

### About this document

The Graduate Attributes and Continual Improvement (GA/CI) rubrics aid the visiting team in their assessment of compliance with the Graduate Attribute or Continual Improvement accreditation criteria. The rubrics are made available to the programs receiving an accreditation visit to demonstrate how the criteria are assessed by the visiting team.

## Graduate Attributes

3.1	Graduate Attributes:	Accreditation Criteria and Procedures Description	Rating	Assessment Category Descriptors
				Quantitative definitions: - almost all (at least 10) - many (at least six) - some (at least two)
3.1.1	Organization and engagement	There must be demonstration that an organizational structure is in place to assure the sustainable development and measurement of graduate attributes. There must be demonstrated engagement in the process by faculty members and engineering leadership.	✓	Strong organizational structure in place to assure sustainable development, measurement and review of GAs <b>AND</b> clear evidence of engagement by faculty and leadership.
			*	Weak or absent organizational structure in place to assure sustainable development, measurement and review of GAs <b>AND/OR</b> limited or no evidence of engagement by some faculty and/or leadership.
3.1.2	Curriculum Maps	There must be documented curriculum maps showing the relationship between learning activities for each of the attributes and the semesters in which these take place.	✓	Sufficient number of learning activities/courses (at least three per attribute) mapped with respect to GAs and program semesters
			*	Insufficient number of learning activities (less than three per attribute) mapped with respect to GAs and program semesters for some GAs <b>AND/OR</b> Entries for at least one GA are missing from the curriculum map <b>AND/OR</b> only a single assessment point measured for some GAs.
3.1.3	Indicators	For each attribute, there must be a set of measurable, documented indicators that describe what students must achieve in order to be considered competent in the corresponding attribute.	✓	Corresponding indicators are well-aligned for almost all GAs <b>AND</b> indicators span all important GA components for almost all GAs (see note 1) <b>AND</b> indicators are consistent with expectations for an engineering graduate for almost all GAs (see note 2) <b>AND</b> number of indicators consistent with assuring a sustainable data collection program for almost all GAs.
			*	Misalignment of corresponding indicators with some or many GAs <b>AND/OR</b> indicators corresponding to at least one important GA component for some or many GAs <b>AND/OR</b> indicators are inconsistent with expectations for an engineering graduate for some or many GAs <b>AND/OR</b> number of indicators inconsistent with assuring a sustainable data collection program for some or many GAs.
3.1.4	Assessment tools	There must be documented assessment tools that are appropriate to the attribute and used as the basis for obtaining data on student learning with respect to all twelve attributes over a cycle of six years or less.	✓	Selection of sufficient and appropriate tools for all GAs <b>AND</b> rationale for selection of assessment tools for all GAs is documented <b>AND</b> expected achievement levels are appropriate to the stage of the program for all GAs
			*	Selection of insufficient or inappropriate assessment tools for some or many GAs <b>AND/OR</b> rationale for selection of tools for some or many GAs is inadequately documented <b>AND/OR</b> expected achievement levels are inappropriate to the stage of the program for some or many GAs.
3.1.5	Assessment results	At least one set of assessment results must be obtained for all twelve attributes over a period of six years or less. The results should provide clear evidence that the graduates of a program possess the attributes or that remedial action is in progress.	✓	Assessment results compiled and documented for almost all GAs over a period of six years or less <b>AND</b> results are able to demonstrate appropriate levels of achievement for almost all GAs.
			*	Assessment results not compiled and documented for several or most GAs over a period of six years or less <b>AND/OR</b> results insufficiently demonstrate appropriate levels of achievement for some or many GAs.

Note 1: "GA component" – a component of the attribute description in section 3 of the "Accreditation Criteria and Procedures" (e.g. mathematics is a component of the knowledge base description)

Note 2: "Performance Levels" – a scale of descriptors of the performance corresponding to an individual indicator. Performance levels for a coherent group of indicators corresponding to individuals are aggregated to measure graduate attribute achievement levels.

## Continual Improvement

3.2	Continual Improvement:	Accreditation Criteria and Procedures Description	Rating	Assessment Category Descriptors
3.2.1	Improvement process	There must be processes in place that demonstrate that program outcomes are being assessed in the context of graduate attributes, and that the results are validated, analysed and applied to further development of the program.	✓	Process (committees, annual cycle, authority, reporting) is in place <b>AND</b> process is adequately documented
			*	Process for continual improvement has some inadequate components or is not in place <b>AND/OR</b> process documentation is limited <b>AND/OR process is not adequately documented</b>
3.2.2	Stakeholder engagement	There must be demonstrated engagement of stakeholders both internal and external to the program in the continual improvement process.	✓	Stakeholders broadly selected (e.g. internal: students, program faculty, engineering faculty; external: non-engineering faculty, alumni, engineering professionals, other professionals, employers, learned societies, etc.)
			*	Stakeholders narrowly or insufficiently selected (some internal and some representation) <b>AND/OR</b> stakeholder roles in the improvement process is inadequately demonstrated or not specified.
3.2.3	Improvement actions	There must be a demonstration that the continual improvement process has led to consideration of specific actions corresponding to identifiable improvements in the program and/or its assessment process. <b>Note, if the evidence suggests no change is warranted, then no change is necessary. This criterion does not apply to new programs.</b>	✓	One or more program-level/process change action(s) implemented ( <b>if change is necessary</b> ) <b>AND</b> timelines and accountability for changes documented
			*	Program-level/process change action(s) implementation is in progress OR have not been implemented (even though evidence suggested change is necessary) <b>AND/OR</b> timelines and accountability for changes not yet assigned <b>AND/OR</b> rationale for decisions not to act yet to be developed.