Proposed changes and rationale

This document describes the proposed changes identified through the CEAB's Policies and Procedures (P&P) Committee and the Engineering Deans Canada (EDC)'s Deans' Liaison Committee (DLC) members' co-design work and explains the rationale for each.

Criterion 3.1

CURRENT CRITERION	PROPOSED CHANGES
GA Professionalism: An understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the professional engineer in society, especially the primary role of protection of the public and the public interest.	**GA Professionalism:** Graduates must demonstrate an understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the professional engineer in society, within the context of a regulated profession in Canada. This includes an understanding of the significance of licensure and self-regulation, the importance of personal and professional accountability, and the profession's responsibility to serve the public good.

Rationale

Criterion 3.1 was revised to clarify, relative to the current wording, what is expected of graduates at the point of graduation. The current criterion refers broadly to the roles and responsibilities of "the professional engineer" and emphasizes "protection of the public," which can be read as implying duties that attach to licensed practice. The revised wording reframes the expectation as a graduate outcome: graduates must be able to recognize and describe the professional role of engineers in society *within the context of a regulated profession in Canada*. This shift maintains a clear boundary between educational outcomes and obligations that apply only to licensed professional engineers, and it reduces interpretive risk by focusing on graduates' understanding rather than compliance, procedural knowledge, or behavioural requirements.

Compared with the current statement, the revised criterion also makes explicit several concepts that underpin professionalism. It identifies *licensure* and *self-regulation* as concepts graduates should understand and be able to explain, and it incorporates *personal and professional accountability* as a core element of professionalism, without implying uniform regulatory models across jurisdictions or assigning regulatory responsibilities to graduates. The language also uses a more inclusive articulation of the profession's mandate by retaining the profession's responsibility to serve the *public good*, understood to include, and not diminish, the paramount importance of public safety. These refinements are intended to support consistent accreditation interpretation and remain aligned with Washington Accord expectations for the Professionalism graduate attribute.

Criterion 3.4.4.1

CURRENT CRITERION	PROPOSED CHANGES
A minimum of 600 Accreditation Units (AU) of a combination of engineering science and engineering design curriculum content in an engineering program shall be delivered by faculty members holding, or progressing toward, professional engineering licensure as specified in the *Interpretive statement on licensure expectations and requirements*.	Remove this criterion and update the *Interpretive statement on licensure expectations and requirements* accordingly.

Rationale

Consistent with Recommendation 7.d of the FEA Path Forward Report, which calls for removal of the Specific AU criteria, P&P and DLC members propose removing criterion 3.4.4.1. Although this criterion was meant to have licensed professional engineers involved in the teaching of engineering, it created an indirect metric with no assurance that the intended outcome was achieved.

Criterion 3.4.4.4

CURRENT CRITERION	PROPOSED CHANGES
A minimum of 225 AU of engineering design curriculum content in an engineering program shall be delivered by faculty members holding professional engineering licensure as specified in the *Interpretive statement on licensure expectations and requirements*.	Remove this criterion and update the *Interpretive statement on licensure expectations and requirements* accordingly.

Rationale

Consistent with Recommendation 7.d of the FEA Path Forward Report, which calls for removal of the Specific AU criteria, P&P and DLC members propose removing criterion 3.4.4.4. Although this criterion was meant to have licensed professional engineers involved in the teaching of engineering, it created an indirect metric with no assurance that the intended outcome was achieved.

Criterion 3.4.4.6

CURRENT CRITERION	PROPOSED CHANGES
The engineering curriculum must culminate in a significant design experience conducted under the professional responsibility of faculty licensed to practise engineering in Canada. The significant design experience is based on the knowledge and skills acquired in earlier work and it preferably gives students an involvement in team work and project management.	The engineering curriculum must culminate in a significant design experience conducted under the overall professional responsibility of a licensed professional engineer. Different models may be used to implement this requirement, provided that professional responsibility and accountability are clearly demonstrated. The significant design experience is based on the knowledge and skills acquired earlier in the programme and preferably provides students with involvement in teamwork and project management, reflecting contemporary engineering practice. Update the *Interpretive statement on licensure expectations and requirements* accordingly.

Rationale

Criterion 3.4.4.6 was revised to emphasize appropriate professional accountability for the culminating (capstone) design experience while preserving flexibility in how programs structure supervision and engagement. Workshop discussions highlighted that the intent is to ensure design outcomes are carried out under clear overall professional responsibility and accountability, aligned with how responsibility operates in contemporary engineering practice, rather than to require direct day-to-day supervision by licensed professional engineers. The revised wording therefore distinguishes overall professional responsibility from project-level mentoring, avoids prescribing specific supervision models, and supports consistent interpretation across a range of interdisciplinary, externally partnered, and distributed delivery arrangements.

Additional refinements were made to improve clarity and durability while keeping the focus on outcomes and accountability. “Skills acquired earlier in the programme” replaces “earlier work” to anchor prerequisite learning within the academic program. The phrase “contemporary engineering practice” was added to clarify that involvement in teamwork and project management should reflect evolving professional expectations. The statement that “different models may be used” was intentionally included to allow institutional flexibility (e.g., industry-led or interdisciplinary capstones, externally partnered projects, and international or distributed arrangements), provided that overall professional responsibility and accountability for design outcomes are clearly demonstrated. Consistent with this intent, the revised criterion does not specify “Canadian-licensed,” allowing for equivalent licensure and appropriate oversight in cross-jurisdictional models while maintaining accountability at the program and home-institution level.

Criterion 3.5.4

CURRENT CRITERION	PROPOSED CHANGES
Expertise and competence of faculty: Faculty delivering the engineering curriculum are expected to have a high level of expertise and competence, and to be dedicated to the aims of engineering education and of the self-regulating engineering profession, which will be judged by the following factors: a. The level of academic education of its members. b. The diversity of their backgrounds, including the nature and scope of their non-academic experience. c. Their ability to communicate effectively. d. Their experience and accomplishments in teaching, research and/or engineering practice. e. Their degree of participation in professional, scientific, engineering, and learned societies. f. Their appreciation of the role and importance of the self-regulating engineering profession, and of positive attitudes towards professional licensure and involvement in professional affairs.	Expertise and competence of faculty: Faculty delivering the engineering curriculum are expected to collectively demonstrate a high level of expertise and competence. Taken as a whole, the faculty complement must demonstrate appropriate depth, diversity, and distribution of: • qualifications, • experience, • scholarship, • engineering practice, and • professional engagement to support program outcomes.

Rationale

Criterion 3.5.4 was revised to clarify that accreditation assesses the capability of the *faculty complement* at the program level (i.e., the collective expertise, competence, and engagement required to deliver program outcomes) rather than imposing individual-level compliance expectations or employment standards. A program-wide approach, rather than an individual-level one, ensures that accreditation does not impinge on institutions' human resource practices. Workshop discussions emphasized the need for clear, assessable, non-prescriptive language that can be applied consistently across institutions where faculty roles and forms of professional engagement vary. Participants also cautioned against wording that depends on subjective judgments about personal attributes or that creates an undue evidence burden during accreditation visits. The revised wording remains consistent with the Washington Accord's expectation that suitably qualified engineering practitioners teach in the programme, while focusing the criterion on demonstrable collective capacity.

Compared with the current criterion—which enumerates a broad set of individual indicators (a–f), including attitudes toward licensure and participation in professional affairs—the revised criterion consolidates expectations into a coherent set of dimensions that can be demonstrated in aggregate: qualifications, experience, scholarship, engineering practice, and professional engagement. This approach preserves the underlying intent (including a positive professional culture and understanding of self-regulation and licensure) without implying that every faculty member must be licensed or meet every listed indicator.

Criterion 3.5.5

CURRENT CRITERION	PROPOSED CHANGES
Professional status of faculty members: Faculty delivering curriculum content that is engineering science and/or engineering design are expected to be licensed to practise engineering in Canada. To evaluate this criterion, the Accreditation Board will rely on the *Interpretive statement on licensure expectations and requirements*, which is attached as an appendix to this document.	Remove this criterion and update the *Interpretive statement on licensure expectations and requirements* accordingly.

Rationale

Consistent with Recommendation 7.d of the FEA Path Forward Report, which calls for removal of the Specific AU criteria, P&P and DLC members propose removing criterion 3.5.5. Furthermore, the proposed changes to the criteria above, which focus on the involvement of licensed professionals, the expected outcomes of this involvement, and the professional oversight of the significant design experience (capstone project), render this criterion superfluous.