



**SOUTH AFRICAN COUNCIL
FOR THE
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL PROFESSION**

P.O. BOX 868, Ferndale, 2160

Tel: 011 789 1384

Fax: 011 789 1385

www.saclap.org.za

registrar@saclap.org.za

PROPOSED ACCREDITATION PROCEDURES

FOR THE

SOUTH AFRICAN COUNCIL FOR THE LANDSCAPE

ARCHITECTURAL PROFESSION

(SACLAP)

FINAL

Prepared by:
Mr Neal Dunstan (Chair Education Committee),
Dr Gwen Theron (LEAP) and
Mr Graham Young (University of Pretoria)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

KEY TERMINOLOGY	3
OVERVIEW OF ACCREDITATION	5
SACLAP ACCREDITATION STRUCTURES	7
SACLAP EDUCATION COMMITTEE	7
THE ACCREDITATION PANEL	7
ACCREDITATION PANEL SELECTION	8
OBSERVER RESPONSIBILITIES	8
RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTIES PRIOR TO THE VISIT	9
ACCREDITATION PANEL	9
INSTITUTION SEEKING ACCREDITATION	9
RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTIES AFTER THE VISIT	10
ACCREDITATION PANEL	10
SACLAP EC REVIEW AND FINALISATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS	10
Accreditation:	10
Provisional Accreditation:	10
Initial Accreditation:	11
Suspension of Accreditation:	11
Accreditation Denial:	11
Withdrawal of Accreditation:	11
INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE	11
CONFIDENTIALITY	12
REFERENCE TO ACCREDITED STATUS	12
DELAYING A SCHEDULED ACCREDITATION VISIT.	12
RESCHEDULING VISIT	12
BIENNIAL INSTITUTION REPORTS AND OTHER REPORTS	12
POLICY ON SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE	13
MAINTAINING GOOD STANDING	13
SUSPENSION OF ACCREDITATION	14
WITHDRAWAL OF ACCREDITATION	14
ACCREDITATION FEES	14

VARIATIONS	14
OTHER SACLAP REPRESENTATION (FACULTY BOARDS ETC)	15
CONFLICT OF INTEREST	15
COMPLAINT PROCEDURE	15
APPEALS	15
APPENDIX 1	16
ACCREDITATION PANEL VISIT PROCEDURES	16
FACILITIES DURING THE VISIT	16
EXHIBITION OF STUDENT WORK	16
MEETING WITH STUDENTS	16
SUGGESTED TWO DAY TIMETABLE	16
DAY ONE	17
DAY TWO	17

1. KEY TERMINOLOGY

Accredit - The process of evaluation and recognition by the SACLAP of educational programs offered by educational institutions relating to the landscape architectural profession, and accreditation has a corresponding meaning

Assessment - Each criterion has one or more questions that seek qualitative and quantitative evidence used to assess the level of compliance with or achievement of the related criteria.

First Professional Program - A first professional program encompasses the body of knowledge common to the profession and promotes acquisition of knowledge and skills necessary to enter the professional practice of landscape architecture i.e. at the bachelor's level in a context enriched by the liberal arts and natural and social sciences and at the master's level by providing instruction in and application of research and or/scholarly methods.

Competency/Criteria: Each criterion requires qualitative evidence, and in some cases also quantitative evidence, to demonstrate an acceptable level of performance. Such performance is to be demonstrated by a combination of:

- Student work outcomes;
- Documented curriculum content;
- Review of documentation of internal reviews;
- Interviews with the students, lecturers and administrator by the accreditation panel;
- Documented assessment events;
- Demonstrated active participation leading to documented outcomes;
- Other documented evidence-based indicators.

Compliance - Achieved when the SACLAP EC concludes, after review of relevant indicators or other evidence, that a standard is met or met with recommendation as defined below. To achieve accreditation a program must demonstrate to the SACLAP EC, through the Self Evaluation Report, site visit, and technical accuracy review by the visiting Accreditation Panel, that it complies with all standards.

Course: A discrete package of instruction, or a unit, within an academic programme.

Course outline: The written description of the scope, inclusions, timetable or learning schedule, assessment criteria, and expectations of students completing the course.

Curriculum: The planned and documented learning experiences of the students in the programme, includes a description of the programme plus the course outlines for all courses in the programme.

Criteria - Each standard has one or more criteria statements that define the components needed to satisfy the related standard. Not satisfying a criterion does not automatically lead to an assessment of a standard as 'not met'. To be accredited a program demonstrates progress towards meeting the criteria

Intent - Explains the purpose of the standard.

Observer - any person or body as allowed by the SACLAP EC to sit in on all reviews and meetings during the accreditation process but which has no say or influence in the final decision of an accreditation other than to confirm that the accreditation process has been followed duly and fairly.

Programme - An inclusive term for the coursework and other learning experiences leading to a qualification and the supporting administration, faculty, facilities and services which sponsor and provide those experiences leading to graduation of students.

Programme Head/Director. The academic responsible for management and academic leadership of the programme.

Recommendation Affecting Accreditation - Are issues of serious concern, directly affecting the quality of the program. Recommendations are derived from the identified areas of weakness in meeting a standard that are described in the rationale sections of the visiting team report. The program is

required to report progress regularly on these issues. Recommendations Affecting Accreditation identifies issues, and do not prescribe solutions.

Shall - is defined as mandatory.

Should - is defined as prescriptive.

Standards - Qualitative statements of the essential conditions that an accredited program must meet. A program must demonstrate adequate evidence of compliance with all standards to achieve accreditation.

Standard Met - Evidence shows that overall program performance in this area meets the SACLAP EC's minimum standards. A standard may be judged as met even though one or more indicators are not minimally met.

Standard Met With Recommendation - Deficiencies exist in an area directly bearing on accreditation. The problem or problems have observable effects on the overall quality of the program.

Standard Not Met - Cited deficiency is so severe that the overall quality of the program is compromised and the program's ability to deliver adequate landscape architecture education is impaired.

Suggestions for Improvement - Areas where the program can build on strengths or address areas of concern that do not directly affect accreditation at the time of the Accreditation review.

2. OVERVIEW OF ACCREDITATION

The South African Council for the Landscape Architectural Profession (SACLAP) has, in terms of Section 13 of the Landscape Architectural Professions Act, 2000 (No. 45 of 2000) (referred to as the Act hereafter) the mandate to accredit institutions that offer programmes and courses related to the landscape architectural profession. In order to meet this mandate, SACLAP has established the Education Committee (EC).

Accredit means the process of evaluation and recognition by the South African Council for the Landscape Architectural Profession (SACLAP) of educational programmes offered by educational institutions relating to the landscape architectural profession, and accreditation has a corresponding meaning. This is the definition presented in the Act.

This document serves to outline the criteria against which courses offering professional qualifications (i.e. qualifications which give eligibility for professional registration in the landscape architectural profession) will be evaluated.

Eligibility for registration in the SACLAP is largely dependent on the Institution being accredited by SACLAP. Categories and National Qualification Framework levels are as follows for individuals wishing to register with the SACLAP once they have graduated:

- Candidate Landscape Architect (NQF 9 and 10)
- Candidate Landscape Technologist (NQF 8)
- Candidate Landscape Technician (NQF 7)
- Candidate Landscape Assistant (NQF 6)

Note:

- i. Certificate Courses as per SAQA qualifications.
- i. Additional categories still to be defined (terminology / competencies) in due course.

In the interests of aligning the SACLAP EC accreditation process (from the perspective of a Statutory Council concerned with professional education) with that of the Council for Higher Education (CHE), the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC), and the potential streamlining of these parallel processes into one, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between SACLAP and the CHE has been signed. The MOU together with Frameworks and Criteria of the CHE and the CBE forms the basis of the accreditation procedure set out in this document.

Note: Should further information in this regard be required, please also refer to the following CHE Documents: HEQC Program Accreditation Framework & HEQC Program Accreditation Criteria.

Furthermore professional accreditation is also the process of review designed to evaluate a programme in the light of its educational objectives and the minimum standards in relation to the Core Competencies as defined by SACLAP. Refer to the SACLAP website (www.saclap.org.za) to obtain a copy of the Core Competencies.

The purpose of professional accreditation is to serve the needs of four key stakeholders:

- The community which is entitled to have confidence and expect that in the employing newly graduated landscape architectural professionals there is adequate knowledge of the theory and practice of landscape architecture;
- The students and graduates who are entitled to assurance that the programme has been independently reviewed and found to meet professional higher education standards and competencies in order for them to be eligible for registration with SACLAP;
- The tertiary institution for which the process provides a consultative peer review and stimulus to continually improve their educational programmes to meet emerging and future needs;
- The profession which is entitled to have confidence in the level of general and technical knowledge of graduates seeking to engage in the profession of landscape architecture.

SACLAP accreditation is achieved when the Accreditation Panel, delegated by the SACLAP EC concludes, after review of performance indicators or any other evidence as required, that the above stated objectives have been and/or are substantially met.

3. SACLAP ACCREDITATION STRUCTURES

3.1. SACLAP EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The SACLAP has ultimate responsibility for overseeing the Education Policy implementation. To achieve this the SACLAP has established an Education Committee to oversee specific tasks but the Education Committee makes all final recommendations to the Council for a final decision.

SACLAP EC's processes rely heavily on the volunteer time of the members to serve on panels and committees as well as the commitment from the programme staff to fulfill the necessary roles and responsibilities.

3.2. THE ACCREDITATION PANEL

An accreditation cycle is four years, which is aligned with a SACLAP Council term of office as per the Act. This ensures that a programme is reviewed at least once in the cycle of each four year accreditation period. The Accreditation Panel is a panel that is constituted by the SACLAP EC. This panel can comprise as a minimum in relation to the programme:

- one senior professionally registered landscape architectural professional in practice from the environmental field and/or
- one senior professionally registered landscape architectural professional in practice from the design field,
- one landscape architectural academic from an accredited institution besides the institution being accredited,
- one professionally registered landscape architectural professional from the public sector,
- one SALI registered contractor, or
- one representative of the profession's private sector client body,
- one observer,
- one selected representative from the institution to be accredited,
- representative from the CHE, and
- the chairperson of the SACLAP EC.

The composition of the Accreditation Panel should reflect a diverse range of practice and interests. It should consist of at least three local registered members with no current formal employment commitment to the programme(s) and not be recent graduates of the programme (s). The majority of the committee should preferably have graduated from other programmes or, if from the programme(s) in question, is to have at least five years practice since graduation.

The SACLAP EC will not appoint any person to these roles against the reasonable objections of the programme in question. Ideally at least one member should be involved in a larger practice or public sector department operating across state or regional boundaries and have experience of graduates from a number of programmes.

The panel should have a gender, geographical and representation of practice and country mix.

Consistency and continuity of accreditation evaluations is to be ensured by a progressive turnover/replacement of panelists and that, at any time, at least one, and preferably two, of the members appointed has served on the previously appointed panel.

Service on the Accreditation Panel by any individual member is ideally limited to eight years.

To avoid any potential members of the committee involved in any substantial commitment should not be individuals who have any formal commitment between themselves and the programme. If any doubts are identified, the matter should be first referred to the SACLAP EC chairperson, who in turn may seek guidance from the SACLAP EXCO, e.g. the occasional volunteer in a part time role with the programme may not be a conflict, whereas a formal paid

on-going lecturing/contract role would most likely be a potential conflict of interest. Any member of staff or student would most likely not be appropriate to serve on the programme's advisory committee.

The SACLAP EC Chair shall meet at least every two years with the programme to discuss a range of matters including the operation of the programme, to update information, and to address any points previously identified in accreditation reports. The cost of this meeting shall be borne by SACLAP EC.

Key tasks of the SACLAP EC in terms of accreditation include:

- Establish regular contact with the programme to promote a supportive relationship and maximise familiarity with its operation;
- The SACLAP EC chairperson, and if deemed necessary an accreditation panel member, to informally meet with the programme's HOD at least once in between accreditation visits to discuss issues, progress and to view a sampler of student work;
- Discuss with the programme new proposed programmes or changes to the present programme;
- Provide advice back to the programme on programme proposals, new directions and amendments;

3.3. ACCREDITATION PANEL SELECTION

Panels are selected to avoid potential conflicts of interest. For example, a previous affiliation with the programme under review, or an affiliation with a programme in the same geographic location with competing enrollments, monies, etc., renders an evaluator ineligible.

All Accreditation Panel members participating in a review of a course of study leading to a first professional ML degree will hold an advanced degree.

The tertiary institution is advised of the proposed panel, including each proposed team member's present position, experience, and areas of expertise. The institution has the right to challenge one panel member, with cause. For the purpose of challenge, conflict of interest can be cited if the nominee comes from the same geographic location and is affiliated with a competitive institution; if the nominee had a previous affiliation with the institution; or if the institution can demonstrate that the nominee is not competent to evaluate the programme, however the final decision on an accreditation panel member assignments rests with the SACLAP EC chairperson.

Following the institution's review of potential accreditation panel members, the members are invited to serve as such. When the accreditation panel composition and date of the review are finalised, the Accreditation Panel and the institution are formally notified. Any subsequent changes in the panel makeup because of scheduling conflicts or emergencies are made in consultation with the institution.

Where special conditions warrant, such as providing Accreditation Panel member training or assisting with site evaluation procedures and matters of due process, a four person Accreditation Panel may be assembled. At the discretion of the SACLAP EC chairperson, one of the following may accompany the accreditation panel: an Education Committee member, a landscape architectural educator who has a specialist background relevant to the programme under review or an educator from a related design profession.

3.4. OBSERVER RESPONSIBILITIES

Observers may participate in discussions as invited by the Accreditation Panel chair. For example, an educator assigned as an observer to prepare as a future visiting panel member may be asked to participate in reviews of student work and ask questions at interviews that the educator member of the team would typically ask. However, the goal of the observer is to prepare to be a future panel member and also to ensure that the accreditation process is followed duly and fairly.

4. RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTIES PRIOR TO THE VISIT

4.1. ACCREDITATION PANEL

The Accreditation Panel Chairperson is responsible for making assignments and assembling the visiting panel report. Panel members receive the Education Policy, Education Standards, Accreditation Procedures, etc. and are expected to be thoroughly familiar with these documents before the accreditation visit. Each panel member must carefully review the programme's Self Evaluation Report and carry out assignments directed by the Accreditation Panel Chairperson.

4.2. INSTITUTION SEEKING ACCREDITATION

Each programme is to have regular contact with the SACLAP EC Committee. The SACLAP EC establishes direct links to the institutions seeking accreditation and is expected to report on a regular basis through their representative to the SACLAP EXCO as well as annually to the Council via the SACLAP EC Chairperson. It is recommended that the invitation for the SACLAP EC to accredit an institution should be approximately 18 months in advance.

The SACLAP EC, after conferring with the panel and the tertiary institution, schedules the dates of the accreditation visit. The institution is responsible for making all the travel, lodging and meal arrangements for the Accreditation Panel including the costs thereof. Hotel accommodations must be comfortable, reasonably priced, and, where possible, use on campus facilities such as those for visiting faculty or guest lecturers. SACLAP is responsible for the daily remuneration of the Accreditation Panel members. Institutions with more than one campus are responsible for the transportation costs between the campuses including additional airfare (example: accreditation panel members fly into one airport and out of another) if applicable.

The institution prepares the visit schedule and forwards it to the SACLAP EC chairperson for forwarding to the accreditation panel, at least sixty (60) calendar days prior to the visit. The recommended schedule includes interviews with students, faculty, and administration officials, as well as alumni and local practitioners (refer to the annexure for a typical program). The process normally takes place over two days and includes:

- a formal review of a representative range of student work (student work will typically comprise samples of work over each of the years of the program and across subjects to demonstrate assessment procedures and benchmark standards for the full range of achievement levels (i.e. fail through pass and credit to distinction grades);
- an inspection of facilities and resources;
- interviews with staff and students;
- a meeting with the Dean of the School and the Vice-Chancellor, to report on the current accreditation and to provide a national context for the programme.

Accreditation Panel members may conduct interviews by telephone with persons who are unable to meet with them on campus, such as alumni, practitioners or faculty on leave. The Head of Department of the programme should be interviewed both at the beginning and at the end of the Accreditation Panel's visit. Early inspection of space and facilities and an exhibit of work produced by students in the programme are vital. No evening events should be scheduled, as the panel needs this time to work on its report and prepare for the next day.

The Accreditation Panel members meet in an executive session immediately after the visit to prepare a complete report in draft form, and to decide on a recommendation to the SACLAP EC on the institution's accreditation status. The content of this report, except the advisory recommendation, is discussed with the Head of Department of the programme as well as the programme administrator, faculty, and students, particularly in regard to strengths and weaknesses of the programme, recommendations affecting accreditation, and suggestions for programme improvement.

5. RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTIES AFTER THE VISIT

After the visit and executive session, the Accreditation Panel consults with the SACLAP EC prior to submitting a report to the SACLAP. The report to Council includes information and recommendations in regard to the on-going accreditation status of the programme. This report also informs national policy directions and becomes the basis for consultations between the SACLAP EC and the Institution for the next four years. The Accreditation Panel's report is compiled using an agreed template in order to achieve national consistency of information. The SACLAP and/or SACLAP EC may initiate other visits as required.

5.1. ACCREDITATION PANEL

Within fourteen (14) calendar days following the visit, the Accreditation Panel chairperson completes the final editing and sends copies to the other accreditation panel members and the SACLAP EC chairperson, who review the report. The accreditation panel members should send any comments to the SACLAP EC Chairperson within fourteen (14) days of receiving the final draft. Any substantive changes or additions will be referred to the Accreditation Panel chairperson and may result in distributing the report to the Accreditation Panel to review the report for final verification.

5.2. SACLAP EC REVIEW AND FINALISATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The accreditation review discussion and finalising of the recommendations will take place at the next scheduled SACLAP Council meeting. The SACLAP Council may consult with a member of the accreditation panel (usually the chairperson) and/or the programme administrator in order to clarify items in the Accreditation Report or institutional response. Programmes may request to appear before the SACLAP Council to discuss the pending accreditation decision. The SACLAP Council's decision will be based upon the institution's self-evaluation report, annual reports, accreditation panel report, and institutional response.

Accreditation is granted for a period of four (4) years as per the Act. A programme may apply for an accreditation review at any time before its term expires, but may not defer a visit to extend its term. The SACLAP EC may vary the terms at its discretion. Reasons for such variance will be supplied to the programme. The official action letter to the institution indicates the date on which accreditation will expire. The annually published list of accredited programmes includes the accredited status of each programme along with the next scheduled accreditation review.

The SACLAP EC can make the following recommendations to SACLAP based on the accreditation panel recommendations:

5.2.1. ACCREDITATION:

Granted when all standards are met or when one or more standards are met with recommendation, and continued overall programme quality and conformance to standards are judged likely to be maintained.

Accreditation may be granted up to four (4) years.

A programme receiving accreditation may be required to submit special progress reports at the discretion of SACLAP EC.

5.2.2. PROVISIONAL ACCREDITATION:

Granted when one or more standards are met with recommendation and the cited deficiencies are such that continued overall programme quality or conformance to standards is uncertain. Provisional accreditation may be granted up to two (2) years. This status shall not be granted more than twice without an intervening period of accreditation. Provisional status is not deemed to be an adverse action and is not subject to be appealed.

5.2.3. INITIAL ACCREDITATION:

Granted on a first review when all standards are at least minimally met and the programme's continued development and conformance to the accreditation standards are likely. Initial accreditation may be granted for up to four (4) years.

Programmes receiving initial accreditation must submit a special progress report after two years or as determined by the SACLAP EC. The SACLAP EC will review the progress report to determine if an accreditation review should be scheduled immediately or as originally scheduled when initial accreditation was granted.

5.2.4. SUSPENSION OF ACCREDITATION:

This status results if a programme fails to maintain good standing for administrative reasons. Suspension of accreditation is not subject to appeal.

5.2.5. ACCREDITATION DENIAL:

This status results when standards are not met. This determination is subject to appeal.

5.2.6. WITHDRAWAL OF ACCREDITATION:

This status results if a programme fails to comply with accreditation standards. This determination is subject to appeal.

The final report will be presented to the SACLAP for final approval at a Council meeting or as delegated to the Executive Committee of Council (EXCO). The Institution will receive the final accreditation report within ninety (90) days of the completion of an accreditation visit.

In the event that the SACLAP EC receives comments from the Institution on the outcome of the Accreditation Visit, the SACLAP EC chair is to forward these, with a recommendation to the SACLAP Council members at least three (3) weeks before the next scheduled council meeting.

Once SACLAP has approved the outcome of the accreditation, copies of the document will be sent to the CHE and CBE.

The SACLAP EC will publish actions of accreditation, accreditation denial, withdrawal of accreditation, suspension of accreditation, or provisional accreditation in the SACLAP Annual Report.

Any adverse accreditation decision, defined as either "accreditation denial," or "withdrawal of accreditation," will be substantiated with specific reasons, and programme administrators will be notified of their right to appeal any such decision (see Appeal Process below). An institution which has not been granted accredited status, or a programme from which accreditation has been withdrawn, may reapply for accreditation when its administrators believe the programme meets current requirements set out by the SACLAP EC.

5.3. INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE

Within fourteen (14) calendar days of the receipt of the Accreditation Report, the Education Committee Chair shall send copies to the Head of Department and the programme administrator of the institution for their comment and technical accuracy review.

Within fourteen (14) days of having received the Draft Accreditation Report, the institution shall submit its institutional response (substantive comments and corrections) to the SACLAP EC chairperson. The programme shall respond to any standard that is assessed as "met with recommendation" or "not met." This response should include any documentation the programme deems pertinent.

5.4. CONFIDENTIALITY

The SACLAP EC and accreditation panel treats all material generated by the program and SACLAP EC for the accreditation review as confidential. However, the SACLAP EC encourages the widest dissemination of all accreditation materials within the institution. The Accreditation Report and Self-Evaluation Report are considered to be the property of the institution. The SACLAP EC reserves the right to release a complete report should the institution release a portion of the Accreditation Report that might, in the judgment of the SACLAP EC, present a biased or distorted view of the findings and recommendations of the accreditation visit.

5.5. REFERENCE TO ACCREDITED STATUS

A program's accredited status must be clearly conveyed in all program and institutional literature. In particular, if a program offers more than one course of study leading to the same degree, (e.g., first professional and post professional ML's) program literature must clearly reflect which course(s) of study is (are) accredited.

5.6. DELAYING A SCHEDULED ACCREDITATION VISIT.

From time to time a program may want to delay a scheduled accreditation visit because of unexpected circumstances. The SACLAP EC will grant an accreditation visit delay for up to one year (from first semester 2014 to first semester 2015 for example) if the following conditions are met:

- The program received a four (4) year term of accreditation at its last review.
- The program is in compliance with Minimum Requirements for achieving and maintaining accredited status.
- All fees and required reports have been submitted.
- A motivation for the delay in the accreditation visit.

To request an accreditation review delay the SACLAP EC must receive a letter from the school Dean or higher-ranking administrator 6 months prior to the programmed visit.

The Institution shall pay an accreditation review delay penalty if the request for delay is not received within the timeframe stipulated. The penalty will be dependent on the preparation that the SACLAP EC and Accreditation Panel had undertaken to date.

If an institution is scheduled to have two programs reviewed at the same time only one delay fee is charged (both must meet above conditions). Regular annual fees may apply.

5.7. RESCHEDULING VISIT

When the visit is rescheduled, priority will be give to Institutions hosting accreditations visits in their regular cycle.

A delayed visit cannot be postponed again for any reason. If the rescheduled review does not take place the program's accreditation will lapse. If a program chooses to then reapply, it will be through the initial accreditation process.

5.8. BIENNIAL INSTITUTION REPORTS AND OTHER REPORTS

The SACLAP EC Chair is to submit the biennial report and monitoring reports to monitor the programme's continuing compliance with accreditation requirements. The report must include:

- Changes in curriculum, personnel, administration and fiscal support that have occurred since the last report.
- The status of the physical facilities

- Current enrollment.
- Number of graduates for the current year.
- Report on employment or enrollment in graduate school for previous year's graduates.
- Progress toward complying with the recommendations of the most recent accreditation review.

The SACLAP EC may alert the programme administrator as well as the institution's Dean of its concern for potential effects of reported changes.

From time to time, SACLAP EC may require programmes to prepare special reports to explain or describe a certain issue or problem. These issues will be ones that the SACLAP EC believes require additional explanation which is required prior to the submission of the next biennial report.

5.9. POLICY ON SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE

In order to support accredited programs as they make changes between regular accreditation visits, SACLAP EC will offer consultative reviews of proposed changes prior to submission of an official request for Substantive Change. Substantive Change will normally be included in annual reports, yet, is encouraged to be reported prior to the change. Primary responsibility for reporting Substantive Change rests with the program or institution administrator.

Substantive Change is any change that compromises a program's ability to meet one or more of the Standards approved and published by SACLAP EC or that makes a program unable to meet any of the following minimum requirements for maintaining accredited status:

- The programme title and degree description does not incorporate a reference to "Landscape Architecture".
- An undergraduate first-professional programme is a baccalaureate of at least four academic years' duration.
- A graduate first-professional programme is a master's equivalent to three academic years' duration.
- Faculty instructional full-time equivalence (FTE) must be as follows: (to be discussed further)
 - An academic unit that offers a single first-professional program has at least three FTE instructional faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture, at least one of whom is full-time.
 - An academic unit that offers first-professional programs at both bachelor's and master's levels, has at least six instructional FTE, at least four of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture, and at least two of whom are full-time.
- The parent institution is accredited by the institutional accrediting body of its region.
- There is a designated program administrator for the programme under review.

Procedures and forms for reporting Substantive Change may be obtained from the SACLAP Registrar. A response regarding a Substantive Change will be provided by SACLAP EC within sixty (60) calendar days as SACLAP will have to ratify the final recommendation. The programme or institution administrator must respond to the SACLAP EC within thirty (30) calendar days after the SACLAP EC response to remain in good standing, pending the response of the SACLAP EC.

5.10. MAINTAINING GOOD STANDING

To maintain good standing a program must continuously meet the minimum requirements for achieving and maintaining accredited status. SACLAP EC must be informed if any of these requirements cannot be met during an accreditation period.

Should a programme fail to maintain good standing, accreditation may be suspended or withdrawn.

5.11. SUSPENSION OF ACCREDITATION

Should a programme fail to maintain good standing for administrative reasons (such as failure to pay required fees or submit required reports) accreditation may be suspended. Before this action is taken the SACLAP EC shall send a letter to the institution requesting the programme to explain why accreditation should not be suspended.

Since suspension of accreditation occurs only for administrative reasons it is not subject to appeal. A programme whose term of accreditation has been suspended will be listed as such on the official list of accredited programmes. Suspensions of accreditation are published in the SACLAP Annual Report. Students attending a programme with suspended accreditation are considered to be attending an accredited programme. A programme can be suspended for a maximum of one year (12 months). SACLAP EC will begin procedures to withdraw accreditation to take effect immediately when the maximum period of suspension is reached and the situation has not changed sufficiently to retain accreditation.

If evidence of remedial action is submitted and judged adequate within the one year period of suspension, reinstatement of the previous grant of accreditation may be made.

5.12. WITHDRAWAL OF ACCREDITATION

Should a programme fail to comply with accreditation standards, accreditation may be withdrawn. Before withdrawing accreditation the SACLAP EC shall send a letter requesting the program to explain why accreditation should not be withdrawn. The SACLAP EC may suggest to the programme that an accreditation visit is in order to assess the situation. Withdrawal of accreditation is an adverse action and can be appealed (see Appeals Process).

If the programme's parent institution or other programs within the institution are placed on suspended status or have accreditation withdrawn by their accrediting agencies the SACLAP EC may send a letter to the landscape architecture program to determine the programme's current condition.

5.13. ACCREDITATION FEES

The SACLAP may promulgate fees associated with Accreditation visits.

5.14. VARIATIONS

The Council reserves the right to vary its decisions on the accreditation of particular programmes based on a case by case assessment of situations that may develop, in particular where such circumstances are not covered by these guidelines and policy documents.

6. OTHER SACLAP REPRESENTATION (FACULTY BOARDS ETC)

The SACLAP recommends that programme heads/university school/faculties consult with the SACLAP EC about any landscape architect representational appointments within the University, for example, the appointment of a local Registered Landscape Architect to a School Advisory Panel or to a Faculty Board.

The SACLAP EC prefers that such appointments are linked back to the SACLAP EXCO. The preference is for members who have a range of expertise and experiences, which are perceived not to be linked to the program historically EC.

7. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The SACLAP's processes rely heavily on the volunteer time of the members to serve on panels and committees as well as the commitment from the programme staff to fulfill the requirements.

Any potential conflicts are to be avoided by members of the SACLAP EC and accreditation panel being selected from those with no formal substantial commitment between themselves and the programme. If any doubts are identified, the matter should be first referred to the SACLAP EC, who in turn may seek guidance from the SACLAP. For instance, the occasional volunteer role with the programme may not be a conflict; however a formal paid on-going tutoring role would most likely be a potential conflict of interest should this person be considered for on the accreditation panel. Any member of staff or student would most likely not be appropriate for membership of the programme's advisory committee that is to liaise with the SACLAP EC or accreditation panel. The aim is to have a mix of registered members, mixed expertise and preferably from a range of tertiary education programs.

8. COMPLAINT PROCEDURE

A complaint is defined as a written statement submitted by persons expressing substantial dissatisfaction with the quality of a program or its review as set forth by current accreditation standards and procedures. Copies of all correspondence shall always be sent to the following concerned parties: Complainant, programme administrator, chief executive officer of the institution, the SACLAP Registrar. When an institution adheres to sound due process procedures within its own organization, it is unlikely that the SACLAP EC will become involved. Each institution is encouraged to develop effective procedures for responding to faculty or student queries and problems, alleviating dissatisfaction, and averting the need for external intervention by any outside agency. Emphasis on cooperative attitudes and prompt action plays a significant role in fair resolution of faculty or student dissatisfaction.

It is proposed that a complaint be processed in as the following manner:

- Stage A: The aggrieved party shall submit the complaint, with documentary evidence, to the program administrator. The programme administrator shall make a thorough investigation of the complaint and within thirty days respond to the aggrieved party.
- Stage B: Should the complainant not be satisfied by the action chairperson of the SACLAP EC only if it is related to accreditation matters. At its next regular meeting, the SACLAP EC will consider the complaint, as well as the response to the institution.

8.1. APPEALS

An Institution may appeal the adverse outcome of an accreditation review that results in refusal or withdrawal of accreditation or the imposition of the conditions and recommendations that are proposed by the accreditation panel.

An appeal must be in writing stating fully the grounds on which the appeal is made and signed by the divisional head (Dean or Head of School) in the institution.

Lodgment of an appeal should be made to Registrar within four working weeks of formal notification of Council's resolution on the Accreditation Report which may include conditions and recommendations.

On receipt of such an appeal, the SACLAP will follow the Appeals process as set out in Section 35 of the Landscape Architectural Profession Act, No 45 of 2000.

APPENDIX 1

ACCREDITATION PANEL VISIT PROCEDURES

Key Elements of the Accreditation Visit includes:

- An introductory discussion with the Head of School, Head of Programme and senior colleagues;
- Inspection of student work; both by open exhibition and guided with the focus on each year;
- Inspection of the school/programme facilities;
- Inspection of the school/programme facilities while in use;
- Discussion with the staff responsible for specific areas of study; where applicable this should include part-time staff;
- Discussion with the teaching staff as a group;
- Discussion with students and recent graduates;
- Discussions with the Accreditation Panel and other local members/employers; and
- A meeting with the Head of the School and Vice Chancellor.

FACILITIES DURING THE VISIT

The Accreditation Panel requires the use of a lockable meeting room for the duration of the visit.

EXHIBITION OF STUDENT WORK

The Accreditation Panel requires easy and unlimited access over the two days to an exhibition of student work completed during the previous twelve (12) months.

The exhibition is to include:

- Work from all years arranged to demonstrate development by the students over the period of the program;
- Assignment and programme guides handed to students;
- Work from all core parts of the programme;
- Written and drawn examples of student work;
- Examples of all aspects of the programme – including where possible, electives;
- Examples of portfolios that achieved a range of results – such as the highest, average and lowest pass grades.

MEETING WITH STUDENTS

The Accreditation Panel requires at least one meeting with students with no staff present. This group should be as representative as possible of the different years, including if possible recently graduated students and international students and any other representation to allow the panel to obtain a comprehensive overview. The students are to be briefed in advance by the programme staff as to the role of the Accreditation Panel's and the accreditation processes.

SUGGESTED TWO DAY TIMETABLE

The programme is requested to develop a timetable based on the following template and confirm a final version with the Head of Department at least one week in advance of the visit.

DAY ONE

TIME	ACTIVITY
9:00	Accreditation Panel convenes in allocated meeting room together with the appropriate staff members of the Institution.
10:00	Accreditation Panel meets with Head of School and senior members of staff. Panel Chair provides overview and raises any issues identified. Head of School/Programme provides overview and comment on /clarify any outstanding points.
11:00	Initial viewing of student work/exhibition.
12:00	Meeting with teaching staff (including part-time staff where possible)
13:00	Lunch – Accreditation Panel meets over Lunch in private session
14:00	Meeting with Students.
15:00	View student work with staff to discuss year by year progress.
16:30	Accreditation Panel meets in private to discuss progress.

DAY TWO

TIME	ACTIVITY
9:00	Discussion with Head of School and Vice Chancellor.
10:00	Accreditation Panel observes programme in normal session.
11:00	Inspection of school/programme facilities.
12:00	Follow up meetings as requested with either groups of students and/or staff or individuals as required.
13:00	Accreditation Panel private session to draft notes for the report.
14:00	De-briefing with Head of School and senior staff.