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DEFINITIONS
For the purpose of this policy:

Act means the Engineering Professions Act (No. 46 of 2000).

Appeal Committee means a committee constituted in terms of Rule 5.

Appellant means the education provider who is the applicant in Rule 1.

CEO (Chief Executive Officer) is the person appointed in terms of section 8(1) of the Engineering Professions Act (No. 46 of 2000).

Council means the Engineering Council of South Africa established in terms of Section 2 of the Engineering Professions Act (No. 46 of 2000).

Education Committee means a committee with delegated power of Council to make decisions on education programmes, to grant accreditation with or without conditions and to withhold or withdraw accreditation.

Provider means a higher education institution that provides engineering education programmes.
1. DOCUMENT CUSTODIAN

The custodian of this document is the Research Policy and Standards Division. The Regulatory Functions Division is responsible for its implementation.

2. PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

The Engineering Profession Act (No. 46 of 2000) defines appeal procedures for persons aggrieved by decisions regarding registration and disciplinary matters. The Act does not make explicit provision for appeals against accreditation decisions. Decisions by the Engineering Council of South Africa (ECSA) in regard to the accreditation of higher education programmes affect both the providers of the programmes and their students and graduates. Natural justice, therefore, dictates that an appeal mechanism relating to adverse accreditation decisions should be open to providers of programmes.

This policy follows the approach of the ECSA policies on appeals against registration and disciplinary decisions. The policy is guided by Section 40(2) of the Engineering Profession Act, 2000 that allows the Council to delegate powers to its committees but does not permit the delegation of power to hear an appeal. This policy prescribes the procedure for appeals by education providers against decisions of the Education Committee in terms of the policy in document E-01-POL.

This policy applies to appeals after the accreditation decision has been conveyed to the provider by the CEO. The policy does not provide for appeals before the Education Committee has considered the report and recommendation of the accreditation team.

3. APPEAL PROCEDURE

In the normal course of events and in terms of its procedures, the Education Committee must

- consider the findings and recommendations of the team together with any representations made by the provider;
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- make the decision in terms of the powers delegated to it by the Council; and advise
  the provider of its decision accordingly.

If a provider is aggrieved by the decision of the Education Committee in relation to one or
more of its programmes, the following procedure must be followed:

1. The provider may appeal to the Council by lodging such an appeal in writing
   with the CEO within 30 days of the date on which the provider was notified by
   the CEO of the decision of the Education Committee.

2. Such an appeal must be in writing and must set out the grounds on which the
   provider seeks to rely. The necessary information to support these grounds
   must be provided.

3. The CEO may grant an extension of time for the lodging of an appeal for
   reasons deemed sufficient and reasonable.

4. The CEO must submit the appeal together with all documentation lodged with
   the appeal to the Education Committee within 14 days of receipt and request
   the Committee to examine the grounds for the appeal and to furnish its
   comments to the CEO within 21 days after receipt of the request. The
   Chairperson of the Education Committee must determine the process by which
   the Education Committee formulates its comments.

5. The CEO must appoint an Appeal Committee that consists of no more than four
   members from a panel of persons pre-approved by the Council. These persons
   must be appropriately qualified to hear the particular case under appeal. No
   appointed member of the Appeal Committee may be a member of the
   Committee from which the original decision emanated or a member of the team
   that visited the provider.

6. The CEO must designate the Chairperson from the members of the Appeal
   Committee.

7. After receipt of the comments of the Committee referred to in Rule 4, the CEO
   must immediately submit the appeal in question with all supporting
documentation and comments to the Appeal Committee for consideration. At the same time and in consultation with the members of the Appeal Committee, a date and venue for considering the appeal must be determined.

8. The Appeal Committee must invite the appellant to present his/her case and may call on a representative of the committee referred to in Rule 4 to present the views of that committee.

9. The Appeal Committee must consider all evidence presented and reach a decision by majority vote. This decision will have the status of a recommendation. If there is an equality of votes, the chairperson has the casting vote.

10. The CEO must, without delay, submit the recommendation of the Appeal Committee to the Council for decision at its next scheduled meeting. If such a meeting is not scheduled to take place within 60 days of receipt of the appeal, the CEO must, in consultation with the President of Council, convene a special meeting of Council as soon as practicable.

11. The Council may confirm, vary or revoke the recommendation of the Appeal Committee or reach its own decision. The CEO must notify the appellant of the decision and provide him/her with adequate reasons for its decision within 21 days.

12. Any member of Council who was a member of the accreditation team or the Committee that made the decision being appealed may not vote on the appeal at Council.

13. The notification referred to in Paragraph 11 must contain an advice to the appellant that he/she may appeal against the decision to the Council for the Built Environment in terms of Section 21 of the Council for the Built Environment Act (No. 43 of 2000).
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