PROGRAM EVALUATION TEAM

1.0 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

The purpose of this document is to describe the composition of the BAETE Evaluation Team, the eligibility criteria of the Evaluation Team Chair and Members, and their responsibilities.

2.0 SCOPE OF THIS DOCUMENT

The document is applicable for the formation of the BAETE Program Evaluation Team. The document also outlines the tasks Evaluation Teams must perform while evaluating a program.

3.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

3.1 Evaluation Team

- Perform program evaluation as per this document.

3.2 BAETE

- Constitutes program evaluation teams as per the guidelines provided in this document.

4.0 DEFINITIONS AND ACRONYMS

See ACC-MAN-06 for *definitions and acronyms*.

5.0 REVIEW BY EVALUATION TEAM

5.1 Composition and Selection of Evaluation Teams

The BAETE maintains a pool of trained Program Evaluators, as per the eligibility and competence requirement mentioned in Section 5.3, from which potential Evaluation Team members are selected. This database is updated periodically. The evaluation team members are drawn from academic institutions, R&D laboratories and establishments, the government, corporations/industries, etc. The program evaluators may be active or retired professionals. An Evaluation Team may be formed to evaluate a single program or multiple programs of an institution concurrently.

Each Evaluation Team has three members: a Chairperson and two Program Evaluators. One of the team members must be from the industry. The program evaluation teams may be smaller for concurrent evaluation of multiple programs of the same institution.

BAETE may also invite Program Evaluators from other full signatory countries of the Washington Accord.

5.2 Tasks for the Evaluation Team

5.2.1 Once the evaluation team members have been appointed, the BAETE will notify the educational institution and the respective Sectoral Committee(s) of the composition of the Evaluation Team. The respective Sectoral Committee(s) will inform the Chair of the evaluation team or the Head of Delegation (in case of concurrent evaluation of multiple programs) of whether any sectoral committee member will accompany the team during the on-site visit as an observer. The BAETE will advise the Chair of the Evaluation Team or the Head of Delegation (as and when appropriate) to contact the educational institution to make arrangements for the on-site visit after a review of the SAR as per the BAETE manual.

CC BY

PROGRAM EVALUATION TEAM

5.2.2 All correspondence between the educational institution and the BAETE, all reports made during the evaluation process and information regarding whether a program from an academic institution is being considered for accreditation are to be classified as confidential.

5.2.3 To maintain impartiality and transparency in the accreditation process, no member of the Evaluation Team should participate in any activity after forming the Evaluation Team that might involve a conflict of interest.

5.2.4 The Evaluation Team members will conduct a comprehensive review of the SAR. If additional information or clarifications of the information furnished by the educational institution are required, members will channel their requests through the Chair of the Evaluation Team or the Head of Delegation (as and when appropriate), who will liaise with the contact person of the educational institution through the BAETE Registrar to obtain the information needed.

5.2.5 The Evaluation Team shall have one or more pre-visit meetings before the on-site visit to discuss its preliminary findings from the documentation.

5.2.6 The on-site visit will be conducted over three days, usually consecutive. A typical schedule of on-site activities is provided in ACC-PLN-04-10 as a guide.

5.2.7 The evaluation team debriefs the program head in a pre-exit meeting to ensure no gap in understanding between the Evaluation Team and the program. In the debriefing meeting, the Program may respond to correct any factual error in the Evaluation Team's Findings.

5.2.8 A concise exit meeting shall be conducted at the end of the on-site visit program, wherein the Evaluation Team will present its preliminary findings (individually for each program in case of concurrent evaluation of multiple programs) orally to the educational institution as per BAETE guidelines. The findings will be presented by the Chair of the Evaluation Team or the Head of Delegation (as and when appropriate); in the latter case, the Head of Delegation may ask the relevant Chairs to present at their discretion.

5.2.9 If an educational institution requires follow-up activities (for example, the educational institution may be required to present additional information that needs to be assessed), the evaluation team may appoint one of its members to conduct another visit to review the activities.

5.2.10 The evaluation team's report shall be prepared and forwarded to the Quality Assurance Cell after the on-site visit as per the schedule (ACC-MAN-04) stipulated in the BAETE manual. The Evaluation Team shall use ACC-TMP-04-05 to prepare the Evaluation Team Report.

5.2.11 For concurrent evaluation of multiple programs of the same institution, the Delegation will perform the following tasks in addition to those mentioned in 5.2.1 through 5.2.9:

a) Program-specific evaluators will review their respective SARs for compliance with eligibility requirements and consistency with formatting within a deadline given by the Head of Delegation.
b) After the deadline, the Head of Delegation will call a joint meeting of all evaluators. If the SAR of any program is found either not in compliance or not as per the template, the Head of Delegation will communicate with the BAETE member-secretary and decide together the next course of action for that program.
c) Program-specific evaluators of the eligible programs with acceptable SARs will evaluate the respective SARs in detail. The evaluations will be discussed in a joint meeting chaired by the Head of Delegation. The evaluators will decide which criteria are to be evaluated jointly for all programs and which will be evaluated separately.
d) All the programs will be visited for onsite evaluation together. The Head of Delegation will decide the visit dates in consultation with all program-specific evaluators and the programs. The dates must comply with the schedule stipulated in the BAETE manual (ACC-MAN-04).

CC BY

e) The Head of Delegation shall ensure consistency in evaluating all the programs. The Head of Delegation shall also ensure that the evaluations and decisions about all the participating programs are taken holistically, considering feedback from evaluators of all the programs.
f) The Head of Delegation will ensure that the report for each program is prepared and shall forward the reports to the Quality Assurance Cell as per the schedule (ACC-MAN-04) stipulated in the BAETE manual. ACC-TMP-04-05 provides the report template to be used by the evaluation team. The Head of Delegation will submit all reports.

5.3 Eligibility Requirement of Evaluators

Normally, program evaluators from academia will possess the following:

a) Significant teaching and research experience in the university, generally not less than five years
b) Demonstrable expertise in engineering education and/or a specific engineering discipline through publication and/or technology development

Normally, the program evaluators from industry will possess the following:

a) Significant industrial experience in relevant fields, generally not less than ten years of considerable professional experience

The Team Chair should have significant experience through prior participation as a program evaluator. The team chair from Academia should preferably be in a senior position with at least ten years of experience. They should have significant managerial/supervisory experience if they come from the industry.

6.0 THE BAETE ACCREDITATION MANUAL, STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES, TEMPLATES, FLOWCHARTS, SCHEDULE, AND WORK INSTRUCTIONS

See ACC-MAN-00 for details.

7.0 REVISION HISTORY

Date	Version	Description of Change
23 March 2017	1.0	Initial Release
05 March 2019	2.0	No change
16 May 2022	2.1	The definition of non-compliance to report in the exit meeting has been added; the ETR template in Annex III referred
23 April 2024	3.0	Released as a standalone document; purpose, scope, definition and acronym, and roles and responsibilities added; A new section the composition and selection of evaluation teams has been added; Sections 5.2 and 5.3 reviewed and revised; provision for concurrent accreditation visit added in sections 5.1 and 5.2; the “noncompliance” terminology has been removed; PhD as an eligibility requirement for evaluators from academic has been removed; 5-year experience as an eligibility requirement for evaluators from academia has been added.

CC BY