highest level or for the final time. | As required |
| e. Program Mapping to AQF Criteria | Provide mapping of subjects/units to each Australian Qualifications Framework Level 9 Criteria | As required |
| f. Additional Information | Only required if the mapping identifies any issues that require more detailed explanation for the Accreditation Review Panel. | 2 pages (approx. 1000 words) |

| PART IV | Digital Evidence Portfolio | Maximum Length |
|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>Overview statement regarding the organisation and presentation of the required information. The Overview statement should describe the ways in which the program addresses the Australian Qualifications Framework Level 9 Criteria relating to acquisition by graduates of specialised knowledge, skills and application.</p> <p>This overview is included in the PDF of the primary document, and all supporting files (as described below) are provided separately, arranged as described.</p> <p>For each of the 37 performance criteria of the National Standard of Competency for Architects (see below) the portfolio must include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subject/Unit information (code, title) where the performance criteria is assessed at its final level or in its most advanced form. 2. Evidence of assessment criteria used (rubrics or equivalent) and standards applied (advice on performance expectations). <p>The 37 performance criteria of the National Standard of Competency for Architects which require evidence in this format are: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 1.7; 2.1, 2.2, 2.3; 3.1, 3.2,3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8; 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7; 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5; 6.2, 6.4, 6.5; 7.1; 8.1; 9.1, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7, 9.8.</p> | <p>2 page (approx. 1000 words)</p> <p>Digital files – PDFs</p> |