

2015-16 Accreditation Experiences

John Donald
University of Guelph

Graduate Attribute and Curriculum Improvement
Process (GACIP) Summit

University of Toronto
December 8, 2016

Overview

- Objectives
 1. Share / Learn From experience in 2015-16 Cycle
 2. Provide feedback to CEAB on two observations
- CEAB
 - Provided comments from 2016 Decisions
 - Summarized for discussion
- Approach
 - Small group table discussions
 - Leverage experience in the room
 - Complete and compile worksheets for distribution

Context – CEAB Accreditation Criteria*

3.1 Graduate Attributes

1. A knowledge base for engineering	7. Communication skills
2. Problem analysis	8. Professionalism
3. Investigation	9. Impact of engineering on society and the environment
4. Design	10. Ethics and equity
5. Use of engineering tools	11. Economics and project management
6. Individual and team work	12. Life-long learning


*2015 Accreditation and Criteria Report (for 2016-17 Cycle)

Context – CEAB Accreditation Criteria*

3.2 Continual Improvement

*“Engineering programs are expected to continually improve. There must be processes in place that demonstrate that program **outcomes are being assessed** in the context of the graduate attributes, and that the **results are applied** to the further development of the program.”*

Accreditation Resources Under Development

- See Engineers Canada website The logo for Engineers Canada, featuring a stylized green and blue circular emblem with a leaf-like shape, and the text "engineerscanada" and "ingénieurscanada" in blue and green.
- Draft - Visitors Guide
- Draft - Criterion Guidelines for Sections 3.1 & 3.2
- VT Rate areas as:
 - A = Acceptable
 - M = Marginal
 - U = Unacceptable

<https://engineerscanada.ca/accreditation/accreditation-resources/accreditation-resources-under-development>

Areas Rated by Visiting Team

3.1 Graduate Attributes

Organization and Engagement

Curriculum Maps

Indicators

Assessment Tools

Assessment Results

3.2 Continual Improvement

Improvement Process

Stakeholder Engagement

Improvement Actions

- Concern:
 - Criterion satisfied;
 - **Potential** exists for non-satisfaction in near future.
- Weakness:
 - Criterion satisfied;
 - Insufficient strength of compliance to assure quality of program will be maintained.
- Deficiency:
 - Criterion not satisfied

Findings - 2016 Decisions – Criteria 3.1

Weaknesses

- Organization and Engagement
- Curriculum Maps
- Indicators
- Assessment Tools and Assessment Results

Deficiencies

- Organization and Engagement
- Assessment Tools and Assessment Results

Findings - 2016 Decisions – Criteria 3.2

Concerns

- CI Process
- Stakeholders

Weaknesses

- Improvement Process
- Stakeholder Engagement
- Improvement Actions

Activity 1 – Discussion of 2016 Findings

- Review the 2016 findings for 3.1 and 3.2
- Discuss items relevant to your own situation
- How do the findings fit with experience of those who have been visited recently
- Capture your thoughts and questions related to the findings to meet on the sheets provided

1. The Capstone is heavily relied upon for GA assessment in some cases
 - Feedback on reasons for this?
 - Will assessments be spread out in the future? Why? Why not?

2. Review of materials on day one of the visit is quite rushed for the accreditation team; and compiling the materials can be a significant task for programs.
 - Are programs open to the possibility of sampling of accreditation visit materials?
 - Can we maintain the integrity of the accreditation process using sampling?
 - To help both visiting teams & programs, what might the process look like?

Activity 2 – Feedback to CEAB

- Answer the questions posed in the previous slide on the worksheets provided.
- Report back 1 or 2 ideas
- Collect sheets to consolidate and distribute later