Procedural Guidelines
for Renewal of Accreditation

2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

To assure prospective students, their families, and the public that the academic programs offered by institutions licensed in the UAE meet international standards, each program must be individually accredited. Programs include both degree programs and concentrations within a degree (see *Standards -- Appendix II: Glossary of Terms* for definitions). The *Standards for Licensure and Accreditation (2011)* are the basis for Accreditation and subsequent Renewal of Accreditation.

Licensed institutions in the United Arab Emirates must receive Initial Accreditation for each academic program they plan to offer before recruiting students or enrolling them. After Initial Accreditation of a program, an institution applies for Accreditation within two years after the graduation of the first cohort of students. Accredited programs must apply for the Renewal of Accreditation every five years. For purposes of these *Procedural Guidelines* (hereafter *Guidelines*), the first Accreditation process and the subsequent Renewal of Accreditation are considered to require the same procedural approach, and are therefore referred to throughout as Renewal of Accreditation.

All of the institutional and programmatic policies of the Commission for Academic Accreditation (hereafter the Commission or the CAA) operate on the principle of integrity. Integrity in the accreditation context is best understood as involving an open process of peer review including that of applying professional judgment and the conscientious application of the *Standards for Licensure and Accreditation*. An institution is expected to be transparent in all of its transactions with the Commission, and with students, the academic and larger communities served, and all stakeholders. Evidence of withholding information, providing inaccurate information, failing to provide timely and accurate information to the Commission, or failure to conduct a candid self-study on compliance with the *Standards,* and/or other similar practices, will be seen as the lack of full commitment to integrity. Evidence of submitting material that is not substantially original to the institution and the work of the institution's officers or employees (including contract employees), shows a lack of commitment to integrity. Failure of an institution to adhere to the principle of integrity may result in a loss of accreditation.

These *Guidelines* are designed to outline the process that an institution must undertake to secure the Renewal of Accreditation of a program. In summary, the process is that each institution must prepare an application for Renewal of Accreditation which includes a Self-Study. The Self-Study addresses the *Standards* (2011 edition) in terms of the program, provides the basis for review by the Commission and provides the basic documentation which will be reviewed by a committee of international experts (the External Review Team -- ERT). In these *Guidelines,* some of the criteria of the *Standards* - those which are mainly relevant to the institution as a whole or which were reviewed during the Licensure or the Renewal of Licensure process are left out, leaving only those which are directly relevant to the program. The ERT will assess the program both through a review of documentation and a campus visit. For most programs, the report of the ERT will include recommendations which must be complied with by the institution before the Renewal of Accreditation can be granted. This response is typically due 60 days after the receipt of the ERT Report.

After review, and a response to the ERT's report from the institution, the Commission recommends an action concerning program accreditation to the Minister of Higher Education and Scientific Research (the Minister),

who decides whether Renewal of Accreditation is to be granted. The full process for Accreditation and the Renewal of Accreditation is depicted in the flow diagram (Figure 1).

Timetable for Review

Any institution applying for the Renewal of Accreditation of a program must follow the timetable for accreditation review as outlined below:

- Applications must be submitted at least six months prior to the lapse of the current period of Accreditation.

- The Commission normally reviews completed and accepted applications submitted by November 1 during the following spring semester; this will include the ERT visit and subsequent report.

- The Commission normally reviews those completed and accepted applications submitted by May 1 during the following fall semester; this will include the ERT visit and subsequent report.

- The institution is responsible for monitoring deadlines related to the Renewal of Accreditation.

Application Process for Renewal of Accreditation

- The institution must have current licensure through the CAA and the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (the Ministry).

- The institution submits a complete application, including four hard and electronic copies of each of the following:

  - The application form (available on the CAA website: http://www.caa.ae);
  - An application letter from the Chief Executive Officer of the institution which verifies the continuing support for the program;
  - The Self-Study for the Renewal of Accreditation of an academic program;
  - The institution's *Catalog*, *Policies and Procedures Manual*, *Quality Assurance Manual*, organization chart, and any other documents deemed relevant by the institution.

- If the Commission finds the Self-Study or the documentation incomplete or inadequate to warrant a full review, it returns the application with an explanation and information about resubmission.

- Assuming satisfactory documentation, the Director of the Commission assigns the Self-Study to a Commissioner who reviews materials and initiates the review process.

Tips for the Submission of Applications

- Submit materials in spiral bound or hard bound format. Do not send notebooks.

- Be sure to number pages.

▦ Include a Table of Contents.

▦ Electronic copies may be either a CD or a flash drive.

▦ Electronic copies should be hyper-linked.

▦ Be sure that all documents are included, and that all are properly labeled.

Review Preparation and Process

▦ The Commission will select several (typically two or three) international experts to constitute the External Review Team (ERT). The responsibility for selecting the international experts rests with the Commission. The Commission will make every effort to secure international experts who are appropriate to the program, the level of study, and to the institution, and who do not have a conflict of interest.

▦ The assigned Commissioner will also work closely with the institution to ensure that the visit to the campus is appropriately timed to meet both the Commission and institutional needs.

▦ The Commissioner is responsible for establishing a schedule for the visit and ensuring logistical support for the ERT. The schedule normally involves institutional and program presentations, meetings with faculty, students, alumni and representative employers of the graduates, and other stakeholders as appropriate. The assigned Commissioner will work closely with the institution on local arrangements including computer support, food/beverage needs of the ERT, additional documentation, interview schedules, exit conferences and more. Detail on these issues will be provided to the ERT and to the institution by the assigned Commissioner or by Commission staff.

▦ The Commission makes travel arrangements including accommodation and transportation to and/or from the campus where the program is delivered.

▦ The Commissioner assigned to the program may request that additional information be provided on site. It is the expectation of the Commission that the institution will fully comply with all requests for information. It is understood that all information provided to the Commission will be handled in a confidential manner.

▦ Institutions should avoid providing gifts (other than a relatively low cost item identified with the institution) to the ERT or the Commissioner. Lavish entertainment should be avoided; the evenings of the ERT are deliberately kept free of activities to enable the ERT to complete the writing of the report.

▦ The on-site review, hosted and funded by the institution, results in an evaluation report concerning the program. The review of the ERT will examine the Self-Study and determine: (a) whether the program documentation provides evidence that the requirements of the *Standards* are continuing to be met; (b) whether the program has been offered with due regard to international best practice and benchmarks associated with the discipline field; (c) whether, if applicable, any professional body requirements have been referred to in the *Self-Study* and have been embraced within the program outcomes; (d) whether internal monitoring and review processes have been implemented and the results of those processes used for continuous improvement.

- After the conclusion of the exit conference, all contact with the members of the External Review Team should be through the assigned Commissioner.

The Report

- The External Review Team will produce a report on the program prior to departing the UAE.

  - The report will include an identification of those matters not meeting the S*tandards,* termed "Recommendations." An institution must respond satisfactorily to all Recommendations before accreditation can be renewed.
  - The report will also include "Suggestions" which are advisory, but which must be responded to by the institution.
  - The report may also include constructive narrative with ideas for possible improvement in the program.
  - The report may include "Commendations" which constitute a recognition of actions taken by the institution which go beyond normal expectations, or as a means of recording an outstanding performance.

- The ERT report is submitted to the Commission for approval before being sent to the campus as the Final Report. The essence of the ERT report will be shared with appropriate campus officials during one or more exit conferences on the last day of the site visit. During such meetings the main findings of the ERT will be shared and clarified. The exit conference will typically include a technical exit meeting with the program coordinator or concerned department chair as appropriate. There will typically be a separate meeting with the CEO and chief academic officer.

- After receiving the report of the ERT, the institution must submit a response to the report. Typically institutions have up to 60 days from the receipt of the report to submit a response. Extensions on the submission of a response are available but must be made in a request to the Commissioner assigned to the program.

- The Response will be reviewed by the Commission. The review will likely involve further consultation with the ERT.

- After review of the Response, the institution will be sent a report. When all recommendations are addressed, the Commission will make a recommendation to the Minister regarding the application for Renewal of Accreditation.

Responding to the Report of the External Review Team

Reports received from the CAA have a consistent format to them, in that reports for all processes are aligned with the *Standards* and present summary statements of compliance and/or non-compliance with the *Standards*. In those instances where there is a Recommendation or a Suggestion, the reasons for the Recommendation or Suggestion will be delineated. The institution must respond to all Recommendations with a narrative statement of response and supporting documentation (usually presented in an Appendix). The institution must respond to all Suggestions, although the institution is not required to comply with Suggestions. Unless otherwise specified, an institution has up to 60 days to respond to the report. Extensions to the deadline given may be granted; institutions should request extensions through an e-mail and/or letter to the Commissioner assigned to the application.

Outline for Response Reports

Institutional responses to CAA reports should follow this outline:

- **Introduction.** Use this section to summarize the institution, the nature of the report as sent by the CAA and the nature of the response.

- **Responses.** As in the examples below, the institution should re-state the Recommendation (including number) and then offer its response. Responses should be accompanied by supporting documentation as appropriate. Documentation may be presented either in the text of the response or as appendices to the response.

Examples of Responses

Recommendation 1: [Name of Institution] is required to …

Institutional Response: [Name of Institution] accepts this recommendation and has taken the following steps to address the concern of the External Review Team. The outcome of this review and follow-up on this recommendation is documented in Appendix 1 of this report.

Suggestion 1: The ERT suggests that [Name of Institution] …

Institutional Response: [Name of Institution] found this suggestion most helpful (or not) and is undertaking the following steps…

Note: Institutions are not required to adopt suggestions. It is expected, however, that institutions indicate whether or not the suggestion is adopted.

Tips for Completing Response Reports:

- Be sure to respond to each Recommendation and each Suggestion.

- Supply appropriate documentation and clearly identify which documentation supports which institutional response.

- Contact the assigned Commissioner if you have questions along the way.

- Be aware of deadlines.

- Submit both a hard (paper) and a soft copy (CD) of the report.

- Direct the report to the assigned Commissioner.

Evaluation of the Response

The Commission evaluation of the response will be organized in terms of the Recommendations and Suggestions. Those Recommendations which are satisfactorily addressed will be indicated as "Recommendation met." Those that are not satisfactorily addressed will be indicated as "partially met" or "not

met" with a narrative to indicate what is still needed. Suggestions which have been addressed will be indicated as "Suggestion adopted," unless the institution chooses not to adopt and that will be so indicated.

Outcomes of the Visit/Review Process

Approved

Given a favorable review and decision from the Minister, the Renewal of Accreditation of a program is normally valid for up to five years.

- Notice of the approval will be posted to the CAA website.

- The program may receive unscheduled visits from the staff of the Commission to ensure that it continues to meet the requirements of the *Standards*. Failure to do so may result in loss of accreditation, as determined by the Commission.

- Institutions with programs approved for Renewal of Accreditation must use the following statement whenever the accreditation status of their programs is stated:

  "[Name of Institution] located in the Emirate(s) of [insert name(s)], has earned accreditation through the Commission for Academic Accreditation of the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research for the following degree(s): Bachelor of Science in ...; Bachelor of Arts in ...; Master of Science in ...., etc."

Delayed

The decision concerning Renewal of Accreditation is delayed until the institution rectifies a problem, provides additional information, or resolves an issue concerning the program. If the institution fails to satisfy the Commission's requirements within six months following receipt of the Commission reports, the program will either be placed on probation or denied Accreditation.

Probation

A program placed on probation must correct any deficiencies noted to the satisfaction of the Commission within a specified period of time. The institution will not be permitted to continue to admit students to the program. At the end of the probationary period, the Commission makes a recommendation to the Minister, which may result in the denial of accreditation or renewal or may result in program approval. Notice of probation will be posted to the CAA website.

Denied

A program denied Renewal of Accreditation may not admit new students and must initiate actions to close the program while protecting enrolled students. A program denied reaccreditation will be removed from the listing of "approved programs" on the CAA website.

Appeal

An institution may challenge a negative action by the Commission by directing its appeal to the Director of the Commission for Academic Accreditation. Appeals must be based on issues of process.

Financial Aspects of Accreditation

The applicant institution is responsible for paying all costs associated with the accreditation review by the ERT.

Prior to the visit, the institution will be informed of the projected costs of the visit. The institution is expected to pay the estimated cost in full. The institution will be refunded any excess payments at the conclusion of the academic year.

Guidelines for Documentation

The Self Study for the Renewal of Accreditation demonstrates the ways in which the program meets the *Standards for Licensure and Accreditation* and their criteria. Each academic program must meet all relevant criteria of the *Standards*, with particular attention to *section 3, The Educational Program*. Each one of the *Standards* should be addressed and be backed with clear, detailed evidence and appropriate documentation.

A Self Study of an existing program demonstrates the achievement of the learning outcomes of the program and of the courses it includes.

A Self-Study should be a self-critical document which identifies both strengths and weaknesses of the program, and proposes, on the basis of assessment, plans and/or action steps which will lead to improvement of the program. References to documentation (typically in the Appendices) should be specific and clear, including page references where appropriate.

Addressing the *Standards*

1.   **Mission, Organization and Governance**

    1.1   Vision and Mission

    The institutional Mission and Vision statements will have been approved by the Commission during the licensure process. However, the Self-Study should provide assurances that the program remains within the scope of the established and approved vision and mission of the institution.

    1.2   Organization

    The Self-Study documents the position of the program within the institution's academic and administrative organization and includes:

    ▪   A current organization chart which clearly shows the place of the program within the organizational structure of the institution;

    ▪   A description of the role of the faculty of the program in curriculum and instructional decisions regarding the courses and curriculum and in faculty recruitment and appointment and evidence of that faculty role;

    ▪   A description and documentation of the role of the program coordinator or chair and other academic

administrators responsible for the program and its development, including faculty hiring and evaluation;

- If the program is offered in more than one location, an explanation of how the coordination between or among different locations has been managed, and how appropriate control of academic policy, standards, and course offerings has been ensured.

  Note: The initiation of an existing program at a new location requires the submission of a "Substantive Change" proposal. See *Stipulation 2: Substantive Change.*

1.5 Policies, Procedures and Documentation

The institution demonstrates that it has developed the full range of program-related policies as required by the *Standards,* and acknowledges any gaps to be filled and how this process is continued, controlled, and how policies are reviewed. The comprehensive collection of institutional policies should be made available to the ERT during the campus visit. See *Stipulation 1A: Policies and Procedures Manual.*

1.6 Multiple Campus Institutions (if relevant)

The institution demonstrates to the Commission that the students studying the program on different campuses receive an equivalent learning experience and have achieved the program learning outcomes at each location.

1.8 Branch Campuses of Foreign Institutions (if relevant)

If the program is delivered in a branch campus, the Self-Study describes any differences to the program and student learning experience, resulting from delivery in the branch campus location, and any implications for program management, human and physical resourcing etc. The institution should explain how these differences, if any, are addressed and have been resolved in order to achieve the same program outcomes.

2. Quality Assurance

2.1 Institutional Research (IR)

The Self-Study demonstrates, with examples specific to the program, the way that the Institutional Research Office has served the program through its routine evaluation of the achievement of program and course outcomes.

2.2 Institutional Planning

The Self-Study demonstrates that documented review processes have been implemented, and the results have contributed to future plans at the departmental level and at the institutional level as appropriate. The benefits of any external Advisory Board input should be described and identified.

2.3 Risk Management

The Self-Study documents that risks associated with the program are appropriately managed.

2.4 Continuous Quality Enhancement

The Self-Study demonstrates how results of routine program reviews have been used to make improvements to the program and its constituent courses. Any engagement of external reviewers/examiners should be stated and the results of their input and consequent action should be presented as documentary evidence to the ERT. Any benchmarking exercises should be evidenced and the relative status of the program performance should be discussed.

2.5 Quality Assurance/Institutional Effectiveness Manual

The current *Quality Assurance Manual* is submitted as part of the application (see *Stipulation* 1B: *Quality Assurance Manual)*.

3. The Educational Program

3.1 Credit-bearing Programs

The Self-Study for an existing program provides a discussion of the ways in which the program fills the needs both for students and society. The discussion builds from the initial "needs assessment" undertaken for the program. The discussion may include but is not limited to:

- An appropriate survey of recent employment opportunities within the Emirate, and the UAE;

- A summary of students enrolled in the program, graduates of the program, and employment of the graduates of the program;

- An account of whether the enrollment to date has met initial targets as presented in the application for Initial Accreditation;

- A cohort analysis (see also Section 5.7);

- An analysis of the ways in which the program parallels and/or differs from any competing programs at both public and private institutions in the UAE;

- An evaluation of the effectiveness of the mode of delivery of the program i.e. full-time, part-time, e-learning etc.

The Self-Study for the Renewal of Accreditation includes a detailed statement of the goals and outcomes of the program and any subsumed concentrations, consistent with the mission and goals of the institution.

The program outcomes achieved should be shown as being consistent with the defined level of the degree or award as specified in the UAE Qualifications Framework (UAEQF).

3.2 The Curricula

The Self-Study includes details of the program structure and course sequence (study plan), completion requirements, and an exposition of the way that the program meets international expectations and/or the criteria of relevant professional bodies, for such a titled program at the

specified level. Any changes made to the curriculum since the last accreditation should be identified and justified in terms of information received in review procedures.

3.3 Academic Courses

The Self-Study includes:

- An evaluation of the educational methodologies and assessment strategies deployed in the program delivery;

- A matrix relating program and/or any concentration outcomes to the learning outcomes of the courses comprising the curriculum;

- Detailed and current syllabi and course files for all courses, including general education courses, that comply with the requirements in *Stipulation* 5: *Course Syllabi* and *Stipulation* 7: *Course Files;*

- An account of the improvements made at course level as a result of regular course evaluation, and an evaluation of the effectiveness of policies and procedures to ensure authentic student work.

3.4 General Education

For undergraduate programs the Self-Study includes:

- Details of the courses within the program classified as General Education and how they meet the requirements of the *Standards;*

- An account of the learning outcomes of the General Education program and whether or not they have been achieved;

- Evidence of any changes in the General Education curriculum that may have occurred as a result of assessments;

- A discussion of whether and how General Education has supported the achievement of the academic program outcomes.

3.5 Internship

If applicable to the program, the Self-Study includes an evaluation of the effectiveness of the internship in contributing to program goals and outcomes and an account of how the internship meets the requirements as set out in *Stipulation* 6: *Internships.*

3.6 Undergraduate Preparatory or Remedial Courses and Programs

The details of any preparatory or remedial programs are specified including structure, content, learning outcomes, admission and completion requirements. The Self-Study should evaluate the effectiveness of the preparatory courses in serving the main academic program.

3.7   Graduate Programs

For programs offered at the graduate level, the Self-Study demonstrates how the program meets the requirements of *Standard* 3.7, particularly addressing the academic rigor and competency in research required in graduate level education.

3.8   Course Delivery

▪   The Self-Study demonstrates that teaching strategies used in the program (including the use of e-learning and hybrid courses if appropriate) are effective, and assesses whether such strategies remain current and appropriate in light of international good practice;

▪   The Self-Study demonstrates that the methods deployed to ensure that faculty deliver the courses according to the syllabus detail, and the marking of assignments and examination scripts is accurate and consistent. Course files must show evidence that this is the case. See *Stipulation* 7: *Course Files.*

3.9   Class Size

▪   The Self-Study demonstrates that class size is appropriate for effective delivery of the program.

▪   The Self-Study demonstrates that the institution has adhered to its policies on class size with regard to the program under review.

3.10   Program Effectiveness

The Self-Study offers a detailed summary and analysis of the results of program effectiveness, including a discussion of the assessment instruments used and an indication of changes that have occurred in the program as a result of these assessments.

4.   Faculty and Professional Staff

4.1   Faculty Handbook

To be submitted with the Self-Study (see *Stipulation* 1C: *Faculty Handbook).* All faculty are expected to have received a copy or have ready access to an electronic version.

4.2   Staff Handbook

To be submitted with the Self-Study (see *Stipulation* 1D: *Staff Handbook).* All staff are expected to have received a copy or have ready access to an electronic version.

4.3   Recruitment and Records

The Self-Study should discuss and document recruitment efforts for faculty, the success of those efforts, the support for faculty recruitment from the institution, and the record keeping on the faculty.

4.4 Faculty Preparation

The Self-Study provides detailed information about the faculty members (full and part-time) who are teaching in the program. This will include:

- Current *curriculum vitae,* preferably in a standardized format, of faculty members who are teaching in the program and their particular course assignments;

- The qualifications, areas of specialization, and academic ranks for faculty and academic administrators who are associated with the program;

- The degree to which faculty and administrators in this program are also assigned responsibilities for other programs, and the impact of such assignments on total work load;

- Information concerning any existing part-time faculty assignments;

- A time line for the appointment of new faculty, if relevant, (including the different stages of advertising, recruitment, interviewing, appointment, arrival, and orientation); the time line to be related to the planned student enrolment and delivery of the course sequence;

- Information on the use of teaching assistants, lab assistants, or other staff to support instruction;

- Information to demonstrate the institution's commitment to achieving a diverse profile in its faculty membership;

- A self-critical analysis of the faculty turnover since the last program accreditation review.

  Full records of the faculty and staff involved in the program (including adjunct or part-time faculty) must be available on campus for the ERT to review. The records should be for the academic year which coincides with the visit. Given the cycle for the submission of Applications (including the Self-Study) for the Renewal of Accreditation, this will mean that institutions will have to update faculty files just prior to the visit of the ERT.

  (see *Stipulation* 8: *Faculty Qualifications* and *Stipulation* 9: *Adjunct Clinical Faculty,* as applicable)

4.5 Graduate Faculty

When the program is offered at the graduate level, the Self-Study explains how the distinctive requirements of graduate level faculty regarding aspects such as research activity, supervisory experience, and high-level teaching experience have been addressed.

4.6 Staff Qualifications

See 4.4 above. Job descriptions for staff should be included as appropriate.

4.8 Professional Development

The Self-Study shows that appropriate arrangements are operating to support faculty and staff in professional development activities associated with the program. The approved budget allocated to professional development should be noted as well as the record of expenditures on such

activities. Documentation should include lists of relevant professional development activity of the faculty and staff.

4.9 Faculty Workload

◼ The Self-Study includes data to demonstrate that the faculty appointments are adequate in number to deliver the program. This data must cover the full spectrum of responsibilities that faculty hold across the institution, including teaching on other programs, and demonstrate that the institution complies with the *Standards* regarding maximum permissible loads.

◼ The Self-Study includes a critical self-analysis of faculty workload.

4.10 Part-Time Faculty

◼ The institution must demonstrate that it maintains the proportion of part-time faculty contributing to the proposed program, within the limits set by the *Standards*.

◼ The Self-Study demonstrates that qualifications of part-time faculty and/or other faculty holding less than full-time appointments adhere to the *Standards* as included in Section 4.4.

4.11 Evaluation

Samples of annual faculty evaluations and resultant professional development plans should be provided.

4.15 Graduate Assistants

The Self-Study includes information on employment of any Graduate Assistants on the program and their responsibilities in accordance with the *Standards*.

5. Students

5.1 Student Handbook

To be submitted with the Self-Study (see *Stipulation* 1E: *Student Handbook)*. All students should have received the current edition or have ready access to an electronic version.

5.2 Undergraduate Admission

◼ The Self-Study details the relevant full admission requirements and any conditions for provisional admission, ensuring that they comply with the requirements set forth in the *Standards*.

◼ The Self-Study includes a review of outcomes and adjustments that have been made to admission criteria, as well as any evaluation of student performance on the program in relation to entry credentials.

5.3 Graduate Admission

■ The Self-Study details the relevant admissions requirements ensuring that they comply with the requirements set forth in the *Standards* (see *Stipulation* 10: *Graduate Admissions*).

■ The Self-Study includes a review of outcomes and adjustments that have been made to admission criteria, as well as any evaluation of student performance on the program in relation to entry credentials.

5.4 Transfer Admission

■ The Self-Study describes any arrangements for transfer students, and any articulation arrangements with other institutions in relation to the program.

■ The effectiveness of these arrangements in recruiting students that succeed on the program should be evaluated and evidence presented in the Self-Study.

5.5 Advanced Standing

The Self-Study defines the conditions and limits on credit for advanced standing and demonstrates compliance with the *Standards.*

5.6 Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)

■ The institution must address this *Standard* in the context of the program, and define any specific conditions which must be met and the procedures followed.

■ The institution must address the degree to which students granted RPL credits have or have not succeeded in the program.

5.7 Student Records

The institution provides evidence that it is using cohort analysis and is critically evaluating program specific attrition, academic probation and warning, grade point averages, graduation rates and average time for graduation.

5.8 Student Services

The Self-Study details:

■ Any particular and unusual demands that students in the program make on the range of student services, and how the institution provides for these students;

■ Any special scholarship schemes of support or other financial aid which are provided to students in the program and the extent of use of these supportive arrangements;

■ The results of client satisfaction surveys and/or focus groups.

5.9   Advising Services

The Self-Study evaluates the success of its Advising Services using feedback data, including student evaluations. Improvements to the service which have been made as part of cycles of continuous improvement should be documented. Advising services includes both academic and career advising.

5.10   Student Activities and Publications

The Self-Study discusses any special student activities associated with the program, and document the activities and the relationship between those programs and the department or college housing the program.

The Self-Study discusses and includes examples of any special publications (including student newsletters or literary magazines) and documents the way in which faculty and staff of the program are involved in maintaining the quality of these publications.

5.11   Student Behavior and Academic Integrity

The Self-Study discusses and critically analyzes program efforts to ensure academic integrity and to monitor student behavior. The institution must demonstrate that it has provided the human and physical resources to fully implement the procedures required to monitor and enforce academic integrity, including detection of plagiarism. Case information should be made available to the ERT.

The Self-Study discusses and critically analyzes program level efforts to ensure adherence to copyright and fair use guidelines and/or laws applicable to the UAE.

6.   Learning Resources

6.1   Learning Resources: Library

The Self-Study includes:

▪   An assessment of the library resources (print and electronic) which are available to support this program;

▪   Detailed timed-action plans to meet any deficiencies related to the library support for the program;

▪   Evidence of student and faculty satisfaction with library services.

6.2   Learning Resources: Technology

The Self-Study includes:

▪   An assessment of the classrooms and the degree to which the technological support is adequate to support the pedagogical strategies used in the program.

- A description and assessment of the technological support for faculty, staff and students in the program.

- A description and assessment of the technical training which is provided to students, faculty and staff of the program.

- Evidence of student and faculty satisfaction with the IT services provided to support the program.

6.3 Learning Resources: Laboratories

The Self-Study includes:

- A description and assessment of laboratories used by the program.

- A description of the short and long-range plan for the enhancement of the laboratories including, as appropriate, the allocation of space, acquisition of equipment, development of appropriate protocols for health and safety, provision of laboratory materials (i.e. laboratory supplies such as glassware or chemicals), and the staffing of the laboratories.

- An evaluation of the adequacy of short and long-range budgetary support for laboratory development, including provision for research as appropriate to the program.

- Evidence of client satisfaction in regard to the equipment, the supplies and the provisions for health and safety in the laboratory environment.

7. Physical Resources

7.1 Physical Environment: Development

The Self-Study includes:

- A description and analysis of the adequacy of the physical resources in which the program is offered, including classrooms, office space, laboratories, studios or other specialized facilities.

- A description or discussion of new facilities (including laboratories or other program specific spaces) added since the last accreditation review.

- A description of plans, both short and long-range, to address any deficiencies.

7.2 Physical Environment: Safety

The Self-Study includes an evaluation of the adequacy of provisions for the ensuring the health and safety of the students, faculty and staff involved with the program.

7.3 Physical Environment: Technology

The Self-Study includes:

- An evaluation of the adequacy of the computer labs, the technology in other laboratories, access to network resources, electronic communication and instructional platforms.

- The short and long-range plan to provide, maintain and upgrade the technological support for the program laboratories, if appropriate.

- An analysis of whether any special security measures are needed to protect the integrity of the program or the research associated with the program, and whether they are effective.

8. Fiscal Resources

8.1 Fiscal Resources

The Self-Study demonstrates the institution's capacity to sustain the program and provides a program-specific balance sheet for the previous two years of the program as well as projections for the next three years.

If the program is deemed by the institution to be no longer sustainable, the Self-Study discusses plans to phase out the program, including plans for personnel, equipment and laboratories specific to the program.

9. Public Disclosure and Integrity

9.2 Publications

The institution must provide current institutional and programmatic publications to demonstrate that:

- documentation pertinent to the program is accurate and consistent in its factual information;

- the program is appropriately described in the *Catalog*. (see *Stipulation* 1F: *Catalog*).

9.3 Institutional Name

The institution should provide the name of the program, and its concentrations, if any, in both English and in Arabic.

9.4 Relationship with the Ministry and the Commission

The Self-Study discusses and documents the development of this program in light of Commission policies and actions since initial accreditation or the last accreditation review. The Self-Study identifies any particular accreditation challenges that have occurred as the program has developed. See *Stipulation* 2: *Substantive Change*.

9.5 Contractual Relationships

The Self-Study includes any contracts/agreements that have a direct impact on the operation of the program, with an accompanying justification for the linkage, and results of evaluative reviews of the agreements.

9.6 Associations with Corporate Institutions

The Self-Study includes details of any associations that have an impact on the operation of the program, and results of evaluative reviews of the associations.

10. Research and Scholarly Activities

10.1 Research Strategy

The Self-Study includes the institution's research strategy and provides evidence of the scholarly and research productivity of the faculty members assigned to the program, and as appropriate to the institutional mission.

10.2 Research Support

The Self-Study discusses the nature and level of support for research extended to the faculty in the program. This can, among other things, include details of financial support as well as forms of public recognition.

10.3 Research Policy

The Self-Study discusses the overall institutional research policy and the implications of that policy for research and scholarship associated with the program.

10.4 Research Expectations

See Section 10.1

10.5 Cooperative Arrangements

The Self-Study discusses and documents any cooperative arrangements for research which have a bearing on the program. Documentation should include examples of cooperative arrangements and any updates to those arrangements as a result of evaluations.

11. Community Engagement

11.2 Employer Engagement

The Self-Study discusses and documents the ways in which program faculty and staff interact with employers of graduates. This may include the ways in which the program uses and benefits from an advisory board. See Section 2.2 above regarding engagement of Advisory Boards.

11.3 Community Relations

The Self-Study discusses the ways in which the faculty, staff and students of the program have advanced community relationships through, for example, service learning, tutoring programs, or sponsorship of community organizations. The Self-Study should include examples of the ways in which community relations have impacted the development and offering of the program.

Figure 1: Institutional Licensure & Program Accreditation Approval Process