

**Report Writing Guidelines** (REMOVE THIS SECTION FROM DRAFT REPORT)

**In General**

Accreditation/Recognition reports are

1. formal ‘documents of record’ related to the accreditation or recognition status of the program
2. documentation of the assessment of the program with respect to BTMAC criteria for accreditation
3. documents of value for stakeholders in the program, providing an external peer review of the program, suggestions for improvements and other feedback.

As a result, they should withstand reasonable scrutiny by external auditors, legal reviewers, and informal or formal challenge or appeal by the program.

Reports should reflect a fair and even-handed review of the program. They should also lead the reader to understanding why accreditation was granted or denied. There should be a clear and explicit link between the facts underlying the Team’s findings, the criteria against which the facts were considered and the analysis or thought process which led to the conclusion.

In those cases where the Team has found serious deficiencies but is still recommending accreditation or recognition, the report should clearly indicate the deficiencies and why accreditation/recognition was still granted. This information will be of particular significance to future teams.

**Report Format**

Reports will have a section for each major criteria. Each section will generally reflect the facts of the situation, peer comments or observations upon the facts, detailed analysis where appropriate, and findings or conclusions expressed in relation to the expectations stated in the CIPS guidelines and criteria.

*Facts*

Required. Statement of factual and statistical data and information without comment. Typically the opening paragraph of a section.

*Observations*

Required. Comments upon the facts. Can be general comparisons or impressions. Can indicate whether the facts are departures from the norm or consistent with other BTMAC accredited/recognized programs.

*Analysis*

Optional. Detailed commentary or comparisons of the data. Is particularly important where the facts are leading to a concern but can also be used to emphasize a strength or other noteworthy situation.

*Findings, conclusions or summary statement.*

Required. Judgments or assessments. Where at all possible, in relation to the criteria. E.g. *“The curriculum covers all topic areas expected by the BTMAC criteria.” Or “The curriculum meets the overall expectations of the BTMAC criteria for the technical curriculum but is weak in coverage of business topics.”*

**Strengths, Concerns and Recommendations**

In most cases, limit to approximately 10 or fewer for each as a rough guideline.

Each strength, concern and recommendation must stem from an observation or analysis. For each, there should be a clear and obvious ‘chain of logic’ that leads from an observation of fact, to analysis, and finally the statement of strength, concern or recommendation. Typically, each strength, concern or recommendation will emanate from at least a full sentence and, if serious, a paragraph.

Strengths should be items that stand out in the opinion of the accreditation team. Strengths can be a summary statement. E.g. “T*he curriculum does a good job of covering all important technical and domain related topics*.” Should avoid items normally expected of a BTMAC accredited program. E.g. “*The Advisory Committee meets regularly*”.

Concerns must refer to a specific guideline or criteria. An item should not be brought up as a concern unless it can be related in some way. The observation and/or analysis should explicitly reference the relevant criteria. Where appropriate, there should be some indication that the accreditation team conducted a fair ‘due diligence’ and that the concern does not stem from a casual observation.

Where a concern is serious or accreditation threatening, clearly state this.

**Things to avoid**

* Undue emphasis on items not in criteria.
* Appearance of obsession with a single item or theme.
* Repetition.

**Guidance on the definition and interpretation of “Strengths”**

Teams should not interpret strengths as "strengths over and above other similar programs" as this interpretation has some deficiencies: 1. It is impossible to measure 2. It conflicts with the definition in our published criteria 3. It is in conflict with the stated view of accreditation as comprising a "holistic" review 4. It leads to inconsistencies -- something can be both a strength and also a deficiency; thus a strength can lead to accreditation denial.

**Guidance**

In determining if something is a strength, teams should strictly use the definition in the criteria and not the "similar programs" interpretation. Accreditation should not be based ad hoc, incomplete comparisons. It should be based to the greatest extent possible on peer review and judgements using absolute criteria. Comparisons might be helpful as one contributing factor in investigating (but never in defining) an area of strength -- or indeed a concern.

*Example*: Suppose a program has 1 machine per 10 students while most programs have, according to national surveys, an average of 1 per 30 students. This particular fact might suggest a strength, but only in the sense that it identifies a situation for further investigation. The program might have too many cheap, limited capability machines, or may have oversupplied the students with workstations at the expense of other needed facilities. In which case, we have a weakness and not strength. Thus the apparent comparative difference should lead to investigation; it should not be a conclusion in its own right.

Furthermore, in a case where a program appears to demonstrate a substantial comparative advantage, the comparative difference is not the strength itself but would usually be the result of underlying strength(s). Such strengths might, for example, involve strong faculty, exceptional leadership, wise and prudent financial practices, excellent student services. The team should investigate these matters and report them as additional strengths as appropriate.

**For Definitions of Concerns, Deficiencies and Recommendations See Section 3.6 in this report template**
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# Executive Summary

## Process

The following program(s) have been assessed using the BTMAC accreditation criteria, which are reproduced at the end of this document. The review focuses on the ensuring that the program(s) enable students to graduate possessing a defined set of attributes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Official Program Name | Program Code in this document |
|  |  |

Table 1: Programs to be considered for accreditation

## General Observations

INSERT GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Following are the strengths, concerns, deficiencies and recommendations. COPY AND PASTE FROM BODY OF THE REPORT

## 

## Strengths

**Environment**

1. Qwerty
2. Qwerty

**Faculty**

1. Qwerty
2. Qwerty

**Students**

1. Qwerty
2. Qwerty

**Curriculum**

1. Qwerty
2. Qwerty

**Facilities and Resources**

1. Qwerty
2. Qwerty

## Concerns

**Environment**

1. Qwertyu
2. Qwerty
3. Qwerty

**Faculty**

1. Qwertyu
2. Qwerty
3. Qwerty

**Students**

1. Qwertyu
2. Qwerty

**Curriculum**

1. Qwertyu
2. Qwerty

**Facilities and Resources**

1. Qwertyu
2. Qwerty

## Deficiencies

**Environment**

1. Qwertyu
2. Qwerty
3. Qwerty

**Faculty**

1. Qwertyu
2. Qwerty
3. Qwerty

**Students**

1. Qwertyu
2. Qwerty
3. Qwerty

**Curriculum**

1. Qwertyu
2. Qwerty
3. Qwerty

**Facilities and Resources**

1. Qwertyu
2. Qwerty
3. Qwerty

## Recommendations

**University Environment**

1. Qwerty
2. Qwerty
3. Qwerty

**Faculty**

1. Qwerty
2. Qwerty
3. Qwerty

**Students**

1. Qwerty
2. Qwerty
3. Qwerty

**Curriculum**

1. Qwerty
2. Qwerty
3. Qwerty

.

**Facilities and Resources**

1. Qwerty
2. Qwerty
3. Qwerty

# Accreditation Status Decision

The accreditation decision is not provided in the draft report. Only reported to the school after the report has been reviewed by the school and the Council. The Council decides on a recommendation on accreditation.

# Section 1: The Review Team

The review team was composed of experienced management information systems professionals. All team members have expertise assessing systems and processes in an educational setting. The team’s overall responsibility is to evaluate the programs for which Recognition status was requested, and to report to the Business Technology Management Council (BTMAC) on the program’s compliance with that Council’s criteria.

The team members were chosen with particular regard for the characteristics of the institution and the program that was to be evaluated; brief *vitae* for the team members appear in the next section of this report.

## Team Lead: INSERT NAME

INSERT PICTURE

|  |
| --- |
| **Current Position/Employment:** |
|  |
| **Academic and Professional Qualifications** |
|  |
| **Relevant Committees, Board, Accreditation Activities** |
|  |

## 

## Team Member: INSERT NAME

INSERT PICTURE

|  |
| --- |
| **Current Position/Employment:** |
|  |
| **Academic and Professional Qualifications** |
|  |
| **Relevant Committees, Board, Accreditation Activities** |
|  |

## Team Member: INSERT NAME

INSERT PICTURE

|  |
| --- |
| **Current Position/Employment:** |
|  |
| **Academic and Professional Qualifications** |
|  |
| **Relevant Committees, Board, Accreditation Activities** |
|  |

# Section 2: Scope of the Accreditation

In accordance with the request received from the institution, this accreditation comprises a review of the program(s) listed in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Official Program Name | Program Code in this document |
|  |  |

# Section 3: Business Technology Management Accreditation

## 3.1 Business Technology Management Accreditation Council (BTMAC) - Accreditation Process

A standard level of professional knowledge among all Business Technology Management (BTM) professionals relies on standard education approaches and curricula. BTMAC has developed a rigorous process to examine and accredit postsecondary BTM programs.

The accreditation process is ongoing. The five key features of accreditation are:

• Self-Study: institutions prepare a written summary of performance based on the accreditation criteria. The self-study provides a foundation for the team.

• Peer Review: the accreditation review is conducted by primarily faculty, university administrators and members of industry.

• Site Visit: the accreditation review is conducted by a team of experienced accreditors. This offers an opportunity to the team to meet with a broad spectrum of individuals such as faculty, advisory committee, students, graduates and senior administration.

• Action (judgment) of accreditation agency: the Business Technology Management Accreditation Council have commission that makes decisions about the accredited status of the program.

• Monitoring and oversight: programs are reviewed over time in cycles. Any major program changes need to be presented to the accreditation council to determine if and how they affect the accreditation status.

## 3.2 Recognition Decisions and Term

Accreditation is granted for a period of time. For programs accredited under the BTM 1.0 (or 2.0), and Master’s criteria, the accreditation period will be up to and not normally exceeding 6 (six) years.

If the BTMAC judges, that there are areas of concern, accreditation may be granted for a shorter term: 3 (three) years for BTM 1.0. (2.0) and Master’s. The areas of concern and method by which the BTMAC will assess if all concerns have been addressed will be explicitly stated. The assessment methods will include either the review of a report submitted by the institution or a visit by an accreditation team. It is expected that the institution will take action to bring the program into full compliance with the criteria.

### **Denial**

A “Denial” decision indicates that a program has deficiencies such that the program is in non-compliance with the applicable criteria.

### **Revocation of Accreditation**

If, during the period of accreditation, the Council has reason to believe that a program is no longer in compliance with the criteria, the institution will be notified of such reason and will be requested to provide a response. If the response is not adequate, Council may institute a revocation of the accreditation decision. Revocation begins with the notification of the institution as to the reasons why the procedures are being implemented. An on-site one-day evaluation may be scheduled to determine the facts. A comprehensive document showing the reasons for revocation will be prepared and provided to the institution for a response. If the institution’s response is not adequate, accreditation will be revoked. The institution is notified of such action together with a supporting statement showing the cause. Revocation constitutes in essence a Denial action and may be appealed.

## 

## 3.3 The Appeal Process

Appeals may be done only in response to a Denial decision. Appeals can be based only upon the grounds that the Denial decision of the Council was inappropriate because of errors of fact or failure to conform to the Council’s published criteria.

### **Appeal**

A notice of appeal must be submitted in writing to the Chair of the Council within 30 days of receiving a notification of Denial. The submission must include the reasons why the decision is inappropriate because either errors of fact or failure of the Council to confirm to the published criteria.

The Chair of the Council will select a group of two members of the Council to serve as an appeal committee.

The appeal committee will be provided with copies of all documentation that has been made available to the institution during the various phases of the Recognition review cycle. The appeal committee will consider only the written materials submitted by the institution in determining its recommendation.

Representatives from the institution may not attend the meetings with the appeal committee. Improvements made to a program subsequent to the completion of the initial team visit will not be considered by the appeal committee.

The appeal committee’s decision will be reported to the Council in writing by the appeal committee Head. The decision rendered by the appeal committee is advice it will give to the Council. The Council will review the appeal committee’s decision and then make the final decision on the appeal.

The institutions will be notified in writing of the decision, and the basis for the decision, within 15 days of the final decision.

## 3.4 Changes During Period of Accreditation

It is the obligation of the institution to notify the Council of any significant changes that might affect the status of a Recognized program including significant changes in:

• Program title

• Faculty

• Curricular Objectives

• Curricular Content

• Student Body

• Administration

• Institutional Facilities

• Institutional Commitment

• Institutional Financial Status

A review process will be initiated as a result of the notification by the institutions. The institution will be asked to provide information to the Council. The information does not need to be extensive but must provide sufficient detail about the change so the affect can be assessed. The Council will review the information within 15 days of receipt to determine if modification of the current recognition status is needed. The Council’s decision will be based on the degree of certainty about whether the affected program continues to meet the appropriate recognition decision. The institution will be notified of the Council determination in a timely manner.

If an Recognized program is terminated by the institution, Recognition by the Council is also automatically terminated.

## 

## 3.5 Publication of Recognition Status and Public Release Policy

A list of programs, which have been Accredited by the Council, is published on the BTMAC website. Information as to whether a program or institution not on the Accredited list has been under consideration by the Business Technology Management Accreditation Council will NOT be made available except to the appropriate officials of the institution in question. The educational institution may use the Accreditation term only while it is valid and only for the programs that are recognized.

The following suggested wording will be provided to the educational institution:

*The following program(s) have been accredited by the Business Technology Management Accreditation Council (BTMAC). BTMAC works with academic institutions to ensure that educational programs prepare students for the demands of the profession and industry. More information about BTMAC can be obtained at XXXX*.

Direct quotation in whole or part from any statement by the Council made to the institution is unauthorized. Correspondence and reports between the Council and the educational institution are confidential documents and should be released only to authorized personnel at the institution.

The educational institution must avoid any implication that programs offered are accredited under program criteria against which they have not been evaluated. Where sub-designation such as “option”, “concentration”, or similar are used for programs, the institution must clearly identify the program criteria under which accreditation has been obtained.

## 3.6 Definition of Report Terms

***Strengths*** are those positive elements of the program that go beyond the normal expectations of the criteria, are valuable and should be continued. Strengths may influence a decision to accredit but does not guarantee it.

***Concerns*** are related to issues that had been determined to fall below the normal expectations, but still meet the minimum requirements of the criteria. A concern indicates that something does not have the strength of compliance that assures that the quality of the program will not be compromised prior to the next general review. The potential thus exists for the situation to change such that the criteria may not be satisfied. Positive action is desirable.

***Deficiencies*** indicate that a criterion is not satisfied. Specific action is required to bring the program into compliance with the criteria, policies or procedures prior to the next visit. Deficiencies may lead to an accreditation with conditions. Where an accreditation with conditions is not granted, deficiencies may lead to a mutual suspension of the accreditation process until such time as the deficiency is corrected. It should be noted that the draft report, prepared by the site visit team and presented to the Institution for initial comment, refers only to Deficiencies and does not specify which, if any, are considered Major. The decision as to which deficiencies, if any, are deemed Major, and the consequent decision on accreditation, is taken by Council once the final report has been prepared. Positive action is required to strengthen compliance with the criteria.

***Major Deficiencies*** are issues that lead to a Not-To-Accredit decision. It should be noted that the draft report, prepared by the site visit team and presented to the Institution for initial comment, refers only to Deficiencies and does not specify which, if any, are considered Major. The decision as to which deficiencies, if any, are deemed Major, and the consequent decision on accreditation, is taken by Council once the final report has been prepared.

***Recommendations*** are linked to concerns and deficiencies and outline suggested actions that might be undertaken to strengthen the program. Recommendations are not intended to be prescriptive and programs may choose from alternative actions to correct the deficiencies in question. Recommendations are expected to be addressed before the next accreditation review.

1. **NOTE: ALL TABLES IN THE EDUCATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE (NOT THE APPENDICES) NEED TO BE COPIED INTO THE REPORT. INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE SCHOOL IN THE ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS CAN ALSO BE COPIED.**
2. Note: All tables and information in the supplemental questions in this report were provided by the educational institution and copied into this report after the information was verified during the site visit.
3. **1** The Educational Institution Environment
   1. **1.1 Size of the academic unit**

**Table 1.1.1: Size of the academic unit**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Your Unit | as %of Faculty | as % of Educational Institution | Comments or clarifications |
| Faculty FTE |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time enrollment |  |  |  |  |
| Part-time enrollment |  |  |  |  |
| Annual student-courses taught at all levels |  |  |  |  |
| Total salary budget |  |  |  |  |
| Total non-salary budget |  |  |  |  |

* 1. **1.2 Educational Institutions structure**

## Strengths



## Concerns

## Deficiencies

## Recommendations

1. **2 Faculty** 
   1. **2.1 Financial resources**
   2. **Table 2.1.1: Financial Resources**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Minimum for Faculty Members funded | Maximum | Number of Faculty Members included | Comments or clarifications |
| Salaries |  |  |  |  |
| Professional or other allowances |  |  |  |  |
| NSERC research grant |  |  |  |  |
| Other research funding |  |  |  |  |
| Other financial support |  |  |  |  |

**Educational institution support for faculty professional developmen**t

* 2. **Non-regular faculty**
  3. Describe use of non-regular faculty
  5. **2.3 Workload Distribution**
  6. Describe workload distribution

* 1. **2.4 Quality indicators**

Describe any additional data demonstrating the high or continually improving quality of faculty members.

**Teaching Evaluations**

**Table 2.1.2: Teaching Honour Roll**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Teaching Honour Roll Period | Core and non-core faculty awarded |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Scholarly Activities**

Describe any scholarly activities

**Table 2.1.3: Journal Submissions**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Journal Title | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 2.1.4: Financial Resources**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Minimum for Faculty Members funded | Maximum | Number of Faculty Members included | Comments or clarifications |
| Salaries |  |  |  |  |
| Professional or other allowances |  |  |  |  |
| NSERC research grant |  |  |  |  |
| Other research funding |  |  |  |  |
| Other financial support |  |  |  |  |

**Student evaluations**

**Table 2.4.6: Average Course and Instructor Evaluations courses (2010-2015) by semester**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Semester | Average Course Rating | Average Instructor Rating |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Strengths



## Concerns

## Deficiencies

## Recommendations

1. **3 Students**

## 3.1 Enrollment and graduates in each program

* 1. **Table 3.1.1: Programs to be considered**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Official Program Name | Program Code\* |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Table 3.1.2: Current enrollment**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Code | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3.1.3: Number of graduates in each of the last five years**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Code | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

* 2. **3.2 Admission requirements, promotion requirements and passing averages**

Describe the requirement to enter or continue in the program.

Describe any articulation agreements in place and describe what policies and processes there are in place to assure the equivalency of courses that are recognized.

* 2. **3.3 Student counseling and advising**
  3. **Course selection**

**Career selection**

* 1. **3.4 Student Real World Work Experiences**

* 1. **3.5 Quality indicators**

**Co-op Placement (if available)**

**Table 3.5.1: Co-op work term placements**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Employer Name | 2013 Spring | 2013 Summer | 2013 Fall | 20114Spring | 2014 Summer | 2014 Fall | 2015 Spring | 2015 Summer | 2015 Fall | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Job Placement**

**Table 3.5.2: BTM graduate job placement one month after graduation (2014, 2015)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2014 | 2015 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Table 3.5.3: Graduate job placement one month after graduation (2014, 2015) by job function**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Job Function | 2014 | 2015 | Total |
| Accounting |  |  |  |
| Administrative (Office / Support)/ Customer Service |  |  |  |
| Finance |  |  |  |
| General Management |  |  |  |
| Management Consulting |  |  |  |
| Management Information Systems |  |  |  |
| Market Research / Analysis |  |  |  |
| Marketing / Public Relations / Advertising / Social Media |  |  |  |
| Marketing/Sales |  |  |  |
| MIS / IT / Technology Consulting |  |  |  |
| Operations/Logistics |  |  |  |
| Project Management |  |  |  |
| Sales / Business Development |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |  |

**Table 3.5.4: Graduate job placement one month after graduation (2014, 2015) by company**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | 2014 | 2015 | Total |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |  |

**Admission Averages**

**Table 3.5.5: Average Admission GPA by Admission Year**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Basis of Admission | 2012/2013 | 2012/2013 | 2013/2014 | 2014/2015 | 2015/2016 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Attrition Rates**

**Graduation Rates and Averages**

**Table 3.5.6: Graduates by Convocation Year and Graduating CGPA**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
|  | - | - | - | - | 2.97 |

## Strengths



## Concerns

## Deficiencies

## Recommendations

1. **4 Curriculum**

Copy and paste curriculum charts here from the educational questionnaire

* 1. **Additional quality indicators**

**How does the Department manage and review its curriculum?**

**How does the Department ensure that the program(s) (and courses) evolves in response to industry needs (include any references or documentation to appropriate environmental scans and or Program Advisory Committee recommendations)?**

**Table 4.3.1: BTM Advisory Board Members (if available)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Organization | Contact | Title |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Are there other innovative aspects of the programs that deserve special mention?**

## Strengths



## Concerns

## Deficiencies

## Recommendations

1. **5 Resources**

**5.1 Physical facilities**

Briefly summarize the physical facilities (including offices, laboratories, and classrooms) available to meet program needs.

## 5.2 Computing resources

Briefly describe the computing resources (hardware and software) available to your undergraduate students. What policies and procedures are in place for maintaining and upgrading equipment?

1. **6** 
   1. Any publications describing physical, computing, library, and other physical resources.

Main website:

Campus maps:

Computing services:

Library resources:

Recreation facilities:

* 1. Any publications describing the Department's organization or operations, such as the latest annual report, descriptions of internship programs, and so forth.

Provide any relevant links:

* 1. General overview of the library facilities available to students

Provide any relevant links:

## Strengths



## Concerns

## Deficiencies

## Recommendations

# . Appendix A: Visit Agenda

# Appendix B: Materials reviewed in preparation of this report

* the accreditation questionnaire
* the programs and courses descriptions
* the teaching assignment
* the CVs of the faculty members

# Accreditation Criteria