



The Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) is inviting comments from accreditation stakeholders on the following proposed changes to the *Interpretive Statement on Licensure* ([Appendix 3 CEAB Accreditation Criteria and Procedures](#)):

Current wording (2019 Accreditation Criteria)	Proposed wording
8. In order to ensure that engineering science, engineering design, natural science, mathematics and complementary studies curriculum contents are readily and easily identifiable, each course in an engineering program should be described using a maximum of three curriculum categories (ES, ED, NS, Math, CS) with no single category constituting less than 8 AU's or 25% of the total AU for a particular course.	8. Engineering science, engineering design, natural science, mathematics, and complementary studies curriculum content should be readily and easily identifiable in each course where they appear.
9. It is up to the institution offering the program to justify the unique aspects of any course that deviates from clause 8.	9. For any course having one or more curriculum categories (ES, ED, NS, Math, CS) constituting less than 10% of the total AU count, the institution should ensure that sufficient course materials are available to support the AU distribution.

The proposed changes are in response to stakeholder feedback that the restrictions on AU distributions:

- Do not support modern pedagogy in engineering programs which promotes integration of multiple concepts across learning activities throughout the curriculum, and
- Are an impediment to curriculum reform and the continual improvement process.

The predicted impact of these changes is minimal and is expected to be of benefit to the stakeholders of the CEAB accreditation system. The proposed wording requires that curriculum content be readily and easily identifiable and that the institutions be prepared to make evidence available to visiting teams that supports the program's reported AU distribution.

Key questions asked of stakeholders:

1. Do the proposed changes to clauses 8 and 9 of the *Interpretive Statement on Licensure* support modern pedagogy in engineering programs?
2. Will the proposed changes to clauses 8 and 9 of the *Interpretive Statement on Licensure* impede the CEAB's ability to assess the curriculum contents of an engineering program?
3. Do the recommendations affect your level of confidence in the established accreditation process?
4. What are the ramifications, both positive and negative, of implementing the recommendations? What risks might be incurred by this implementation? How can these risks be mitigated?

Who should participate?

The CEAB has identified higher education institutions, members of Engineering Deans Canada (EDC), engineering regulators' councils, boards of examiners, and/or academic review committees as potential participants in this process. However, other interested parties are invited to provide feedback on the proposal.

The CEAB invites interested parties to submit their written responses to these questions by January 29, 2021. Written responses should be directed to accreditation@engineerscanada.ca or by mail to:

Interpretive Statement on Licensure Consultation
c/o Mya Warken
Engineers Canada
300-55 Metcalfe St.
Ottawa, ON K1P 6L5

Written responses must be received by **January 29, 2021**.