

Report on the 2021 consultation on the Required Visit Materials Working Group Report

(September 2021)

Contents

1.	Introduction3				
	1.1.	Description of the issue requiring consultation3			
	1.2.	The Required Visit Materials Working Group			
2.	2. 2021 Consultation scope and methodology				
	2.1.	Consultation objectives5			
	2.2.	Consultation approach5			
	2.3.	Website statistics6			
	2.4.	Stakeholders6			
	2.5.	Key questions asked of each stakeholder7			
3.	Fin	dings8			
	3.1 Li	st of stakeholders that provided feedback8			
	3.2 Feedback themes				
4.	I. Recommendations to CEAB10				
5.	De	finitions14			
6.	6. Appendices15				
	Appendix 1: Proposal for consultation15				
	Appendix 2: Engineers Canada's Consultation Process1				
	Appendix 3: Required Visit Materials Consultation Invitation Email				
	Appendix 4: Consultation Presentation Slide Deck24				

Suggested citation (APA 7th edition):

Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board Required Visit Materials Working Group. (2021). *Report on the 2021 consultation on the Required Visit Materials Working Group report.* Engineers Canada, Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board. [hyperlink to webpage]

1. Introduction

1.1. Description of the issue requiring consultation

The Required Materials Working Group was convened to identify the needs of a visiting team to determine the depth, breadth, and quality of a program, including the outcomes assessment program (such as, but not limited to, the course materials, curriculum committee minutes, and details of outcomes). The required materials have varied at least since 2014, and the HEIs are looking for consistency. In addition to the lack of consistency, additional challenges to the current scenario were noted:

- Information requests vary between Visiting Team Chairs, making it difficult for the HEI to plan collection before a Visiting Team Chair has been announced.
- Preparation is intensive for HEIs, and uncertainty with respect to material collection adds to the preparation efforts.
- Information review is intensive for the visiting team.
- Disconnections between course content and competencies, particularly with respect to design, lead to a lack of understanding of courses by the visiting team.
- Engineering programs with a heavy science component sometimes lack student samples in senior courses taught outside the Engineering faculty.
- Information from the HEI may not be standardized from course to course and may not be organized in a manner conducive for efficient review by the visiting team.
- Some HEIs have issues with information access and confidentiality guidelines at their institution with respect to student work.

Promulgated detailed and consistent expectations will help both the visiting teams and HEIs manage workloads and expectations. Not all of these other issues can be addressed by standardizing the required materials (and are outside the scope of the Required Materials Working Group's mandate) but focusing on the minimum materials needed to assess the current criteria is a step on the path forward.

1.2. The Required Visit Materials Working Group

At their September 14, 2019 meeting, the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) struck a working group to examine the on-site material requirements for accreditation visits and to recommend an implementation and consultation approach for any changes. Following its first meeting, the Working Group expanded its scope from on-site materials to all materials required from a program during a CEAB accreditation visit.

The Working Group was composed of the following members:

Members:

Paula R. Klink, P.Eng., Chair Pemberton Cyrus, P. Eng. Ray Gosine, P.Eng. Anne-Marie Laroche, ing. Julius Pataky, P.Eng. Ramesh Subramanian, P.Eng. Advisors: Carol Jaeger, P.Eng. Christine Moresoli, P.Eng. Salvatore Paneduro

Secretariat support:

Aude Adnot-Serra Elise Guest Mya Warken

The Required Visit Materials Working Group reviewed the current expectations for materials and, using the principles of minimum path, weakest link, and audit best practices, are recommending a new set of requirements, which have been simplified and which are each explicitly tied to accreditation criteria.

The primary outcome of the Required Visit Materials Working Group's efforts is a list of requirements for documentation from programs undergoing a CEAB accreditation visit; each requirement is tied directly to a criterion and rationale is provided for each request. At their February 2021 meeting, the CEAB directed the Working Group to confer with the various stakeholders that will be affected by the report's recommendations via a national consultation. This process ran from April 6 to June 4, 2021.

2. 2021 Consultation scope and methodology

2.1. Consultation objectives

The objectives of the consultation on the 2021 report of the Required Visit Materials Working Group Report were to:

- 1. Inform stakeholders that the CEAB is considering making changes to the required materials submitted to the visiting team for accreditation purposes.
- 2. Investigate stakeholder reaction to the Working Group's recommendations.
- 3. Identify the impact of the recommendations to the data-collection needs of programs, accreditation visitors and CEAB members.
- 4. Identify barriers to change if the report recommendations are adopted.
- 5. Develop a reasonable implementation plan that accommodates the diverse viewpoints of stakeholders.

The consultation process had four guiding principles:

- 1. Be inclusive of all relevant stakeholder groups.
- 2. Be transparent.
- 3. Be procedurally fair.
- 4. Encourage feedback (both positive and constructive).

2.2. Consultation approach

In at their February 2021 meeting, the CEAB instructed the Require Visit Materials Working Group to consult with stakeholders on the recommendations made in the document, "The Required Materials for a CEAB Visit Working Group Report" (Appendix 1). In keeping with Engineers Canada's consultation process (Appendix 2), the consultation team used a virtual focus group methodology accompanied by a general call for comments. Focus groups allowed the consultation team to focus on the specific questions of interest with targeted stakeholders of accreditation.

To standardize the consultation meetings as much as possible, the planning team developed the following materials:

- An invitation to participate which describes the process by which stakeholder feedback will be collected and how it will be used, and explains that feedback will be summarized and made available to stakeholders (Appendix 3).
- A presentation slide deck which will be used at every consultation (Appendix 4).
- Engineers Canada <u>web content</u> to inform readers about the consultation process and outcomes.

The "<u>Required Materials for a CEAB Visit Working Group Report</u>" was also used to provide an overview of the recommendations to those participating in the consultation.

Stakeholders were made aware of the consultation process through the Engineers Canada bi-weekly <u>newsletter</u> and the weekly update email from Engineers Canada's CEO. Additionally, a web page dedicated to the consultation was hosted on the Engineers Canada <u>website</u>.

The consultation period opened on April 6, 2021. All stakeholders were invited to participate in two introductory webinars in both English and French, which were recorded and shared on the Engineers Canada <u>website</u>. The webinars provided:

- background on the Working Group's creation and purpose,
- an overview of the recommendations, and
- the ways by which each stakeholder group would be consulted.

The English introductory webinars were held on April 7th and April 12th (with 24 and 19 participants, respectively). The French introductory webinars were held on April 8th and April 13th (with five and 12 participants, respectively).

All stakeholders were then invited to:

- 1. Request a 1-hour webinar or in-person meeting to provide feedback on the recommendations.
- 2. Submit written feedback.

2.3. Website statistics

Page/Item	Unique page	Average time	Number of
	views	spent	downloads
Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board's 2021	298	3:25	N/A
Required Visit Materials Working Group Report			
webpage			
Rapport 2021 du Groupe de travail sur la	75	3:44	N/A
documentation requise du Bureau canadien			
d'agrément des programmes de génie <u>webpage</u>			
The Required Materials for a CEAB Visit Working	N/A	N/A	47
Group Report			
Documents requis dans le cadre des visites du	N/A	N/A	30
BCAPG - Rapport du Groupe de travail			

2.4. Stakeholders

The following stakeholders were invited to participate in the consultation:

- Canadian Federation of Engineering Students (CFES)
- CEAB members
- Engineering Deans Canada (via the DLC), with a request for Deans members to share with faculty
- Engineering regulators' councils/Boards of examiners/Academic review committees (via the CEO Group)
- Higher Education Institutions (HEIs)
- National Admissions Officials Group (NAOG)
- Program visitors from the last three years
- The Graduate Attribute & Continual Improvement Process Network (GAPNet)
- Visit chairs from the last three years, in addition to the CEAB members

Given the diverse structure of each stakeholder group, the primary contact within each organization was invited to request a meeting with members of the Working Group for a tailored consultation focus group.

2.5. Key questions asked of each stakeholder

Each stakeholder was asked to respond to the following questions:

- Does the description of required materials provide responsible individuals (including, but not limited to, designated officials, relevant faculty and administrative staff) with enough guidance on what materials to collect to demonstrate compliance with the CEAB Accreditation Criteria related to:
 - a. Graduate attributes
 - b. Continual improvement
 - c. Students
 - d. Curriculum content
 - e. Program environment
 - f. Additional criteria
- 2. Is the description of required materials sufficient to allow the CEAB to identify those engineering programs whose graduates are academically qualified to begin the process to be licensed as professional engineers in Canada?
- 3. Does the description of required materials represent an actual reduction in the number of materials that programs will have to produce?
- 4. Do you have any other comments regarding the required materials that the CEAB ought to consider at this time?

3. Findings

3.1 List of stakeholders that provided feedback

Table 1 lists the stakeholders that provided feedback, the method by which feedback was provided, and the date it was received.

Stakeholder	Feedback method	Date received
Dan Candido	Email	April 7, 2021
Program Visitor/Past CEAB member		
Hani Henein	Email	April 14, 2021
Program Visitor		
Jen Pelletier	Email	April 15, 2021
University of British Columbia		
Jason Grove	Email	April 26, 2021
University of Waterloo		
Jay Nagendran	Email	May 31, 2021
(On behalf of the Association of Professional		
Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta)		
Carol Jaeger	Email	June 2, 2021
(On behalf of the Engineering faculty at the		
University of British Columbia)		
Marie-José Nollet	Email	June 3, 2021
(On behalf of the Engineering faculty at École de		
technologie supérieure)		
Christine Moresoli	Email	June 4, 2021
(On behalf of the Engineering faculty at the		
University of Waterloo)		
Chris Donaldson	Email	June 4, 2021
(On behalf of the Engineering faculty at York		
University)		
Manu Gill	Email	June 4, 2021
(On behalf of the Engineering faculty at British		
Columbia Institute of Technology)		
Roni Khazaka	Email	June 4, 2021
(On behalf of the Engineering faculty at McGill		
University)		
Bruce Sparling	Email	June 4, 2021
(On behalf of the Engineering faculty at the		
University of Saskatchewan)		

Table 1: List of stakeholders that provided feedback

Input was received from 12 sources, representing individuals, HEIs, and regulatory bodies. In total, approximately 14 pages of materials were generated via the consultation process.

3.2 Feedback themes

The feedback received from the consultation process reflected the following:

- There is general support of the initiative.
- The importance of this initiative was recognized, particularly around improving clarity of current instructions and expectations.
- Some stakeholders expressed a concern that the proposed requirements may not reduce the work required to prepare visit materials (as intended).
- Participants identified areas that remain unclear and required further details.

4. Recommendations to CEAB

In light of the feedback received through the 2021 consultation, the Required Visit Materials Working Group recommends to the CEAB that:

- the existing list of materials programs are required to prepare for an accreditation visit be withdrawn,
- the following instructions be provided instead, in the Questionnaire for Evaluation of an Engineering Program,
- the new instructions be implemented for the 2023/2024 visit cycle (therefore, applied to the Questionnaire that will be published in Fall, 2022), and
- no changes be made to the list of materials programs are required to prepare for an accreditation visit for a 6-year period from implementation.

The following are the instructions that the Required Visit Materials Working Group is recommending to the CEAB be adopted:

Required Materials to Support a CEAB Visit

Definitions

- **Learning Activities:** typically consist of courses, but may include non-coursework requirements such as seminars, training sessions, or work terms as defined by the Program.
- **Core Learning Activities:** Learning Activities that all students must successfully complete to graduate from the Program.
- **Elective Learning Activities:** Learning Activities that supplement the Core Learning Activities. Typically, students must successfully complete a specified number of activities selected from a list of eligible electives to graduate from the Program.
- Minimum Number (M) of Elective Activities Specified by the Program: the number of Elective Learning Activities a student must take to graduate, as specified by the Program.
- Minimum Path: the set of Learning Activities which provide the least number of Accreditation Units (AUs) within each Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board curriculum component, calculated based on Course Information Sheet input. The Minimum Path calculation assumes the student chooses courses with the lowest number of Engineering Science or Engineering Design AUs, which may require the student to complete more Elective Learning Activities than the minimum number **M** specified by the program to meet the Criteria specifications, particularly if a Program offers a significant number of Elective Learning Activities with low Engineering Science or Engineering Design AUs.

Shortest Graduation Path: the smallest set of Learning Activities a student needs to complete to be granted a degree from a program.

- If the Program meets all AU minima in Core Learning activities, the Shortest Graduation Path includes the Core Learning Activities and any **M** Elective Learning Activities.
- If the Program requires Elective Learning Activities to meet AU minima, and the Program has internal mechanisms to constrain Elective Learning Activities to ensure AU minima are met, the Shortest Graduation Path includes the Core Learning Activities and M Elective Learning Activities that follow the constraints.
- If the program requires Elective Learning Activities to meet AU minima, and has no internal mechanisms to constrain Elective Learning Activities to ensure AU minima are met, the Shortest Graduation Path includes the Core Learning Activities and the Elective Learning Activities calculated by the Minimum Path.

Faculty of Engineering (or equivalent): the administrative body governing the program.

Culminating Design Experience: significant design experience based on the knowledge and skills acquired in earlier work, and preferably involves teamwork and project management. A capstone design course is one example of a culminating design experience.

A. Program Operational Information (Criteria 3.1, 3.2, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.4.7, 3.4.8) This information is provided in the questionnaire and associated documents before the visit. Links to documents (or areas in a larger document) that provide a direct answer to the question posed are acceptable. If a precise link to information is not possible, provide a short summary.

B. Graduate Attributes and Continual Improvement Detailed Explanation (Criteria 3.1, 3.2) This information may be given at a presentation to all visiting team members or provided at other meetings during the visit.

- <u>1</u> Explain the strategy of GA/CI, including involvement of teaching staff, curriculum or other committees involved with the process, how the procedures and processes are implemented at program, faculty, and institutional levels, and how these levels participate in the process.
- 2 Describe the philosophy behind the curriculum, including sequencing of courses, highlighting linkages.
- <u>3</u> Explain the choice of indicators, linking to course learning objectives.
- <u>4 Explain philosophy and choice of assessment tools.</u>
- 5 Explain compilation and interpretation of results.
- 6 Explain the improvement process, and how GAs contribute to decisions.
- 7 Describe the program's internal and external stakeholder consultations.
- 8 Discuss improvement actions, their implementation, and timelines.
- <u>9</u> Provide three examples where assessment results were considered as a part of program improvement actions.
- <u>10</u> Evaluate the overall GA/CI process, discuss what is working, what is not working, and any improvements that have been identified and implemented.

C. Detailed Syllabi (Criteria 3.1, 3.4)

Course Syllabi and additional information as required should be provided in electronic form, at a time agreed upon by the Visiting Team Chair and the Program.

- 1 For Core Activities satisfying the Mathematics and Natural Sciences AU requirements, provide course syllabi.
- 2 For Core and Elective Activities satisfying the Engineering Science and Engineering Design AU requirements, provide a week-by-week (or equivalent) description of course content and learning outcomes, indicating engineering tool use and lab experience.
- 3 For Core Activities satisfying the Complementary Studies or Other AU requirements, provide references or links to calendar descriptions; a week-by-week (or equivalent) description of course content is not required. If calendar descriptions don't provide clear evidence of humanities, social sciences, arts, languages, management, engineering economics, or communication content, detailed course syllabi including learning outcomes must be provided.
- 4 For Core and Elective Activities taught outside the Faculty of Engineering (or equivalent) that directly support evidence of Graduate Attributes and are not covered in items C.1 to C.3, provide a detailed, week-by-week (or equivalent) syllabi of course content and expectations, indicating engineering tool use and lab experience.

D. Documentation of Assigned Work and Assessments (Criteria 3.1, 3.4.4, 3.4.6, 3.4.7) Document the assigned work and assessments of the Program's Learning Activities on the Shortest Graduation Path claiming Engineering Science or Engineering Design Accreditation Units. This information should be provided in electronic form when possible, at a time agreed upon by the Visiting Team Chair and the Program.

- 1. Provide problem set questions. If questions are from a textbook, provide the text or copies of the questions.
- 2. Provide laboratory information given to students, as well as detailed marking schemes or detailed rubrics for the Program's Learning Activities on the Shortest Graduation Path. When detailed marking schemes or detailed rubrics are not available, submit up to six samples of marked laboratory work. These samples must include at a minimum three examples of work that in the opinion of the instructor(s) marginally meet expectations at the time of assessment. If all work meets expectations, provide at least three works that, in opinion of the instructor(s), are the lowest quality products.
- 3. Provide project descriptions with detailed marking schemes or detailed rubrics for the Program's Learning Activities on the Shortest Graduation Path. When detailed marking schemes or detailed rubrics are not available, submit up to six samples of marked project work. These samples must include at a minimum three examples of work that in the opinion of the instructor(s) marginally meet expectations at the time of assessment. If all work meets expectations, provide at least three works that, in the opinion of the instructor(s), are the lowest quality products.
- 4. Provide quizzes, tests, exams, and other summative assessments with detailed marking schemes or detailed rubrics, if available for the Program's Learning Activities on the Shortest Graduation Path.

E. Evaluated Student Work (Criteria 3.1, 3.4.4, 3.4.6, 3.4.7)

Evaluated student work should be provided in electronic form when possible, at a time agreed upon by the Visiting Team Chair and the Program.

- 1 For culminating design experiences, provide all student deliverables from ten evaluated projects, including, but not limited to, written reports, physical models, or mathematical models as appropriate. If less than ten projects were completed in the course, include all projects. These samples must include at a minimum, three examples of work that in the opinion of the instructor marginally meet expectations at the time of assessment. If all work meets expectations, provide at least three works that, in the opinion of the instructor(s), are the lowest quality products.
- 2 For ten Core Learning Activities providing Engineering Science and Engineering Design AUs (other than the Engineering Design Culminating Experiences) taken by all students in the program in the final two years of study, provide exams, quizzes, tests, or other summative assessments that are worth in any combination at least seventy-five per cent of the total mark in the Core Learning Activity. For each assessment, up to six samples may be submitted. These samples must include at a minimum three examples of work that in the opinion of the instructor marginally meet expectations. If all work meets expectations, provide at least three works that, in the opinion of the instructor(s), are the lowest quality products.
- 3 If the Program requirements for the final two years of study consist of fewer than ten Core Learning Activities, the Program can choose to submit Core Activities in the previous year of study, or high enrolment Elective Learning Activities on the Shortest Graduation Path in the final years. The Program should provide sufficient information to demonstrate compliance to the Criteria.
- 4 Provide additional examples of performance in Graduate Attributes that have not been included in the culminating design experience (E.1) or the ten learning activities selected in E.2 and E.3 so that at least one sample set related to each of the Graduate Attributes is available. These examples should be taken from courses on the Shortest Graduation Path at an intermediate development (D) or advanced application (A) level. Up to six examples may be provided to support compliance to each of the Graduate Attributes not addressed in E1, E2, or E3, but they must include at least three examples of work that, in the opinion of the instructor(s) at the time of marking, marginally meet expectations.

F. Evidence of a Culture of Safety (Criteria 3.4.7)

Evidence of a culture of safety should be available at the visit, including, but not limited to safety manuals, documentation of training provided to students, safety meeting minutes, records, and signage.

5. Definitions of terms used in the Report on the 2021 consultation on the Required Visit Materials Working Group Report

CEAB, AB: The Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board, or simply the Accreditation Board. Though referred to as a 'Board' the CEAB is technically a committee of the Board of Directors of Engineers Canada.

Engineers Canada Board: The Board of Directors of Engineers Canada.

Higher education institution, HEI: A post-secondary institution, which would refer to an institution offering educational programming after high school.

Regulators: The provincial and territorial associations established under law to regulate the practice of professional engineering within their respective jurisdictions, and who are the Members of Engineers Canada, as defined in the Articles of Continuance.

Working group: For the purposes of this report, a working group is a subcommittee operating for a defined period with a specific task. Working groups may include members who are not members of the committee or Board that created the group.

6. Appendices

Appendix 1: Proposal for consultation

The Required Visit Materials Working Group report can be viewed on <u>the Engineers Canada website</u> <u>here.</u>





Appendix 3: Required Visit Materials Consultation Invitation Email

(le français suit)

RE: Consultation on the Required Visits Materials Working Group Report

Dear colleagues,

(Distribution: Engineers Canada Board, CEO Group, NAOG)

At their February 6, 2021 meeting, the Accreditation Board directed the Required Visit Materials Working Group to consult stakeholders on the recommendations of their report regarding changes to the type and quantity of materials that programs have to provide to visiting team members as part of an accreditation visit. **All regulators are invited to provide comments on the recommendations contained within the report.** The consultation period will be between April 6 and June 4, 2021.

Who should participate

The Required Visit Materials Working Group has identified engineering regulators as potential participants in this process.

How to participate

1. Introduction to the consultation process - webinar

Any individual within your organization who may be interested is invited to attend one of our scheduled introduction webinars. By clicking their preferred option below, participants will be provided within instructions on how to register:

- Wednesday, April 7th at 3pm 4pm EDT (offered in English)
- Thursday, April 8th at 2pm 3pm EDT (offered in French)
- Monday, April 12th at 1pm 2pm EDT (offered in English)
- Tuesday, April 13th at 12pm 1pm EDT (offered in French)

The introduction webinar will provide an overview of the report development process, highlight the recommendations contained within the report, and define the ways by which we will consult each stakeholder group. Any individual who is not able to participate in the live webinar will be able to access the webinar recording on the Engineers Canada website.

2. Webinar meeting with organization officials

Should you or your colleagues wish to organize a web meeting to discuss the Required Visit Materials Working Group recommendations, please email <u>accreditation@engineerscanada.ca</u> to schedule the meeting.

3. Submit written feedback

You are invited to participate in the consultation through any of the means listed above. Additionally, you are invited to submit a formal written response. Written responses should be directed to <u>accreditation@engineerscanada.ca</u> or by mail to:

Required Visit Materials Working Group c/o Elise Guest Engineers Canada 300-55 Metcalfe St. Ottawa, ON K1P 6L5

Written responses must be received by June 4, 2021.

How your feedback will be used

All feedback from all stakeholders will be collected and presented to the Required Visit Materials Working Group, CEAB, and Engineers Canada Board of Directors. A summary of all feedback received will be circulated to stakeholders and posted on the Engineers Canada website.

Background

Following feedback from programs, Engineering Deans Canada and CEAB members, the Required Visit Materials Working Group was struck to determine what efficiencies could be found in the list of documents prepared for CEAB accreditation visits. Briefly, the proposed changes are:

Comparison of existing and proposed required materials to support a CEAB visit					
Existing request	Proposed request	Change	Workload savings		
Description of the policies and regulations that cover various aspects of the program, including, but not limited to admission, appeals, grade approval and practices.	Links to source materials online that describe the appropriate policies, procedures, and regulations.	Description no longer required. Links to source documents are sufficient. More Precise specification of visiting team needs.	Written descriptions are replaced by documents, or links to documents.		
Syllabi for all learning activities in the program curriculum.	Syllabi for courses on the minimum path that incorporate Math, NS, ES, ED, and CS.	Syllabi are only required for courses on the minimum path.	Fewer courses need to be documented.		
Assessment materials and three examples of student work from the low, middle, and high end of each assessment in 15 to 20 courses. All graded lab and design reports.	Assessment materials and three examples of student work with the lowest acceptable performance as judged by the instructor at the time of assessment, representing 75 per cent of the final course assessment for ten course taken by all students with ES, ED, and GAs. Instructor's discretion to add any three more.	Only ten courses on the minimum path are sampled. Only 75 per cent of the assessment is required. Only examples of the lowest acceptable work are required, other samples are at the instructor's discretion.	Fewer assessment materials required. All learning activities do not need to be sampled: only 75 per cent of assessments are required.		

Comparison of existing and proposed required materials to support a CEAB visit					
Existing request	Proposed request	Change	Workload savings		
Ten examples of the culminating design experience.	Ten examples of the culminating design experience, including the three minimum acceptable examples.	The three minimum acceptable samples must be included.	No difference.		
Dossiers with examples for 15-20 courses which measure the graduate attributes.	Examples of minimum acceptable student work in courses on the minimum path with attributes at the D or A level.	These samples are only required if not included with the assessment covering ES + ED.	A separate dossier of GAs with samples is no longer needed.		
Exhibit 1	Exhibit 1 – detailed expectations	No change – requirements are specified in detail.	Less time spent preparing documentation as expectations are clearer.		
GA/CI presentation	GA/CI presentation – detailed expectations	No change – requirements are specified in detail.	Less time spent preparing presentation as expectations are clearer.		
Health and safety manuals required.	Health and safety manuals not required.	No safety manuals required. Safety culture will be assessed on-site.	No time spent gathering manuals.		
Changes in data collection requirements made every year.	Changes in data collection requirements made every six years.	Requirements are frozen for six years at a time.	Less time spent preparing as information can be gathered over several years.		
Collection requirements not explicitly tied to criteria.	Every requirement is tied to a specific criterion.	Criterion-based data collection.	Less time spent preparing as HEI knows how information will be used by visiting team.		

On behalf of the Required Visit Materials Working Group, the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board, and Engineers Canada, thank you for considering this invitation. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me (<u>mya.warken@engineerscanada.ca</u> or at 1-877-408-9273 extension 206) or Elise Guest (<u>elise.guest@engineerscanada.ca</u> or at 1-877-408-9273 extension 260).

Best regards,

Mya Warken Manager, Accreditation

Objet : Consultation sur le rapport du Groupe de travail sur la documentation requise

(Distribution : conseil d'Ingénieurs Canada, Groupe des chefs de direction, GNRA)

Chers collègues,

Lors de sa réunion du 6 février 2021, le Bureau d'agrément a demandé au Groupe de travail sur la documentation requise de consulter les parties prenantes sur les recommandations de son rapport concernant les modifications à apporter au type et au nombre de documents que les programmes doivent fournir aux membres de l'équipe de visiteurs dans le cadre d'une visite d'agrément. Les organismes de réglementation sont invités à faire part de leurs commentaires sur les recommandations présentées dans le rapport. La consultation se tiendra du 6 avril au 4 juin 2021.

Participants recherchés

Le Groupe de travail sur la documentation requise a désigné les organismes de réglementation comme des participants potentiels à cette consultation.

Comment participer

1. Présentation du processus de consultation – webinaire

Toute personne intéressée de votre organisme est invitée à assister à l'un de nos webinaires. Il suffit de cliquer sur l'une des options ci-dessous pour s'inscrire :

- Mercredi 7 avril, 15 h-16 h (HE) en anglais
- Jeudi 8 avril, 14 h-15 h (HE) en français
- Lundi 12 avril, 13 h-14 h (HE) en anglais
- Mardi 13 avril, 12 h-13 h (HE) en français

Dans le webinaire de présentation, nous passerons en revue le processus d'élaboration du rapport, les recommandations qui y figurent et les modalités de consultation de chaque groupe de parties prenantes. Si vous n'êtes pas en mesure d'assister au webinaire en direct, vous en trouverez un enregistrement dans <u>le site Web d'Ingénieurs Canada</u>.

2. Webinaire avec les représentants des organismes Si vous ou vos collègues voulez organiser une réunion en ligne pour discuter des recommandations du Groupe de travail sur la documentation requise, veuillez envoyer un courriel à <u>agrement@ingenieurscanada.ca</u> pour fixer une date.

3. Soumission de commentaires par écrit Vous pouvez participer à la consultation d'une des façons indiquées ci-dessus. Vous pouvez aussi soumettre vos commentaires par écrit à <u>agrement@ingenieurscanada.ca</u>, ou les envoyer par la poste à l'adresse suivante :

Groupe de travail sur la documentation requise a/s de Elise Guest Ingénieurs Canada 55, rue Metcalfe, bureau 300 Ottawa, ON K1P 6L5

Les réponses écrites doivent nous parvenir au plus tard le 4 juin.

Utilisation de vos commentaires

Les commentaires de toutes les parties prenantes seront colligés et présentés au Groupe de travail sur la documentation requise, au Bureau d'agrément et au conseil d'Ingénieurs Canada. Un résumé de tous les commentaires reçus sera envoyé aux parties prenantes et affiché dans le site d'Ingénieurs Canada.

Contexte

Pour donner suite aux commentaires des responsables des programmes, de Doyennes et doyens d'ingénierie Canada et des membres du BCAPG, le Groupe de travail sur la documentation requise pour les visites a été mis sur pied avec pour mandat de déterminer les gains d'efficacité qui pourraient être réalisés en ce qui concerne la liste des documents à préparer pour les visites d'agrément du BCAPG. En bref, les modifications proposées sont les suivantes :

Comparaison entre les documents exigés actuellement à l'appui d'une visite du BCAPG et ceux

proposés					
Demande actuelle	Demande proposée	Modification	Allégement de la charge de travail		
Description des politiques et des règlements qui couvrent différents aspects du programme, notamment l'admission, les appels, l'approbation des diplômes et les pratiques.	Liens vers les documents sources en ligne qui décrivent les politiques, les procédures et les règlements appropriés.	La description n'est plus nécessaire. Les liens vers les documents sources suffisent. Précision des besoins de l'équipe de visiteurs.	Les descriptions écrites sont remplacées par les documents ou des liens vers les documents.		
Plan de toutes les activités d'apprentissage du programme.	Plan des cours du cheminement minimal des catégories mathématiques, sciences naturelles, sciences du génie, conception en ingénierie et études complémentaires.	Seuls les plans de cours du cheminement minimum sont exigés.	Il y a un nombre réduit de cours pour lesquels il faut soumettre des documents.		
Documents d'évaluation et trois exemples de travaux d'étudiants (note la plus faible, note moyenne et note la plus élevée) pour chaque évaluation de 15 à 20 cours. Tous les rapports de laboratoire et de conception notés.	Pour 10 cours suivis par tous les étudiants (sciences du génie, conception en ingénierie et QRD), documents d'évaluation et trois exemples de travaux qui, selon l'enseignant, satisfont minimalement aux attentes qui représentent au moins	Les échantillons proviennent de 10 cours du cheminement minimum seulement. Seules 75 % des évaluations sont demandées. Seuls des exemples de travaux minimalement acceptables sont demandés; les autres sont à la discrétion de l'enseignant.	Un nombre réduit de documents d'évaluation est demandé. Il n'est pas nécessaire de fournir des échantillons de toutes les activités d'apprentissage; seules 75 % des évaluations sont demandées.		

	75 % de la note globale		
	du cours		
	À sa discrétion		
	l'enseignant neut en		
	fournir trois autros		
Div exemples de	Div overneles de	Los trois troyoux avant	Auguno différence
Dix exemples de	L'avrésiones de la		Aucune difference.
i experience de la	i experience de la	obtenu les notes les	
conception en	conception en	plus faibles au-dessus	
ingénierie.	ingénierie, dont les	de la note de passage	
	trois travaux ayant	doivent être inclus.	
	obtenu les notes les		
	plus faibles au-dessus		
	de la note de passage.		
Dossiers contenant des	Exemples de travaux	Ces exemples ne sont	L'établissement
exemples de mesures	qui satisfont	nécessaires que s'ils ne	d'enseignement
des QRD tirés de 15 à	minimalement aux	sont pas inclus dans les	supérieur n'a pas besoin
20 cours.	attentes dans des	évaluations couvrant	de créer de dossier
	cours du cheminement	les sciences du génie et	distinct pour les QRD.
	minimum qui couvrent	la conception en	
	l'évaluation des	ingénierie.	
	normes relatives aux		
	QRD de niveau « en		
	développement » ou «		
	avancé »		
Tableau 1	Tableau 1 — attentes	Aucun changement —	Diminution du temps
	détaillées	les exigences sont	nassé à prénarer les
	actances	nrácisáns en dátail	documents car les
		precisees en detail.	attentes cont clairement
Drécontation dos	Drécontation dos	Augun changanant	Diminution du tomas
Presentation des	Presentation des	Aucun changement —	
QRD/AC	QRD/AC — attentes	les exigences sont	passe a preparer la
	detaillees	precisees en détail.	presentation, car les
			attentes sont clairement
			précisées.
Guides de santé et de	Guides de santé et de	Les guides de santé et	Pas de temps passé à
sécurité exigés.	sécurité non exigés.	de sécurité ne sont pas	rassembler les manuels.
		exigés. La culture de la	
		sécurité est évaluée sur	
		place.	
Modification des	Modification des	Les exigences sont	Diminution du temps de
exigences de collecte	exigences de collecte	fixées pour six années.	préparation, car
de données chaque	de données tous les six		l'information peut être
année.	ans.		recueillie sur plusieurs
			années.
Les exigences de	Toutes les exigences	Collecte de données	Diminution du temps de
collecte ne sont pas	de collecte sont liées à	fondée sur des normes	préparation, car les
explicitement liées aux	une norme précise.		établissements
normes.			d'enseignement
			supérieur savent
			comment l'équine de
			visiteurs utilisera
			l'information
			THIUTHALIUH.

Au nom du Groupe de travail sur la documentation requise, du Bureau d'agrément et d'Ingénieurs Canada, je vous remercie de considérer cette invitation. Si vous avez des questions, n'hésitez pas à communiquer avec moi (<u>mya.warken@ingenieurscanada.ca</u> ou 1 877 408-9273, poste 206) ou avec Elise Guest (<u>elise.guest@ingenieurscanada.ca</u> ou 1 877 408-9273, poste 260).

Cordialement,

Mya Warken Gestionnaire, Agrément

Appendix 4: Consultation Presentation Slide Deck





1. Does the description of required materials provide responsible individuals (including, but not limited to, designated officials, relevant faculty and

a. Graduate attributes

c. Students d. Curriculum content e. Program environment f. Additional criteria

b. Continual improvement

administrative staff) with enough guidance on what materials to collect to demonstrate compliance with the CEAB Accreditation Criteria related to:



Report on the 2021 consultation on the Required Visit Materials Working Group Report

Consultation questions (cont'd)

- Is the description of required materials sufficient to allow the CEAB to identify those engineering programs whose graduates are academically qualified to begin the process to be licensed as professional engineers in Canada?
- 3. Does the description of required materials represent an actual reduction in the number of materials that programs will have to produce?
- 4. Do you have any other comments regarding the required materials that the CEAB ought to consider at this time?

engineers canad



Stakeholder groups being consulted

CEAB members

ingénieurs consta

- Higher Education Institutions (HEIs)
- Engineering Deans Canada (via the DLC), with a request for Deans to share with faculty
- Engineering regulators (via the CEOs and National Admissions Officials Group)
- The Graduate Attribute& ContinualImprovement Professionals Network
- Program visitors from the last three years
- Visit chairs from the last three years, in addition to the CEAB members
- Canadian Federation of Engineering Students (CFES)



National consultation: objectives

- Inform stakeholders that the CEAB is considering making changes to the required materials submitted to the visiting team for accreditation purposes.
- 2. Investigate stakeholder reaction to the Working Group's recommendations.
- 3. Identify the impact of the recommendations to the data -collection needs of programs, accreditation visitors and CEAB members.
- Identify barriers to change if the report recommendations are adopted.
 Develop a reasonable implementation plan that accommodates the diverse viewpoints of stakeholders.
- How to participate in this consultation



1. Groups can schedule a meeting with us to discuss the report's

- Groups can schedule a meeting with us to discuss the report recommendations and provide your feedback.
- 2. Submit written feedback to: <u>accreditation@engineerscanada.ca</u> Attn: Elise Guest Accreditation Program Advisor Engineers Canada

accreditation@engineerscanada.ca | 613.232.2474 engineerscanada.ca/accreditation

Submission deadline: June 4, 2021

Thank you

For more information



engineers canada Ingénieurs canada