

**S A COUNCIL FOR THE
PROPERTY VALUERS PROFESSION**

Policy and Procedures Document :

**Accreditation of University and University of Technology Programmes,
leading to registration as a candidate valuer.**

The Higher Education Act of 1997 assigns responsibility for quality assurance in higher education in South Africa to the Council on Higher Education (CHE). This responsibility is discharged through its permanent sub-committee, the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC). It is anticipated that the South African Council for the Property Valuers Profession will make application to enter into a Delegation Model Memorandum of Understanding for whole qualifications with the HEQC. With this in mind, this policies and procedures for accreditation document has been drawn up in alignment with CHE and HEQC documents *Framework for Programme Accreditation, November 2004* and *Criteria for Programme Accreditation, November 2004*

The purpose of this document is to record Council's current policy and procedures to

- evaluate property valuation degree programmes offered by educational institutions and
- accredit programmes that meet the required standards.

In this policy document, unless the context indicates otherwise:

“**accredit**” means the process of evaluation and recognition by the Council of education programmes offered by educational institutions relating to the property valuers profession

“**Council**” means the South African Council for the Property Valuers Profession established by section 2 of the Property Valuers Profession Act, 2000

“**educational institution**” means, in the case of a South African educational institution, a higher educational institution as defined in the Higher Education Act, 1997 (Act No. 101 of 1997), or, in the case of a foreign educational institution, an educational institution registered as such in terms of the laws of the foreign jurisdiction concerned

“**property valuation education**” means an academic examination or qualification prescribed or recognized by the Council for purposes of registration in terms of section 20 of the Act

“**the Act**” means the Property Valuers Profession Act, 2000

“**the Education Committee**” means the Education Committee of the Council, established under section 18 of the Act

This policy document may be subject to amendment from time to time

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Accreditation Policy
 - 1.1 General policy
 - 1.2 Accreditation Categories
 - 1.3 Delegation of Authority
 - 1.4 Accreditation Team
 - 1.5 Accreditation Report
 - 1.6 Accreditation Approach
 - 1.7 Accreditation Charges/costs
 - 1.8 Certificate of Accreditation

- 2.0 Criteria for Accreditation
 - 2.1 Institutional Setting and Programme Aims, Objectives and Stated Outcomes
 - 2.2 Student Intake and Entrance Requirements
 - 2.3 Staffing : Department leadership, staff, development and support
 - 2.4 Teaching and Learning
 - 2.5 Student Assessment and Feedback
 - 2.6 The Learning Environment
 - 2.7 Quality Assurance
 - 2.8 Vocational Relevance
 - 2.9 Postgraduate policies

- 3.0 Documentation

- 4.0 Visit for Accreditation

- 5.0 EXTENSION OF CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION - indicative questions intended as guidance for both educational institutions and accreditation teams

1.0 ACCREDITATION POLICY

1.1 General policy

The Council :

- 1.1.1 respects the autonomy of tertiary educational institutions and does not prescribe standard or compulsory programme structures, curriculum details or teaching methods.
- 1.1.2 will consider baccalaureus degree programmes, with property valuations as a major subject, of three-year (minimum) and four-year duration at South African tertiary educational institutions, for accreditation. In addition, the programmes are required to have the following broad characteristics of adequate education and training:
 - Property economics
 - Property finance
 - Law on property valuation
 - Property law
 - Information technology
 - Complementary studies
 - Discretionary studies
- 1.1.3 will consider taught masters degree and/or postgraduate diploma programmes, with sufficient property valuation modules, of two-year duration at South African tertiary educational institutions, for accreditation. In addition, the programmes are required to have the broad characteristics of education and training as outlined for baccalaureus degree programmes
- 1.1.4 grants full accreditation for a maximum period of four years, awarded to a programme meeting Council requirements. Regular accreditation evaluations are undertaken on a four-year cycle
- 1.1.5 grants conditional accreditation when a programme has been identified as having inadequacies which affect the standard of the degree but which, in the opinion of the Council, the educational institution will remedy within a reasonable period of time, or maximum one year
- 1.1.6 will convert conditional accreditation to full accreditation provided deficiencies have been remedied, in which case a re-evaluation visit may be waived. (The educational institution will be required to submit a satisfactory report on improvements that have been made)
- 1.1.7 grants provisional accreditation for a two year period, when a new degree programme has students who have completed the second year of study, and indicates to the educational institution and students in the programme that those parts of the programme already implemented are considered satisfactory and that the planned further implementation is likely to result in accreditation of the programme

Graduates meeting the requirements for the degree during the period of conditional or provisional accreditation are granted recognition retrospectively when the degree is awarded full accreditation

During the period of accreditation, the educational institution is expected to inform the Council of significant changes which may affect the accreditation status of a programme and if necessary, to initiate a re-evaluation of the programme

The Council requires prior examination of the required documentation and an on-site evaluation before the award of accreditation to a degree programme

The Council undertakes to publish annually a list of all degrees accredited, with the respective accreditation periods

Details of investigations, documentation, correspondence or discussions between the Council, the accreditation team and the educational institution concerned, will remain confidential

1.2 Accreditation Categories

1.2.1 Fully accredited degree programmes

In the third year of a period of accreditation, the Council will notify the educational institution of the termination date of the current accreditation and enquire whether the educational institution wishes to initiate an accreditation visit to take place during the following (fourth) year.

1.2.2 Conditionally accredited degree programmes

Before the end of the period, the Council will notify/remind the educational institution to submit the required report on improvements made. Should the educational institution consider that the necessary improvements have been made earlier than the term set by the Council, it may submit a report detailing the changes. The Council will then decide whether full accreditation be granted.

1.2.3 Existing non-accredited programmes

An educational institution may request the Council to conduct an evaluation of an existing degree programme which is not currently accredited. The educational institution will be asked to submit a full set of documentation as specified in Part 3 of this document, after scrutiny of which an evaluation visit will be conducted.

1.2.4 Provisionally accredited new degree programmes

An educational institution wishing to introduce a new degree programme (which it is anticipated will achieve full accreditation by the Council) is advised, at the planning stage, to submit the relevant portions of the documentation specified in Part 3 of this document, to the Council for initial evaluation of the likely accreditability of the programme, if implemented as planned. When the new programme has students who have completed the second year of study, provisional accreditation may be awarded for a two year period for the part of the programme already implemented and considered satisfactory, and provided that the planned further implementation is likely to result in accreditation of the programme.

1.2.5 Withdrawal or withholding of accreditation

Accreditation of an existing programme is withdrawn if the programme has become so deficient that the educational institution can not reasonably be expected to remedy the deficiencies within a reasonable time or the educational institution is unable or unwilling to remedy the deficiencies

The Council reserves the right to withdraw accreditation at any time

1.3 Delegation of authority

The Council has delegated authority to the Education Committee (established under section 18 of the Act) to carry out the following functions and make recommendations on the accreditation of degree programmes:

- 1.3.1 consider and decide on matters of policy relating to accreditation of degree programmes
- 1.3.2 draw up and maintain guidelines on matters of policy and the conducting of accreditation visits
- 1.3.3 compile and maintain a list of persons considered eligible for appointment as members of an accreditation team
- 1.3.4 appoint accreditation teams
- 1.3.5 approve accreditation visit schedules, reporting deadlines and dates of meetings
- 1.3.6 consider reports of accreditation teams, grant full, conditional or provisional accreditation to degree programmes and to withdraw or withhold accreditation, as the case may be
- 1.3.7 issue annually a list of degrees accredited by the Council
- 1.3.8 institute such observation exercises as may be necessary to ensure that Council accreditation standards are substantially equivalent to those of foreign accrediting bodies with whom the Council has entered into mutual recognition agreements
- 1.3.9 evaluate qualifications which have not been accredited or evaluated by the Council for purposes of recognition in terms of the Act, or have not been recognised as a result of a mutual accreditation agreement with any foreign accrediting body
- 1.3.10 keep the Council informed of decisions taken in terms of all delegated powers.

1.4 Accreditation team

An accreditation team is appointed, for each degree programme to be evaluated, by the Education Committee. The team is composed of at least four members:

- one registered professional valuer who is active in the valuation industry or profession
- one registered professional valuer who has had recent experience in evaluating degree programmes for accreditation purposes
- one assessor who is an experienced academic planning / course development expert
- the Council Registrar, or nominee, who records the proceedings

A member of the team is appointed by the Education Committee as chairperson

No persons who have any relationship with the educational institution concerned will be appointed to the accreditation team.

1.5 Accreditation Report

Preparation and processing of the accreditation report follows the sequence set out below:

- 1.5.1 The accreditation team will prepare a draft recommendation which will be discussed with the educational institution at the close of the visit
- 1.5.2 A draft report will be circulated to all members of the accreditation team for comment and agreement by an agreed date, prior to finalization
- 1.5.3 The agreed report and recommendations of the accreditation team will be submitted to the educational institution for comment, mainly relating to factual errors, by an agreed date
- 1.5.4 The chairperson of the accreditation team will approve the final report which will be circulated to Education Committee members prior to the following Council meeting
- 1.5.5 The decision of the Education Committee is final in terms of the Council's delegated powers, however should the recommendation be withdrawal of accreditation, the report and Education Committee recommendation are forwarded to the Council for ratification

- 1.5.6 The Registrar of the Council informs the educational institution of the decision by letter to the Registrar, copied to the Dean and the Head of Department
- 1.5.7 If the decision is conditional accreditation, the educational institution will be required to indicate within a reasonable but specified time whether it is in a position to make the necessary improvements, failing which the conditional accreditation shall expire
- 1.5.8 The Council shall be informed of all decisions taken by the Education Committee.

Should documentation or information provided by an educational institution be deficient, the Chairperson of the Education Committee may, before, during or after the visit, call for such information to be provided within a specified period and the finalisation of the report on an accreditation visit may be delayed until the information is provided.

1.6 Accreditation Approach

All accreditation visits should be conducted in an open and professional manner. Deficiencies, comments or constructive criticism must be raised with the Dean, Head of Department and relevant staff members during the accreditation visit.

1.7 Accreditation Charges/costs

Educational institutions are expected to bear the costs of an accreditation visit conducted by the Council. Costs may include flights, documentation, subsistence and honoraria for the accreditation team.

1.8 Certificate of Accreditation

The Council will issue a Certificate of Accreditation to successful educational institutions, on which the restrictions or conditions, if applicable, will be endorsed.

2.0 CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION

The following criteria are general guidelines for evaluation of acceptability of degree programmes :

2.1 Educational Institution Setting and Programme Aims, Objectives and Stated Outcomes

The educational institution should demonstrate the value ascribed to the programme in terms of its status, continuity, resource provision and validity. Departments will be expected to have clearly stated aims and objectives which guide academic policies and transformation. Programmes will be expected to have clearly stated aims and objectives which guide the curriculum in achieving the balance of academic and vocational outcomes expected by the Council.

2.1 Student Intake and Entrance Requirements

Admission and selection criteria of students should align with the academic requirements of the programme, within a framework of equity, diversity and recognition of prior learning.

2.3 Staffing : Department leadership, staff, development and support

The academic and support staff associated with the management and delivery of the programme should be consistent with its aims, size and diversity. Recruitment and employment of staff should reflect appropriate equity and diversity considerations. An appropriate proportion of academic staff should be registered professional valuers.

2.4 Teaching and Learning

The composition of the programme in terms of its duration and timing, subjects, focus and allocation of academic credits should relate clearly to stated aims and objectives.

2.5 Student Assessment and Feedback

The assessment mechanisms used in the various components of the programme should be clearly identified in relation to stated aims, objectives and learning outcomes. Discussion with students, past and present, will provide an important reference in determining the health, validity and output quality of the programme.

2.6 The Learning Environment

The learning environment and physical, information and computing resources available, should be conducive to programme aims and objectives, size and diversity.

2.7 Quality Assurance

The educational institution should operate a structured system of quality assurance and programme enhancement. This should align with Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC) requirements for quality assurance. External examiner reports should assist in providing an independent view of the programme in operation.

2.8 Vocational Relevance

The programme should have clear and progressive vocational relevance which prepares students for employment and lifelong learning necessary for career development.

2.9 Postgraduate policies

Policies should be in place for admission, selection of postgraduate students and the appointment of supervisors, which align with the academic requirements of the programme, within a framework of equity, diversity and recognition of prior learning.

Note: See also Part 5 of this document for indicative questions intended for guidance and extension of Criteria for Accreditation

3.0 DOCUMENTATION

Submission of documentation, in report and tabular format, prior to the accreditation visit is to include :

3.1 For review of an accredited programme :

- 3.1.1 General educational institution, department and programme information
- 3.1.2 Operation, management and resourcing, including budget allocations
- 3.1.3 Perceived strengths and weakness
- 3.1.4 Achievement of aims and objectives
- 3.1.5 Detailed submission relating to criteria outlined in Part 2 of this document
- 3.1.6 Student demographics, entry levels, enrolment and throughput statistics for the previous four years
- 3.1.7 Academic staff details (full-time and part-time) including academic qualifications, professional affiliation, experience and any changes in staff during the previous four years
- 3.1.8 Support staff details and their responsibilities
- 3.1.9 Research and publications of the department for the previous four years

Additional information, for the previous four years, to be made available at the accreditation visit:

- Examination papers
- Examination scripts
- Detailed mark sheets
- Study material supplied to students
- Examples of student submissions
- Course convenor reports

3.2 For accreditation of an existing non-accredited degree programme :

- 3.2.1 Documentation demonstrating that the educational institution meets the HEQC candidacy phase criteria (CHE & HEQC Criteria for Programme Accreditation, November 2004)
- 3.2.2 Documentation required for review of an accredited programme outlined in Part 3.1 of this document

3.3 For accreditation of a new degree programme at the planning stage :

- 3.3.1 Documentation demonstrating that the educational institution meets the HEQC candidacy phase criteria (CHE & HEQC Criteria for Programme Accreditation, November 2004)
- 3.3.2 Strategies to ensure that criteria are met for provisional accreditation (Part 1.2 of this document)
- 3.3.3 Plan for the implementation of the new programme

4.0 VISIT FOR ACCREDITATION

Accreditation visits will be limited to one day. An agenda will be agreed with the Head of Department prior to the visit. Interviews or meetings with staff, students and where applicable, graduates and employers will take place during the evaluation visit. Tour of specific facilities may be requested. The visit will be timed during an academic term and in consultation with the educational institution. An exclusive use venue of suitable size will be required for the visit.

5.0 EXTENSION OF CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION

- the following are indicative questions intended as guidance for both educational institutions and accreditation teams.

Questions relating to Criteria 2.1 : Educational institution Setting and Programme Aims, Objectives and Stated Outcomes

What is the position and value ascribed to the programme within the educational institution/faculty portfolio?

What contribution is made by the programme to the achievement of the educational institution/faculty strategic objectives?

How are financial, human and physical resources allocated to the programme?

What are the ways in which the educational institution determines programme validity and quality?

How is the role of the professional valuer identified and nurtured?

Does the department have aims and objectives regarding not only academic policies but also transformation, equity, redress and student profiles?

How does this align with the University mission statement?

How are the outcomes of the programme formulated?

To what extent do market needs influence the programme and requirements of graduates?

How are the aims and objectives of the department communicated to students?

In what ways have the stated aims and objectives been achieved?

Does the programme have clearly stated aims and objectives which guide the curriculum in achieving the balance of academic and vocational outcomes consistent with Council expectations?

How are vocational skills developed?

Are the expected outcomes of the programme clearly identified?

Do the subjects/modules making up the programme have clear aims and learning outcomes?

Is the contribution that subjects/modules make to the outcomes of the programme evident?

How is the programme managed in academic, operational and pastoral terms?

Questions relating to Criteria 2.2 : Student Intake and Entrance Requirements

Does information contained in programme documentation and recruitment brochures accurately inform potential students of academic and admission requirements?

Are student numbers relative to programme capacity?

Is sufficient information available regarding professional accreditation and registration on graduation?

What student mentoring, support or counseling programmes are in place and what role do staff and other students play in these?

How are new students orientated into the educational institution and the department?

Are special facilities available for students with learning difficulties, at an educational institution or departmental level?

Questions relating to Criteria 2.3 : Staffing : Department leadership, staff, development and support

Is the number of academic staff associated with the management and delivery of the programme consistent with its aims, size and diversity?

Is the research profile of the staff adequate for the level of the programme?

How are recruitment and employment policies adequately addressing issues of equity and diversity?

Are staff adequately qualified and experienced to deliver the programme?

Does the staff include an appropriate proportion of registered professional valuers?

What are staff teaching loads, staff/student ratios and staff/graduate ratios?

Is the balance of full-time and part-time staff appropriate?

Are there professional growth and development opportunities for academic staff?

Is the number of administrative and support staff associated with the programme consistent with its aims, size and diversity?

Are support staff adequately qualified and experienced?

Are there growth and development opportunities for support staff?

Questions relating to Criteria 2.4 : Teaching and Learning

How is the programme structured in terms of its duration and timing, subjects, focus and allocation of academic credit?

Does the content of the programme reflect the expected outcomes?

Is there a logical progression between levels and subjects of the programme?

Are service departments relied on for assistance and are their services satisfactory?

Are teaching and learning methods appropriate and evaluated?

How is technology used?

How is the interrelationship of education and research brought into the programme?

Questions relating to Criteria 2.5 : Student Assessment and Feedback

Are assessment mechanisms used in the various components of the programme clearly identified in relation to stated aims, objectives and learning outcomes?

Are these mechanisms appropriate and thorough in determining performance?

How are students informed of their performance and progress throughout the programme?

How is security and integrity of assessment procedures ensured?

How are student opinions, perceptions and evaluations of courses and the programme sought?

How are these evaluations responded to by the educational institution?

How are student complaints dealt with?

How are students afforded the opportunity for representation and contribution to programme development?

Students views on :

- Structure, content and delivery of the programme

- Challenges and standards achieved

- Vocational relevance and preparation

- Facilities available

- Opportunities for representation and contribution to programme development

Questions relating to Criteria 2.6 : The Learning environment

Is the learning environment conducive to programme aims and objectives, size and diversity?

Do students have adequate access to library, information services, computing and information technology facilities?

Do students receive adequate tuition in the use of specialist facilities?

Questions relating to Criteria 2.7 : Quality Assurance

What is the means by which the quality of the programme is assured and enhanced?

What systems are in place to ensure the validity and attainment of the programme, including reporting and action mechanisms?

How are responsibilities and accountabilities for quality assurance allocated?

What are the procedures for dealing with adverse outcomes?

How are staff, students, employers and professional councils and educational institutions able to contribute to the development of the programme?

How are external examiners appointed and for what term?

What are the views of the external examiners in relation to programme relevance, scope, quality, resources and output?

Have external examiners identified areas of concern?

Are external examiners supportive of the assessment processes and achievement of students?

Questions relating to Criteria 2.8 : Vocational relevance

How is programme vocational relevance identified and maintained?

How are students prepared for employment?

How are students prepared for lifelong learning and continuing professional development?

Questions relating to Criteria 2.9 : Postgraduate policies

How is consistency in implementation of admission requirements achieved?

Are supervisors appointed according to the relevant field of study?

How are new or inexperienced supervisors supported?

How are roles and responsibilities of supervisors and students communicated?
