

Program Logic Model for Engineers Canada Accreditation System

Resources

Engineers Canada (Internal)

- Executive Leadership Team
- Accreditation Team
- Organizational Excellence Team
- Communications Team
- Operational Infrastructure Team
- Research
- Community Engagement
- Business Plan
- Annual Operating Plan and Budget
- Terms of Reference & Policies
- Training (for all stakeholders)

Stewardship

- Engineers Canada Board
- Engineering Regulators

Boards, Committees, Expert Group Insight

- Accreditation Board
- Volunteers
- Qualifications Board (input)
- Engineers Change Lab
- Institutions & their staff
- Canadian Federation of Engineering Students
- Training (for all resources)

Suppliers

- Audio Visual Contractors
- Hotels/Venues

Enabling Technology

- Information Exchange Site

Outputs

Visits

- Evidence for decision making (assessments)
- Framework for future system of assessment for foreign credentials

Documentation

- Materials (Standard Letters, Forms, Database, Website, presentations, Engineers Canada Board Reports)
- Repository of potential Volunteers for visits
- Decision Letters
- Certificates
- Key Messages Summary for Corporate Communications
- Meeting Materials (i.e. Minutes, Trip Reports Other Reports)
- Improved processes (program logic model/ process maps)

Customer Services

- Statistics/Trends
- Recommendations re: Criteria
- Advice to Engineers Canada Board

Make Decisions / Progress Mandate / Establish Policies

Meeting Planning / Attendance of: Accreditation Board, Policies & Procedures Committee, Deans' Liaison Committee, Engineers Deans Canada, Association of Accrediting Agencies of Canada, International Engineering Alliance

- Recommended policy changes

Research

- Reports
- Surveys
- Recommendations

Improvements

- Implementation of a Accreditation Technology System
- Stakeholder engagement
- Clear communication messaging
- Volunteer onboarding process, training program & tools
- Improved intake and scoring process

Indicators

The CEAB Accreditation System ...

A. Sufficiently identifies engineering education programs that prepare academically qualified graduates.
B. Has criteria published by CEAB that is sufficiently accessible.

A. Has a lack of denials, deficiencies or assignment of additional academic requirements of graduates of CEAB accredited engineering education programs by regulator licensure boards based on academic qualifications.
B. Meets academic qualification needs of regulator licensure boards.
C. Provides sufficient confidence in minimum standard being consistently applied.

A. Has an appropriate distribution of decisions and identifies criteria with higher rates of deficiency.
B. Allows for innovation, adaptive change and differentiation (i.e. to adapt to regional factors, express their institution's ideals or meet additional educational objectives).
C. Leads to specific actions to enhance the quality of engineering education programs.
D. Engages stakeholders in the CEAB accreditation process.

A. Maintains Washington accord signatory status.
B. Maintains ABET bilateral agreement.
C. Maintains CTI bilateral agreement.

A. Has transparent timelines, transparent requirements for materials and format, and transparent guidance on the criteria.
B. Has a transparent decision-making process for accreditation status.
C. Has clearly described roles and responsibilities.
D. Provides a consistent approach by visiting teams to the CEAB accreditation criteria when evaluating engineering education programs.
E. Maintains Regulators' confidence that the CEAB accreditation process is consistently implemented in accordance with published accreditation policies and criteria.

A. Has processes and results that are perceived to be aligned with criteria.
B. Adequately consults stakeholders, considers feedback and informs them when changes are implemented.
C. Provides sufficient training and coaching for roles.
D. Has visiting teams that are perceived to have sufficient knowledge, skills, ability and support to complete their roles.
E. Is implemented in a manner consistent with the values and ethics of the engineering profession.
F. Is perceived, overall, as trustworthy by stakeholders.

A. Makes available early enough the Questionnaire, criteria, policies, and changes therein.
B. Provides a Questionnaire that is efficient to complete and to review.
C. Efficiently utilizes time during each visit by visiting team and in visit schedule.
D. Provides the Visiting team (Program Visitors, Chair and General Visitor) with the information needed to efficiently assess engineering education programs.
E. Provides tools needed for individuals' CEAB accreditation roles.
F. Overall, represents an efficient design.

Intermediate-Term Outcomes

1. The Accreditation System identifies to engineering regulators the programs that prepare academically qualified individuals.

2. The Accreditation System confirms academic qualifications for licensure across Canada.

3. The Accreditation System promotes high quality and ensures a minimum program standard across Canada.

4. The Accreditation System facilitates graduates' international mobility.

5. The Accreditation System is Transparent.

6. The Accreditation System is Trusted.

7. The Accreditation System is Efficient.

Long-Term Outcomes

Continual improvement of engineering education

Stronger profession

Enablement of domestic and international mobility

Defensible & transparent accreditation process

Effective use of regulator resources to deliver licensure

