

Accountability in Accreditation forms

Regulator

Your feedback through this form will inform the systematic improvement of the accreditation system.

The Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board's (CEAB) Accountability in Accreditation Committee is collecting feedback from all stakeholder groups to measure the effectiveness, trustworthiness, transparency, and efficiency of the accreditation system. As part of this process, we are collecting feedback from regulators, program visitors, visiting team chairs and vice-chairs, CEAB and Engineers Canada Board members, Engineers Canada staff, HEI deans, designated officials or program accreditation leads, and student leadership at visited HEIs.

As a regulator for the engineering profession, you can provide us with valuable insight into the accreditation system and how to improve it.

This form contains questions requiring broad knowledge of the CEAB accreditation system to be typically answered by the appropriate volunteer or responsible staff (Section 1) and questions requiring knowledge of visits to be typically answered by the registrar or chief regulator staff person (Section 2), as well as an open-ended comment section for general feedback on the accreditation system (Section 3).

We request that you respond to the survey below before **(date)**. Scale ratings will be aggregated and anonymized comments will be provided to the Accountability in Accreditation Committee.

Thank you for taking the time to provide your thoughts.

Section 1. Appropriate volunteer or responsible staff with overall knowledge of the CEAB accreditation system

	Yes	No	Please comment, particularly if you selected no.
1. Does the CEAB accreditation system sufficiently identify engineering education programs that prepare academically qualified graduates for licensure?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
2. Do you have sufficient access to the CEAB accreditation criteria?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
3. Have you assigned additional academic requirements, identified deficiencies, or denied licensure to any recent CEAB graduates based on academic qualifications in the last 5 years?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	If yes, what was the basis on which a graduate was denied licensure?
4. Does the CEAB accreditation process continue to meet your needs to determine academic qualifications of CEAB graduates for licensure?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
5. Do you have sufficient confidence in the consistent application of the minimum standard to accept graduates from any CEAB accredited engineering education program?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

	Yes	Partially	No	Please comment, particularly if you selected partially or no.
6. Did the level of detail provided by the CEAB to regulators give confidence that the CEAB accreditation process is consistently implemented in accordance with published accreditation policies and criteria?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

7. When changes to CEAB accreditation criteria or procedures have been considered,	Yes	Partially	No	Please comment, particularly if you selected partially or no.
a) Did you feel consulted?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
(b) Did you have an opportunity to provide feedback on proposals?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
(c) If you provided feedback, did you feel your feedback was considered?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
(d) Were you informed when change was implemented?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

Section 2. Registrar or chief regulator staff person

	Yes	No	Not applicable	Please comment, particularly if you selected no.
8. As a regulator, do you feel that representatives from your organization who have engaged in the CEAB accreditation process (go on visits and/or observed a CEAB meeting) have confidence in the process?	()	()	()	

9. If you were asked, could you describe the following roles and responsibilities in the CEAB accreditation process?	Yes	Partially	No	Please comment, particularly if you selected partially or no.
(a) HEI deans or designated officials	()	()	()	
(b) HEI program leads	()	()	()	
(c) CEAB program visitors	()	()	()	
(d) CEAB visiting team chairs	()	()	()	
(e) Regulators	()	()	()	
(f) Students	()	()	()	
(g) Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board	()	()	()	
(h) Engineers Canada Board	()	()	()	

	Yes	Partially	No	Please comment, particularly if you selected partially or no.
10. 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)	()	()	()	
11. Overall, do you trust the CEAB accreditation system's assessment of engineering education programs?	()	()	()	
12. From your perspective, does the CEAB accreditation process represent an efficient design, where the time and resources you invested were worthwhile?	()	()	()	

Section 3: General feedback

	Please comment
13. Please describe any significant POSITIVE outcomes of the CEAB accreditation process.	
14. Please describe any significant NEGATIVE outcomes of the CEAB accreditation process.	
15. 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.	