

**AGRICULTURAL INSTITUTE OF CANADA**

**2012 REPORT ON ACCREDITATION**





9 Corvus Court  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K2E 7Z7 Canada  
[www.aic.ca](http://www.aic.ca)

Cover Photo  
Johnston Hall, University of Guelph  
Courtesy Ontario Agricultural College

Agricultural Institute of Canada

**2012 REPORT ON ACCREDITATION**

**Table of Contents**

Acknowledgements .....	1
Accreditation Committee Members .....	1
Introduction to the Accreditation Program .....	2
Accreditation Philosophy .....	2
The Accreditation Program .....	3
Overview .....	3
Accreditation Status .....	4
Initiated Provisional Accreditation .....	4
Maintenance of Accreditation .....	5
Appeal Process .....	5
Accreditation Standards .....	6
Precepts .....	6
The Program .....	7
Program Coordinator .....	9
Faculty .....	9
Students .....	10
Curriculum .....	11
Graduates .....	12
Resources .....	12
External Advice .....	13
Outcomes for Education in Agrology .....	13
Definitions .....	13
Programs Granted Accreditation, by Institution .....	15
Accreditation Review Schedule .....	17
Substantial Equivalency .....	18
Programs Granted Substantial Equivalency, by Institution .....	18
Substantial Equivalency Review Schedule .....	19

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Accreditation Program is heavily reliant on the help of numerous volunteers, most notably members of the Site Review Teams and the Accreditation Committee members. It also relies on the support and assistance from the students, alumnae and employers. The Agricultural Institute of Canada gratefully acknowledges the time and expertise given and thanks these volunteers for their support.

## ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Director of Accreditation  
Dr. Bryan Harvey, OC, SOM, FAIC, PAg

Accreditation Program Manager  
Tom Beach, FGSAP, FAIC, FGHIH (Ex officio)  
Agricultural Institute of Canada

Douglas D. Hedley (Ex officio)  
Executive Director  
Canadian Faculties of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine

Gary Myrden, B.Sc., MEd, PAg  
Campus Administrator  
College of the North Atlantic

Dr. Bert Christie, PAg  
Research Scientist (retired)

Dr. Dian Patterson, PAg  
Nova Scotia Agricultural College

Margaret Mann, PAg  
Fredericton, New Brunswick

Dr. David J. Hume, PAg  
Professor Emeritus  
Department of Plant Agriculture  
University of Guelph

Frederick A. Holm, PAg  
Professor, Dept of Plant Sciences  
University of Saskatchewan

George Jones  
Business Finance Consultant PAg (retired)

Arthur Bomke  
British Columbia

## INTRODUCTION

In November of 1993 the Deans of Agriculture from eight Canadian Universities requested the Agricultural Institute of Canada, in cooperation with l'Ordre des agronomes du Québec, to set up a process of accreditation for programs in agriculture leading to qualification to practice the profession of Agrology. It was recognized that Faculties of Agriculture had evolved and grown well beyond the traditional bounds of agriculture. A number of the programs offered did not lead to the practice of Agrology. At the same time, there was an increased mobility of professionals not only nationally but globally. The Deans recognized the importance to provide the opportunity for graduates to work wherever employment opportunities present themselves. They also recognized the importance that employers are guaranteed that graduates meet professional standards that are accredited nationally and recognized internationally.

Over the next three years the AIC reviewed the accreditation programs of other professions and, with OAQ, developed the joint AIC-OAQ Accreditation Program as outlined in a manual which was approved by the Deans of faculties of agriculture and the provincial institutes of agrologists in 1997.

Over the next year the Accreditation Committee was formed, Charter Accreditation status was granted to programs at the eight participating institutions and a pool of qualified individuals was developed from which to select Site Review Team members. The first site review occurred in early 1999 and, over the next six years programs at all eight institutions were reviewed.

In 2004 an initial review of the program was done by the Accreditation Program Manager and an evaluation team selected. The evaluation and revision of the Accreditation Manual involving representatives of the Deans and the Provincial Institutes occurred in early 2005.

University program accreditation is viewed as a means of ensuring that academic experience obtained in the program meets with national professional standards. The criteria and guidelines however, are intended to encourage creativity and innovation in agricultural education.

A program in this document refers to a sequence of courses taken by a student in order to attain expertise in a specific aspect of agriculture and to obtain a baccalaureate degree. Examples include, but are not limited to, animal science, soil science, agricultural economics, crop science, agroecology, environmental studies, food science, rural engineering and horticulture. Such programs lead to qualification to practice the profession of agrology.

## ACCREDITATION PHILOSOPHY

Contrary to common usage, the term accreditation philosophy does not refer to individuals or to institutions, but refers to the evaluation of educational programs. Accreditation is the process to determine and to certify the achievement and maintenance of reasonable and appropriate national standards of education for professionals.

The guidelines for accreditation provide a framework for undergraduate curriculum development and evaluation. The responsibility for curriculum development rests with the university. The university has the freedom and flexibility to plan a program that is compatible with its philosophy and organizational structure. The establishment of minimum educational standards for granting professional designation resides with the professional associations.

Accreditation is one aspect of the evaluation of an educational program. The process includes the components of evaluation which are obtained by self-assessment and peer review rather than an inflexible disciplinary process. The faculty of the university has the responsibility to demonstrate how the program meets the educational guidelines.

The accreditation team evaluates the faculty documents from the perspective of non-involvement in the program. The members of the accreditation team are selected on the basis of their leadership in agrology education and practice. They participate actively with the university faculty in all aspects of the consultative exercise, in the review of the self-study, in the site visit and in the evaluation report.

Accreditation of university agrology programs is a process which provides support for programs and initiatives for development. Accreditation can assist universities in addressing educational issues which will affect the future practice of the profession. The accreditation process provides an opportunity for practising members of the profession to consult with educators and to share concerns related to the professional practice.

## THE ACCREDITATION PROGRAM

### Overview

Faculties applying for accreditation status for their programs should notify the Director of Accreditation of their intention and begin a comprehensive self-analysis of program objectives and outcomes several months prior to completing the self-study report. The format outline for the self-study report is included in the AIC Accreditation Program Manual ([http://www.aic.ca/agrology/pdf/Accred\\_2005.pdf](http://www.aic.ca/agrology/pdf/Accred_2005.pdf)). The self-study report is designed to provide basic information for the accreditation surveyors and the Accreditation Committee. It is the responsibility of the university to provide documentation to verify that the programs meet the national standards for accreditation.

A date for the program(s) accreditation is arranged by the Director of Accreditation in conjunction with the university. Normally all programs being considered at an institution would be evaluated simultaneously.

The completed self-study report is sent to the Director of Accreditation and reviewed to assure that all required information has been included.

The report is then forwarded to the site surveyors, appointed by the Committee in consultation with the university. One surveyor is designated as the senior surveyor who will act as chair.

The surveyors review the self-study report, conduct a two or three day site visit and prepare a report. For more details about the Site Visit refer to the AIC Accreditation Program Manual. The report is forwarded to the Accreditation Committee for approval. The Committee considers the report and determines accreditation standing.

The university Accreditation Coordinator will receive a letter indicating accreditation status within three months of the site visit.

## Accreditation Status

**Tentative accreditation** is granted to a new program or a program which has not been accredited previously. It is granted after the self-study report is submitted and demonstrates compliance with the accreditation standards and published policies. A site visit will be scheduled following the graduation of at least one class of students.

**Full accreditation** is granted to a program in compliance with the Standards for Accreditation. Full accreditation is granted for a period of **seven** years.

**Provisional accreditation** is granted to a program which fails to comply with the Standards for Accreditation and where it would require relatively minor changes to comply with the Standards of Accreditation. Deficiencies must be corrected within **two years** or accreditation is withdrawn.

Provisional accreditation is withdrawn when a program fails to comply with the Standards for Accreditation within the specified time period of two years. Students enrolled in the program **at the time of provisional accreditation** are considered graduates of an accredited program upon successful completion of the program.

If accreditation is withdrawn, a period of 2 years must elapse before application can be made for a renewal of accreditation.

### AIC Initiated Provisional Accreditation

The status of accreditation will be changed to provisional accreditation when the program does not comply with one or more of the requirements for maintaining accreditation. These include submission of annual updates by the scheduled due dates and notification of significant academic changes in a program within 90 calendar days of the changes.

Accreditation status decisions may be appealed. The appeal process is outlined on page 5. Decisions are considered final when the time limit for initiating an appeal lapses or after an appeal is complete.

Programs with accreditation status will receive a certificate from AIC recognizing the status and will be placed on a list of accredited university programs presented in AIC's annual Accreditation Report.

## Maintenance of Accreditation

An annual update of the status of accredited programs is reviewed by the AIC Accreditation Committee. Faculties will be sent a letter in the fall of each year requesting a status report describing any major changes and an explanation of any impact that would have on accreditation status.

A major change in an accredited program is one that may significantly affect its quality, objectives, scope, or location of educational offerings; the degree offered; or control. The following are examples:

1. A significant change in the program's mission or objectives;
2. A change in the philosophical underpinning of the curriculum;
3. Any change in the legal status, sponsorship, or control of the institution that offers the program;
4. A merger or affiliation with another institution;
5. A significant change in quantity of education offered in the program, including the addition of course or programs that represent a significant departure in terms of content or method of delivery from those offered at the time of the AIC Accreditation Program's most recent evaluation of the program;
6. Greater than one-third of the learning outcomes/intents are changed;
7. A change in the credential awarded for completion of the program;
8. A change in the way educational quantity of the program is measured, such as from clock hours to credit hours;
9. The initiation of a branch campus, centre or teaching clinic where students are permanently assigned, or another instructional site in an area or region not previously served, where students may fulfil any portion of their degree requirements.

## Appeal Process

1. All decisions shall be final unless the Director of Accreditation receives a written request for reconsideration from the faculty within 30 days of the date of receipt of the notice of that decision.
2. The written request for reconsideration of a decision must include a concise statement of the reason(s) for contesting the decision. Information provided should be based on information available at the time the decision was made.
3. Upon receipt of the request for appeal, an appeal committee must be activated.
4. The appeal hearing will take place within two months of the appeal request.
5. Costs associated with the Accreditation Coordinator's attendance at the appeal hearing will be paid by the university.
6. The President of the Agricultural Institute of Canada will name 3 members to the ad hoc Appeal Committee for the university in question. None of the members will have had an affiliation with the program, filing the appeal, or with the accreditation process related to the program.

7. The Appeal Committee will review the self-study report and the report of the on-site accreditation review during the appeal hearing.
8. New information will not be considered by the Appeal Committee. Changes made to the program which were not described in the original documents will not be considered.
9. The decision of the Appeal Committee will be forwarded to the AIC Accreditation Committee.
10. The faculty will be notified of the decision by mail within two months of the appeal hearing. Notification will include a statement of specific findings.

## ACCREDITATION STANDARDS FOR BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS IN AGROLOGY

### Precepts

The following precepts guided the development of the criteria and guidelines for accreditation.

1. The primary purpose of accreditation is to evaluate the program according to the educational guidelines approved by the AIC.
2. Reduced to its simplest terms the requirement for accreditation is that a program must be capable of producing graduates who are academically prepared to complete experiential requirements for membership in a Provincial Institute of Agrologists or l'Ordre des agronomes du Québec and to practice agrology.
3. The evaluation criteria for accreditation should allow and encourage program flexibility, innovation and growth.
4. The intent of accreditation is not to limit or set the objectives of an educational program but to ensure that the objectives required for accreditation are encompassed within them.
5. The accreditation team will utilize judgement with respect to the application of the accreditation standards. The expectation is that programs will meet all criteria.

## ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

### The Program

#### A. Program Philosophy

##### Criterion

- (i) There is an explicit philosophy which guides the program.

##### Guideline

Evidence is provided that the philosophy is reflected in the program and guides the continuing development and evaluation of the program.

#### B. Program Objectives

##### Criteria

- (i) Program objectives reflect the program's philosophy.
- (ii) Program objectives provide a basis for program planning and for evaluation of the program.
- (iii) Program objectives identify the foundation of professional practice in agrology.

##### Guidelines

There is an explicit statement of program objectives.

The objectives are coherent with the philosophy of the program.

Faculty and students involved in the program are aware of the program objectives and their meaning.

There is a plan setting out ways in which the institution evaluates achievement of program objectives.

## C. Program Organization

### Criteria

- (i) The organization of a program and its location in the administrative structure facilitates the achievement of program objectives and quality education.
- (ii) The professional nature of the program is explicitly acknowledged by the institution.
- (iii) Primary responsibility for curriculum development and program standards rests with the university faculty.
- (iv) University faculty and students participate in systematic planning and evaluation of the program.
- (v) There is a systematic effort to consider reports of the progress of graduates in their professional careers and include these considerations in program planning.
- (vi) There is a systematic effort to consider input from employers of program graduates and from the Provincial Institute of Agrologists or l'Ordre des agronomes.

### Guidelines

- Evidence is presented on the appropriateness of the program location (administratively and academically) within the institution and the ways in which the location facilitates achievement of program objectives and quality education.
- The program is listed as such in the university calendar and identified as a program leading to professional qualifications.
- Program faculty hold regular, formal meetings to review curriculum and courses and for program planning.
- There is provision for student representation or input to meetings of curriculum committees.
- Periodic reports on career progress of graduates are solicited and are considered in program planning.
- Periodic reports on employer and professional organization views are solicited and considered in program planning.

## Accreditation Coordinator

### Criteria

- (i) The program has a designated Accreditation Coordinator. (e.g. Dean, Assoc. Dean-Acad).
- (ii) The role of the Accreditation Coordinator is to provide academic leadership for the program(s).
- (iii) The Accreditation Coordinator is responsible for communication with the AIC concerning the program.

### Guidelines

The Accreditation Coordinator is a member of the academic unit in which the program is located.

The Accreditation Coordinator has a major time and career commitment to the program.

The Accreditation Coordinator is professionally qualified and provides evidence of continuing development. (e.g. scholarly publication, continuing education, active participation on committees, scientific and professional organizations).

The Accreditation Coordinator is responsible for submission of documentation on the program. Communications with regard to implementation of recommendations of the Accreditation Committee will be directed to the Accreditation Coordinator.

## Faculty (including the Accreditation Coordinator)

### Criteria

- (i) The number and type of faculty are sufficient for the achievement of program objectives.
- (ii) The faculty are academically and professionally qualified for their responsibilities to the program.
- (iii) The responsibilities of faculty are designated by the director or the Dean, including teaching, research, extension and public service.

### Guidelines

The program faculty have appropriate training and experience to give them expert knowledge of the discipline area and of the branch(s) of agriculture relevant to the program.

Program faculty will provide evidence of continuing development in their profession (e.g. teaching skill development, scholarly publication, continuing education, active participation in professional activities and public service).

The number of faculty is sufficient to provide quality education to the students in the program.

Criteria for recruitment, tenure and promotion and the expectations for scholarly activity and research of faculty in the program are at least equal to those for faculty in other units of the university.

## Students

### Criteria

- (i) There is an explicit statement of standards for admission, continuation of study and graduation.
- (ii) There is a formal system for counseling students on the course of study and about career opportunities.
- (iii) Students are encouraged to develop professional attitudes.

### Guidelines

Requirements for admission, continuation of study, and graduation are published by the university.

There is documentation of a formal system of counselling students in the program on the course of study and career opportunities. Counsellors are individuals in the teaching program who are academically and professionally qualified for the task.

There is evidence of student participation in activities, which are related to professional development.

## Curriculum

### Criteria

- (i) The curriculum is consistent with the philosophy and objectives of the program.
- (ii) The curriculum provides for the sequential development of the knowledge required for professional practice.
- (iii) The curriculum provides for the acquisition of a sound basic background, knowledge of the agriculture industry and in-depth knowledge of an area of specialization.
- (iv) The curriculum includes opportunities for students to develop an appreciation of professional ethics and professional attitudes relevant to practice.
- (v) The curriculum provides for the development of skills in written and oral communication.
- (vi) The curriculum provides for the development of computer skills
- (vii) The curriculum provides for the development of skills in critical analysis and problem solving.
- (viii) The curriculum provides for the development of skills in teamwork for planning and problem solving. The curriculum takes advantage of unique or distinctive features of the university and community environment in which the program is located.
- (ix) The curriculum takes advantage of unique or distinctive features of the university and community environment in which the program is located.

### Guidelines

Evidence is presented as to how the curriculum facilitates fulfilment of program philosophy and objectives.

Evidence is presented as to how the curriculum develops knowledge in a logical sequence.

Applied experiences such as laboratory courses and field experiences are planned for throughout the program. These have stated learning objectives and are appropriately evaluated.

Evidence is presented that the curriculum provides for discussions regarding professional ethics and practice. Faculty members' scholarly and professional activities provide role models of professionalism. Unique features of the curriculum are described.

Evidence is presented as to show the development of skills in computer use, communication, problem solving, critical thinking and writing to integrate knowledge.

Evidence is presented to show how students work on projects in teams.

## Graduates

### Criterion

- (i) Graduates of the program perform satisfactorily in the workplace.

### Guidelines

Evidence of employer satisfaction is provided.

## Resources

### Criteria

- (i) The university is committed to the program.
- (ii) The academic resources of the university are sufficient to meet the curriculum requirements of the program.
- (iii) The physical facilities available to the program are adequate for the achievement of the program objectives

### Guidelines

There is a written statement from the university administration in support of the program.

There is a statement of commitment to continuation of program support from the administrative head of the unit in which the program is located.

Faculty/student ratio in program courses is conducive to student learning and achievement of program goals.

Physical facilities for the program are adequate and appropriate for achievement of program objectives. Program facilities include faculty office space, conference rooms and student study space and laboratory space.

There is adequate clerical and technical support for the Program Coordinator and program faculty.

Library resources such as number, currency, and accessibility of books, journals and other pertinent materials are demonstrated to be sufficient to meet the needs of the program.

Courses required for the program are available within the institution and open to students in the program.

Computer facilities are available for both faculty and students.

Evidence is provided that the program receives adequate attention from support services related to student recruitment, program promotion and public relations.

## External Advice

Criterion	Guidelines
(i) The program will have a mechanism for obtaining external advice on a regular basis.	A statement describes how external advice is obtained and utilized

## Outcomes for Education in Agrology

The baccalaureate program should provide graduates with the following:

- a sound basis in appropriate natural and social sciences;
- a general knowledge of the agri-food system;
- sufficient depth in the area of specialization;
- the ability to think critically and solve problems especially in a team context;
- the ability to communicate orally and in writing;
- computer literacy;
- an appreciation of the arts and humanities;
- an understanding of the elements of the business of agriculture;
- knowledge of the profession of agrology and of ethical professional behaviour.

## Definitions

**Accreditation** — a process, an external review of an educational program designed to maintain predetermined standards and ensure uniform, reciprocal qualifications for graduates.

**Accreditation Coordinator** — the person appointed by the Dean who is responsible for coordinating the institution's participation in the accreditation process.

**Criterion** — a predetermined element or specified expectation forming the basis for testing or judging whether a standard has been met.

**Curriculum** — an educational plan which includes content, instructional methods, and evaluation measures.

**AIC/OAQ Educational Guidelines** — elements of education that are basic to entrance to the profession of agrology.

**PAG** — an individual who qualifies to practice the profession of agrology as recognized by membership in a provincial Institute of Agrologists or l'Ordre des agronomes du Québec.

**Evaluation** — the process of rating or appraising achievement of a pre-determined standard or goal.

**Faculty** — the academic faculty with primary responsibility to the program.

**Goal** — a statement of purpose or intent toward which effort is directed.

**Guideline** — a statement that amplifies a criterion or provides an example of how a criterion may be

interpreted.

**Objective** — a specific statement identifying desired accomplishments.

**Philosophy** — a statement of belief that serves to guide the planning and activities for an institution or program.

**Professional Courses** — those courses of instruction in agricultural subjects which provide didactic learning required for agrology practice.

**Program** — a collection of academic and professional courses designed to provide a total number of credits in a professional field to meet requirements for a baccalaureate degree; usually what appears in a calendar listing.

**Standard** — something that is established by general consent or authority as a model or example to be followed.

## ACCREDITED AGROLOGY PROGRAMS BY INSTITUTION

### **McGill University, Macdonald Campus**

Agricultural Economics 1998 - 2009

Agricultural Sciences 1998 - 2009

Animal Science 1998 - 2009

Plant Science 1998 - 2009

Agricultural Engineering 1998 - 2009

### **Dalhousie University (formerly Nova Scotia Agricultural College)**

Agribiology, Pest Management 1998 - 2007

Agricultural Business 1998 -

Agricultural Chemistry 1998 - 2007

Agricultural Economics 1998 -\*

Agricultural Environmental Studies 1998 - 2007

Agricultural Mechanization 1998 - 2007

Animal Science 1998 -

Aquaculture 1998 - \*

Bio-Environmental Systems Management 2007 -

Environmental Sciences 2007 -

Plant Science 1998 -

### **Université Laval**

Agronomy 1998 - 2008

Agrifood Economics and Management 1998 - 2008

Agro-Environmental Engineering 1998 - 2008

Food Science and Technology 1998 - 2008

### **University of Alberta**

Agricultural and Resource Economics 1998 - 2010

Animal Science 1998 - 2010

Crop and Horticultural Sciences 1998 - 2010

Range and Pasture Management 1998 - 2010

Sustainable Agricultural Systems 1998 - 2010  
Agricultural Business Management 1998 - 2010

**University of British Columbia**

Agroecology 1998 - 2011

**University of Guelph**

Agricultural Business 1998 - 2007  
Agricultural Economics 1998 -  
Agroecosystem Management 1998 - 2007  
Agronomy 1998 - 2007  
Animal Science 1998 -  
Crop, Horticulture and Turfgrass Sciences 2007 -  
Horticultural Science and Business 1998 - 2007  
Honours Agriculture 1998 -  
Organic Agriculture 2007 -  
Urban Landscape Management 2007 - \*

**University of Manitoba**

Agronomy 1998 - 2009  
Animal Science 1998 - 2009  
Plant Systems 1998 - 2009  
Agribusiness 1998 - 2009  
Agricultural Economics 1998 - 2009  
Agroecology 1998 - 2009  
Food Science 1998 - 2009

**University of Saskatchewan**

Agricultural Biology 1998 - \*  
Agricultural Business 2007 -  
Agricultural Chemistry 1998 - 2007 \*  
Agricultural Economics 1998 -  
Agronomy 1998 - 2007

Animal Science 1998 -  
Applied Microbiology 1998 - 2007  
Crop Science 1998 - 2007  
Environmental Science 1998 -\*  
Food and Applied Microbiological Sciences 2007 -  
Food Science 1998 - 2007  
Horticulture Science 1998 - 2007  
Mechanized Agriculture 1998 - 2007  
Plant Ecology 1998 - 2007\*  
Plant Science 2007 -  
Rangeland Resources 1998 - 2007\*  
Soil Science 2007 -

\* In Québec, under legislation, academic qualifications for acceptance into the profession are judged by specific numbers of credits for each discipline. We refer to this as Equivalency Requirements.

The programs marked with an asterix (\*) did not have sufficient credits in all the discipline areas and, as such, OAQ will not accept graduates from them as having the academic requirements for acceptance into the profession.

Graduates from these programs can still apply for acceptance into the profession in Québec and will be judged on a case by case basis which takes into consideration elective courses, background, additional education and experience.

## Review Schedule

### 2014

Dalhousie University (Nova Scotia Agricultural College)  
University of Guelph  
University of Saskatchewan

### On Request

Université Laval  
McGill University, Macdonald Campus  
University of Manitoba  
University of Alberta  
University of British Columbia

## **SUBSTANTIAL EQUIVALENCY**

Evaluations of university agriculture education programs leading to baccalaureate degrees in Canada are conducted by the Agrology Accreditation Program (AAP) which is managed by the Agricultural Institute of Canada (AIC) in cooperation with Canadian provincial institutes of agrology and universities and colleges. AIC works with them to ensure the highest standards of education in agriculture.

Evaluation of university agriculture education programs leading to baccalaureate degrees in Canada are conducted by the AIC upon request by institutions granting the degree. If a program meets the accreditation criteria, it is granted the label of Full Accreditation.

The AAP expanded its mandate to include evaluations of agricultural programs outside Canada in 2007. These evaluations follow AAP policies and procedures and may lead to a decision of Substantial Equivalency of programs in foreign institutions. Since AAP accreditation was designed to ensure that graduates of accredited institutions receive an education satisfying the academic requirements for registration in the provincial Institutes of Agrology and the OAQ within Canada, AAP uses the term “accreditation” only within Canada. Evaluations conducted outside Canada are called Substantial Equivalency evaluations.

## **AGROLOGY PROGRAMS GRANTED SUBSTANTIAL EQUIVALENCY, BY INSTITUTION**

### **United Arab Emirates University, College of Food and Agriculture**

Horticulture 2008 –  
Agribusiness 2008 –  
Animal Science 2008 – 2009  
Marine Fisheries 2008 – 2009  
Marine Fisheries and Animal Science 2009 -

### **King Saud University, College of Food and Agriculture Sciences**

Agricultural Economics 2009 –  
Agricultural Engineering 2009 -  
Animal Production 2009 –  
Food Science and Human Nutrition 2009 –  
Plant Production 2009 –  
Plant Protection 2009 –  
Soil Science 2009 –  
Agricultural Extension and Rural Society 2010 –  
Soil Science 2010-

### **King Faisal University, College of Agricultural and Food Sciences**

Food Science and Technology 2012 –

## **Substantial Equivalency Review Schedule**

United Arab Emirates University 2016

King Saud University 2017

King Faisal University 2018