

Appendix B.1

EVALUATION MATRIX

The evaluation matrix corresponds with the ALS report (**APPENDIX C**) and provides guidelines to a Validation Board (VB) for the evaluation of the Architectural Learning Site (ALS). In addition, the SACAP competencies (**APPENDIX A**) and the subject review template (**APPENDIX B.2**) should be used as part of the evaluation approach and process. The evaluation matrix, with comments, must be included in the Final Validation Report (format in **APPENDIX B.3**).

<p>a. ALS PEDAGOGIC POSITION, IMPACT AND FUTURE VISION</p>	
<p>Does the ALS have a clear focus? Is the ALS making an impact on the profession and community? Is the ALS aware of, and responsive to, its own strengths and weaknesses? Does the ALS have a clear future vision and strategy?</p>	
<p>b. TRANSFORMATION</p>	
<p>Does the ALS engage with, and address, transformation, decolonisation, diversity, equity and inclusivity in the design of the curriculum, in its approach to staff and students and its engagement with the institution and the wider community?</p>	
<p>c. PROGRAMME DESIGN</p>	
<p>Is the structure and design of the curriculum clear and aligned with the respective NQF exit level outcomes required of the qualification. Are the aims and objectives, expected outcomes modules/units clear? Do the exit levels achieve the outcomes of related SACAP competencies? Is design the core of professional architectural education and does it constitute at least half of the curriculum? Are the changing needs of the architectural profession, societies and technologies met through the programme design?</p>	
<p>d. TEACHING AND LEARNING</p>	
<p>Are the ALS's strategic objectives and the tactical and pedagogic approaches of each academic year valid, clearly defined, understood by staff and learners and effectively implemented? Is the content of the curriculum and syllabus relevant and adequately covered in the presentation of the coursework and projects? Is the coordination of the subjects/modules/units and the qualifications rigorous, valid and reliable? Do the resources of the ALS support its teaching and learning strategy? Is communication to the students clear? Is there teaching and learning support and capacity building at ALS and institutional level? Does the ALS integrate with the institutional learning management system? If applicable, is there a work-readiness program and how is it managed and assessed?</p>	
<p>e. ASSESSMENT</p>	
<p>Does assessment support the teaching and learning strategy? Are the assessment strategies and processes transparent and clearly communicated to students? Are the assessments reliable, rigorous and secure? Are there strategies in place to deal with copying and plagiarism?</p>	
<p>f. STAFF</p>	
<p>How are staff members integrated and supported as valuable contributors to the success of the ALS? Are there ALS and institutional opportunities for staff development and promotion and are these effectively implemented? How are disputes managed? What are the formal leave/sabbatical arrangements? Are staff registered as SACAP professionals?</p>	

g. STUDENTS	
Are student voices included in curriculum development and the operational aspects of the ALS? Are at risk students identified and supported? How is student success prioritised? Are there effective strategies for recruitment of new students? Are the processes for application, selection and registration transparent, clear and well managed? How does the ALS implement RPL in the context of higher education transformation? Does the ALS have a relationship with its alumni and how is that managed?	
h. OPERATIONAL STRATEGIES	
Does the ALS have a clear management structure in relation to leadership, decision making and liaison with the higher education institution? Is highly qualified architectural expertise incorporated into the ALS? Does the ALS receive FTE funding? Does the educational environment and the extent of available resources support the ALS? Is the budget, infrastructure and resources sufficient to support the academic pursuits and other needs of the ALS? Comment on: a) the accommodation: are required spaces (lecture rooms, crit venues, etc.) available for students and staff? Are they suitable: well-lit and ventilated, quality and comfort, complying with all regulations (such as fire)? Are recreational facilities; storage; toilets; tea kitchens; parking places available? b) physical equipment: is there a workshop and is it adequately equipped? Is suitable furniture provided? c) IT and connectivity: is it suitable for current and future developing practices?	
i. RESEARCH AND PRACTICE	
What is the position of the ALS on research and practice involvement of staff and students? What is the research focus, impact and output? Is research supported and funded by the institution and how is support and funding allocated?	
j. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT	
What is the position of the ALS on community engagement by staff and students? Is community engagement integrated into the curriculum? How are students prepared, selected and assessed for community engagement? Is community engagement supported and funded by the institution and how is support and funding allocated?	
k. LINKS TO ACADEMIA, PRACTICE AND THE PROFESSION	
Does the ALS pursue and facilitate staff and student exchanges with other schools, study visits, exhibitions of work and participation in international competitions? Are students aware of the SACAP resources, are they registered with the SACAP (although not a requirement, it is a recommendation)? Do students have a student body and are they represented on the national student body? Does the ALS play a role in regional or national continuing professional development activities? Is there an Advisory Board and is it effectively facilitated?	
l. ADMINISTRATION	
Is there clarity in terms of ALS and institutional operational procedures, the administration of marks and students?	
m. QUALITY ASSURANCE (RELATED TO CHE CRITERIA 1.19)	
Does the ALS have a system for self-evaluation and peer review and is this conducted at regular intervals? Does the ALS include academics from other ALSs and practising architects in its review panels? Are the formal review processes of the ALS and the institution well managed and implemented?	

