

**PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES**  
**FOR**  
**COURSE ACCREDITATION**



Singapore Institute of  
Surveyors and Valuers

**EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

JULY 1993

REVISED IN APRIL 2003



**PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES  
FOR ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS  
SEEKING ACCREDITATION OF COURSES**

1.	Introduction .....	1
2.	Procedures For Approval .....	2
3.	Application Procedures For Accreditation.....	2
	Accreditation Visit .....	2
	Fees And Expenses .....	3
4.	Submission Of Documentation .....	3
	New Submission .....	3
	Re-Accreditation.....	3
5.	Criteria Of Assessment .....	4
6.	Conditions Of Approval.....	5
7.	Liaison And Monitoring.....	5
8.	Accreditation Process.....	6

## 1. Introduction

The Singapore Institute of Surveyors and Valuers (SISV) has its history way back in 1937 and represents the only national body representing professional surveyors and valuers in Singapore. Its members comprise quantity surveyors, land surveyors and valuation and general practice surveyors.

The main objective of the Institute is to secure the advancement and facilitate the acquisition of that knowledge which constitutes the profession of Land Surveying, Quantity Surveying, or Valuation and General Practice Surveying.

The Institute conducts technical and practical examinations for SISV membership admission when necessary. However, the Council may grant exemption from examinations to persons who are professionally qualified in comparable examinations conducted by public authorities or Institutions of Land Surveyors, Quantity Surveyors, Valuation and General Practice Surveyors.

To-date, the Institute had concluded reciprocity agreements with the followings :

- Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, UK (RICS) on 2 October 1992;
- Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors on 21 November 1997;
- Australian Property Institute (API; *previously known as Australian Institute of Valuers and Land Economists*) on 24 April 1998;
- New Zealand Institute of Valuers on 24 April 1998;
- Australian Institute of Quantity Surveyors (AIQS) on 23 June 1998;
- New Zealand Institute of Quantity Surveyors (NZIQS) on 23 June 1998; and
- Institution of Surveyors, Australia (ISA) on 2 November 1999.

With such reciprocity agreements, SISV and the respective institutes recognise either institution's qualifications.

The Institute is prepared to consider proposals from academic institutions for courses leading to exemption from the SISV's examinations. These Guidelines outlines the procedures in applying for such exemptions. They are intended as a procedural aid and are normally reviewed. Each course is considered on its own merits.

## 2. Procedures For Approval

The responsibility for dealing with applications lies with the SISV Education Committee. The Committee meets six times a year, and generally appoints a small Panel to consider each application. In the case of a new course, and subject to satisfactory proposals and documentation, the Committee will authorise the Panel to visit the academic institution. The Panel will typically include three to four members with academic and practitioner representatives. The Visiting Panel is required to report back with the final decision on exemption being taken by the Council on recommendations of the Committee.

## 3. Application Procedures For Accreditation

Any academic institution of higher education desirous to seek accreditation of its course(s) by SISV shall submit the application to the Secretary of the SISV Education Committee. The application should be completed in full and accompanied by the necessary payment of an Administrative Fee and documentation (please refer to *Section 4 - Submission of Documentation*).

### Accreditation Visit

The academic institution should extend invitation to the relevant professional institution of its country to co-opt a representative from its local industry into the Accreditation Panel for the visit. The Panel will make a 2½ - 3 days accreditation visit to the academic institution.

The visit will comprise :

- a) Interviews / meetings with
  - senior management staff, for example, Vice Chancellor or Dean of the Faculty, the Course Advisory Committee members, Head of the Department;
  - academic staff; and
  - group meeting with students, both local and overseas, and with representation from each year of study.
- b) Documentation review session for panel members to review the following documents :
  - minutes of Advisory Committee's meetings; and
  - samples of students' work, assignments and project.
- c) Tour of the library, laboratories and computer facilities of the Faculty.
- d) Private meeting sessions among the Panel members.

## **Fees And Expenses**

All submission of application and documentation must be accompanied by an Administrative Fee. The Administrative Fee payable for the accreditation is SDG\$2,000 per course (a proportionate reduction would apply for more courses). In the case of a re-accreditation, the Administrative Fees payable is SDG\$1,000 per course.

The academic institution should also undertake the following expenses for all members of the visiting accreditation panel :

- business class return tickets;
- 4N hotel accommodation;
- all transport expenses (including to and from airport) during the visit; and
- meals expenses during the visit.

## **4. Submission of Documentation**

### **New Submission**

Information required in support of a new submission is necessarily extensive, and academic institutions are requested to make every effort to address the following requirements with completeness and clarity. The Committee requires all submissions to cover the following details :

- a) Definitive Course Documentation  
Full details must be supplied. Please refer to the SISV Accreditation Documentation Checklist for a list of the information required.
  
- b) Documentation Pertaining to Internal and External Validation  
All relevant documentation and reports arising from the internal validation process should form part of the submission, where possible.

### **Re-Accreditation**

For institution seeking re-accreditation, the course documentation should include the following :

- a) A Critical Review of the Existing Course
  - covering the following aspects :
    - operation, management and resourcing of the course;
    - achievement of aims and objectives;

- the relevance and balance of course contents including teaching methods and assessment;
  - student performance, cohort progression and achievement and where appropriate employment destinations;
  - results of consultations with students, employers and the profession; and
  - external examiner's reports.
- b) Definitive Course Documentation
- including full details together with details of the changes proposed, a justification for those changes and the process leading to the decisions taken.
- c) Internal Review Documentation
- including any details of internal review reports, minutes of meetings and other relevant documentation recording the process.

The course documentation should be complete and clear as the Committee may consider applications for re-accreditation based upon the foregoing documentation only, without the need for an accreditation visit. It is for the applying academic institution to make the case.

Please note that a complete set of documentation covering the inadequate information by the initial submission should be submitted again if certain information is lacking. (This applies to both accreditation and re-accreditation documentation.)

## 5. Criteria Of Assessment

Each application will be judged on its own merits. The main criteria on which courses are assessed include :

- the context within which the course will operate;
- course philosophy and development process;
- the nature and composition of the course planning and management team;
- quality, experience and numbers of staff with the appropriate background and experience;
- the resources allocated;
- the research base of the submitting Department / Faculty;
- the course documentation;
- course structure and duration;
- the contents of the course in relation to the course objectives and employer requirements;
- the level of knowledge taught and the depth of understanding expected;
- admission and assessment procedures;
- employer's opinions;

- External Examiner Reports and the response of the institution / department to issues raised therein;
- a reasonable expectation that the proposals are achievable;
- an appropriate scope and focus of content; and
- the institutional monitoring and validation process.

## **6. Conditions Of Approval**

The Institute may grant accreditation approval to a course for up to five years, but shorter periods may be appropriate where further development or other changes in the course or academic institutions are expected, where the nature of the course renders this inappropriate, or where an earlier review is considered desirable.

Courses are normally granted approval subject to conditions that can be both precedent and subsequent to approval. In order to maintain the validity of an approval, the academic institutions must comply with conditions usually within a specified time limit. The Committee reserves the right to withdraw approval where conditions are not fulfilled. The timing of such a withdrawal will relate to whether the condition was precedent or subsequent to approval.

The terms of approval may include a number of recommendations on which academic institutions are invited to take action. Recommendations do not require mandatory action, but will be a point of focus when courses are considered for re-accreditation.

## **7. Liaison And Monitoring**

Within the periods of course approval, it is recognised that evolutionary changes will occur. The Committee expects to have referred to its major changes that are introduced after a course has received its approval, together with papers relating to their internal approval. Whilst not an exhaustive list, such changes would include, for example :

- a) A change in title of the course or the award that is made after successful completion of the course.
- b) A change in the published syllabus for the course (such a change would be one where subjects are added or discontinued, rather than changes in the emphasis of teaching within an established subject area to keep pace with developments).

## 8. Accreditation Process

