ICACIT

ACCREDITATION POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANUAL

The Accreditation Policies and Procedures Manual (MPPA) is part of a series of documents associated with the ICACIT Evaluation Cycle and was approved by the ICACIT Board of Directors in its session of November 26, 2020.

Document Code	Version	Year	Reviewed
AC-MPP-01	3.1	2021	15/06/2021

Requests for further information about ICACIT, its accreditation process, or other activities please visit www.icacit.org.pe or may be addressed to Av. Del Pinar 152, Office 707, Santiago de Surco, Lima 033, Lima or to acreditacion@icacit.org.pe

Table of Contents

ACCREDITATION POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANUAL

PLEASE NOTE
 (1) THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ESTABLISHED AND APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF ICACIT.
 (2) SEGMENTS IN **BOLD** REFLECT REVISIONS APPROVED BY THE ICACIT BOARD THAT COME INTO FORCE FOR THE PRESENT ACCREDITATION CYCLE.

INTRODUCTION
The purpose of this document is to articulate the policies and procedures that govern the ICACIT accreditation process. It is provided for the use of programs, accreditation committee, team chairs, and program evaluators. The program seeking accreditation is responsible to demonstrate clearly that it is in compliance with all applicable ICACIT policies, procedures, and criteria.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT ICACIT.

ICACIT is a non-profit civil association that is made up of institutions that have an interest in quality assurance in the training of professionals that the world demands: (1) Peruvian Academy of Engineering - API, (2) Peruvian Association of Producers of Software and Technologies - APESOFT, (3) College of Engineers - CIP, (4) National Confederation of Private Business Institutions - CONFIEP, and (5) Peru Section of the IEEE.

ICACIT accredits educational programs in architecture, science, computing, engineering and engineering technology.

ICACIT promotes the continuous improvement of professional training, identifying accredited programs that meet recognized international quality standards. Graduates of ICACIT accredited programs are prepared to take on the challenge of practicing the profession globally and take on ever-increasing challenges.

Responsibilities

ICACIT is made up of five accreditation committees: The Architecture Accreditation Committee (CAA), the Science Accreditation Committee (CACi), the Computing Accreditation Committee (CAC), the Engineering Accreditation Committee (CAI) and the Engineering Technology Accreditation Committee (CAT).

The ICACIT accreditation committees are in charge of the following responsibilities:

(1) Present to the Board of Directors of ICACIT proposals to improve the criteria, policies and procedures of accreditation.

(2) Manage the accreditation process and the making of accreditation decisions based on the criteria and on the ICACIT Accreditation Policies and Procedures Manual.

Procedures and decisions in cases of appeal on accreditation actions are the responsibility of the Appeal Commission appointed by the Board of Directors of ICACIT.

Accreditation decisions are based solely on the provisions of the Accreditation Policies and Procedures Manual and the applicable accreditation criteria published by ICACIT.

Recognition

ICACIT is a member organization of the European Network for Accreditation of Engineering Education - ENAEE, since January 2020**.**

ICACIT is an accreditation agency, a signatory of the Washington Accord, since June 2018, and a provisional member of the Sydney Accord, since June 2016. The Washington Accord and the Sydney Accord are two of the six agreements that make up the International Engineering Alliance (www. ieagreements.org).

ICACIT is an Accreditation Agency before the National System of Evaluation, Accreditation and Certification of Educational Quality - SINEACE, to accredit university engineering programs since August 2016 and to accredit technology programs in engineering of higher education institutes since March 2018.

II. <u>ACCREDITATION POLICIESAND PROCEDURES</u>

II.A. <u>Public Release of Information by the Institution/Program</u>

II.A.1. Institutions are required to represent the accreditation status of each program in the respective modality accurately and without ambiguity. Programs are either accredited or not accredited. ICACIT does not rank programs.

II.A.2. Unauthorized use of ICACIT's official logo is prohibited. Only higher education institutions and its accredited programs are authorized to use special logos provided by ICACIT for use on websites, in course catalogs, and in other similar publications.

II.A.3. When ICACIT awards accreditation to a program, the accreditation action indicates only the nature of the next review and is not an indicator of the program's quality. Public announcement of the accreditation action should only relate to the attainment of accredited status. All statements on accreditation status must refer only to those programs that are accredited. No implication should be made that accreditation by one of the ICACIT committee applies to any programs other than the accredited ones.

II.A.4. Direct quotation in whole or in part from any ICACIT statement to the institution is unauthorized. Correspondence and reports between ICACIT and the institution/program are confidential documents and should only be released to authorized personnel at the institution. Any document so released by the institution/program must clearly state that it is confidential. Wherever law or institution policy requires the release of any confidential document, the entire document must be released.

II.A.5. The institution must be clear when referring to the ICACIT accreditation criteria group under the program it has been accredited: computing, engineering or engineering technology.

II.A.6. Institution catalogs and similar publications must clearly indicate the programs accredited by the committees of ICACIT as separate and distinct from any other programs or kinds of accreditation. Each accredited program must be specifically identified as "accredited by the ___ Accreditation Committee of ICACIT, <u>http://www.icacit.org.pe</u>".

> II.A.6.a. Each ICACIT-accredited program must publicly state the program's educational objectives and student outcomes.

> II.A.6.b. Each program accredited by ICACIT must publicly state the number of students enrolled and graduate per year.

II.A.7. If accreditation is withdrawn or discontinued, the institution may no longer refer to the program as being accredited.

> II.A.7.a. ICACIT publicly identifies programs whose accreditation is withdrawn.

> II.A.7.b. If ICACIT withdraws its accreditation, then the institution/program must provide, upon request from the public, a statement summarizing ICACIT's reasons for withdrawal of accreditation; that statement can be accompanied by a response from the affected program addressing the ICACIT decision. This statement must be available within 60 days of the final decision by ICACIT. ICACIT will post on its public website a notice regarding the availability of this statement from the institution/program.

> II.A.7.c. In the event that the program files an official request for appeal, reconsideration, or immediate re-visit in accordance with APPM II.K., the 60-day period for public notification will begin when the processes described in that section have provided a final accreditation action.

II.A.8. The institution must make a public correction if misleading or incorrect information is released regarding the items addressed in Section II.A.

II.B. Confidentiality of Information

II.B.1. ICACIT requires ethical conduct by each volunteer (boards of directors, members of advisory council, members of accreditation committees, members of evaluation teams) and staff members engaged in fulfilling the mission of ICACIT. The organization requires that every volunteer and staff member has the highest standards of professionalism, honesty, and integrity. The services provided by ICACIT require impartiality, fairness, and equity. All people involved with ICACIT activities must perform their duties under the highest standards of ethical behavior.

Information provided by the institution is for the confidential use of ICACIT and its agents, and will not be disclosed without specific written authorization of the institution concerned.

II.B.2. The contents of all materials furnished for review purposes and discussion during the accreditation committee meetings are considered privileged information. The contents of those documents and the accreditation actions taken may be disclosed only by ICACIT staff and only under appropriate circumstances determined by the Board of Directors of ICACIT. All communications between institutions and regarding final accreditation actions must be directed to ICACIT Headquarters.

II.B.3. ICACIT publicly identifies programs that have been accredited and programs for which accreditation was withdrawn by ICACIT, in accordance with Section II.A.7 of this manual. ICACIT does not divulge information regarding programs that have requested ICACIT review but have not received ICACIT accreditation.

II.C. Conflict of Interest

II.C.1. Service as an ICACIT board member, committee member, team chair, program evaluator, or staff member creates situations that may result in conflicts of interest or questions regarding the objectivity and credibility of the accreditation process. ICACIT expects these individuals to behave in a professional and ethical manner, to disclose real or perceived conflicts of interest. The intent of this policy is to:

> II.C.1.a. Maintain credibility in the accreditation process and confidence in the decisions of the Board of Directors, accreditations committee members, team chairs, program evaluators and staff members.
>
> II.C.1.b. Assure fairness and impartiality in decision-making;
>
> II.C.1.c. Reveal any real or perceived conflict of interest; and
>
> II.C.1.d. Avoid the appearance of impropriety.

II.C.2. Individuals representing ICACIT must not participate in any decision-making ability if they have or have had a close and active association with a program or institution that is being considered for official action by ICACIT. Close and active association includes, but is not limited to:

> II.C.2.a. Current employment or within the last three years as faculty member, staff, or consultant by the institution or program;
>
> II.C.2.b. Discussion or negotiation of current employment or within the last three years with the institution or program.
>
> II.C.2.c. Attendance as a student at the institution;
>
> II.C.2.d. Receipt of an honorary degree (e.g. doctor *honoris causa*) from the institution;
>
> II.C.2.e. Current or within the last three years participation of a relative within the second degree of consanguinity or the first degree of affinity as a student or employee of the institution or program;

II.C.2.f. A current or within the last three years unpaid official relationship with an institution, e.g., membership on the institution's board of trustees or industry advisory board; or

II.C.2.g. Any reason that prohibits the individual from rendering an unbiased decision.

II.C.3. Program evaluators and team chairs must not establish a close and active relation with the institution or program under evaluation until the accreditation cycle has been concluded.

II.C.4. Committee members are not eligible to serve concurrently on the Board of Directors; nor are members of the Board of Directors eligible to serve on an ICACIT committee. Members of the ICACIT Board of Directors and ICACIT staff members may observe an accreditation visit, but they are not eligible to serve as program evaluators or team chairs.

II.C.5. A record of known conflicts of interest will be maintained for every individual involved in the accreditation process. The records of conflicts of interest will be utilized in selection of team chairs and program evaluators.

II.C.6. Each individual representing ICACIT must sign a conflict of interest and confidentiality statement indicating that he has read and understands ICACIT policies on conflict of interest and confidentiality. The policies on conflict of interest and confidentiality will be presented and discussed at the start of each committee meeting.

II.C.7. People who have a real or perceived conflict of interest with an institution or program should refrain from participating in any committee meetings where the accreditation action of the program is discussed.

II.C.8. The name of people who refused themselves for having a conflict of interest will be registered.

II.D. Accreditation Criteria

II.D.1. General Criteria: -These criteria address requirements for all programs accredited by a given accreditation committee. General Criteria are posted on the ICACIT web site: www.icacit.org.pe

II.D.2. Program Criteria:-These criteria address program-specific requirements within areas of specialization. Program Criteria are posted on the ICACIT web site: www.icacit.org.pe

II.D.3. Complementary Criteria: Each program must satisfy the Complementary Criteria that you select in its respective Evaluation Request. These criteria include:

• Criterion 10 - Research and Social Responsibility: Applicable in evaluations for initial accreditation and reaccreditation purposes.
• Criterion 11 - International Context: Applicable only in evaluations for reaccreditation purposes.

The selection of a Complementary Criterion in the Evaluation Request implies that it will be considered in determining the final accreditation action of the program. The Complementary Criteria are published on the ICACIT website: www.icacit.org.pe

II.E. Eligibility of Programs for Accreditation Review

II.E.1. ICACIT defines an educational program as an integrated, organized experience that culminates in the awarding of a degree. The program will have program educational objectives, student outcomes, a curriculum, faculty, and facilities.

II.E.2. Programs will be considered for accreditation if they are offered by an institution of higher education that has verifiable governmental recognition to confer degrees. For university programs, they must be offered by an institution of higher education licensed by the National Superintendence of Higher Education University (SUNEDU) or Ministry of Education, as appropriate.

II.E.2.a. ICACIT accredits individual educational undergraduate programs, in its face to face modality.

II.E.2.b. ICACIT does not accredit departments or institutions.

II.E.3. A program must be accreditable under at least one or more of the committees of ICACIT:

II.E.3.a. <u>CAA,</u> Committee on Architecture Accreditation - CAA accredited programs are those at the college level that lead to the professional practice of architecture.

II.E.3.b. <u>CACi,</u> Science Accreditation Committee - CACi accredited programs are those at the college level that lead to professional practice in the physical sciences, mathematics, and chemistry.

II.E.3.c. <u>CAC</u>, Computing Accreditation Committee - Programs accredited by CAC are those leading to professional practice across the broad spectrum of computing, computational, information, and informatics disciplines. CAC accredits a program at the baccalaureate degree level.

II.E.3.d. <u>CAI</u>, Engineering Accreditation Committee - Programs accredited by CAI are those leading to the professional practice of engineering. CAI accredits a program at the baccalaureate degree level.

II.E.3.b.(1) CAI – All engineering program names must include the word "engineering".

II.E.3.e. <u>CAT</u>, Engineering Technology Accreditation Committee - programs accredited by CAT are those leading to the professional practice of engineering technology. Associate degree programs prepare graduates for careers as engineering technicians. CAT accredits a program at the associate or baccalaureate degree level.

II.E.3.d. Those programs whose name include modifiers "computation" "systems" or "informatics" will be subject to a review of its content to determine the proper accreditation committee.

II.E.4. Program names must meet ICACIT requirements.

II.E.4.a. The program name must be descriptive of the content of the program.

II.E.4.a.(1) Each program must provide ICACIT with both the name of the program in Spanish and English.

II.E.4.b. There must be consistency between the name of the program, study certificates, academic degrees, institutional publications in electronic and printed media, and in the Program Evaluation Request sent to ICACIT.

II.E.4.c. The program name determines the committee and the criteria applicable to its review.

II.E.4.c.(1) Every program must meet the General Criteria for the committee(s) under which it is being reviewed

II.E.4.c.(2) If a program name implies specialization(s) for which Program Criteria have been developed, the program must satisfy all applicable Program Criteria

II.E.4.c.(3) If a program name invokes review by more than one committee, then the program will be jointly reviewed by all applicable committee.

II.E.5. To be eligible for an initial accreditation review, a program must have at least one graduate within the academic year prior to the academic year of the on-site review.

II.E.6. A program must belong to the ICACIT system at least one year prior the application of the Request for Evaluation.

II.E.7. A Readiness Review (REv) **is given only once and** and must be completed prior to the first evaluation of a program. In this case, the institution must contact ICACIT to provide its Self-Study Report **without appendices**, in electronic format, no later than September 30 of the year prior to its evaluation cycle. **If a program belongs to an educational institution with programs previously accredited by ICACIT, it is not required to undergo a Prior Review.**

II.E.7.a. A Readiness Review is a process **carried out by an ad hoc committee** that determines if a program is ready for its **first** evaluation. The Prior Review serves to reduce the possibility of a program spending resources without being properly prepared

II.E.7.b. The outcome of a Readiness Review (REv) for a program is one of three non-binding options:

II.E.7.b.(1) A recommendation to submit the RFE in the immediate upcoming accreditation review cycle, addressing the REv suggestions, if any;

II.E.7.b.(2) A recommendation to postpone the RFE submission unless substantive changes in the Self-Study preparation and documentation are made; or

II.E.7.b.(3) A recommendation not to submit the RFE in the immediate upcoming accreditation review cycle because it is likely to be rejected.

II.E.7.c. The outcome of a Readiness Review (REv) will be notify by the October 31 the same year in which it is carried out.

II.E.8. A program requesting to be evaluated for the first time must have completed at least two cycles of continuous improvement demonstrated in its self-study report.

II.F. Accreditation Cycle and Timeline

II.F.1. The accreditation cycle regularly lasts 12 month, beginning in January with the submit of the Request for Evaluation and ending in December with the delivery of the Final Statement to the institution.

II.F.2. Programs are considered for accreditation review only at the written request of the institution. An institution contemplating an ICACIT review for the first time must contact ICACIT for more information prior to making the formal request.

II.F.2.a. An institution wishing to have programs considered for accreditation or reaccreditation must submit to ICACIT a Request for Evaluation (RFE) not later than January 31 of the calendar year in which the review is desired. The RFE must be signed by the institutional Chief Executive Officer (President, Chancellor, Rector, or equivalent). A separate RFE must be submitted for each committee that will review any of the institution's programs that year.

II.F.2.b. If more than one ICACIT committee will be reviewing programs at an institution in the same academic year, the institution may request that all on-site reviews be conducted simultaneously.

II.F.2.c. A RFE requiring a correction shall be returned to the institution for the respective correction.

II.F.2.d The institution will have the possibility to choose that the program evaluators are local or foreign in its Evaluation Request. In case you choose foreign program evaluators, you will additionally assume the expenses involved in your international transfer.

II.F.3. The institution presents a Self-Study Report or an Interim Report for each program depending on the type of review that corresponds.

II.F.3.a. The institution must send to ICACIT the Request for Evaluation by January 31 with:

II.F.3.a.(1) 1 copy of the report printed in Spanish, for each program.

II.F.3.a.(2) an electronic version of the report in Spanish and English, of each program.

II.F.3.a.(3) the electronic and printed version of the complementary material indicated in section II.F.3.b, and

II.F.3.a.(4) at least three proposal dates for the on-site review.

II.F.3.b. The institution must provide the following complementary information to each report:

II.F.3.b. (1) admission prospectus,

II.F.3.b. (2) program brochure,

II.F.3.b. (3) list of program graduates during the year prior to the evaluation, organized in alphabetical order according to the first letter of the paternal surname, and

II.F.3.b. (4) 6 original study certificates of graduates of the program, starting with the graduate whose paternal surname begins with the letter "B", and following the order in which they appear in the list of graduates previously described until completing the 6 certificates.

II.F.3.b. (5) Each study certificate must be accompanied by the respective academic record, study plan (s), equivalence tables, simple copy of validation resolutions, simple copy of pre-professional internship certificates, a simple copy of the academic degree diploma and other information that demonstrates that the graduates meet the graduation requirements of the program.

II.F.4. During the months of February and March, the institution and ICACIT mutually determine dates for any on-site review that is required and evaluation team members are designated.

II.F.4.a Prior to the final appointment of the team, the institution will have the opportunity to review all assigned team members with regard to ICACIT's published Conflict of Interest Policy (Section II.C.) within the next five working days upon receipt of notification. The institution may reject a team member only in the case of real or perceived conflicts of interest.

II.F.4.b On-site reviews are normally conducted during May through August. The on-site review date must be at least 60 days after the official designation of the evaluation team.

II.F.5. The invoice for fees associated with the ICACIT review must be paid by April 30. Failure to meet the payment terms will result in cancellation of the program review.

II.F.6. The duration of an on-site review is normally three days from team arrival to departure but may be extended or shortened depending on review requirements. Typically, the on-site review is conducted from Sunday through Tuesday and ends with an Exit Interview.

II.F.7. During the Exit Interview, the institution receives a printed copy of the Program Audit Format of each program containing a summary of the findings identified by the Evaluation Team.

II.F.8. Since the completion of the review in the campus, the institution has 7 calendar days to pronounce on form errors identified in the Program Audit Format.

II.F.9. In September, the accreditation committee approves and issue the Preliminary Statement.

II.F.10. In September, the institution receives the Draft Statement. The institution has 30 calendar days from the receipt to send to ICACIT its 30 Day Response.

II.F.11. Final action on each program is based upon the committee's consideration of the findings in the Draft Statement, the analysis of the 30-Days Response, and the analysis of additional information received in time for proper consideration. The Draft Statement will be modified to reflect these analyses, resulting in a Final Statement that reflects the final action by the committee.

II.F.12. In November, the accreditation committee approves and issues the Declaration Final.

II.F.13. In December, the institution receives the Final Statement and the Summary of Accreditation Actions.

II.F.14. Failure to meet any deadline by the institution and/or the program will result in cancellation of the program review.

II.G. Program Reviews

II.G.1. Reviews are conducted to verify that a program is in compliance with the appropriate accreditation criteria, policies, and procedures. In order for a program to be accredited, all paths to completion of the program must satisfy the appropriate criteria.

II.G.2. Types of Review

II.G.2.a. A Comprehensive Review addresses all applicable criteria, policies, and procedures.

II.G.2.a.(1) A Comprehensive Review consists of:

II.G.2.a.(1)(a) The examination of a Self-Study Report prepared by the program and

II.G.2.a.(1)(b) An on-site review by a team.

II.G.2.a.(2) An Initial Program Review, conducted on a program that is not already accredited, must be a comprehensive review.

II.G.2.a.(3) Comprehensive Reviews must be conducted for each accredited program at intervals no longer than six years for continuous accreditation.

II.G.2.a.(3)(a) ICACIT establishes a six-year cycle of scheduled general reviews for each program.

II.G.2.a.(3)(b) An institution may request that all accredited programs by the same committee receive simultaneously a general review provided that the crediting period of a program is not interrupted.

II.G.2.a.(3)(c) An institution with accredited programs in more than one committee can request alignment of general review years so that general reviews by more than one committee occur in the same year

II.G.2.b. An <u>Interim Review</u> occurs when weaknesses remain unresolved in a prior review. An Interim Review typically uses the accreditation criteria in effect at the time of the previous comprehensive review. However, the institution may elect to base its interim review on criteria in effect at the time of the last comprehensive review or on those in effect at the time of the Interim Review.

II.G.2.b.(1) A review following an Interim Report (IR) accreditation action consists of:

II.G.2.b.(1)(a) The examination of an Interim Report prepared by the program addressing Concerns and Weaknesses that remained unresolved in the Final Statement from the prior review.

II.G.2.b.(2) A review following an Interim Visit (IV) accreditation action consists of:

II.G.2.b.(2)(a) The examination of an Interim Report prepared by the program addressing Concerns and Weaknesses that remained unresolved in the Final Statement from the prior review, and

II.G.2.b.(2)(b) An on-site review focused on Concerns and Weaknesses that remained unresolved in the Final Statement from the prior review.

II.G.2.b.(3) New Concerns, Weaknesses, and Deficiencies can be cited if they become evident during the conduct of an Interim Review.

II.G.3.<u>Self-Study Report</u> – The Self-Study Report addresses how a program meets each criterion in addition to applicable policy requirements. To assist programs in completing a Self-Study Report, each committee has developed a Self-Study Questionnaire that is posted on the ICACIT website (<u>www.icacit.org.pe</u>).

II.G.4. <u>Final Preparation for On-Site Review</u>

II.G.4.a. Submittal of Transcripts - Prior to arriving on-site, the team will request official transcripts of the most recent graduates from each program. Each program being evaluated will provide official transcripts with associated worksheets and any guidelines used by the advisors.

II.G.4.b. Additional Information – Prior to arriving on-site, the team may request additional information it deems necessary for clarification.

II.G.5. <u>On-Site Review</u> – ICACIT conducts an on-site review to assess factors that cannot be adequately described in the Self-Study Report.

II.G.5.a. Teams for on-site reviews will typically consist of a team chair and one program evaluator for each program being reviewed. The typical minimum team size is three members.

II.G.5.a.(1) In the case where a program must satisfy more than one set of Program Criteria, there typically will be one program evaluator for each set of Program Criteria to be used in the review.

II.G.5.a.(2) A review team may include observers at the discretion of the team chair and the institution.

II.G.6. <u>Comprehensive Review</u> – The review team will examine all program aspects to judge compliance with criteria and policies. ICACIT will assist each program in recognizing its strong and weak points. To accomplish this, the team will:

II.G.6.a. Interview faculty, students, administrators, and staff to obtain an understanding of program compliance with the applicable criteria and policies and of specific issues that arise from the examination of the Self-Study Report and from the on-site review.

II.G.6.b. Examine the following:

II.G.6.b.(1) Facilities - to assure the instructional and learning environments are adequate and are safe for the intended purposes. Neither ICACIT nor its representatives offer opinions as to whether, or certify that, the institution's facilities comply with any or all applicable rules or regulations pertaining to: fire, safety, building, and health codes, or consensus standards and recognized best practices for safety.

II.G.6.b.(2) Materials - Evaluators will review samples of displayed course materials including course syllabi, textbooks, example assignments and exams, and examples of student work, typically ranging from excellent through poor.

II.G.6.b.(3) Evidence that the program educational objectives stated for each program are based on the needs of the stated program constituencies.

II.G.6.b.(4) Evidence of the assessment, evaluation, and attainment of student outcomes for each program.

II.G.6.b.(5) Evidence of actions taken to improve the program.

II.G.6.b.(6) Student support services to confirm adequacy of services appropriate to the institution's mission and the program's educational objectives and student outcomes.

II.G.6.b.(7) The process for certifying completion of the program and awarding of the degree, including visits with persons responsible to ascertain that the process works as reported.

II.G.6.c. During the Exit Meeting, the team present factual findings orally for the institution's chief executive officer or designee and such personnel as the chief executive officer wishes to assemble.

II.G.6.d. During the Exit Meeting, the team chair provide to the dean or other appropriate academic officer, a copy of the Program Audit Form (PAF) for each program reviewed.

II.G.7. <u>Effective Date of Initial Accreditation</u> – start from the approval of the accreditation action

II.G.7.a. For a program obtaining initial accreditation, the accreditation applies to all students who graduated from the program since July 1 of the year prior to the on-site review.

II.G.7.b During the period of validity of the accreditation of the program, ICACIT will carry out an annual follow-up review of its improvement plan. Therefore, all accredited programs must submit an annual report to ICACIT until July 31. In case the program fails to send its Annual Report, ICACIT will initiate the Accreditation Revocation procedure described in section II.J. of this manual and will suspend ICACIT benefits. This procedure is not applicable in the year in which the program has an evaluation process scheduled.

II.G.7.c. During the validity period of its accreditation, the program must continue to belong to the ICACIT System.

II.G.7.d. During the validity period of the accreditation, ICACIT will issue a certificate to the graduates of the program with the study plans that meet the accreditation criteria.

II.G.8. <u>Interim Review</u>

II.G.8.a. Types of Interim Reviews – There are two types of interim reviews:

II.G.8.a.(1) Those that do not require an on-site review (resulting from an Interim Report action), and

II.G.8.a.(2) Those that require an on-site review (resulting from an Interim Visit action).

II.G.8.b. <u>Composition of Interim Review Team</u>

II.G.8.b.(1) If an on-site review is not required, a team chair will typically review an Interim Report.

II.G.8.b.(2) If an on-site review is required, review teams will typically consist of a team chair and one program evaluator for each program having an on-site review.

II.G.8.b.(2)(a) The minimum team size for an Interim Review Visit is three persons.

II.G.9. <u>Draft Statement to the Institution</u> –The team chair prepares a Draft Statement of preliminary findings and recommendations to be edited by designated committee members and for transmission to the institution. ICACIT will prepare a Draft Statement to the Institution for each review conducted. The

Draft Statement will consist of general information plus a program-specific section for each program reviewed.

II.G.9.a. The statement to each program will typically include the following:

II.G.9.a.(1) Findings of Fact – A finding of fact indicates a program characteristic that exists and is verifiable through the review process.

II.G.9.a.(2) Findings of shortcomings:

II.G.9.a.(2)(a) Deficiency – A Deficiency indicates that a criterion, policy, or procedure is not satisfied. Therefore, the program is not in compliance with the criterion, policy, or procedure.

II.G.9.a.(2)(b) Weakness – A Weakness indicates that a program lacks the strength of compliance with a criterion, policy, or procedure to ensure that the quality of the program will not be compromised. Therefore, remedial action is required to strengthen compliance with the criterion, policy, or procedure prior to the next review.

II.G.9.a.(2)(c) Concern – A Concern indicates that a program currently satisfies a criterion, policy, or procedure; however, the potential exists for the situation to change such that the criterion, policy, or procedure may not be satisfied.

II.G.9.a.(3) Findings of Observation – An Observation is a comment or suggestion that does not relate directly to the current accreditation action but is offered to assist the institution in its continuing efforts to improve its programs.

II.G.10. 30-Day Response – After ICACIT provides the institution with a Draft Statement, the institution may respond in 30 days to report progress in addressing shortcomings or to correct errors of fact in the Draft Statement. This is referred to as the 30-Day Response.

II.G.10.a. Shortcomings are considered to have been resolved only when the correction or revision has been implemented during the academic year of the review and substantiated by official documents signed by the responsible administrative officers.

II.G.10.b. All unresolved shortcomings will be evaluated by the appropriate committee at the time of the next review.

II.G.10.c. Supplemental Information from the Institution – The team chair may, at his or her discretion in consultation with the committee chair, accept additional information after the 30-day Due Process period.

II.G.11. Final Statement to the Institution – The team chair will prepare a draft of the Final Statement incorporating the 30 day response of the institution. Designated officers of the appropriate committee perform a consistency check, will edit the draft and determine the accreditation actions based on this draft.

II.G.12. Accreditation Actions –The decision on program accreditation rests with the appropriate committee of ICACIT. The following actions are available to the committee:

II.G.12.a. NGR (Next General Review) – This action indicates that the program has no Deficiencies or Weaknesses. This action is taken only after a Comprehensive General Review and has a typical duration of six years.

II.G.12.b. IR (Interim Report) – This action indicates that the program has one or more Weaknesses. The Weaknesses are such that a progress report will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. This action has a typical duration of two years.

II.G.12.c. IV (Interim Visit) – This action indicates that the program has one or more Weaknesses. The Weaknesses are such that an on-site review will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. This action has a typical duration of two years.

II.G.12.d. RE (Report Extended) – This action indicates that satisfactory remedial action has been taken by the institution with respect to Weaknesses identified in the prior IR action. This action is

taken only after an IR review. This action extends accreditation to the next General Review and has a typical duration of either two or four years.

II.G.12.e. VE (Visit Extended) -- This action indicates that satisfactory remedial action has been taken by the institution with respect to Weaknesses identified in the prior IV action. This action is taken only after an IV review. This action extends accreditation to the next General Review and has a typical duration of either two or four years.

II.G.12.f. Deferred Decision (DD) - This action indicates that the program has the opportunity to solve the Deficiencies identified by the corresponding accreditation committee. In this case, the program must submit a new evaluation request the following year. This case will only apply for initial accreditations.

II.G.12.g. NA (Not to Accredit) – This action indicates that the program has Deficiencies such that the program is not in compliance with the applicable criteria.

II.G.12.g.(1) For accredited programs, ICACIT will require the institution to formally notify students and faculty affected by the revocation of the program's accredited status and to remove the accreditation designation from all program catalog copy, electronic and print.

II.H. <u>International Accreditations</u>

II.H.1. Educational institutions seeking request a review of some of their program by an international accrediting agency member of the Washington Accord or Sydney Accord must submit an Application for Approval to ICACIT.

II.I. <u>Changes during the Period of Accreditation</u>

II.I.1. The institutional administrative officer responsible for ICACIT accredited programs will notify the ICACIT President of changes that potentially impact the extent to which an accredited program satisfies ICACIT accreditation criteria or policies. A third party may also notify ICACIT of a change to an accredited program. The institution provides ICACIT with detailed information about the nature of each change and its impact on the accredited program. Such changes include, but are not limited to:

II.I.1.a. Changes related to criteria

II.I.1.a.(1) Students

II.I.1.a.(2) Program Educational Objectives

II.I.1.a.(3) Student Outcomes

II.I.1.a.(4) Continuous Improvement

II.I.1.a.(5) Curriculum

II.I.1.a.(6) Faculty

II.I.1.a.(7) Facilities

II.I.1.a.(8) Institutional Support

II.I.1.a.(9) Research and Innovation.

II.I.1.a.(10) Program Criteria

II.I.1.b. Changes related to ICACIT policy

II.I.1.b.(1) Program name

II.I.1.b.(2) Methods or Venues of Program Delivery

II.I.1.b.(3) Decision to Terminate a Program's Accreditation

II.I.1.b.(4) Decision to Terminate an Accredited Program

II.I.2. ICACIT will review the information provided by the institution and any third party as follows:

II.I.2.a. The ICACIT President sends copies of the information provided by the institutions or the third party to the appropriate accreditation committee.

II.I.2.b. The selected committee review the documentation provided and make recommendations within 30 days.

II.I.2.b.(1) These committees may request additional information through ICACIT headquarters.

II.I.2.b.(2) These committees will review the information and make one of the follow decisions recommend either: (1) that accreditation be maintained for the duration of the current accreditation period, or (2) that a focused on-site review be required to determine the accreditation status of the changed program.

II.I.2.c. ICACIT will notify the institution of the committee's decision.

II.I.2.d. If an immediate focused on-site review is required and the institution declines to do so, this action shall be cause for revocation of accreditation of the program under consideration (II.J.5 y II.J.6).

II.J. Revocation of Accreditation

If, during the period of accreditation, a program appears to be no longer in compliance with criteria or policies, ICACIT may institute Revocation for Cause according to the following procedures:

II.J.1. ICACIT will notify the institution, providing a comprehensive document showing the reasons why revocation is being considered.

II.J.2. The institution will be asked to provide an analysis and response to the reasons provided by ICACIT.

II.J.3. An on-site review may be scheduled to evaluate the reasons provided by ICACIT.

II.J.4. If the on-site review and/or the institution's response fail to demonstrate compliance with accreditation criteria and/or policies, accreditation will be revoked.

II.J.5. ICACIT will promptly notify the institution of such revocation. The notice will be accompanied by a supporting statement detailing the cause for revocation.

II.J.6. Revocation for Cause constitutes a Not to Accredit (NA) action and the institution may appeal.

Revocation of Accreditation will be automatically in case that the institution fails to fulfill its financial commitments.

II.K. Appeals, Reconsiderations, and Immediate Re-Visits

II.K.1. Appeals, requests for reconsideration, and requests for immediate revisits may be made only in response to not-to-accredit actions. Further, those appeals or requests for reconsideration may be based only upon the grounds that the not-to-accredit decision of the committee was inappropriate because of errors of fact or failure to conform to ICACIT's published criteria, policies, or procedures. Only conditions known to the committee at the time of the committee's decision will be considered by ICACIT in the cases of appeals or requests for reconsideration. In the case of a request for immediate revisit, substantive improvements and corrective actions taken prior to the request and documented by the institution will also be considered.

II.K.2. In lieu of an immediate appeal, an institution may first request reconsideration or an immediate revisit. If such a request is denied, the institution may appeal the original not-to- accredit action. Requests for reconsideration or an immediate revisit must be made in writing to the General Manager of ICACIT within 30 days of receiving notification of the not-to-accredit action.

II.K.3. Appeals must be made in writing to the General Manager of ICACIT within 30 days of receiving notification of the not-to-accredit action or notification of the denial of a request for reconsideration or an immediate revisit.

II.K.4. Immediate Revisit

II.K.4.a. A program that has received a not-to-accredit action may be a candidate for an immediate revisit if it will undergo substantive and documented improvement before the onset of the next accreditation cycle.

In such cases, the institution must submit a written request for an immediate revisit to the General Manager of ICACIT within 30 days of receiving notification of the not-to-accredit action. This request must be accompanied by 5 copies set of a report stating the actions already taken to eliminate the deficiencies cited in ICACIT's statement to the institution. This report should contain appropriate documentation of substantive improvements and corrective actions taken, and should support the request for a revisit. The institution is cautioned, however, that the extent to which corrective actions have not been made effective may make a revisit unproductive.

II.K.4.b. The appropriate committee shall accept or deny the institution's request within 15 days of ICACIT's receipt of the institution's request for immediate revisit. This action will be based solely on the report and supporting documentation supplied by the institution in accordance with the nature of the deficiencies which led to the not-to-accredit action.

II.K.4.c. If the appropriate committee judges that an immediate revisit is not warranted, the request will be denied with a statement of reasons and a reiteration of the institution's right to pursue an appeal of the not-to-accredit action.

II.K.4.d. When an immediate revisit is granted by the appropriate committee, the institution shall be deemed to have waived its right to appeal either the original not-to-accredit action or the action that will result from the revisit. If the request for revisit is granted, the institution will be charged the regular visitation fee for the revisit.

II.K.4.e. If, following the immediate revisit, the appropriate committee, upon unanimous vote, judges that the institution is correct in its claim of substantive improvement, the committee may overturn the not-to-accredit decision and grant whatever accreditation action it deems appropriate, within the choices that were available to the committee itself.

II.K.5. Reconsideration

II.K.5.a. A program that has received a not-to-accredit action may be a candidate for reconsideration if it can demonstrate that there were major, documented errors of fact in the information used by the committee in arriving at the not-to-accredit decision.

In such cases, the institution must submit a written request for reconsideration to the General Manager of ICACIT within 30 days of receiving notification of the not-to-accredit action. This request must be accompanied by 5 copies set of a report specifying the major, documented errors of fact and how such errors contributed to the not-to-accredit action, along with substantiating documentation.

II.K.5.b. The appropriate committee shall accept or deny the institution's request for reconsideration of the not-to-accredit decision within 15 days of ICACIT's receipt of the institution's request for reconsideration. This action will be based solely on the report and supporting documentation supplied by the institution in accordance with the nature of the deficiencies which led to the not-to-accredit action.

II.K.5.c. If the appropriate committee judges that reconsideration is not warranted, the request for reconsideration will be denied with a statement of reasons and a reiteration of the institution's right to pursue an appeal of the not-to-accredit action.

II.K.5.d. When a reconsideration is granted by the appropriate committee, the institution shall be deemed to have waived its right to appeal either the original not-to-accredit action or the action that will result from the reconsideration.

II.K.5.e. If, following reconsideration, the appropriate committee, upon unanimous vote, judges that the institution is correct in its claim of such error leading to an erroneous conclusion by the committee, the committee may overturn the not-to- accredit decision and grant whatever accreditation action it deems appropriate, within the choices that were available to the committee itself. The new accreditation action must be decided by unanimous vote of the committee.

II.K.6. <u>Appeal</u>

II.K.6.a. Only not-to-accredit actions may be appealed. A notice of appeal must be submitted in writing by the chief executive officer of the institution to the General Manager of ICACIT within 30 days of receiving notification of the not-to-accredit action. This submission must include the reasons why the not-to-accredit decision of the responsible accreditation committee is inappropriate because of either errors of fact or failure of the respective accreditation committee to conform to ICACIT's published criteria, policies, or procedures.

II.K.6.b. Upon receipt of a notice of appeal, the President of ICACIT will notify the ICACIT Board of the appeal and will select three or more members or past members of the other committees and one member of the ICACIT Board to serve as an appeal committee. At least one member of this committee will be experienced as a program evaluator and/or former member of the appropriate committee. The President of ICACIT will designate one of the committee members as chair of the committee.

II.K.6.c. The appeal committee will be provided with copies of all documentation that has been made available to the institution during the different phases of the accreditation cycle, including the institution's due process response and other materials submitted by the institution or the committee.

II.K.6.d. The institution is required to submit a response (normally one page) to the committee summary previously sent to the institution. The institution may also submit other material it deems necessary to support its appeal. However, such materials must be confined to the status of the program at the time of the accreditation action of the committee and to information that was then available to the committee.

II.K.6.e. It is emphasized that improvements made to a program subsequent to the annual meeting of the committee will not be considered by the appeal committee.

II.K.6.f. The respective committee, may submit written materials beyond the statement to the institution and the executive summary for clarification of its position. Such materials must be provided to the institution and appeal committee at least 60 days prior to the date of the committee's meeting. Any rebuttal by the institution must be submitted to the appeal committee at least 30 days prior to the committee meeting.

II.K.6.g. The appeal committee will meet and, on behalf of the ICACIT Board of Directors, consider only the written materials submitted by the institution and the respective committee in arriving at its determination. Representatives from the institution and the committee may not attend this meeting. The appeal committee's decision is limited to the options available to the committee responsible for the not-to-accredit determination. The appeal committee's findings and its decision

will be reported to the ICACIT Board of Directors in writing by the appeal committee chair. The decision rendered by the appeal committee is the final decision of ICACIT.

II.K.6.h. The institution and the Committee will be notified in writing of this decision, and the basis for the decision, by the General Manager of ICACIT within 15 days of the final decision.

II.L. About Exceptional Situations

In those exceptional situations in which the conditions do not exist to carry out an evaluation on campus, as part of the evaluation for the purposes of accreditation of a program, one of the following actions will be determined:

II.L.1. If the educational institution does not have programs previously accredited by ICACIT, the evaluation of the program requested in said evaluation cycle will be canceled. Therefore, the educational institution must submit a new request for program evaluation in the next evaluation cycle.

II.L.2. If the educational institution has programs previously accredited by ICACIT, a remote evaluation will be carried out considering the following alternatives for accreditation actions:

Intermediate Visit (VI) - This action indicates that the program does not have any Deficiency. This action has a typical duration of two years.

Not Accredited (NA) - This action indicates that the program has one or more Deficiencies such that it does not meet the applicable accreditation criteria.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE ACCREDITATION POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANUAL

Changes in accreditation policies and procedures can be proposed by the accreditation committees and must be approved by the ICACIT Board of Directors. Typically, changes in accreditation policies and procedures take effect in the evaluation cycle immediately upon approval. However, this period may be extended, when deemed appropriate, and suggested changes may require a period for public review and comment before approval.

The following section presents the proposed changes to the accreditation policies and procedures as approved by the ICACIT Board of Directors in its November 2020 session, for a review and comment period that expires on December 31, 2020. The The ICACIT Board of Directors will determine, based on the comments received and the proposals of the accreditation committees, the content of the policies and procedures to be adopted.

Comments related to the proposed changes should be sent in writing to Av. Del Pinar 152. Office 707. Santiago de Surco. Lima 033. Peru, or by email to accitacion@icacit.org.pe.

Proposed Changes

II.E. Eligibility of Programs for Accreditation Review

II.E.1. A program is an organized and integrated educational experience that culminates in the achievement of an academic degree. The program will have educational objectives, student outcomes, a curriculum, faculty, and facilities.
The evaluation process for accreditation purposes considers individual programs.
II.E.1.a. Decisions on individual accreditation are made for programs duly identified in the academic degree.
II.E.1.b. In cases where the program is offered in several locations or campuses and the academic degree does not specify where the program is offered, it will be accredited only if all the locations or campuses where the program is offered are evaluated and found to meet the criteria and accreditation policies.

II.E.2. A program will be considered for accreditation if it is offered by a government-recognized institution of higher education to award academic and / or professional degrees. Therefore, the program must be offered by an educational institution with institutional licensing granted by the National Superintendency of Higher University Education or the Ministry of Education, as appropriate.
II.E.2.a. ICACIT accredits higher education programs at the undergraduate and postgraduate level, individually, in its face-to-face and **blended modality.**
II.E.2.b. ICACIT does not accredit departments, faculties, institutions or people.