CEAB Accreditation Feedback - Visiting Team Vice-Chair

(untitled)

	*		Please comment, particularly
	Yes	No	if you selected no.
1. Do you have sufficient access to the CEAB accreditation criteria?	O	О	

		*		Please comment, particularly
	Yes	Partially	No	if you selected partially or no.
2. Did students have the opportunity to provide feedback on the engineering program during the CEAB accreditation process?	O	0	O	

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

		*			Please provide comments on how the CEAB accreditation			
	Extensively engaged	Moderately engaged	Not engaged	Unknown	process engaged these stakeholders.			
3a. Deans or designated individuals	О	C	О	О				
3b. Students	С	С	С	O				
3c. Faculty	o	o	o	o				
3d. Staff, including student services	0	0	0	0				
3e. Senior administrators (Vice-Provost, Presidents, Principals)	O	0	O	O				
3f. Individuals from other academic or administrative units at the institution that support the engineering program	•	0	0	0				
3g. External stakeholders of HEI, including employers	O	О	О	O				

		*		Please comment, particularly
	Yes	Partially	No	if you selected partially or no.
4. Were the timelines for the accreditation process provided by CEAB clear?	0	O	О	
5. Were CEAB requirements for the materials that HEIs prepare for the visiting team transparent?	O	O	О	
6. Were the criteria used in the CEAB accreditation process transparent?	O	o	0	
7. If asked, could you describe the steps in the CEAB decision-making process for accreditation status?	O	o	O	

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

	*			Please comment, particularly if
	Yes	Partially	No	you selected partially or no.
8a. HEI deans or designated official	O	o	0	
8b. HEI program leads	O	O	О	
8c. CEAB program visitors	O	0	О	
8d. CEAB general visitors	0	O	0	
8e. CEAB visiting team chairs	O	О	0	
8f. Regulators	O	O	О	
8g. Students	O	О	0	
8h. Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB)	O	o	0	
8i. Engineers Canada Board	O	0	О	

Was the visiting team's approach to applying CEAB accreditation criteria						
	Vaa		k NJ-	I halva avvva	Please comment, particularly if you selected partially or no.	
	Yes	Partially	INO	Unknown		
9a. Consistent across engineering programs on this visit?	O	o	O	0		
9b. Consistent with previous visits you have experienced?	O	O	O	o		

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

			*		Diagon comment portioularly
	Yes	Partially	No	Not applicable	Please comment, particularly if you selected partially or no.
10a. If you provided feedback, did you feel your feedback was considered?	O	0	0	O	
10b. Were you informed when change was implemented?	O	O	O	0	

Did you receive sufficient coaching from the CEAB accreditation visiting team chair...

			*		Places comment particularly if you
	Yes	Partially	No	Not applicable	Please comment, particularly if you selected partially or no.
11a. Leading up to the visit?	O	O	O	o	
11b. On-site?	O	O	O	O	

		*		Please comment, particularly
	Yes	Partially	No	if you selected partially or no.
12. Were the accreditation processes, up to and including the visit, aligned with your understanding of CEAB accreditation criteria?	O	0	О	
13. As a visiting team vice-chair, were you trained on how to complete your role in the CEAB accreditation process?	O	O	C	
14. In your interactions, did you feel that the visiting team had the skills, knowledge, and ability to complete their role?	O	0	O	
15. 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)	O	O	c	
16. Overall, do you trust the CEAB accreditation system's assessment of engineering programs?	0	o	0	

		*		Please comment, particularly
	Yes	Partially	No	if you selected partially or no.
17. Was the Complete Questionnaire (including Exhibit 1 and Excel files) designed by CEAB in a way that should make it efficient for visiting team members to review?	0	o	O	
18. Did the visiting team make efficient use of provided information and time on site?	O	O	C	
19. Did the visit schedule include the right amount of time with the right people?	O	O	O	
20. Was the visiting team provided with the information they needed to efficiently assess the engineering program by the HEI?	O	O	0	
21. Was the visiting team provided with the information they needed to efficiently assess the engineering program by the CEAB Secretariat?	O	O	О	
22. In your role as a visiting team vice-chair, were you provided with the tools you needed for your accreditation role?	O	o	O	
23. From your perspective, does the CEAB accreditation process represent an efficient design, where the time and resources you invested were worthwhile?	С	C	О	

24. Please describe any significant POSITIVE outcomes of the CEAB accreditation process.
25. Please describe any significant NEGATIVE outcomes of the CEAB accreditation process.
26. 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.