

Guidance for compiling Approval, Accreditation and Centre of Excellence Documentation

Overview

Accreditation visits are census points that allow CIAT to assess developments across cycles. Submissions must include only the **most up-to-date and relevant information**, specifically related to the **Programme** seeking Approval/Accreditation or status in the case of **Centre of Excellence**. All data and documentation should be directly related to the specific Programme Approval/Accreditation or status is being sought.

Sub-Honours applications/submissions

Approval

As this is likely to be CIAT's first engagement with the educational establishment, it is recommended to include a **brief overview of the educational establishment**, outlining its educational context and relevant history. If the Programme seeking Approval is part of a broader suite, ensure the submission focuses **exclusively on the Programme in question**. This should include key details such as module content, assessment methods, learning resources, and delivery structures.

Approval Review

Educational establishments are required to submit a **concise, reflective report** (approximately 3,000 words) evaluating the Programme's development since initial Approval. The report should highlight significant changes, improvements, or challenges, demonstrating how the Programme continues to meet CIAT's expectations and supports student progression.

Honours applications/submissions

Accreditation in Principle

As this is likely the Institute's first formal engagement with the educational establishment, it is recommended to provide a **brief and focused overview of your educational establishment**, including its background and context relevant to the Programme seeking Accreditation.

Interim visit

The initial years of a new Programme can present challenges as it becomes fully embedded. An **Interim visit** offers an opportunity for dialogue and guidance. Educational establishments are expected to submit a **progress report** to the Education Department approximately **one month prior to the visit**. This report should highlight:

- Any challenges encountered
- Actions or adjustments made by the Programme Team
- Progress since Accreditation in Principle was granted

Accreditation

By this stage, the Institute will be familiar with the educational establishment and its broader context. In addition to addressing the **sixteen required elements** outlined in the Accreditation Guidelines, the submission should provide a **succinct summary of developments** since the previous Accreditation-related submission. There is no need to revisit earlier history beyond the most recent Accreditation in Principle documentation.

Accreditation Review

This phase serves as a **maintenance review**. The submission should reflect on the Programme's evolution over the past five years, with a focus on:

- How the curriculum remains current and aligned with industry standards

- Any significant updates or innovations introduced
- Strategic plans for future development within the educational establishment or curriculum

Masters applications/submissions

For submissions from educational establishments that **already offer a CIAT Accredited Honours degree Programme**

Masters Accreditation

For any educational establishment that already offers a CIAT Accredited Honours degree Programme, the Institute will be familiar with the history and background of the educational establishment. In addition to the **fourteen required elements** outlined in the Accreditation Guidelines, as part of this submission, please keep descriptions succinct and it is only necessary to provide details on the Programme seeking Accreditation.

Masters Accreditation Review

This cycle of Accreditation should be thought of as a maintenance stage. The submission should:

- Reflect on programme developments over the **past five years**
- Demonstrate how the Masters programme continues to meet **CIAT standards**
- Highlight any **future plans** that may influence Programme delivery or positioning

For submissions from educational establishments that **do not offer a CIAT Accredited Honours degree Programme**

Masters Accreditation in Principle

As this is likely the Institute's first formal engagement with the educational establishment, include a **succinct background/history** about the organisation alongside a focused summary of the **Masters Programme** seeking Accreditation. This should cover the Programme's structure, objectives, and strategic positioning within the academic offering.

Masters Accreditation

By this stage, CIAT will be familiar with the educational establishments background. Your submission should respond to the **sixteen required elements** as outlined in the Accreditation Guidelines, with emphasis placed solely on the **Programme under review**. Keep all information **succinct** and limit historical context to developments since the previous submission only.

Masters Accreditation Review

As with other review cycles, this stage is focused on **maintaining Accreditation**. Your submission should:

- Review changes and developments over the **last five years**
- Explain how the Programme remains **current and aligned** with industry and academic expectations
- Outline any **anticipated developments** within the Programme or educational establishment's future plans.

Centre of Excellence Status

Centre of Excellence

Submissions should consist of a **concise report**. As the Institute is already familiar with the educational establishment, there is **no need to include educational establishment history**. The report should **clearly demonstrate how the educational establishment meets the Centre of Excellence criteria**, providing evidence of excellence in teaching, research, industry engagement, and professional development related to Architectural Technology.

Centre of Excellence Review

This is a **reflective report**, also limited to **3,000 words**. It should:

- **Reaffirm how the educational establishment continues to meet the Centre of Excellence criteria**
- **Detail any significant changes or developments** since the last review
- Highlight ongoing or planned initiatives that contribute to maintaining or enhancing excellence in the field

Tips for putting together documentation for submissions.

1. Keep File and Folder Names Concise

All files submitted must be downloadable and storable by CIAT, as the Institute is required to retain copies for a minimum of five years for each Accredited or Approved Programme and Centre of Excellence submission.

- File and folder names should not exceed **10 characters** to avoid file path errors during download.
- Avoid unnecessary or overly descriptive naming conventions.

2. Submit All Required Documentation by the Deadline

All documents listed in the **relevant submission checklist** must be provided by the stated deadline.

- This includes the **covering letter** from the Dean of Faculty, Head of Department, or equivalent, authorising the submission. This letter is critical and must be submitted **as a separate document**.
- The checklist also serves as a structural guide—ensure each item is addressed.
- If any element cannot be provided, include a clear explanation (e.g. “Two low-, medium-, and high-scoring student samples for Module XXX are not included as the module has not yet run/marked.”)

3. Student Work Samples

For each module, include the following:

- **Two low-scoring, two mid-scoring, and two high-scoring** examples of student work
- Clearly label each file to indicate the performance level (e.g. “High 1”, “Mid 2”)

4. External Examiner Reports

Include **External Examiner reports** relevant to the Accredited Programme -related modules only.

- Where multiple examiners are involved, focus should only be on reports for **Accredited Programme-related content**.
- Where possible, include the educational establishment **formal response** to the reports, as this provides useful context.

5. Staff CVs

Staff CVs should be:

- **One page (A4, one side) that relate to the deliver of the Approved/Accredited Programme**
- Submitted using the **template provided** at the end of the Accreditation or Approval Guidelines

6. Quality Assurance Policy

Provide either:

- A **full copy/link** of the educational establishment's most recent **quality assurance policy**, or
- A **summary** highlighting relevant elements for programme delivery and evaluation

7. Premises and Relocation

If the educational establishment is in the process of relocating or moving into new facilities, this can be noted in the documentation.

- However, there is **no requirement** for the visiting Panel to tour new premises **unless the Programme is currently delivered from that location**. Alternatively, photos or a video of these can be included as part of the submission for convenience.