

CEAB Accreditation Feedback - HEI Post-Visit

(untitled)

	*		Please comment, particularly if you selected no.
	Yes	No	
1. Does the CEAB accreditation system sufficiently identify engineering programs that prepare academically qualified graduates for licensure?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
2. Do you have sufficient access to the CEAB accreditation criteria?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>

	*		If you responded yes or partially, what obstacle(s) did you encounter at your institution?
	Yes	No	
3. Has the CEAB accreditation process posed an obstacle to innovative and adaptive change for engineering programs at your institution?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>

	*			Please comment, particularly if you selected partially or does not allow.
	Sufficiently allows	Partially allows	Does not allow	
4. To what extent does the CEAB accreditation process allow for differentiation of your engineering program (e.g. to adapt to regional factors, express your institution's ideals, or meet additional educational objectives)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<div style="border: 1px solid gray; height: 60px; width: 100%;"></div>

	*			Please comment, including describing the actions accreditation led to (e.g., changes to capstone, increasing internships, course assessment changes, admission changes...):
	Yes	Partially	No	
5. Did the CEAB accreditation process lead to specific actions to enhance the quality of the engineering program?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<div style="border: 1px solid gray; height: 60px; width: 100%;"></div>

To what extent was each of the following stakeholder groups engaged by the CEAB accreditation process?

	*				Please provide comments on how the CEAB accreditation process engaged these stakeholders.
	Extensively engaged	Moderately engaged	Not engaged	Unknown	
6a. Deans or designated individuals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
6b. Students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
6c. Faculty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
6d. Staff, including student services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
3e. Senior administrators (Vice-Provost, Presidents, Principals)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
6f. Individuals from other academic or administrative units at your institution that support the engineering program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
6g. External stakeholders of HEI, including employers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>

	*			Please comment, particularly if you selected partially or no.
	Yes	Partially	No	
7. Were the timelines for the accreditation process provided by CEAB clear?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
8. Were CEAB requirements for the materials that HEIs prepare for the visiting team transparent?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
9. Were the criteria used in the CEAB accreditation process transparent?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
10. If asked, could you describe the steps in the CEAB decision-making process for accreditation status?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>

If you were asked, could you describe the following roles and responsibilities in the CEAB accreditation process?

	*			Please comment, particularly if you selected partially or no.
	Yes	Partially	No	
11a. HEI deans or designated officials	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
11b. HEI program leads	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
11c. CEAB program visitors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
11d. CEAB general visitors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
11e. CEAB visiting team chairs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
11f. Regulators	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
11g. Students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
11h. Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
11i. Engineers Canada Board	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>

Was the visiting team's approach to applying CEAB accreditation criteria ...

	*				Please comment, particularly if you selected partially or no.
	Yes	Partially	No	Unknown	
12a. Consistent across engineering programs on this visit?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
12b. Consistent with previous visits you have experienced?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>

When changes to CEAB accreditation criteria or procedures have been considered...

	*				Please comment, particularly if you selected partially or no.
	Yes	Partially	No	Not applicable	
13a. Did you feel consulted?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
13b. Did you have an opportunity to provide feedback on proposals?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
13c. If you provided feedback, did you feel your feedback was considered?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
13d. Were you informed when change was implemented?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>

	*			Please comment, particularly if you selected partially or no.
	Yes	Partially	No	
14. Were the accreditation processes, up to and including the visit, aligned with your understanding of CEAB accreditation criteria?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
15. As a HEI dean or designated official or program lead, were you trained on how to complete your role in the CEAB accreditation process?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
16. In your interactions, did you feel that the visiting team had the skills, knowledge, and ability to complete their role?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
17. In your experience, has the implementation of the CEAB accreditation process been consistent with the values and ethics of the engineering profession? (e.g., act professionally, manage conflicts of interest, respect your scope of practice, show your work)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
18. Overall, do you trust the CEAB accreditation system's assessment of engineering programs?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>

	*			Please comment, particularly if you selected partially or no.
	Yes	Partially	No	
19. Was the Questionnaire available early enough to allow for efficient data collection during the snapshot year?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
20. Were the CEAB accreditation criteria and policies made available early enough to allow for efficient data collection during the snapshot year?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
21. Were you made aware of changes to CEAB accreditation criteria and procedures far enough in advance to allow for efficient data collection during the snapshot year?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
22. Was the Complete Questionnaire (including Exhibit 1 and Excel files) and accompanying instructions designed in a way that made it efficient to complete?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
23. Did the visiting team make efficient use of provided information and time on site?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
24. Did the visit schedule include the right amount of time with the right people?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
25. In your role as a HEI dean or designated official or program lead, were you provided with the tools you needed for your accreditation role?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>
26. From your perspective, does the CEAB accreditation process represent an efficient design, where the time and resources you invested were worthwhile?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="text"/>

27. Please describe any significant POSITIVE outcomes of the CEAB accreditation process.

28. Please describe any significant NEGATIVE outcomes of the CEAB accreditation process.

29. Please provide any additional comments or ideas you would like to share with us about the CEAB accreditation system, including but not limited to comments on visit documents such as the Questionnaire, the visit process, or schedule; advice provided by Engineers Canada staff or the visiting team chair; and this feedback process.