

CONFIDENTIAL

Canberra Accord on Architectural Education

Type of Report:

Periodic Review

Name of Accreditation, Validation or Recognition System Reviewed (hereafter referred to as 'Accreditation System'):

ANPADEH (Acreditadora Nacional de Programas de Arquitectura y Disciplinas del Espacio Habitable), MEXICO

Dates of Review Visit(s):

15 May - 18 May 2016

Date of Review Report:

October 13, 2016

Status/Edition: (draft/final/confirmed)

FINAL DRAFT

B. 1. Introduction

a) Summary

The Periodic Review of Acreditadora Nacional de Programas de Arquitectura y Disciplinas del Espacio Habitable (ANPADEH) was scheduled for May 15-18, 2016 as a decision by the signatories of the Canberra Accord, and was scheduled to coincide with the Accreditation Visit of the Architecture program at the Universidad Del Valle De Mexico (Campus Tlaipan, Mexico City).

The Review Team members selected and approved by the Canberra Accord Secretariat and were subsequently approved by ANPADEH. Mr. Sang Jun Lee, AIA, Architect in Seoul, Korea was nominated by KAAB to represent architectural practice, and Prof. Loraine Fowlow, Associate Professor of Architecture at the University of Calgary, Canada, was nominated by the CACB to represent architectural educators.

Arriving in Mexico City separately on May 13th, the Review Team convened and were welcomed at breakfast on Saturday, May 14th with Mr. Fernando Mora Mora, ANPADEH/CA Facilitator, Dr. Jose J. Jimenez, ANPADEH President, and Mr. Alfredo Toledo Molina, ANPADEH Executive Director. On Saturday and Sunday, May 14th and 15th, the Review Team and hosts were generously provided with guided tours of Mexico City's historical center, the historic site Teotihuacan, and the former convent of Tepotzotlan.

Following breakfast at the hotel on Monday, May 15th, the Review Team were transported to the Universidad Del Valle de Mexico, and introduced to the Accreditation Team, and School's administrative team. The Review Team was provided with a workroom within close proximity to both the Accreditation Team room and the exhibition of student work. Both Teams then convened in a meeting room and were welcomed by the Rector of the University, and given the opportunity to ask questions. The Review Team then attended the faculty member meeting with the Accreditation Team, followed by a guided tour of the school's facilities.

In late afternoon of the 15th, the Review Team were transported to the offices of ANPADEH for a tour of facilities and a meeting with Dr. Jimenez and Mr. Molina, also attended by Mr. Mora Mora. (for more detail on this meeting, please refer to Section B.4.e of this Report).

On Tuesday, May 16th and Wednesday, May 17th, the Review Team continued reviewing relevant materials and working on this Report at the School, conferring with School administrators, ANPADEH staff, and the Coordinator of the Accreditation Team, as needed. The Review Team then attended the Closing Ceremony of the Accreditation Visit that concluded their work at the School.

The Review Team wishes to thank the following for their warm and welcoming hospitality throughout the Visit: Dr. Jose Jimenez, Mr. Alfredo Molina, and particularly Mr. Fernando Mora Mora for his assistance throughout the Visit.

b) Reviewers

Loraine Fowlow
Faculty of Environmental Design
University of Calgary
2500 University Dr. N.W.
Calgary, AB T2N 1N4, Canada
lfowlow@ucalgary.ca
+1 403-819-6361

Educator Member

Sang Jun Lee, AIA
518-201 Jamsil 3-dong
Songpadaero 567
Seoul, Korea
sjohn@yonsei.ac.kr
010-5345-0306 (Korea)

Practitioner Member

B. 2. Recommendation

a) Recommendation to Canberra Accord signatory systems:

It is the recommendation of the Review Team that ANPADEH be accepted by the other signatory systems, for a period of not more than **three years**, subject to the responsible signatory system providing, within six months, a report which satisfies the other signatory systems that adequate steps are being taken to address the specific deficiencies or concerns identified by the review team.

b) Operational and educational output standards

The Review Team found the overall operational and educational output standards were not found to be substantially equivalent to those of other signatory systems in the Canberra Accord.

c) Compliance with criteria for substantial equivalence

The Review Team found the following criteria to be not substantially equivalent with other signatory systems:

Section B.II.g
Section V

B. 3. Characteristics, Principles and Criteria for Assessing Substantial Equivalency

I. General Characteristics

Organizations running accreditation systems covered by the Accord are expected to have the following general characteristics:

- a) be named organizations (authorities, agencies, or institutions) that are representative of the architecture profession and which have statutory powers or recognized professional authority for accrediting, validating or recognizing programs designed to satisfy the academic requirements for admission to the profession in the locality where accreditation, validation or recognition takes place, subject to additional requirements imposed by local regulations and practice requirements;**

MET

ANPADEH(Acreditadora Nacional Programas de Arquitectura y Disciplinas del Espacio Habitable A.C.) is an autonomous organization recognized officially (9 October 2002) by the COPAES(National Council for the Accreditation of Higher Education). It is represented by Academia (ASINEA – Association of Institutions and Schools of Architecture) and practicing architects association(FCARM – Federation of Colleges of Architects of Mexico) among others.

- b) be independent of the academic institutions, professional organizations, and government agencies delivering accredited programs within their jurisdiction;**

MET

ANPADEH is an independent self supported organization.

- c) have an active, robust accreditation system in place, with established processes, procedures, and practices that are well-documented;**

MET

Refer to *General Manual for the Accreditation Processes of the ANPADEH* and *ANPADEH Accreditation Procedures for Visiting Teams*.

- d) have a record of accomplishment in accreditation with sufficient experience and magnitude of operation (normally a minimum of five programs over at least seven years).**

MET

97 Architectural Programs have been accredited by ANPADEH as of June 2015. The list of accredited Academic Programs is attached to *ANPADEH Accreditation Procedures for Visiting Team*.

II. Common Agreed Principles

- a) the system must operate at all times in accordance with a high standard of professionalism, ethics, and objectivity;**

MET

The ANPADEH requires that all accreditation visit team members and observers participate in an integration and orientation session prior to visit where the team will review the Accreditation process, the ANPADEH Code of Ethics, etc.

- b) the process must be transparent and consistent;**

MET

Refer to ANPADEH-CANBERRA ACCORD SELF ANALYSIS 4.c) and 5

- c) the activities must be conducted in relation to individual programs in confidence and with firmly established procedures and conditions for objective and consistent evaluation;**

MET

- d) those involved in the accreditation process must be knowledgeable and competent in matters related to architectural accreditation, education, and practice;**

MET

Refer to SELF ANALYSIS 7.

- e) accreditation is of individual programs/academic awards/qualifications and not of institutions;**

MET

- f) evaluations of specified academic programs are conducted by peer reviewers and must include review of the program's self-evaluation documents, a site visit, and inspection of student work;**

MET

- g) the standard of students' work should be the main criterion in determining accreditation;**

NOT MET

Assessment of students' performance outcome during the Accrediting Team visit is set out to be the main criterion for accreditation by the ANPADEH. However, no evidence was presented by the signatory system that specific performance criteria other than COMPAES general guidelines have been set to ensure consistent students' performance evaluations. Consequently, *Instrumento de Evaluación en Sitio Con Fines de Acreditación de Programas Educativo*, (document B.5.b.2), the evaluation instrument for Visiting Teams, does not place an emphasis on the standard of student work. The item for evaluation in this document is only one item out of twenty-four criteria.

- h) levels of physical, financial, human, and information resources should be appropriate to the context of the institution.**

MET

ANPADEH Document Annex 4 – Self Study Instrument describes various Criteria including these aspects.

III. Criteria for Accreditation, Validation or Recognition

The criteria for accreditation, validation or recognition should address the following:

- a) a suitable environment to deliver the program;**

MET

Evidence located in: *ANPADEH Self Study Instrument*, Section 9.1 (Infrastructure); 9.2 (Equipment), and, *ANPADEH General Manual for the Accreditation Processes*, Section 9 (Infrastructure and Equipment).

- b) adequate leadership for the program;**

MET

Evidence located in: *ANPADEH Self Study Instrument*: Section 10.0 (Administrative and Financial Management)

- c) a team of suitably qualified people teaching in the program;**

MET

Evidence located in: *ANPADEH Self Study Instrument*: Section 1.0 (Academic Staff), and, *ANPADEH General Manual for the Accreditation Processes*, Section 1 (Academic Staff).

d) a curriculum providing a broad preparation for architectural practice;

MET

Based on reviews of students work including sample theses work and contents of final exam, which is a prerequisite to the graduation, this requirement appears to be met. However: while the *ANPADEH Self Study Instrument*, Section 3.5 (Course Subject Contents), provides a list of 'generic competencies' for curriculum, there is insufficient detail of architectural skills included. At minimum, the UNESCO-UIA *Charter for Architectural Education* list of "generic student skills, knowledge, and competencies" should be included in the requirements for curriculum content and development.

e) appropriate entry, progression, and exit standards;

MET

Evidence located in: *ANPADEH Self Study Instrument*, Section 2.0 (Students), and, *ANPADEH General Manual for the Accreditation Processes*, Section 2 (Students)

f) adequate human, physical, and financial resources to support the program;

MET

Evidence located in: *ANPADEH Self Study Instrument*, Section 10.0 (Administrative and Financial Management), and,

g) periodic re-evaluation to maintain accreditation status;

MET

Accreditation is valid for five years. Evidence located in *General Manual for the Accreditation Processes of the ANPADEH*, Section entitled "Characteristics of ANPADEH's Accreditation," page 4 (unnumbered).

h) a period of academic study at, or in association with, a university/tertiary-level institution sufficient to demonstrate skills, abilities, attitudes and knowledge at a defined standard adequate for initial entry to the architecture profession; in order to gain the balanced acquisition of subjects and capabilities, this period of academic study should be normally not less than the equivalent of five years full-time studies.

MET

"Five years and or 400 credits are recommended" (but not required) for a program of Architecture. Evidence located in the *General Manual for the Accreditation Processes of the ANPADEH*, Section 3 (Curriculum), page 28 (unnumbered).

IV. International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE) *Guidelines of Good Practice*

As External Quality Assurance Agencies (EQAA), signatory systems should embrace the key principles of the *Guidelines of Good Practice* published by INQAAHE (revised edition 2006).

- a) has a written mission statement or set of objectives that takes into account its cultural and historical context.**

MET

ANPADEH's Mission Statement and list of objectives are included in the Foreword of the document, *ANPADEH-Canberra Accord Self Analysis*, page 1 (unnumbered).

- b) has adequate and accessible human and financial resources to conduct external evaluation effectively and efficiently in accordance with its mission statement and its methodological approach.**

MET

According to *ANPADEH-Canberra Accord Self Analysis*, Section 6, page 7 (unnumbered), ANPADEH's sole revenue source is from service fees paid by the evaluated programs. Anecdotally: the ANPADEH's office and staff were observed during this Visit. The ANPADEH office is located in an historic building in the downtown district of the city, and provides ample space for staff and leadership, including a spacious boardroom.

- c) has a system of continuous quality assurance of its own activities that emphasizes flexibility in response to the changing nature of higher education, the effectiveness of its operations, and its contribution towards the achievement of its objectives.**

MET

ANPADEH works under the aegis of COPAES, as one of twenty-nine Mexican Accrediting Boards. COPAES requires annual reporting of these accrediting agencies, and, additionally, a five year process of renewal. There are also twice yearly assemblies of educators, and an annual international congress of educators that ANPADEH participates in. Evidence located in *ANPADEH-Canberra Accord Self Analysis*, Section 4c, page 6 (unnumbered).

- d) informs and responds to the public in accordance with applicable legislation and the cultural context of the EQAA.**

MET

ANPADEH maintains a website (www.anpadeh.org.mx) that includes information on the Accreditation process, including relevant documentation. News items are also

listed, as well as a calendar of events. Information about ANPADEH is also included, as is contact coordinates. The Contact page also has a form for direct communication to ANPADEH through the website. Although the website links to Twitter and Facebook pages, these have not been updated since 2014 and 2015, respectively.

- e) recognizes that institutional and programmatic quality and quality assurance are primarily the responsibility of the higher education institutions themselves; respects the academic autonomy, identity and integrity of the institutions or programs; applies standards or criteria that have been subject to reasonable consultation with stakeholders; and aims to contribute to both quality improvement and accountability of the institution.**

MET

In Section 3, *ANPADEH-Canberra Accord Self Analysis*, Section 4c, page 6 (unnumbered): there is clear acknowledgement and respect for the autonomy and individual identity of the many Mexican architecture programs.

In Section 4a, *ANPADEH-Canberra Accord Self Analysis*, page 5 (unnumbered): ANPADEH's General Assembly meets at least twice a year with representatives of the Federation of Colleges of Architects of México (FCARM), during which ANPADEH's evaluation criteria are discussed. In addition, ANPADEH's Technical Committee meets five times yearly, and regularly considers changes to the framework of Accreditation reviews.

- f) has documents that indicate clearly what the EQAA expects of the institution.**

MET

The documents that meet this requirement are:

- *Marco General para los procesos de Acreditación de la ANPADEH (General Framework for the Accreditation Process of the ANPADEH)* – Most of the document but particularly on page 6, 7 and 9.
- *General Manual for the Accreditation Processes of the ANPADEH* – All of the document.

- g) has documentation concerning self-evaluation which explains the purposes, procedures, process and expectations in the self-evaluation process. The documents also include the standards used, the decision criteria, the reporting format, and other information needed by the higher education institution.**

MET

The documents that meet this requirement are:

- *Marco General para los procesos de Acreditación de la ANPADEH (General Framework for the Accreditation Process of the ANPADEH)* – All of the document, particularly on page 5, 6 and 9 to 26.

- *General Manual for the Accreditation Processes of the ANPADEH* – All of the document
 - *ANPADEH Self Study Instrument 2016* – All Document
- h) has clear documentation concerning the external evaluation that states the standards used, assessment methods and processes, decision criteria, and other information necessary for external review.**

MET

The documents that meet this requirement are:

- *Accreditation Procedures for Visiting Team*
 - *ANPADEH Indicative Curriculum*
 - *Annex 5 – Basic Criteria for Academic Quality for the disciplinary contents of the Study Plan* – This document states the abilities, skills and competencies that students must meet and that must be included in the architectural program curriculum.
- i) evaluations address both the higher education institution’s own self-assessment and external reference points, such as judgments by knowledgeable peers or relevant legislation.**

MET

The documents that meet this requirement are:

- *Marco General para los procesos de Acreditación de la ANPADEH (General Framework for the Accreditation Process of the ANPADEH)*, All of the document, particularly on pages 2- 5.
 - *General Manual for the Accreditation Processes of the ANPADEH*, Pages 3, 4
- j) has appropriate methods and policies for appeals.**

MET

The documents that meet this requirement are:

- ANPADEH website (Acreditacion, Documentos de apoyo), the document, *Manual General para los Procesos de Acreditación de la ANPADEH* (untranslated) outlines a process for appeals in the instance of a negative Accreditation review.
- *Marco General para los procesos de Acreditación de la ANPADEH (General Framework for the Accreditation Process of the ANPADEH)*, Page 7

NOTE:

To date, as none of the ninety-seven ANPADEH Accreditation reviews has resulted in a negative outcome, therefore, the appeals process has yet to be implemented.

- k) collaborates with other EQAAs, if possible, in areas such as exchange of good practices, capacity building, review of decisions, provision of transnational education, joint projects, and staff exchanges.**

MET

ANPADEH participates in COPAES meetings twice a year, and once a year in a general meeting with all EQAA that are part of COPAES.

Other activities include congresses and other meetings with architectural education institutions such as: ASINEA (twice a year); special events with national and international agencies in Mexico and abroad throughout the year (CENEVAL, Universidad de Guadalajara, Cuba, Spain, etc.).

- l) has policies relating to both imported and exported higher education.**

MET

The documents that meet this requirement are:

- *Marco General para los procesos de Acreditación de la ANPADEH (General Framework for the Accreditation Process of the ANPADEH), Pages 3, 4*
- *General Manual for the Accreditation Processes of the ANPADEH, Pages 3, 4*

V. UNESCO-UIA *Charter for Architectural Education*

Commentary:

Two additional documents (listed in Sections B.5.b.1 and B5.b.2, both in Spanish) were provided to the Team during the Visit that include two different lists of curriculum competencies, neither of which were compliant with the *UNESCO-UIA Charter* list.

[*Note: Instrumento de Evaluacion en Sitio Con Fines de Acreditacion de Programas Educativo*, document B.5.b.2, which functions as the Visiting Team’s template report, is drawn directly from the document, *ANPADEH General Manual for the Accreditation Processes 2016*, which overlaps the document *APADEH Self Study Instrument 2016* which, both provided to this Team in English]

As explained to the Canberra Accord Team by ANPADEH representatives and the Coordinator of the UVM Visiting Team, these two documents are cross-referenced as part of the process of evaluating the school’s student work. According to these explanations: the list of 23 competencies in the document B.5.c.1 is used directly to evaluate student work, and course outlines are checked for inclusion of these competencies. This evaluation of 23 competencies is then condensed and assimilated into the assessment of the single item 3.5.1 of the document B.5.c.1 (which functions as the equivalent of the Visiting Team Report).

This Team also noted that in Section 5 of the document B.5.a.3 (*ANPADEH-Canberra Accord Self-Analysis 2016*), the first paragraph states:

“As part of its Requirements for Accreditation, ANPADEH has defined a list of 24 indicators that students must demonstrate to acquire the competencies to have a minimum profile. These must met [sic] at a level of ‘awareness,’ ‘understanding,’ or of ‘ability’ for all programs seeking accreditation.”

As explained above, the Accreditation process that ANPADEH Visiting Teams follow does not directly evaluate each of these indicators, but instead indirectly includes assessment of all of the indicators in the Team’s assessment of one item in their report.

In addition, there is not a process in place that determines or distinguishes these indicators at a level of accomplishment (awareness, understanding, or ability), a fact which places the ANHAPDEH Accreditation process at variance with the statement above which is drawn from the document *ANPADEH-Canberra Accord Self-Analysis 2016*.

Therefore, due to the variances described above, this Team was unable to assess the items listed in this Section of the Periodic Review report, and has found all to be Not Met.

- a) an ability to create architectural designs that satisfy both aesthetic and technical requirements.**

NOT MET

- b) an adequate knowledge of the history and theories of architecture and the related arts, technologies, and human sciences.**

NOT MET

- c) knowledge of the fine arts as an influence on the quality of architectural design.**

NOT MET

- d) an adequate knowledge of urban design, planning, and the skills involved in the planning process.**

NOT MET

- e) an understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and between buildings and their environment, and of the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale.**

NOT MET

- f) an understanding of the profession of architecture and the role of the architect in society, in particular in preparing briefs that take into account social factors.**

NOT MET

- g) an understanding of the methods of investigation and preparation of the brief for a design project.**

NOT MET

- h) an understanding of the structural design, constructional, and engineering problems associated with building design.**

NOT MET

- i) an adequate knowledge of physical problems and technologies and of the function of buildings so as to provide them with internal conditions of comfort and protection against the climate.**

NOT MET

- j) the design skills necessary to meet building users' requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations.**

NOT MET

- k) an adequate knowledge of the industries, organizations, regulations, and procedures involved in translating design concepts into buildings and integrating plans into overall planning.**

NOT MET

And, that the following special points be considered in the development of a curriculum:

- l) awareness of responsibilities toward human, social, cultural, urban, architectural, and environmental values, as well as architectural heritage.**

NOT MET

- m) adequate knowledge of the means of achieving ecologically sustainable design and environmental conservation and rehabilitation.**

NOT MET

- n) development of a creative competence in building techniques, founded on a comprehensive understanding of the disciplines and construction methods related to architecture.**

NOT MET

- o) adequate knowledge of project financing, project management, cost control, and methods of project delivery.**

NOT MET

- p) training in research techniques as an inherent part of architectural learning, for both students and teachers.**

NOT MET

B. 4. Commentary

a) Self evaluation by signatory system

On 1 April 2016, the Review Team received documents from the Mexican signatory system, entitled 'ANPADEH Analysis of Compliance Canberra Guidelines' along with other extensive documents. In said documents and in answering the Canberra Accord basic question 5, the signatory system indicated that ANPADEH has defined 24 indicators that students must demonstrate to acquire the competencies to have a minimum profile, and these must be met either at a level of: "awareness", "understanding" and "ability", which set guidelines to assess students' performance outcomes by accrediting teams. No more specific students' performance criteria (NAAB's SPC equivalent) are in place to back up these guidelines, which indicates that each accreditation team follows their own discretion to evaluate students' work. Thus, consistency in assessing the students' performance outcomes remains uncertain.

b) Refer to any changes to system mapped against Accord compliance criteria (see section 1.0 of Rules and Procedures) and any recent challenges to system

No changes to the system have been identified, and there have not been any challenges to the system.

c) Other documentation by signatory system

See Section B.5.

d) Accreditation visit by signatory system

The Visit observed by the Review Team was:

Universidad Del Valle De Mexico, Campus Tlaipan, May 15-18, 2016.

The Review Team had full access to the Accreditation Team and the exhibition of student work and documentation. The Review Team also attended the Accreditation Team's introduction to the School, as well as the Closing Ceremony. (The Visit schedule is attached)

e) Meetings with representatives of signatory system

The Review Team met in the offices of ANPADEH (2^o Patio Antigua Academia de San Carlos Emiliano Zapata # 37) on Monday, May 16th, 2016, from 17:00 to 19:00.

The Review Team met with the following attendees:

- Dr. Jose J. Jimenez – ANPADEH President
- Alfredo Toledo Molina – ANPADEH Executive Director
- Fernando Mora Mora – Review Team Facilitator; Member, ANPADEH Technical Committee

Following a tour of the building, a presentation was made to the Review Team in the office boardroom. The presentation included the following areas:

- Context for Accreditation in México, including historical and political forces
- Institutional Infrastructure for the Evaluation of Higher Education in México
- Historical evolution of ANPADEH
- ANPADEH's Organizational Structure
 - Regulatory Framework
 - Internal Actors
 - External Actors
- ANPADEH's Annual Accreditation Process (calendar of Accreditation activities)
- Principles of ANPADEH
- Mission and Vision 2020
- ANPADEH's Evaluation Process
- Educational Systems in México
- ANPADEH Accredited programs: Mexican, and foreign

Discussion that followed the presentation was very helpful to the Review Team's understanding of ANPADEH's processes and scope.

f) Overview of criteria, policies, and procedures of the system

The Review Team conducted a thorough and comprehensive review of all documents provided prior to, and requested during the Visit. The ANPADEH Accreditation Process can be summarized as:

1. Call for applications (October; November)
2. Receipt of applications (last week of November)
3. Evaluation of applications by the Technical Committee and Notification to Accepted Programs (second week of December)
4. Orientation Workshop for the Accrediting process and completion of the Self-Study Instrument (January-February)
5. Evaluation of the Self-Study Instrument and Visit programming (mid-March)
6. On site Visits (April, May, June)
7. Evaluation of the on site Visit reports by the Technical Committee, and notification of results to the institutions (first week of July)
8. Accreditation Ceremony (August-September)

Sources:

"ANPADEH General Manual for the Accreditation Processes 2016"

"General Context for the Accreditation of Academic Programs," PowerPoint Presentation

g) Conclusion

The Review Team identified the following issues for attention and development by ANPADEH in the near future:

1. **Evaluation process of curriculum:** in the absence of identified student performance criteria (or equivalent), and levels of accomplishment, the Accreditation process lacks consistency from school to school. The clear identification of a set of student performance criteria by ANPADEH would provide a streamlined Accreditation process that would ensure consistency across accredited programs.
2. **Team and Chair training:** Although ANPADEH holds an orientation workshop for Visiting Teams, there is an absence of actual training for both Teams and Chairs. This could be accomplished through an online series of courses, similar to the training of other signatory systems.
3. **Team Composition:** The current ANPADEH Accreditation teams include a member of ANPAHDEH's Technical Committee as Chair, and an alumnus of the program as a voting member. There are no non-voting Observer members, as is the case with other signatory systems. **This composition – particularly having a member of the ANPADEH Technical Committee, which oversees the Applications for Accreditation, act as the Chair of the Accreditation Team - holds the potential for conflict of interest.**

B. 5. Attachments

a) Documentation provided prior to the review visit

1. ANPADEH Canberra Visiting Team Time Schedule 2016
2. ANPADEH General Data Students and Professionals 2016
3. ANPADEH-Canberra Accord Self-Analysis 2016
4. ANPADEH General Manual for the Accreditation Processes 2016
5. ANPADEH Indicative Curriculum 2016
6. ANPADEH Self Study Instrument 2016
7. ANPADEH Accreditation Procedures for Visiting Teams
8. ANPADEH Accredited Programs and General Data as of 2015
9. ANPADEH Example of Accreditation Diploma 2015
10. ANPADEH COPAES Diploma of Compliance

b) Additional information supplied during the review visit

“General Context for the Accreditation of Academic Programs,” PowerPoint Presentation (ANPADEH)

In Spanish:

1. ANEXO 5: Criterios Basicos de Calidad Academica (ANPADEH)
2. Instrumento de Evaluacion en Sitio Con Fines de Acreditacion de Programas Educativos, Version 3.0 (ANPADEH)

c) Review visit agenda and record of meetings

Attached. (Attachment 1)

B. 6. Report Signatures

Accord Reviewer Representing Practice

Accord Reviewer Representing Education

Local Facilitator (observer of above signatures)