

## **Section C - Guidelines**

### **C.1 Computing and IT-related Programs Within the Scope of the Accord**

Section D, *Seoul Accord Graduate Attributes*, describes the profile of graduates of the computing and IT-related programs within the scope of the Seoul Accord. The attributes document may be modified from time to time as deemed important according to the procedures for modifying Guidelines specified in the Rules and Procedures.

### **C.2 Applying for Provisional Status**

#### **C.2.1 Preliminary Steps Prior to Making Application**

1. An applicant wishing to become a Signatory should first contact the Secretariat.
2. The Secretariat will provide the necessary documentation on procedures and will invite the applicant to provide preliminary documentation on its accreditation/recognition system. The applicant will be informed that mentoring may be available. (See 3.2.)
3. The Secretariat will provide the preliminary documentation to the Committee for evaluation. If in their opinion it does not appear to be compatible with the Requirements, the Committee will advise the applicant that its system differs from the Requirements in certain fundamental respects (to be indicated) and determine whether the applicant wishes to undertake the major development work and pursue its application further when it believes the issues identified have been addressed.
4. If the documentation appears to the Committee to be compatible with the Requirements and, if it is the wish of the applicant, the Committee may assign a team of two or three Signatories to act as Mentors to assist the applicant in progressing towards Provisional status.
5. When the applicant chooses to proceed with its application for Provisional status, having worked or not with Mentors, it will request two of the existing Signatories to act as Nominators.
6. When potential Nominators consider the applicant's accreditation/recognition system approaches and has the potential to achieve the Requirements, they should inform the applicant that they are prepared to act as Nominators.
7. There is no obligation on applicants to ensure that all Signatories are familiar with the applicant's accreditation/recognition system. However, in addition to the Mentors up to three further Signatories should have had the opportunity to become familiar with the accreditation/recognition system prior to consideration of the application.

#### **C.2.2 Documentation in Support of Applications**

The applicant must meet all the requirements set out in the Rules and Procedures (Section B). The documentation provided on the accreditation/recognition system should include the following sections:

- I. **ACCREDITING/RECOGNISING ORGANIZATION**  
Provide the name of the organization. List the names of the officers of the organization with brief CVs. Define the applicable jurisdiction for the organization, and describe the affiliations of the organization with other computing and IT-related bodies, government, and industry within the jurisdiction.
- II. **INTRODUCTION**  
Provide general information about the jurisdiction and the context of computing and IT.
- III. **EDUCATION**  
Provide a description of primary, secondary, and tertiary education. Describe the nature of programmes, including admission standards. Provide the number and type of institutions

offering computing and IT-related programmes. Indicate whether the institutions are public or private.

IV. **STRUCTURE OF THE COMPUTING AND IT-RELATED COMMUNITY**

Describe the context of computing and IT-related practice and the degree of regulation (i.e., registration or licensing). Describe if there is a protected title and scope of practice. Describe any differing categories of computing and IT-related practitioners and their academic requirements. Describe the relationship of the organization to licensing, registration, or certifying agencies, and the extent to which the organization can influence the acceptance of accreditations/recognition by those agencies.

V. **ROLE OF ACCREDITATION/RECOGNITION**

Describe the role of accreditation/recognition within the jurisdiction. Given that accreditation is normally voluntary, describe the degree of participation.

VI. **ACCREDITATION/RECOGNITION SYSTEM**

Describe the development of the accreditation/recognition system and its maturity. Provide a description of the accreditation/recognition board including its composition and authority. List the objectives of accreditation/recognition. Provide the criteria for accreditation/recognition (general, program specific; curriculum content- technical and non-technical; incorporation of practical experience; length of the program; naming of the program; faculty requirements). Provide details for conducting the accreditation/recognition evaluation and making the accreditation/recognition decision; include relevant documentation (initiation of visit; self-evaluation questionnaire; selection of evaluation team; organization of the visit; due process). Provide a list of currently accredited/recognised programs and a schedule of upcoming evaluations. Describe relationships with external computing and IT-related organizations including any agreements.

### **C.2.3 Guidelines to Assist in Evaluation of Applications**

Assessing equivalence of professional preparation is a complex matter. The experience of the existing Signatories is that an assessment based on documentation is only a first step- necessary but not sufficient. Confidence can be achieved only through a detailed evaluation, including close interaction and planned visits to observe accreditation/recognition procedures.

In particular, it is difficult to define on paper the standard to which graduates must be able to exercise the required attributes. The same words can embrace a wide range of standards. Documentation can describe criteria and procedures; but standards can be reliably judged only by experienced people through live interaction. Therefore, applicants must give the opportunity for the Mentors, and some other Signatories, to be present at key decision points where the quality of student learning is evaluated against accreditation/recognition criteria.

Ultimately, the applicant must demonstrate that the level and content of the studies of accredited/recognised programmes are Substantially Equivalent to those of the current Signatories in preparing graduates to enter a computing or IT-related profession. Therefore, the program must be offered at an appropriate tertiary-level institution. The duration of academic formation will normally be at least sixteen years.

Accreditation/recognition systems should adhere to the following general characteristics:

1. The Signatories to the Accord are authorities, agencies, or institutions that are representative of the computing and IT-related community and that have statutory powers or recognized professional authority for accrediting/recognition programs designed to satisfy the academic

- requirements for professional computing and IT-related practice within a defined jurisdiction (e.g. country, economy, geographic region).
2. Any such authority, agency or institution must be independent of the educational providers delivering accredited programs within their jurisdiction and should also be free from influence or control over accreditation/recognition decisions by other organizations.
  3. An accreditation/recognition system must be in place with well-documented accreditation/recognition procedures and practices. Accreditation/recognition of programmes is expected to conform to generally accepted principles such as:
    - a. The system must operate at all times in accordance with high standards of professionalism, ethics and objectivity;
    - b. The process must be transparent and consistent and the activities in relation to individual programs must be conducted in confidence;
    - c. Those involved in the accreditation/recognition process must have access to knowledge and competence in matters related to computing and IT-related accreditation/recognition, computing and IT-related education and computing and IT-related practice.
    - d. Accreditation/recognition is of individual programmes or of coordinated groups of programmes quality-assured as a whole.
    - e. Evaluations of programs are conducted by peer reviewers and include a self-evaluation and site visit.
    - f. The criteria for accreditation/recognition should include requirements for:
      - i. a suitable environment to deliver the program;
      - ii. adequate leadership for the program;
      - iii. suitably qualified computing and IT-related professionals teaching in the program;
      - iv. a curriculum providing a broad basis for computing and IT-related practice;
      - v. appropriate entry and progression standards;
      - vi. adequate human, physical and financial resources to support the program.
    - g. The process should include periodic re-evaluation to maintain accreditation/recognition status.

### **C.3 Mentoring**

Accord members may provide support, advice, and guidance through voluntary mentoring to jurisdictions that are anticipating making formal application for Provisional or full member status to the Accord.

#### **C.3.1 Consultants**

Accreditation/recognition bodies sometimes contract the services of a consultant to provide them with support in the development of accreditation/recognition systems and qualification standards. These consultants are paid a fee for their services and are not recognised as representatives of the Signatories of the Accord. If a professional/accreditation/recognition body chooses to contract the services of a consultant, they must do so at their own risk. If a Signatory is providing consultancy support to an accreditation/recognition body it must inform other Signatories so as to declare any pecuniary interest.

#### **C.3.2 Mentoring provided by individual Signatories**

Accreditation/recognition bodies may approach Signatories directly to request support through a mentoring arrangement. If Signatories accept this request then they must inform the Secretariat so that other Signatories are made aware of the mentoring arrangement. The Accord, as a whole, cannot be responsible for the quality of advice and support provided through such a mentoring arrangement.

## **C.4 Applying to Become a Signatory**

1. During the period of Provisional status, it shall be open to all Signatories to visit the applicant at their own cost, but this is not a requirement nor part of the Review process.
2. As stated in Section 2.2 of the Rules and Procedures, when the applicant requests, the Committee will assign three Signatories as Reviewers to examine and report on the applicant system and to recommend to the Signatories, when they are satisfied that the requirements for becoming a Signatory are met. The qualifications of the Reviewers are the same as for a Review of a Signatory, and are given in Section C.5 below.
3. The Reviewers will normally evaluate the systems of the applicant in a similar fashion to that stipulated as Procedure A for the conduct of a periodic Review visit of an existing Signatory. However, the Review process may be modified as appropriate for applicants that can document an evaluation by an external body that meets the expectations of the Accord Reviewers. Such modification will normally be limited to applicants that are Signatories of similar accords.
4. In addition to the criteria set out in Procedure A, the Reviewers must consider whether
  - a. the accreditation/recognition system is well established (normally with at least one program having gone through a full accreditation/recognition cycle and being re-evaluated) and
  - b. a substantial proportion of its programmes offered have been evaluated under the system as described.
  - c. organisations holding Provisional status may seek guidance from their Mentors (if any) and the Committee as to how soon during their granted period of Provisional status they might apply for Review.
5. The Reviewers must ensure that they observe visits to a representative cross-section of institutions, and also observe the accreditation/recognition process for a range of decisions, unless there is documentation of such observation by an appropriate external body, such as Reviewers from a similar accord, providing sufficient information for a recommendation by the Reviewers.
6. The expected characteristics of an accreditation/recognition system and criteria for accreditation/recognition, including the attributes expected of computing and IT-related graduates, are set earlier in Section C. If an applicant's system appears on paper to be Substantially Equivalent to those of the Accord, tests of the system in operation might then be:
  - a. Is the accreditation/recognition system similar in methods and means of delivery to the systems of other Signatories? Performance indicators/key attributes:
    - Has a clear definition of academic quality in the context of its mission.
    - Is non-governmental.
    - Accredits/recognises programs at institutions that have legal authority to confer higher educational degrees/qualifications.
    - Has official, written policies and procedures that are available to the institutions and to the public.
    - Has a process that includes a self-evaluation by the institution and the program seeking accreditation/recognition.
    - Has an on-site review by a visiting team comprised of peers.
    - Demonstrates independence from any parent organization or entity in its policy-setting and decision-making process.
    - Requires a periodic review of accredited/recognised programs.
    - Publishes or makes available to the public a list of accredited/recognised programs.

- b. Is there a clearly defined and published scope of activity for the organisation?  
Performance indicators/key attributes:
- What degree programs/qualifications are recognized (undergraduate, graduate)?
  - Are there geographic bounds?
  - What disciplines (computing, engineering, etc.) and computing and IT-related sub-disciplines (computer science, information systems, information systems, informatics, etc.) are recognized?
- c. Does the organisation demonstrate the use of appropriate and fair procedures in decision making? Performance indicators/key attributes:
- Is the organisation subject to interference from professional organisations, societies, special interest groups or government?
  - Within the accrediting/recognising organization, is there a separation of those who establish accreditation/recognition policy and those who make accreditation/recognition decisions?
  - Has written standards, criteria, policies and procedures for the evaluation of programs.
    - i. Are these publicly available?
    - ii. Is there a process for public comment or review?
  - Accreditation visits are conducted in accordance with the documentation.
  - Applies standards and criteria in a consistent and fair manner from institution to institution, program to program and year to year.
  - Provides a written report to the institution that clearly distinguishes between actions required for accreditation/recognition and actions recommended for academic program improvement.
  - Visit reports provide sufficient detail for the accreditation/recognition board (or equivalent) to make informed decisions whether or not to accredit particular programs, or to impose conditions.
  - The board demonstrates a capacity to make difficult decisions in a way likely to be beneficial to the computing and IT-related community in the longer term.
  - Has a process for appealing adverse accreditation/recognition decisions.
  - Has a clear conflict of interest policy for all involved in the accreditation/recognition process including visiting teams, accreditation/recognition decision-makers and policy-makers.
  - Are the procedures capable of addressing unusual circumstances in a perceptive way, and is this illustrated in practice?
- d. Does the organisation have the capacity to conduct accreditation/recognition activities on an ongoing basis? Performance indicators/key attributes:
- Has sufficient staff and financial resources to conduct and sustain an effective accrediting/recognising process.
    - i. How is the organisation financed?
    - ii. What is the outlook for financial viability?
  - Has an effective process for the recruitment, selection, training & evaluation of program evaluators/visitors.
    - i. How are evaluators selected?
    - ii. Are there written training materials?
    - iii. What is process for evaluation?
    - iv. Does the visiting team pool include computing and IT-related practitioners as well academicians?

- Conducts periodic self-review to improve its standards, criteria, policies and procedures.
- e. Does the operating documentation focus attention on the fundamental criteria for accreditation/recognition? Performance indicators/key attributes:
- The required graduate attributes are documented in a way that is clearly evident to the educational provider concerned, and the required attributes are Substantially Equivalent to the Accord exemplar.
  - The criteria translate into procedures that evaluate in depth the outcomes of each program and how they are assured.
- f. Ultimately, as an overarching test, is the outcome standard, as evaluated by existing Signatories during live observation and interaction, consistent with that represented by the Accord?

## **C.5 Reviews**

### **C.5.1 Procedure A: Normal Review**

1. Review teams must embody a range of expertise and should include at least one academic and one industrial representative. According to the Accord Rules and Procedures, the Committee must select at least three members for the Review Team and normally at least two team members will physically take part in visits.
2. In selecting the Review Team, the Committee as well as the Secretariat must be cognisant of any activities that may impede individuals from participating due to conflict of interest.
3. The chair of the Review Team must be appointed by the Committee at the time of notification of the team composition.
4. Confirmation of substantial equivalency should be based on visits to at least two educational providers including a total of at least two programs relevant to the Accord undergoing evaluation. The programs should be representative of the diversity among program types and educational provider characteristics when practical. In addition, at least one team member shall observe a meeting of the accreditation/recognition board or other body responsible for final accreditation/recognition actions.
5. Design of a typical visit: In order to make most efficient use of time and to ensure timely production of the report, the following procedures should be adopted:
  - a. A copy of the most recent Review report will be made available to the Review team.
  - b. Prior to the first visit, the review team should review data, determine aspects to be examined in more detail, outline the report structure, allocate individual team member responsibilities and communicate with the host Signatory to obtain background information and clarify the accreditation/recognition systems and the visit programme.
  - c. The visit or visits accompanying the accreditation/recognition panels shall take place in accordance with the protocols in 5.1.6 below.
  - d. A post-visit team review to structure the report and if possible prepare it in outline.
  - e. The review team should visit the headquarters office of the agency administering the computing and IT-related accreditation/recognition process.
6. In general the protocols to be observed by the review team during the visit should be:
  - a. The team members should be non-participatory observers.
  - b. The team members should refrain from making comments on the procedures or outcomes during the visits and only comment to the accreditation/recognition panel when requested to do so, after visits have been concluded and the intended recommendations made known to the universities concerned.

- c. Where appropriate and necessary and in order to achieve complete coverage the team may split to accompany accreditation/recognition sub-panels according to the individual specialization of the team members.
- d. The team members may participate in the discussions with students as their questions in these forums may assist the team to understand the educational culture and student perceptions. This is judged to not unduly influence the accreditation/recognition process.
- e. A draft team report must be submitted to the accreditation/recognition agency being reviewed to ensure correctness as to matters of fact.

### **C.5.2 Procedure B: Continuous Review**

1. The Committee will nominate the Signatories from which Accord Review Teams (ARTs) may be drawn.
2. For each of not less than two accreditation visits within a five-year period, the Signatory being reviewed will indicate to the Secretariat that it wishes an Accord Review Team (ART) to be formed for that visit.
3. The ART will be formed by the Committee and Signatory being reviewed jointly, ensuring that a proportion of accreditation visit panel members but not less than one per visit must be from the panel set up for this purpose. The Committee will designate one of the ART as the team leader.
4. The Signatory being reviewed must ensure that at least one member of the ART, in the last two years of the period, meets with the accreditation/recognition agency, reviews the accreditation/recognition procedures with the agency and observes an accreditation/recognition board decision meeting.
5. At least fifteen months prior to the end of the six-year period the Secretariat will circulate all Review Reports from the previous five-year period to all Signatories.
6. If no objections to the acceptability of the Review Reports as sufficiently demonstrating equivalence are received by the Secretariat twelve months prior to the end of the Review period, the accreditation/recognition procedures and practices of the subject organisation shall be deemed to comply and the Review is complete. The process will then restart in the next six year Review period should Procedure B continue to apply.

### **C.5.3 General protocols applying to both procedures**

1. Protocols to be observed for non English speaking organisations where the review team members are not fluent in the language of the jurisdiction being reviewed:
  - a. English translations shall be provided of the key parts of the pre-visit documents for each visit that is to be observed and must include sufficient information for the observers to become familiar with the observed institutions, programs, and visiting teams.
  - b. For Procedure A: Normal Review, a single translator at each visited program shall be provided. The selection of translators is an important issue. The accreditation/recognition organization being observed should be responsible for that selection, but should select individuals who, in addition to having good language skills and a knowledge of the accreditation/recognition process, agree to hold a neutral position with regard to the observation process.
  - c. When multiple programs are to be observed at the same institution, it is recommended that the review team members remain with their translator, but that they time-share their participation among the multiple visiting panels.
  - d. For Procedure B: Continuous Review, translators must be provided for each panel on which there is an international Reviewer.

2. At the conclusion of a visit to a given Signatory, the review team shall prepare a report with recommendations for the Secretariat that, in turn, shall be distributed to the other Signatories. For Procedure A in all cases, and in Procedure B in cases when an Overall Review Team was appointed, the report shall be submitted no less than 90 days prior to the next General or Mid-term Meeting of the Accord Signatories.
3. The Final Report shall include:
  - a. An executive summary outlining major system characteristics and citing recommended action with the appropriate action statement.
  - b. An overall introduction to the accreditation/recognition system under Review and its standards.
  - c. Information on accreditation/recognition policies/procedures and criteria for the system under Review, including a comprehensive analysis of how the accreditation/recognition process addresses marginal, difficult conditional actions.
  - d. A brief description of the educational provider and a listing of the programmes and results in order set the context for the Review.
  - e. Information on the conformity of the system with its own published accreditation/recognition policies and procedures.
  - f. Indications of any stated or observed substantial change to the accreditation/recognition criteria, policies or procedures of the system under Review and the rationale for the change.
  - g. A statement as to whether the standard of the graduates of accredited/recognised programs are Substantially Equivalent to graduates of other Accord Signatories in preparation for a computing or IT-related profession.
  - h. Any statement of weakness or deficiency. A *weakness* indicates that the accreditation/recognition system is satisfactory but lacks the robustness that assures that the quality of the system will not be compromised prior to the next general Review. A *deficiency* indicates that the processes, policies and procedures for granting accreditation/recognition to programmes have been examined and found not to be Substantially Equivalent to comparable practices of other Signatories that assess the quality of programmes. This action changes the Signatory's status to that of conditional as defined in Part 1 of Section B.
  - i. Recommended action to the Accord Signatories in accordance with Part 3.6 of the Rules and Procedures.
4. Review reports may be not be communicated to any Signatory except through the Secretariat except that the draft reports may be submitted by the Reviewers to their home organisations for the purposes of quality assurance and advice and to the agency being reviewed, but solely to ensure factual accuracy.
5. In Procedure B, the ORT Report shall additionally focus on the remedial actions taken by the Signatory to address the deficiencies or weaknesses cited by the earlier Accord Review Teams and shall be submitted to the Secretariat.
6. Conditional status of a Signatory means that:
  - a. the Signatory must upgrade its policies and procedures to meet the Accord requirements within a specified period.
  - b. the Review report will specify what further report or visit will be required to confirm the satisfactory upgrading of policies and procedures.
  - c. these reports shall be received before the end of the defined period.
  - d. graduates who complete academic degrees during the period of conditional status will not be recognized.
  - e. the status as a Signatory will be revoked unless the upgrading requirements are met.
7. Costs of Reviews



- a. The direct costs of Reviews, either under Procedure A or Procedure B will be borne by the Signatory under Review. Such costs will include travel costs of Reviewers, preparation of Review documents by the Signatories and other associated costs. Further, these direct costs will be governed by the policies, procedures and practices of the Signatory under Review. A signatory may send observers on a review visit with the agreement of the reviewed signatory and the review team provided that all costs for the observer's participation are borne by the observer or observer's signatory.

#### **C.5.4 Qualifications of a Reviewer**

1. The following would normally be requirements for a Reviewer nominated by a Signatory:
  - a. Thorough knowledge of, and experience in, the current practices and procedures for evaluating whether a program satisfies the nominating Signatory's requirements for accreditation. This would normally include service as a member of at least three review teams (or panels) for programs that are relevant to the scope of the Seoul Accord, with service that is sufficiently recent to provide currency and with some experience as chair of a review team.
  - b. Thorough knowledge of, and experience in, the nominating Signatory's procedures for determining accreditation actions on programs that are relevant to the scope of the Seoul Accord. This would normally include the equivalent of service for at least two years on the nominating Signatory's unit (board, commission, etc.) that makes accreditation decisions based on the reports from review teams.
  - c. Knowledge and understanding of the processes and support needed by an accreditation organization to manage and conduct accreditation procedures for programs that are relevant to the scope of the Seoul Accord.
  - d. An understanding that effective educational preparation for entry into a computing and IT-related profession can be provided in many different ways. Specifically, it is important to recognize that appropriate characteristics for professional preparation may be affected by such things as
    - the qualifications and preparation of students who begin the educational preparation,
    - the cultural context in which the educational preparation is provided,
    - the objectives of the educational preparation.
  - e. Fluency in written and spoken English, and the ability to use word processing software, email, etc. in preparing and reviewing reports and in communicating with review team members and contacts at the reviewed organization.

The nominating Signatory should interpret the intent of requirements a, b, and c as appropriate within the nominating Signatory's context.

2. Desirable Requirements for Nominated Reviewers  
Depending on the Reviewer's home country and the country of the organization to be reviewed, the following may be desirable additional characteristics for a nominating Signatory to consider:
  - a. Experience visiting, and interacting with colleagues from, countries other than the Reviewer's home country.
  - b. An understanding of the validity of cultural differences and the importance of conducting professional education in a way that is appropriate to its cultural context.
  - c. The advantages of having some ability in the native language of the reviewed organization's country.

3. Reviewers nominated by a Signatory must normally complete any required training that has been established by the Accord in order to qualify for service on a review team.

## **C.6 Fulfillment of Accord Obligations**

### **C.6.1 Biennial Reporting by Signatories**

1. The Accord places obligations on Signatories, including that Signatories will make every reasonable effort to ensure that the bodies responsible for registering or licensing members to practice in its jurisdiction accept the equivalence of programs accredited by the Signatories to the Accord.
2. Accordingly, at each biennial General Meeting of the Accord, each Signatory is required to submit a written report on fulfillment of its obligations. This report must be submitted to the Secretariat at least 90 days prior to the meeting. The report shall include:
  - a. Updated contact information
  - b. Updated key personnel
  - c. Updated accreditation/recognition information
    - i. Any changes in the scope of accreditation/recognition
    - ii. Changes in accreditation/recognition standards/criteria
    - iii. Number of currently accredited/recognised programs recognized under the Accord
    - iv. Overview of the accreditation/recognition visit programme- frequency of visits and scope of programme for the next six years
  - d. Any recent major activities
  - e. Any changes in operating environment
  - f. Updated statement of fulfillment of Signatory obligations to other Signatories
    - i. Any changes in the structure of the licensing/registration/regulatory system for provision of computing and IT-related services within the jurisdiction of the Signatory
    - ii. Changes in the licensing/registration/regulatory/membership bodies
    - iii. Changes in the relationship of the Signatory with the relevant licensing/registration/regulatory/membership bodies
    - iv. Credit given to graduates of programmes accredited/recognised by the Signatory in the licensing/registration/regulatory/membership processes within the jurisdiction
    - v. Credit given to graduates of other Accord Signatories in the licensing/registration/regulatory/membership processes within the jurisdiction
    - vi. A copy of a statement that can be widely publicised by other Signatories stating the level of recognition that the relevant licensing/registration/regulatory/ membership bodies are presently providing to graduates of programmes of other Signatories
  - g. The experiences of graduates of programmes accredited by the Signatory in seeking recognition of their computing and IT-related education within the jurisdictions of other Signatories.
  - h. A list of all programs accredited/recognized outside the Signatory's jurisdiction since the previous report, and an indication of which of those programs the Signatory intends to designate as recognized under the Accord.

### **C.6.2 Biennial Reporting by Organizations Holding Provisional Status**

1. At each biennial General Meeting of the Accord, organizations holding Provisional status are required to submit a written report. This report must be submitted to the Secretariat 90 days prior to the meeting. The report shall include:
  - a. Updated contact information
  - b. Updated key personnel
  - c. Updated accreditation/recognition information
    - i. Any changes in the scope of accreditation/recognition
    - ii. Changes in accreditation/recognition standards/criteria
    - iii. Number of currently accredited/recognised programs (as of 30 June in the year of the General Meeting)
    - iv. Number of other accredited programs to which Accord recognition does not apply
    - v. Overview of the accreditation/recognition visit programme- frequency of visits and scope of programme for the next six years (comprehensive and provisional accreditation/recognition)
  - d. Any recent major activities
  - e. Any changes in operating environment
  - f. Updated statement on the potential ability to fulfil obligations to Signatories if admission as a Signatory was to occur in the future:
    - i. Any changes in the structure of the licensing/registration/regulatory system for provision of computing and IT-related services within the jurisdiction of the Signatory
    - ii. Changes in the licensing/registration/regulatory/membership bodies
    - iii. Changes in the relationship of the Signatory with the relevant licensing/registration/regulatory/membership bodies
    - iv. Credit given to graduates of programmes accredited/recognised by the Signatory in the licensing/registration/regulatory/membership processes within the jurisdiction
    - v. Credit already given to graduates of Accord Signatories within the licensing/registration/regulatory/membership processes within the jurisdiction

### **C.6.3 Review of Biennial Reports**

1. Biennial reports will be distributed by the Secretariat to Accord members promptly and prior to the General Meeting.
2. Any Signatory may raise questions or concerns about any Biennial report within 60 days of the report being distributed by the Secretariat.
3. The Signatory submitting the report in question will have 30 days to respond to these questions or concerns via the Secretariat
4. Any Signatory member not satisfied with the response may request the matter to be brought forward at the next Accord General Meeting. Such requests must have a second. This process does not preclude the provisions of B.5.1.3.

### **C.6.4 Listing of Programs**

1. Introductory information on the Accord should be clearly accessible. The introduction should, at a minimum:
  - a. introduce the Accord and its purpose,
  - b. include a link to the Accord web page,
  - c. advise the date from which the host jurisdiction became a Signatory to the Accord,

- d. explain the obligations of other Signatory jurisdictions to recognise graduates from accredited programmes, taking account of key dates.
- e. The following generic introductory statement is provided and Signatories are encouraged to adapt it to their own situation:

*Programmes listed below have been accredited by [host Signatory organisation] and are recognised as meeting the initial academic requirements for [computing roles] in [country/jurisdiction/territory]. International recognition of these programmes is provided through the Seoul Accord, which was established in 2008.*

*Signatories to the Seoul Accord have undertaken to make every reasonable effort to ensure that the bodies responsible for registering or licensing [computing role] to practise in its country or territory mutually recognise the substantial academic equivalence of computing academic programmes accredited by other Accord Signatories.*

*[Host Signatory organisation] became a Signatory to the Seoul Accord in [year] and other Signatories are under no formal obligation to recognise the graduates of accredited programmes prior to that year. Individual Accord Signatories recognise [host Signatory organisation] accredited programmes prior to [year] at their own discretion.*

*Further details about the Seoul Accord and details of all current Signatories with links to their web sites can be found at: [www.seoulaccord.org](http://www.seoulaccord.org).*

2. The introductory information should also include any interpretive statements necessary to explain terminology and assist in interpretation (see below).
3. It is essential that users of the listing can readily identify programmes that are accredited by the Signatory body within its jurisdiction, and can differentiate programmes that are recognised under a particular accord from those that are not.
4. Listings of accredited programmes should be maintained in discrete listings, discrete sections, or in a combined listing that enables searching by accord.
5. Users also need sufficient certainty over whether programmes of study that may be differentiated in some way are covered by the scope of accreditation. Examples of this may be:
  - programmes offered at multiple campuses within the jurisdiction,
  - programmes offered within the jurisdiction and at campuses external to the jurisdiction,
  - programmes offered in multiple delivery modes,
  - programmes that may be awarded both with and without honours or other distinguishing designation.
6. In general terms, Signatories are encouraged to list accredited programmes at the level of differentiation shown on the graduate's qualification documents.
7. Where programmes offered by the same provider at different campuses within the accreditation jurisdiction are not differentiated on the qualification documents and are accredited on the basis that all pathways to award of the qualification have been assessed and accredited, a single listing for the provider would typically be shown.
8. Where multiple pathways to the award of a programme qualification exist and are covered under the scope of a single undifferentiated accreditation, a general clarifying statement to this effect should be provided. The following generic wording is suggested for adaptation by Signatories to the specific jurisdiction:

*Unless explicitly stated, accreditation, and recognition under the Seoul Accord, extends to the award of listed programmes based on delivery across any {jurisdiction/country name} campus operated by the provider or in any delivery mode through which the programme is offered.*

9. Where programmes offered by the same provider at different campuses are differentiated on the qualification documents and can be accredited on an individual basis, separate listings of accreditations by campus would typically appear.
10. Where multiple pathways to the award of a qualification exist (i.e. multiple campuses or modes of delivery) and some pathways have not been accredited, then accredited pathways must be explicitly stated on the accreditation listing and there must be sufficient differentiation on the qualification documents to enable proper interpretation by the user.
11. The first date from which accreditation applies to graduates should be clearly stated. The listing should provide clarity over whether the dates relate to the year of programme enrolment, completion or graduation.

### **C.6.5 Issue Resolution**

1. In cases where it comes to the attention of a particular Signatory that graduates of programmes accredited by that Signatory have not been accorded the same level of recognition by a licensing/registration/regulatory/membership body within a jurisdiction as graduates from programmes accredited/recognised by the Signatory within that jurisdiction then the Signatory concerned must notify the Signatory responsible for the jurisdiction within which the lack of recognition has occurred, and request the latter to undertake actions to resolve the issue.
2. If, in the view of the aggrieved Signatory, reasonable opportunity has been given but the matter has not been satisfactorily resolved, then the aggrieved Signatory may request an issue resolution session, open only to Signatories, where issues on implementation of the Accord can be raised in a solution-focused environment. Prior to an issue being accepted for discussion, it must be demonstrated via a formal written report that substantive discussions leading up to the meeting were undertaken but issues were not able to be resolved. Both individual cases and trends or systemic issues may be raised.
3. Requests for an issue resolution session, with supporting documentation, shall be submitted to the Committee at least 60 days prior to an Accord meeting, and the Committee, after communicating with both Signatories concerned must make a decision as to whether to proceed to hold the session at least 30 days prior to the meeting. The Secretariat shall circulate the notice of the session and the relevant documentation immediately after the Committee has decided to schedule the issue resolution session. In instances where the Signatory is not the licensing or registration body, the Signatory is expected to provide evidence of procedures and processes that it has undertaken to encourage full implementation of the Accord in their jurisdiction.
4. If a number of Signatories can provide substantive evidence of failure of a Signatory to meet its Accord obligations, they may choose to invoke the provisions under Rule 4.3 Termination for Failure to Meet Obligations as a Signatory.

### **C.7 Principles of Good Practice for Accord Signatories Working Internationally**

These principles are intended to provide a generally accepted framework for undertaking reviews in jurisdictions where there is no organisation that is a Signatory of the Accord. They are intended to strengthen the international stature of the Accord Agreement, strengthen the working relationship among Accord Signatories and international quality assurance agencies, and encourage and enhance ongoing cooperation and communication.

#### **Principle 1. Considerations for Accord Signatories When Determining to Undertake Quality Assurance Evaluations in another Jurisdiction covered by no member of the Accord**

Accord Signatories will:

- Affirm their organizational capacity to undertake a review (e.g., language, trained staff and evaluators, budget, experience, basic information about the jurisdiction);
- Clarify the relationship of international review activity to the priorities of the accrediting organization;
- Communicate with other Accord Signatories about international review activity;
- Promulgate a clear statement of the scope of the evaluation and the use of the recognition status by an institution or program in another jurisdiction, especially with regard to transfer of credit and degree and qualifications equivalency;
- Assure clear understanding of the relationship of the review to any international agreements that address quality assurance.

## **Principle 2. Expectations for Conduct of Evaluation Reviews Abroad**

Accord Signatories will:

- Inform jurisdiction quality assurance agencies in jurisdictions where reviews are undertaken and, where appropriate, seek information, guidance, and concurrence from these agencies;
- Communicate with rectors and other college and university officials at institutions where they are conducting reviews;
- Assure that staff and evaluators are adequately informed about higher education and quality assurance in the jurisdictions in which they are conducting reviews to preclude the appearance of cultural insensitivity;
- Communicate fully and clearly about costs and currencies associated with a review.

## **Principle 3. Quality Assurance of Online and Web-based Instruction and programs**

Accord Signatories will:

- Work as closely as possible with their institutional and programmatic exporters of online and web-based education to assure quality as offerings are made available in a variety of jurisdictions, especially when the offerings involve instructional strategies that are unfamiliar to the host jurisdiction;
- Urge that these exporters review language, literacy and study skills levels of the target audience for these offerings, preparing separate or supplemental material to meet special needs if appropriate.

## **Principle 4. Responsibilities to Students and Colleagues**

Accord Signatories will:

- Work with the appropriate agencies in non-Signatory jurisdictions to provide the most comprehensive and accurate information available about educational services and programs to avoid the export of diplomas of questionable quality offered for a fee;
- Develop, in coordination with international colleagues, the appropriate protocol to assist non-Signatory jurisdictions in reviewing educational imports from questionable provenance