

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

FORMAT FOR VISIT TEAM LEADER REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS (GUIDANCE: APPROVED BY EAB CHAIR)

ADAPTED on EAB Document: EAB-A014-P (Visit Team Report Format)

REPORT of EVALUATION

Of

< University >

< Degree Name > Degree Programme

VISIT DATE < Insert >

CONTENTS:

The REPORT

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Evaluation Support Forms

Appendix A1: Possible recommendation formats

Appendix B: Format for recording deficiencies or concerns

ANNEXURES

Annexure 1 : Template for Visit Reports on BEng-type programmes

List of Figures

Figure 1: Documents defining the EAB Accreditation System

CONTENTS

- 1.1 Institution, programme and team details
- 1.2 Background to the visit
- 1.3 Criteria and procedures applied
- 1.4 General observations on the programme and its provider (the HEI)
- 1.5 Follow-up on previous visit
- 1.6 CRITERION-1: Programme Educational Objectives and Programme Structure
- 1.7 CRITERION-2: Assessment of Graduate Attributes and Assessment System
- 1.8 CRITERION-3: Teaching and Learning and Quality Assurance Processes
- 1.9 CRITERION-4: Resourcing and Sustainability
- 1.10 Recommendation
- 1.11 Acknowledgements
- 1.12 Signature Section [Team Leader & Visit Team Leader]

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

		State whether from Academia or industry	
1.1.6.2	Member-1	Name & Title State whether from Academia or industry	
1.1.6.3	Member-2	Name & Title State whether from Academia or industry	
1.1.6.4	Member-3	Name & Title State whether from Academia or industry	
1.1.7	Observers	Name & Title (Professional Affiliations)	1. 2. 3.
1.1.8	Type of Evaluation [Regular Visit] [Interim Visit / Report] [Final Visit]		
1.1.9	Date of Previous Visit (if applicable)		
1.1.10	Decision on Previous Visit (if applicable)		
Note	<i>Please refer to HoF & HoF Submission for additional particulars and contact details</i>		

1.2. Background to the visit.

For relevant background or contextual information, the Team must refer to previous accreditation decisions, if applicable, and accredited status of the Faculty's programmes, and progress with move towards Outcome-Based Assessment. Information may be found in the Head of Faculty's submission. *If a first intervention by EAB, state when RFE was submitted, and the procedure put in place thereafter.*

[HoF(S 1.7.6)][Eval-Form:Q 4.6]

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

1.3. Criteria and procedures applied	
1.3.1 Extent of Conformity [Comment after completing the visit]	Extent of conformity
(i) State if the programme structure, deliverables, delivery environment and achievement and assessment of Graduate Attributes conformed to EAB requirements as per EAB's documentation on policies, criteria, standards and processes.	
(ii) Identify the areas of significant non-conformity:-	
1.3.2 List EAB documentation on accreditation policies, criteria, standards and applied processes, specifying their relevant issue/revision numbers and dates:-	
1.4. General observations on the programme and its provider	
Provide holistic observations of the programme and the provider responsible for the programme (e.g., department or school, faculty or university level). [HoF(S 1.3 & 1.4) [HoD(A2,3) [EAB-A12-P: Sn 5.1 & Sn 6.1(5)].	
1.4.1 TEAM's OBSERVATIONS on programme	
1.4.2 TEAM's OBSERVATIONS on Provider:-	
[HoD(A7)] [HoF(S 1.7.17) (Literature/Prospectus on HEI, Faculty, Dept]	

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

--

1.5 FOLLOW-UP ON PREVIOUS VISIT – IF Applicable

- (a) List the deficiencies (if any) and concerns (if any) arising from previous visit(s) as communicated by EAB in its Decision Letter, and
(b) summarise the provider's response to each deficiency or concern and the team's evaluation of whether each issue has been resolved or not.

[HoD(A5, 6)] [EAB-A12 (Sn 6.2) & [Eval-Form:Q 5.1(a) & (c)]

1.5.1 a(i) < DEFICIENCIES> from Previous Visit (If any):-[HoD(A5)]

1:

2:

Etc

1.5.1 b(i) < Provider's Response to Deficiencies> (Summary):-

1:

2:

Etc

TEAM's EVALUATION of response to each Deficiency) :-

1:

2:

etc

1.5.1a(ii) <CONCERNS> from Previous Visit (if any) :- [HoD(A5)]

1:

2:-

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

etc
1.5.1 b(ii) <Provider's Response to Concerns> :- (Summary):- 1: 2: etc
TEAM's EVALUATION of response to each Concern) :-
1.5.1 (c) Major changes- UNRELATED-to additional deficiencies that must be remedied. (i) Summarise the major changes; (ii) Team's Recommendations on these changes, and (iii) Comment on impact of Team;s Recommendations above. <i>[HoD(A 6 & 6.1)] [EAB-A12: Sn 6.2(1)(b)] [Also HoF(S 1.5)] & [Eval-Form: Q 5.1(b)]</i>
Summary of Major Changes
Team's Recommendations on Changes
Team's Comment on Impact of above Recommenations
1.5.1 (d) Changes that will become effective in the NEXT accreditation cycle [IF Applicable] [EAB-A12-P(Sn6.1(7))
If Changes are planned to programme, outcomes, assessment and resources:

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

- (i) Please identify the *cohorts of students* that will graduate under each identified variant curriculum and the range of years over which graduates are expected.
- (ii) **If these changes intervene prior to end of Accreditation of programme under evaluation,** Team to comment on impact, if any, of the changes on the accreditation of the programme.:
[HoD Report: A6] [EAB-A12: Sn 6.2(1)(b)]

(i) State the cohorts/Years to be impacted by these planned changes:-

(ii) Team's Comments on impact (if any) on the present accreditation, if changes intervene prior to end of present accreditation.

1.5.2 Evaluation of Request for Extension of Accreditation of Accredited [If Applicable]

HEI to comply with Section 4.1 (b) of document EAB-A12-P. An **ADDENDUM** to the Self Study Report would need to be submitted for Evaluation
[HoF(S 1.8)] [EAB-A12:Sn 5.1.4]

EVALUATION of COMPLIANCE with CRITERIA #1 to #4

For each of CRITERIA #1 to #4, Team to evaluate HEI's response to the relevant Sections 6.3, 6.4, 6.5 and 6.7 of EAB-A12-P and compile its Report. **COMMENTS** to be **VERY BRIEF**

Team should disregard or amend the statements hereinafter as it deems appropriate, or amplify the text as necessary to reflect a full and accurate outcome of its evaluation of the programme, based upon:

- the Evidence that TEAM has accessed and examined,
- Evidence supplied in the HEI's Submission, against each CRITERION and on-site materials that together demonstrates that each aspect of each CRITERION has been effectively addressed in the Self-Study Submission.

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

1.6. CRITERION-1: Programme Educational Objectives and Programme Structure

1.6.1 Programme Educational Objectives and Programme Structure				
1 (i) PEOs are published and are consistent with the Vision and Mission of the Institution, Faculty and Department, <i>and are reviewed periodically to maintain consistency</i> . [Eval-Form: Q 1.1] [HoF(S 1.7.1- 1.7.6)] [HoD(B1 to B1.3)]		Y / *		
[* Remarks]				
(ii) The Programme Outcomes (also referred to as Graduate Attributes/Learning Outcomes/Student Outcomes) are well defined and are consistent with and contribute to achieving the Programme Educational Objectives . [Eval-Form: Q 1.1] [HoD(B1.4, 1.5)]		Y / *		
[* Remarks]				
2. (i) The Structure of the programme has been properly described and the courses/modules, compulsory/elective, and credits allocation properly indicated, along with the allocation to semesters or year of study); [HoD(B2, 2.1)] [Eval-Form Q 1.2(a)]		Y / *		
(ii) Table-1 as per document EAB-A13-P has been compiled .				
[* Remarks]				
3. (i) The Knowledge area breakdown (shown hereunder), including complementary studies has been detailed and fully complies with the EAB standards. [HoD(B3)] [Eval-Form Q 1.3]		Y / *		
(ii) The Credit Multipliers used are indicated, explained and justified . [EAB-A13: Table 1: Sheet "Table 1A": Explanation (?)				
[* Remarks]				
	Knowledge area	Minimum Credits	Actual Credits	Compliance Yes/No
	Mathematics	56		
	Natural Sciences	56		
	Engineering Sciences	180		
	Design and Synthesis	72		
	Complementary studies	56		
	Subtotal	420		
	For reallocation	140		
	Total	560		

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

<p>4. (i) The core modules and the core design comprising mathematics, basic sciences and fundamental engineering sciences have been properly identified and described.</p> <p>(ii) The logic behind the design of the core modules has been explained. The arguments are coherent. [HoD(B4)] [Eval-Form Q 1.4(a) & (b)]</p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>5. The Specialist study modules have been listed and identified, and the objectives and rationale underlying these modules are explained, and show how they enable development in a traditional / emerging discipline through [compulsory] [elective] credits,</p> <p>[HoD (B5)] [Eval-Form Q 1.5(a) &(b)]</p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>6. (i) The progression rules for constructing curricula have been described. They [fully] [partly] ensure learning activities associated with delivery of graduate attributes progress from Introductory Level (I) through the developmental level (D), to advanced application (A) level, and the award of the qualification.</p> <p>[HoD(B6)] Eval-Form:Q1.7(b)]</p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>(ii) The articulation options into, out of, and beyond the programme are described and explained, and shown in Table-4. [HoD: Table-4, A3,, B7.5, 7.6][Eval-Form: Q 1.7(b), 1.8]</p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>(iii) The alignment of the curriculum with the Programme Educational Objectives [is properly structured] [needs reviewing]. [HoD(B6)]</p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>(iv) The process of curriculum design and review is satisfactorily explained and involves consultations with stakeholders, including the Industry. [Appendix-2 (Industry Committee), B6, B9.2,] Eval-Form-: Q 1.10]</p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>(v) The curriculum [fairly well] [effectively] prepares students for their professional career or further studies, and supports the achievement of the programme outcomes (or Graduate Attributes), including with respect to complex problems. [Eval-Form Q 1.7(b)]</p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>7. (i) The Criteria for awarding credit, re-assessment, repeat courses/modules, progression of students from one year to the next, graduation and exclusion</p>	<p>Y / *</p>

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

from the programme have been summarised in Table-2 of EAB-A13-P. [HoD(B7, C1)] [Eval-Form Q 1.7(a)]	
[*]	
(ii) The various Methods of Assessment and Details of the Assessment System, including use of Rubrics, and the expected level of attainment for each of the student outcomes have been properly described. [HoD(B7.1,C1, D6)] [Eval-Form Q 1.9 & EAB-A13: Table-2]	Y / *
[*]	
(iii) The use of assessment tools to assess the impact of course delivery / course content, as well as how laboratory and project work are contributing towards the attainment of the Module Outcomes and POs has been very well explained. [HoD(B7.1)]Eval-Form Q 2.1, 2.2]	Y / *
[*]	
8. (i) The Submission includes an Appendix 1, which provides a specification for each course/module of the curriculum, including Final Year (Capstone) Project, industrial training/work-based learning schemes and service courses/modules, setting out the course outcomes, detailed course content, graduate attributes, how outcomes are assessed, list of prescribed textbooks and other supporting material, as specified in Section 6.3(8) of document EAB-A12-P, [HoD(B8)] [Eval-Form Q 1.9]	Y / *
(ii) A Table of Content (as per Columns 1 and 2 of Table-1) is included.	
[*]	
9. The Submission includes an Appendix 2 on the composition of the Industry Advisory Committee and associated notes of meetings evidencing industry participation in the development of the curriculum towards ensuring that the curriculum is relevant and meets the needs of the industry in areas experiencing rapid changes. [HoD(B6, B9.2)] [Eval-Form Q 1.10]	Y / *
[*]	
10. Any other issue/issues Team wishes to comment or report on	

1.6.2 Team Leader's comment on the evaluation of the evidence against CRITERION-1. Team must support to the recommendation that is to be given;

--

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

1.6.3 Team Leader to comment *on the Team's conclusion* regarding compliance of programme with this criterion;

1.6.4 Deficiencies identified by the Team and the concerns noted in respect to compliance with CRITERION-1 are as stated hereunder: Please refer to Section 10 for the formal statement of concerns and deficiencies in the prescribed format.

1.7. CRITERION-2: Assessment of Graduate Attributes & Assessment System

1.7.1 Assessment of Graduate Attributes & Assessment System	
1. The HOD's Submission <i>provides evidence</i> showing that the Assessment System <i>ensures that every graduate satisfies each of the eleven graduate attributes.</i> [HoD(C1)] [Eval-Form Q 2.1 & 2.2]	Y / *
[*]	
2. (i) The Assessment System <i>involves the utilisation of a documented set of assessment criteria and processes that together demonstrate that the outcomes are satisfied at the level indicated by the range statement?</i> [HoD(C1)]	Y / *
[*]	
(ii) <i>The Submission explains how the assessment system (criteria and processes) ensures that Graduate Attributes are satisfied at the level indicated by the range statement.</i> [HoD(C1)]	Y / *
[*]	
3. The associated evidence in respect of the statement in 2 above included the following:	

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

<p>(i) Matrix as per Table-4 of EAB-A13-P has been compiled showing the links between courses/modules (including industrial training/work-based learning where applicable), to graduate attributes, permitting the identification and tracking of the contribution of each module to the graduate attributes; Each and every Graduate Attribute has been addressed.</p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>(ii) Tabular format as per Table-3 of EAB-A13-P showing that every Graduate Attribute specified in the EAB standard has been explicitly addressed in terms of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the course(s)/module(s), including industrial training/work-based learning where applicable, in which assessment of the attribute takes place at exit level, • how it is assessed (the means of assessment, the criteria for satisfaction of each outcome or attribute), • the level of performance required of the student; the required level, and • the consequences for the student of not satisfying the outcome or attribute. <p>[HoD(C1)][Eval-Form: Q 2.4(a), 2.4(b)]</p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>(iii) The Submission contains a description as well as the evidence on the internal policies and procedures used to validate the assessment of graduate attributes at exit level through both internal processes and external moderation; [HoD(C3, D8, D9, D11)] [Eval-Form- Q 3.9]</p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>(iv) the Submission includes evidence of the use of analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the assessment system for assessing graduate attributes.. [HoF(S 1.7.1)] [Eval-Form Q 2.6]</p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>(v) the Team has seen evidence on site of the assessment material for each course/module.</p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>4. Any other issue/issues Team wishes to comment or report on</p>	

1.7.2 Team Leader's comment on the evaluation of the evidence against CRITERION-2.

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

--

1.7.3 Team must be able to comment on the team's conclusion regarding compliance of programme with this criterion and substantiate the recommendation that is to be given;

--

1.7.4 Deficiencies identified by the Team and the concerns noted in respect to compliance with CRITERION-1 are as stated hereunder: Please refer to Section 10 for the formal statement of concerns and deficiencies in the prescribed format.

--

1.8. CRITERION-3: Teaching and Learning and Quality Assurance Processes .

1.8.1 Teaching and Learning and Quality Assurance Processes

1. Team is satisfied with the explanation on how, for a student being admitted at the entry level, his foundation engineering knowledge, <i>the</i> core disciplinary knowledge, as well as his specialist knowledge are developed for him to satisfy the graduate attributes. This has also been shown in Table-4 . [Eval-Form Q 3.3(a)]	Y / *
---	-------

[*]

2. (a) The teaching and learning methodology has been described . The methodology is geared towards the student entry routes and level(s) .	Y / *
---	-------

[*]

The methodology creates the following learning opportunities:

- (i)**
- (ii)**

Etc

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

[*]	
<p>(b) <i>The Submission includes information on the following recent Reviews of the Teaching and Learning aspects of the programme done by As well as the HEI's responses/comments:</i></p> <p>(i) date....[annual/periodic];</p> <p>(ii) ... etc.,</p>	Y / *
[*]	
<p>3. ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES</p> <p>[Either]There is no provision for the students' academic development programmes; students are admitted on the basis of common prior academic achievement,</p> <p>[Or] :The academic development programmes for students not meeting the common entry requirements <i>are identifiable and have been described. However such students are required to submit evidence of prior learning as follows:</i></p> <p>(i)</p> <p>(ii)</p> <p>[HoF(S 1.7.10)] [Eval-Form Q 4.15]</p>	
4. The Submission <i>satisfactorily describes</i> how independent learning is developed and coordinated.	Y / *
[*]	
<p>5. <i>The role of formative assessment in the programme is fully described, including description of the various methods of formative assessment applied in the programme, and how it contributes to achieving the programme outcomes.</i></p> <p><i>Timely feedback is given to students (how? When?).</i></p> <p><i>Data on students' performance over Years have been accessed. The is evidence of monitoring of students' progress through and at (at which stages).</i></p> <p><i>Formative assessment data are reflected in the final assessment, where it accounts for [nn %] in the final assessment of students' performance.</i></p> <p>[HoF(S 1.7.7)]; [HoD(B7.1, D6)]</p>	Y / *
[*]	
6. Team [<i>has seen</i>] [<i>not seen</i>] detailed evidence of moderation of assessment by internal and external moderators.	Y / *
[*]	

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

<p>The roles and duties of internal and external moderators and external examiners <i>have been spelt out in writing, and copies of same were supplied.</i></p>	<p>Y/*</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>Data as per Table-5 of document EAB-A13-P <i>has been compiled showing the qualifications and affiliations of moderators and examiners.</i> <i>External Examiners' reports have been supplied for the programme.</i> <i>Notes of meeting [for three recent meetings] with External Moderators and Examiners have been accessed.</i></p>	<p>Y/*</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>7. <i>There is documented evidence</i> of the processes used by the faculty/department for assessing and continuously improving the quality of the teaching and learning as well as the assessment of the programme. [Eval-Form Q 3.11(a), Also Q 2.1, 2.2] [HoF(S 1.7.7)] <i>Team has accessed specimen paper trails for quality assurance and the explanation of how the system is used for programme quality improvements</i></p>	<p>Y/*</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>8. The Submission <i>contains an explanation of how internal academic and administrative checks and balances are effectively used in the assessment and promotion system.</i> <i>Team has also accessed explanation of the operation of the academic and administrative procedures for programme review and development, including service courses.</i></p>	<p>Y/*</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>9. A cohort analysis as per format of Table-6 of document EAB-A13-P <i>has been carried out and tabled.</i> The analysis displays the following trends[enter text] . The analysis <i>includes</i> throughput by gender. [Insert comment on the gender distribution if supplied]). The Submission <i>includes</i> steps taken to monitor and improve/maintain throughput.</p>	<p>Y/*</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>10. <i>There is evidence of recent analysis of the strengths and weaknesses</i> of the teaching, learning and assessment process having been carried out. <i>The Strengths and Weaknesses have been identified for remedial action.. [HoF(S 1.7.1)] [Eval-Form Q Q 2.6]</i> <i>The quality assurance and improvement process has been described, and an analysis of the quality assurance and improvement process has been included in the Submission.</i></p>	<p>Y/*</p>
<p>[*]</p>	

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

11. Any other issue/issues Team wishes to comment or report on

1.8.2 Team Leader's comment on the evaluation of the evidence against CRITERION-3. Team must state its reasoning, which leads to the recommendation that is to be given

1.8.3 Team Leader to comment on the team's conclusion regarding the compliance of programme with this criterion.

1.8.4 Deficiencies identified by the Team and the concerns noted in respect to compliance with CRITERION-1 are as stated hereunder: Please refer to Section 10 for the formal statement of concerns and deficiencies in the prescribed format.

1.9. CRITERION-4: Resourcing and Sustainability

1.9.1 Resourcing and Sustainability

1.9.1 (a) Students Related. (See response against EAB-A12: Section 6.6.1)

- (i) *Uniform Entry routes/Requirements and entry qualifications for the programme have been specified and explained.
There is [no] provision for entry of students with sub-qualifications requiring academic development programmes.*

Y / *

[*]

Admission rating formulae *are used and have been explained.*

Y / *

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

<p>The Submission <i>includes a compilation of students Data</i> as per Table-7 of EAB document EAB-A13-P, showing the distribution and student rating for recent admissions. [HoF(S 1.7.10)] [Eval-Form Q 4.15]</p>	
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>(ii) The HEI <i>has [no] policies</i> on exemptions on account of credits for modules earned elsewhere.</p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>(iii) The HEI <i>has the capacity to conduct the programme for the enrolled number of students, while also having capacity to fulfil its other obligations. Data compiled as per Table-6 of EAB document EAB-A13-P amply show this..</i></p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>(iv) The Submission <i>has provided information on the resources available and processes in place for the academic counselling of students. It includes details on the academic and welfare support placed at the disposal of student, and also the arrangements in place for collection of student feedback, including from and from the Staff Student Coordination Committee (if applicable) The Team has been provided with the Department's comments in response to a recent Student Survey by the Administration.</i></p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>The Submission <i>explains that Invited Speakers from the Professional Engineering Institutions inform the students on the role of Professional Engineering Institution or Society, and on benefits of professional engineering institution's membership. These Speakers also brief the students on the need for and requirements to be satisfied for professional registration after their graduation.</i></p>	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>1.9.1 (b) Staff Related: See Self Study submission response to 6.6.2 of document EAB-A12-P.</p>	
<p>(i) The Submission <i>includes a table compiled as per Table-8 of EAB document EAB-A13-P, showing</i> for all staff teaching in the programme, the staff numbers, their academic and professional qualifications and experience, specialities, as well as their publication numbers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The table <i>also shows staff giving support courses</i> to the degree programme). • Also shown <i>are the professional institution membership and Professional Engineering registration</i> with the Registered Professional Engineers Council, for those holding such memberships and registrations. 	<p>Y / *</p>
<p>[*]</p>	
<p>(ii) The Team <i>had access to the CVs of the academic staff and their research profiles.</i></p>	<p>Y / *</p>

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

<p>The Submission does show evidence of Institution's policies as well as opportunities for the research development of staff.</p> <p>Team has also seen evidence of the overall responsibilities and contributions of support staff to the programme.</p> <p>Data as per Table-9 of EAB-A12-P has been compiled for key staff indicators.</p> <p>There is evidence of [insert number ??] qualified staff, of which [mm] are permanent, and [p] with professional registration, against the requirements of 8 qualified staff and at least 1 professionally registered staff as per Section 3.4.2(3) of EAB-A03-P: Accreditation Criteria.</p>	
[*]	
<p>(iii) The Submission includes information on the policies as well as a description of the strategies for staff recruitment, development, and retention. [HoF(S 1.7.14)] [Eval-Form Q 4.5]</p>	Y/*
[*]	
<p>(iii) Data as per Table-11 of EAB Document EAB-A13-P have been compiled showing the teaching load of academic staff for the current academic year; the computed staff/student ratio by year for all academic years for the current and past three years are as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Current Year [], Year -1 [], Year -2 [], Year3 []</p>	y/*
[*]	
<p>(v) The submission contains a list of invited speakers from industry/public bodies and for previous years as well as the current academic year, together with information on the nature of their lectures and the level of students for whom the lectures were intended.</p>	Y/*
[*]	
<p>(vi) The Submission explains the Institution's policy on staff consultancy, including provision of equal opportunities to academic staff for undertaking consultancy services. There is a compilation of names of academic staff who have been engaged in in consultancy activities as well as the nature of engineering activities in which they were engaged.</p>	Y/*
[*]	
<p>(viii) Any other issue/issues Team wishes to comment or report on</p>	

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

<p>1.9.1 (c) Resources Related [See provider's Self Study response to Section 6.6.3 of EAB-A12-P] [HoF(S 1.7.8)] [Eval-Form: Q 4.11 & 4.12]</p>	
<p>(i) Data <i>has been compiled as per Table-12 of Doc EAB-A13-P showing the budgetary allocations to the [Faculty] [programme's host department] for a five-year period covering the period [Year YY, YA, YB, YC, and YD] for each of the following headings: Capital equipment, Operating Expenses, Computing and Networking, library books and journals.</i> Team considers the allocations are <i>[adequate/not adequate]</i> for the purposes for which the budgetary allocations have been made, <i>that is to acquire, maintain, and operate facilities & equipment to meet the curriculum requirements of the programme.</i></p>	Y / *
[*]	
<p>The Submission contains a description of safety policy and measures in place within the laboratories, and there are safety notices/instructions in each laboratory visited.</p>	y/*
[*]	
<p>(ii) The Submission <i>contains a full description of the following laboratories and the facilities available there in and their functions.</i></p> <p>[1.] [2.] [3.], [4.....] [5. [.....] [6.], etc.</p>	Y / *
<p><i>Team is satisfied</i> from the tour of the laboratories and additional information given during the tour and staff interview <i>that the facilities are [adequate/not adequate]</i> to support the programme. Team considers that the facilities are <i>[adequate/not adequate]</i> for demonstrating ability in matters of {example <i>..to demonstrate ability to investigate complex problems.</i></p>	Y / *
[*]	
<p>(ii) Team <i>has had access to the Department's Computer Laboratory.</i> <i>Team has noted [] work-stations that can effectively permit [] students to access the Software applications that have been pre-installed.</i></p>	Y / *

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

<p><i>The Submission lists the following softwares and tools relevant to the programme which can be accessed by the students operating the workstations.</i></p> <p>[1.] [2.] [3.] [4.], etc.</p> <p>The Computer facilities are on a network that is <i>[part of] [separate from]</i> the University computer network, and <i>[can be] [cannot be]</i> accessed remotely.</p> <p><i>Team considers there is also capacity in terms of resources and time for academic staff teaching in the programme.</i></p>	
[*]	
Impact of the programme (See Self Study response to Section 6.6.4 of EAB-A12-P)	
<p>(d) Team to state if it has seen evidence of assessment of the impact of the programme ; and</p> <p>How was the assessment done, and what use, if any, have been made or proposed of the results to improve the programme?</p> <p>Team must also comment on the information and evidence gathered during interviews on the sustainability of this and other Programmes within the Department and comment on the Institution's endeavours to ensure high standards of its programmes through its policy on staff, opportunities for research, funding, collaboration with other institutions, self financing, quality and variety of its programmes, publications by its academic staff, etc.</p>	Y /*
[*]	

1.9.2 Team Leader's comment on the *evaluation of the evidence against CRITERION-4*. Team must state its reasoning which lead to the recommendation that is to be given.

1.9.3 Team Leader to comment on the *team's conclusion regarding compliance of programme with this criterion*.

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

1.9.4 Deficiencies identified by the Team and the concerns noted in respect to compliance with CRITERION-1 are as stated hereunder: Please refer to Section 10 for the formal statement of concerns and deficiencies in the prescribed format.

1.10. Team Leader's Recommendation

- (i) Preamble: Overall reasoning of the team leading to the recommendation;
- (ii) Recommendation to be made using one of the standard forms in Appendix A:

Choose from {D1 to D9} [See APPENDIX-A1] or

for Initial Evaluation choose

either 01, 02, or 03, or combination of 02 and 03;

- (iii) Team Leader to make a clear, complete statement of any deficiencies and concerns in the format prescribed in Appendix B.

1.11. Acknowledgements

In this section of the Report, Team leader should thank and recognize assistance obtained from Head of the Faculty and his staff, etc.

1.12. Signatures

The Team Leader and the Visit Leader must sign and date the *final* version of the report.

In the event only one programme was evaluated, then Team Leader and the three (3) other members of the Team should sign.

As Team Leader, I certify that this report has been approved by the Team.

Team Leader:

Signature:

Date:

Report noted:

Visit Deputy Leader:

Signature:

Date:

Report Noted:

Visit Leader

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

Signature:

Date:

Report Noted:

.....
ATTACHED (with Report): APPENDIX-A: Evaluation Support Forms
.....

APPENDICES to Team Leader's Report

Appendix A: Evaluation Support Forms

The Evaluation Support Forms lead the team through the accreditation CRITERIA-1 to 4 and provide spaces for recording judgements and supporting notes against each criterion and its their sub-items.

While Appendix A is attached to the report, the body of the report must be comprehensive and stand alone.

Appendix A1: Possible recommendation formats

The Accreditation Team recommends to the Accreditation Committee (AC) that:

[Choose one of the following recommendations and delete the others]

D1: Applicable to any type of visit or evaluation by an Interim Report.

(If the programme has no deficiencies)

The degree programme is accredited until the year, that is, until the year of the next regular accreditation visit.

D2(a): Applicable at a Regular Visit

(If the programme is deficient and an Interim Visit within one, two or three years is considered appropriate)

The degree programme is accredited until the year Deficiencies identified in this report are to be addressed. An Interim Visit is required in(year) to evaluate the results of actions to overcome the deficiencies.

D2(b): Applicable at a Regular Visit

*(If the programme is deficient and an Interim Report **within one year is appropriate**)*

The degree programme is accredited until the year Deficiencies identified in this report are to be addressed. An Interim Report is required by(year), detailing actions undertaken to overcome the deficiencies and objective measures that indicate the success of these actions.

D3: Applicable in the case of evaluation by an Interim Report

(If Deficiencies persist from the previous visit or new deficiencies appear)

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

The degree programme is accredited until the year Deficiencies identified in this report are to be addressed. Notice is given that an Interim Visit must be initiated within months.

D4: Applicable following an Interim Visit

(where Deficiencies persist from the previous visit or new deficiencies appear)

The degree programme is accredited until the year Deficiencies identified in this report are to be addressed. *Notice is given that accreditation will be withdrawn if the deficiencies are not satisfactorily remedied.* A final accreditation visit is required not later than(date) to evaluate the results of actions undertaken to overcome the deficiencies.

D5: Applicable following a Final Visit

(Where Deficiencies persist from the previous visit or new deficiencies appear)

Accreditation of thedegree programme is to be withdrawn with effect from(date) [This recommendation is to the EAB through AC]

D6. Applicable following any of the above visits

(If there are Current or previously declared deficiencies for which there is a demonstrable lack of commitment and lack of capacity to improve on the part of the provider)

Notice is hereby issued that accreditation of the programme will be terminated if deficiencies identified in this report are not remedied within six (6) months of the decision being communicated to the provider. **A Final Accreditation Visit must be conducted within this period.** The provider must provide a plan for teaching out or transferring students registered in the programme should accreditation be withdrawn. [This recommendation is to the EAB through AC]

D7: Applicable in the case of a programme not currently accredited

(If the Programme is judged to be deficient)

The degree programme is not accredited due to the deficiencies identified in this report. [Recommendation is to the EAB through AC]

D8: Applicable in the case of a programme evaluated for provisional accreditation

(If Programme is judged likely to receive accreditation if implementation continues according to documented plans)

The degree programme is provisionally accredited until the year *The first Regular Visit must take place the year after the first graduates are produced.*

D9: Applicable for a programme that demonstrates actual or potential deficiencies

(Where the Deficiencies make accreditation unlikely if implementation continues according to documented plans)

Provisional accreditation will not be granted to the programme.

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS

Engineering Accreditation Board

Initial Evaluation

Applicable in the case of a programme submitted for initial evaluation, the opinion on the planned programme is one of the following or a combination of items O2 and O3:

- O1:** The planned programme for as reflected in the documentation is free from deficiencies and concerns.
- O2:** Aspects of the planned programme for as reflected in the documentation are potentially deficient in the criteria listed above.
- O3:** Aspects of the planned programme for as reflected in the documentation are cause for concern regarding the criteria listed above.

When concerns are recorded (See Appendix B)

If necessary, for any type of visit, add:

Concerns recorded in this report must be addressed and will be reviewed at the next regular accreditation visit.

Appendix B: Format for recording deficiencies or concerns

- (i) The programme is deficient in relation to Criterion X [item Y] as stated hereunder:

<Insert what was found and state why it does not meet the criterion.>

.....
.....

- (ii) The team is concerned that the programme

.....
.....

<Describe herein above the condition that is cause for concern and that relates to possible future non-compliance with criteria.>

- (iii) The team comments that *<Describe the condition that is good or bad in the programme.>*

.....
.....

APPENDIX A [

Appendix A: Evaluation Support Forms

SEE DRAFT REPORT FORMAT- PART-B Evaluation Support Form