



**APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF ACCREDITATION OF
PROGRAMMES (RE-ACCREDITATION)
SELF-EVALUATION REPORT**

2014 - 2015

Please note: All self-evaluation reports and any additional documentation for re-accreditation 2014 and 2015 must be submitted to reaccreditation@che.ac.za. No hard-copy submissions will be accepted by the CHE.

GUIDELINES FOR THE REVISED RE-ACCREDITATION PROCESS

NOTE: these guidelines should be read in conjunction with the Criteria for Programme Accreditation (August 2013)

Introduction

On an annual basis, the CHE receives communication from the Private Higher Education Directorate of the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) informing the CHE that the registration of specific private providers of higher education (PHEIs) is due to expire. In order to re-register these PHEIs, the DHET requests the CHE to review the programmes offered by these institutions and to re-accredit them thereby confirming that the programmes continue to meet the quality standards in terms of the stipulated criteria and minimum standards for programme accreditation.

All institutions due for reaccreditation in the 2014 – 2015 cycle will be required to collect information, and provide and analyse data on the programmes offered, and following reflection and discussion of the individual programme findings, submit a comprehensive consolidated self - evaluation report (SER). These guidelines outline principles and intentions of the CHE that should guide the compilation of the SER and results that should be achieved in the institution through this process.

Towards Continuous Quality Improvement

The CHE and the PHEIs strive towards achieving a culture of continuous quality improvement in the institutions. It is evident from previous cycles of re-accreditation conducted that institutions with rigorous quality assurance systems and regular review and improvement cycles demonstrate improved performance and increasing success. The aim of the CHE in this re-accreditation cycle is to facilitate credible internal review by an institution, both at a systemic and programme level and to communicate to the CHE its successes and weaknesses, as well as its plans for improvement.

Integration of Information

Valuable insights into the quality of the programmes offered by individual institutions may be gleaned from the outcomes of processes such as accreditation, re-accreditation and site visits to institutions. Conditions may be attached and recommendations made related to these processes that are aimed at improving quality in terms of the stipulated criteria and minimum standards to be met for accreditation. This accreditation history will be considered for purposes of re-accreditation in a more systematic way by requiring institutions to report on previously flagged areas that required improvement.

Verification through Site Visits

An identified shortcoming of the accreditation, re-accreditation and review processes is the limitation of verifying the claims in written reports, particularly where a site visit has never been conducted or has been conducted long ago. A concerted effort will be made in this cycle of reaccreditation to schedule site visits to those institutions not recently visited or where quality concerns have been raised.

Format of the Self-Evaluation Report

The Self-Evaluation Report (SER) takes two forms. Where programmes offered by an institution have not been previously re-accredited, individual online programme self-evaluations will need to be submitted. This applies to institutions entering first or second cycles of re-accreditation. Where an institution does not have any programmes that have been accredited since the last cycle of re-accreditation, or the programmes offered by the institution are non-HEQSF-alignable, an offline SER will be required. Institutions that are in the second cycle of re-accreditation and have programmes that were not considered in previous cycles of re-accreditation will need to submit both the offline SER, and individual programme submissions for those programmes that have not been previously reviewed.

The focus areas and aspects that re-accreditation focuses on are outlined in terms of Criteria 10 - 19 in the Criteria for Programme Accreditation (2013). Preparing for this CHE review of programmes for re-accreditation presents an opportunity for institutions to engage its members to reflect on their practices and to participate in quality improvements. The institution needs to discuss the internal process undertaken in order to compile the SER. Evidence to support the claims made is an essential requirement for the SER.

Since the evaluation is of accredited programmes, it is expected that the quality of the programmes in terms of the criteria and minimum standards for accreditation has generally improved and all concerns raised by the CHE have been addressed. At the very least the quality standards against which the programmes were accredited ought to have been maintained.

1. INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

1.1 Name of the institution

1.2 The Institution is required to verify and update the following information on the Institutional Profile on the HEQC on-line system:

- Contact details for the Head of Institution, Academic Head and Administrative Head
- Contact information for all higher education sites of delivery that the institution is operating on
- Relevant policies and procedures
- Student headcount enrolment for undergraduate and postgraduate programmes per site of delivery
- Staff profile of full-time and part-time staff members
- Details of the institution’s facilities for teaching and learning
- Uploaded copy of the most recent Certificate of Registration as issued by the DHET (Question 15)

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 In previous applications for re-accreditation the institution may have been provided with a number of recommendations by the HEQC to improve the quality of programmes. In the template below, briefly outline the quality improvements effected that address the issues raised by the HEQC and provide details of the institutional plans to address outstanding recommendations that have not yet been met.

(Please note that information should be provided for each programme and mode of delivery on all relevant sites of delivery. Additional rows should be added to the template for responses to individual programme recommendations. Should the institution wish to submit supporting evidence, this can be attached as annexures to the SER)

Site of Delivery:		
Programme Name:		Mode of Delivery:
Recommendation:	Improvements and actions	
Programme Name:		Mode of Delivery:
Recommendation:	Improvements and actions	
Programme Name:		Mode of Delivery:

Recommendation:	Improvements and actions

2. 2 SITES OF DELIVERY

As part of institutional growth, the institution may have extended / relocated its accredited programme offerings to new sites of delivery. Approval of these extensions and / or relocations may have included a number of conditions set by the HEQC to improve the quality of programme offerings on these sites. In the template below, briefly outline the quality improvements effected that address the issues raised by the HEQC and provide details of the institutional plans to address outstanding conditions that have not yet been met.

(Please note that information should be provided per site of delivery and should include a list of each programme and / or mode of delivery offered on this site. Additional rows should be added to the template for responses to individual conditions set. Should the institution wish to submit supporting evidence, this can be attached as annexures to the SER)

Site of Delivery:		Date of most recent site visit:	
Programme Name:		Mode of Delivery:	
Condition:	Improvements and actions		

Site of Delivery:		Date of most recent site visit:	
Programme Name:		Mode of Delivery:	
Condition:	Improvements and actions		

3. PROGRAMME OUTPUT, IMPACT AND REVIEW

3.1 Based on an analysis of the student success rates in the different programmes across all sites and modes of delivery, comment on significant successes, areas of concern and planned improvements to address throughput rates, graduation rates and dropout rates. Provide examples and evidence to support the conclusions drawn. *(Should the institution wish to submit supporting evidence, this can be attached as annexures to the SER)*

3.2 Briefly describe current internal and external programme review processes to ensure its quality? Provide evidence or examples of quality improvements introduced as a result of programme reviews conducted during the last three years. *(Should the institution wish to submit supporting evidence, this can be attached as annexures to the SER)*

3.3 Provide examples of any tracer studies conducted during the last three years to track the employability of graduates. Explain and assess how the results of these studies are incorporated into the institutional and programmatic strategic, academic and resource planning in order to improve the quality of programme provision? *(Should the institution wish to submit supporting evidence, this can be attached as annexures to the SER)*

3.4 What user surveys (graduates, peers, external examiners, employers, relevant professional bodies) does the institution conduct to ascertain whether the programme offerings are achieving the intended outcomes? Explain and assess how the results of these surveys are incorporated into the institutional and programmatic strategic, academic and resource planning in order to improve the quality of programme provision? *(Should the institution wish to submit supporting evidence, this can be attached as annexures to the SER)*

4. INSTITUTIONAL SELF-EVALUATION

4.1 The compilation of this SER requires an evaluation of the programmes offered per mode and per site of delivery. Describe briefly the internal and external consultation processes, the methods of data collection and analysis undertaken, and any planned use of the results of the evaluation for quality improvement of the programmes and processes in the institution. Provide evidence and/or examples to

support the institution’s response. (Should the institution wish to submit supporting evidence, this can be attached as annexures to this SER)

5. DECLARATION BY HEAD OF INSTITUTION

I declare that the information provided in this application and its supporting documents is accurate and verifiable. I declare that I have taken all reasonable steps to confirm the accuracy of statements.

Signature of Head of institution

Date of submission