3. ACCREDITION CRTIERIA

The following sections describe the measures used by the Accreditation Board to evaluate Canadian engineering programs for the purpose of accreditation.

3.1 Graduate attributes

The institution must demonstrate that the graduates of a program possess the attributes under the following headings.

a) **Knowledge base for engineering:** Demonstrated competence in university level mathematics, natural sciences, engineering fundamentals, and specialized engineering knowledge appropriate to the program.

b) **Problem analysis:** An ability to use appropriate knowledge and skills to identify, formulate, analyze, and solve complex engineering problems in order to reach substantiated conclusions.

c) **Investigation:** An ability to conduct investigations of complex problems by methods that include appropriate experiments, analysis and interpretation of data, and synthesis of information in order to reach valid conclusions.

d) **Design:** An ability to design solutions for complex, open-ended engineering problems and to design systems, components or processes that meet specified needs with appropriate attention to health and safety risks, applicable standards, and economic, environmental, cultural and societal considerations.

e) **Use of engineering tools:** An ability to create, select, apply, adapt, and extend appropriate techniques, resources, and modern engineering tools to a range of engineering activities, from simple to complex, with an understanding of the associated limitations.

f) **Individual and team work:** An ability to work effectively as a member and leader in teams, preferably in a multi-disciplinary setting.

g) **Communication skills:** An ability to communicate complex engineering concepts within the profession and with society at large. Such ability includes reading, writing, speaking and listening, and the ability to comprehend and write effective reports and design documentation, and to give and effectively respond to clear instructions.

h) **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.

i) **Impact of engineering on society and the environment:** An ability to analyze societal and environmental aspects of engineering activities. Such ability includes an understanding of the interactions that engineering has with the economic, health, safety, legal, and cultural aspects of society, the uncertainties in the prediction of such interactions and the concepts of sustainable design and development and environmental stewardship.

j) **Ethics and equity:** An ability to apply professional ethics, accountability, and equity.

k) **Economics and project management:** An ability to appropriately incorporate economics and business practices including project, risk, and change management into the practice of engineering and to understand their limitations.

l) **Life-long learning:** An ability to identify and to address their own educational needs in a changing world in ways sufficient to maintain their competence and to allow them to contribute to the advancement of knowledge.

The attributes will be interpreted in the context of candidates at the time of graduation. It is recognized that graduates will continue to build on the foundations that their engineering education has provided.

To assess the suitability of a program for developing the above list of attributes, the Accreditation Board

will rely on criteria 3.1.1 to 3.1.5, given below, and on the *Interpretive Statement on Graduate Attributes* which is attached as an appendix to this document.

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 processes by faculty members and engineering 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.

3.1.3 Indicators: For each attribute, there must be a set of measureable, documented indicators that describe what students must achieve in order to be considered competent in the corresponding attribute.

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.

3.1.5 Assessment Results: At least one set of assessment results must be obtained for all twelve attributes over a cycle of six years or less. The results should provide clear evidence that graduates of a program possess the above list of attributes.

3.2 Continual improvement
> Engineering programs are expected to continually improve. To evaluate this criterion, the Accreditation Board will rely on criteria 3.2.1 to 3.2.3 given below and on the *Interpretive Statement on Continual Improvement*, which is attached as an appendix to this document.

3.2.1 Improvement process: There must be processes in place that demonstrate that program outcomes are being assessed in the context of the graduate attributes, and that the results are validated, analyzed and applied to the further development of the program.

3.2.2 Stakeholder engagement: There must be demonstrated engagement and involvement of stakeholders both internal and external to the program in the continual improvement process.

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 to the program and/or its assessment process. This criterion does not apply to the evaluation of new programs.

3.2 Students
> Accredited programs must have functional policies and procedures that deal with quality, admission, counselling, promotion and graduation of students. Although all accreditation criteria connect directly and indirectly with their education, particular attention is drawn to admission, promotion and graduation, and academic advising.

3.3.1 Admission: There must be documented processes and policies for admission of students. Admission involving advanced standing, prior studies, transfer credits and/or exchange studies must be in compliance with the associated Accreditation Board regulations. The document entitled Regulations for granting transfer credits is available as an appendix in this document.

3.3.2   Promotion and graduation: Processes and policies for promotion and graduation of students must be documented. The institution must verify that all students have met all its regulations for graduation in the program identified on the transcript and that the curriculum followed is consistent with that of the accredited program. The program name must be appropriate for all students graduating from the program.

3.3.3.   Academic Advising: There must be processes and sufficient resources in place for the academic advising of students. Clear statements of such policies or procedures should be available to faculty and students. Depending on the governance structures in place, aspects of student advising should normally be at both the program and Faculty levels.

3.3.4.   Degree auditing: A requirement for accreditation is that the institution has verified, using methodologies accepted by the Accreditation Board, that all its student-related policies, procedures, and regulations apply to, and are met by, all students.

3.4   Curriculum content and quality
The curriculum content and quality criteria are designed to assure a foundation in mathematics and natural sciences, a broad preparation in engineering sciences and engineering design, and an exposure to non-technical subjects that supplement the technical aspects of the curriculum. All students must meet all curriculum content and quality criteria. The academic level of the curriculum must be appropriate to a university-level engineering program.

3.4.1   Approach and methodologies for quantifying curriculum content

3.4.1.1 Accreditation units (AU) are defined on an hourly basis for an activity which is granted academic credit and for which the associated number of hours corresponds to the actual contact time between the student and the faculty members, or designated alternates, responsible for delivering the program:
   • one hour of lecture (corresponding to 50 minutes of activity) = 1 AU
   • one hour of laboratory or scheduled tutorial = 0.5 AU
This definition is applicable to most lectures and periods of laboratory or tutorial work. Classes of other than the nominal 50-minute duration are treated proportionally. In assessing the time assigned to determine the AU of various components of the curriculum, the actual instruction time exclusive of final examinations should be used.

3.4.1.2 For an activity for which contact hours do not properly describe the extent of the work involved, such as significant design or research projects, curriculum delivered through the use of problem-based learning, or similar work officially recognized by the institution as a degree requirement, an equivalent measure in accreditation units, consistent with the above definition, should be used by the institution.

3.4.1.3 One method for determining an equivalent measure in AU is a calculation on a proportionality basis. This method relies on the use of a unit of academic credit defined by the institution to measure curriculum content. Specifically, a factor, K, is defined as the sum of AU for all common and compulsory courses for which the computation was carried out on an hourly basis, divided by the sum of all units defined by the institution for the same courses.

Then, for each course not accounted for on an hourly basis, the number of AU is obtained by

multiplying the units defined by the institution for that course by K.

$$K = \frac{\Sigma \text{ AU for all common and compulsory courses for which the computation was carried out on an hourly basis}}{\Sigma \text{ units defined by the institution for the same courses}}$$

3.4.1.4 The Accreditation Board can give consideration to departures from this approach and these methodologies in any case in which it receives convincing documentation that well-considered innovation in engineering education is in progress.

3.4.2   Minimum Program Content
The program must have a minimum of four years of full-time (or equivalent) appropriate content at a university level. An Interpretive Statement on minimum program content is attached as an appendix to this   document.

3.4.3   Minimum curriculum components:
An engineering program must include the following minima for each of its components.
Engineering science and engineering design: Minimum 900 AU
Which includes a minimum 225 AU in each of Engineering science and Engineering design
Mathematics and natural sciences: Minimum 420 AU
Which includes a minimum 195 AU in each of Mathematics and Natural sciences.
Complementary Studies: Minimum 225 AU
Laboratory experience and safety procedures instruction

3.4.4   A minimum of 420 AU of a combination of mathematics and natural sciences:
Within this combination, each of mathematics and natural sciences must not be less than 195 AU. An Interpretive Statement on Natural Sciences is attached as an appendix to this document.

3.4.4.1 A minimum of 195 AU in mathematics is required. Mathematics is expected to include appropriate elements of linear algebra, differential and integral calculus, differential equations, probability, statistics, numerical analysis, and discrete mathematics.

3.4.4.2 A minimum of 195 AU in natural sciences is required. The natural sciences component of the curriculum must include elements of physics and chemistry; elements of life sciences and earth sciences may also be included in this category. These subjects are intended to impart an understanding of natural phenomena and relationships through the use of analytical and/or experimental techniques.

3.4.5   A minimum of 900 AU of a combination of engineering science and engineering design:
Within this combination, each of Engineering Science and Engineering Design must not be less than 225 AU.

3.4.5.1 A minimum of 225 AU in engineering science is required. Engineering science subjects involve the application of mathematics and natural science to practical problems. They may involve the development of mathematical or numerical techniques, modeling, simulation, and experimental procedures. Such subjects include, among others, the applied aspects of strength of materials, fluid mechanics, thermodynamics, electrical and electronic circuits, soil mechanics, automatic control, aerodynamics, transport phenomena, and elements of materials science, geoscience, computer science, and environmental science.

3.4.5.2	In addition to program-specific engineering science, the curriculum must include engineering science content that imparts an appreciation of the important elements of other engineering disciplines.
3.4.5.3	A minimum of 225 AU in engineering design is required. Engineering design integrates mathematics, natural sciences, engineering sciences, and complementary studies in order to develop elements, systems, and processes to meet specific needs. It is a creative, iterative, and open-ended process, subject to constraints which may be governed by standards or legislation to varying degrees depending upon the discipline. These constraints may also relate to economic, health, safety, environmental, societal or other interdisciplinary factors.
3.4.5.4	The engineering curriculum must culminate in a significant design experience conducted under the professional responsibility of faculty licensed to practise engineering in Canada, preferably in the jurisdiction in which the institution is located. 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.
3.4.5.5	Appropriate content requiring the application of modern engineering tools must be included in the engineering sciences and engineering design components of the curriculum.
3.4.6	**A minimum of 225 AU of complementary studies:** Complementary studies include humanities, social sciences, arts, management, engineering economics and communications that to complement the technical content of the curriculum.
3.4.6.1	While considerable latitude is provided in the choice of suitable content for the complementary studies component of the curriculum, some areas of study are essential in the education of an engineer. Accordingly, the curriculum must include studies in the following: a. Subject matter that deals with central issues, methodologies, and thought processes of the humanities and social sciences b. Oral and written communications c. Professionalism, ethics, equity and law d. The impact of technology on society e. Health and safety f. Sustainable development and environmental stewardship g. Engineering economics and project management
3.4.6.2	Language instruction may be included within complementary studies provided it is not taken to fulfill an admission requirement. Furthermore, curriculum content that principally imparts language skills can be counted toward the required AU of complementary studies but cannot be used to satisfy the requirements for subject matter that deals with central issues, methodologies, and thought processes of the humanities and social sciences.
3.4.7	Appropriate laboratory experience must be an integral component of the engineering curriculum. Instruction in safety procedures must be included in preparation for students' laboratory and field experience.
3.4.8	The requirements for curriculum content must be satisfied by all students, including those claiming advanced standing, credit for prior post-secondary level studies, transfer credits and/or credit for exchange studies. The document entitled *Regulations for granting transfer credits* is available as an appendix in this document.

3.4.8.1 It is recognized that, for programs at some institutions, some of the mathematics, natural sciences and complementary studies components of the curriculum may have been covered in prior university level (or post-secondary) education and this circumstance must be considered in the institutions admission policy.

3.4.8.2 These criteria do not limit accreditation to any particular mode of learning. In the case of distance learning, the Accreditation Board will rely on *the Interpretive statement on distance learning,* which is attached as an appendix to this document.

3.5 Program environment

The Accreditation Board considers the overall environment in which an engineering program is delivered.

3.5.1 **Quality of the educational experience:**

Major importance is attached to the quality of the educational experience as reflected by the following:

3.5.1.1 The quality, morale, and commitment of the:
a. students
b. faculty
c. support staff
d. administration

3.5.1.2 The quality, suitability, and accessibility of the:
a. laboratories
b. library
c. computing facilities
d. other supporting facilities

3.5.2 **Faculty:**

The character of the educational experience is influenced strongly by the competence, expertise, and outlook of the faculty. The faculty delivering the program must have the following characteristics:

3.5.2.1 There must be sufficient faculty to cover, by experience and interest, all areas of the curriculum.

3.5.2.2 Even though the faculty involved in delivery of program elements may include full-time and part-time members, there must be a sufficient number of full-time faculty members to assure adequate levels of student-faculty interaction, student curricular counselling, and faculty participation in the development, control, and administration of the curriculum.

3.5.2.3 Faculty administrative and teaching duties should be appropriately balanced to allow for adequate participation in research, scholarly work, professional development activities, and industrial interaction.

3.5.2.4 Under no circumstances should a program be critically dependent on one individual.

3.5.3 **Leadership:**

The dean of engineering (or equivalent officer) and the head of an engineering program (or equivalent officer with overall responsibility for each engineering program) are expected to provide effective leadership in engineering education and to have high standing in the

engineering community. They are expected to be licensed to practice engineering in Canada, the officers are expected to be engineers licensed in jurisdiction in which the institution is located. 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.

3.5.4   **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.

3.5.5   **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, preferably in the jurisdiction in which the institution is located. In those jurisdictions where the teaching of engineering is the practice of engineering, they are expected to be licensed in that jurisdiction. 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.

3.5.6   **Financial resources: Financial resources must be sufficient to ensure that:**
   a.   Qualified academic staff can be recruited, retained, and provided with continuing professional development.
   b.   Qualified support staff can be recruited, retained, and provided with continuing professional development.
   c.   Infrastructure can be acquired, maintained, and renewed.
   d.   Equipment can be acquired, maintained, and renewed.

3.5.7   **Authority and responsibility for the engineering program:**
The Engineering Faculty Council (or equivalent engineering body) must have clear, documented authority and responsibility for the engineering program, regardless of the administrative structure within which the engineering program is delivered.

3.5.8   **Curriculum committee:**
Engineering program curriculum changes are expected to be overseen by a formally structured curriculum committee. The majority of the voting members of the committee are expected to be licensed to practice engineering in Canada.

3.6 Additional Criteria

3.6.1   For purposes of accreditation, a program is characterized by a formally approved and published

	curriculum that is regarded as an entity by the institution and that can be considered independently. All options in the program are examined. Following the principle that a program is only as strong as its weakest link", a program is accredited only if all options meet the criteria.
3.6.2	An accredited program must have the word "engineering" in its title.
3.6.3	The title of an accredited engineering program must be properly descriptive of the curriculum content.
3.6.4	If a program, by virtue of its title, becomes subject to the content requirements for two or more engineering curricula, then the program must meet the Accreditation Board requirements for each engineering curriculum named.
3.6.5	The Accreditation Board must have evidence that all engineering options contain a significant amount of distinct curriculum content and that the name of each option is descriptive of that curriculum con- tent. An *Interpretive statement on curriculum content for options and dual-discipline programs* is attached as an appendix to this document.
3.6.6	The Accreditation Board must have evidence that the program name is appropriate for all students graduating in the program regardless of the option taken.

4. Accreditation policies and procedures

The accreditation process comprises two parts: program evaluation by a visiting team and   accreditation decision by the Accreditation Board. The evaluation of the program is based on detailed data provided by the institution and on the collective opinion of the members of the visiting   team.

The accreditation decision is made by the Accreditation Board based on qualitative and quantitative considerations, including the program's responses or clarifications to the visit report.

4.1 Initiation and timing of accreditation visit
An accreditation assessment is initiated only at the invitation of an institution and with the consent of the appropriate member of Engineers Canada.

Accreditation applies only to programs, not to departments or faculties.

The Accreditation Board does not evaluate or accredit non-engineering degrees, diplomas, or certificates or components thereof; only the engineering degree will be listed in the annual report section on accredited engineering programs.

An accreditation visit to assess or reassess an engineering program or programs normally takes place in October or November. A request from the institution for such a visit must be received by the Accreditation Board Secretariat by January 1 of the calendar year in which the visit is to take place.

Accreditation of a program is granted only after students have graduated from the program. For new programs, an accreditation visit may be undertaken in the final year of the first graduating class.

An accreditation visit to assess or reassess an engineering program or programs normally takes place in October or November. A request from the institution for such a visit must be received by the Accreditation Board Secretariat by January 1 of the calendar year in which the visit is to take place.

Accreditation of a program is granted only after students have graduated from the program. For new programs, an accreditation visit may be undertaken in the final year of the first graduating class.

4.2 Selection of visiting team

The Accreditation Board selects a chair for the visiting team; usually, the chair is a member of the Accreditation Board. The other members of the visiting team are selected by the chair except for the member(s) selected by the Accreditation Board in consultation with the appropriate constituent association of Engineers Canada. All visiting team members must be registered professional engineers. A request for a replacement on the visiting team may be made by the institution only for good cause. Specialists, as outlined in Section 1.2.7, may be used as resource persons on visiting teams.

4.3 Preparation for accreditation visit

Several months before the date of an accreditation visit, the Accreditation Board Secretariat sends to the institution documentation required for the visit. This documentation includes: a questionnaire to be completed by the institution, details regarding procedures to be followed before, during and after the visit, documentation required by the visiting team and the Accreditation Board and a schedule of events for the entire process which concludes with the Accreditation Boards accreditation decision report to the institution.

Copies of the questionnaire, with supporting documentation, completed by the institution must be received by each visiting team member and the Accreditation Board Secretariat at least eight weeks before the visit. If adequate documentation is not received as required, the Accreditation Board Executive Committee, in consultation with the visiting team chair, may cancel the visit.

4.4 Accreditation visit

An accreditation visit normally spans over three days. It provides an opportunity for the visiting team to assess qualitative factors such as intellectual atmosphere and morale, professional attitudes and quality of staff and students. The visit provides the opportunity for such activities as:

a. interviews with appropriate senior administrative officers, including the president, the dean of engineering and the chairs of the departments responsible for the programs,
b. interviews with individuals and groups of faculty members to evaluate professional attitudes, motivations, morale and the balance of opinions concerning theoretical and practical elements of the curriculum,
c. interviews with individuals and groups of students,
d. tours of physical facilities such as laboratories, libraries and computing facilities to evaluate their effectiveness, and
e. a review of recent examination papers, laboratory instruction sheets, student transcripts (anonymous, if necessary), student reports and theses, models or equipment constructed by students and other evidence of student performance.

Before the end of the visit, the visiting team meets with the dean and, preferably, the chairs of the departments responsible for the programs to review the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the programs and to indicate any areas of concern.

4.5 Visiting team report

The chair of the visiting team, working with the team members, prepares a report on the

program(s) visited. This is a report of the teams findings which includes: perceived strengths and weaknesses; areas of conformance to and deviation from the Accreditation Board criteria, as interpreted by the visiting team; matters of concern (both for the present and for the future); and, suggestions for improvement, if any. No recommendations for Accreditation Board accreditation action are included in the report.

The visiting team's findings, as outlined in the report, are sent by the Accreditation Board Secretariat to the institution for comment and reaction and to ensure accuracy and completeness. This also provides an opportunity for the institution to advise on improvements being implemented in the current academic year. The Accreditation Board may communicate with both the institution and the visiting team chair with the intent of ensuring that the program dossier is complete.

4.6 Accreditation decision

The accreditation decision is made by the Accreditation Board as the result of information gained from the accreditation visit process or from reports submitted by the institution at the request of the Accreditation Board.

In arriving at an accreditation decision following a visit, the Accreditation Board considers the accreditation history, the information included in the completed questionnaire, the visiting team report, the institutions response to the visiting team report, any further clarifying correspondence and any other relevant information.

In arriving at a decision following receipt of a report requested by the Accreditation Board, the Accreditation Board considers that report and any other relevant information.

4.6.1   Accreditation of a program is granted for a specific term, the maximum is six years. Any term of accreditation may be conditional upon the institution satisfying one or more requirements. The accreditation term ends on June 30 of the specified year. The term of accreditation is subject to review for cause at any time. Changes in an accredited program which violate the conditions under which accreditation was granted by the Accreditation Board may lead to an immediate reassessment of the program and/or termination of accreditation. Accreditation is granted if the Accreditation Board judges that, at the time of the decision, the program meets the published Accreditation Board criteria.

In some cases, accreditation for less than six years is granted to make the term of accreditation of the program coincide with the term of accreditation of the other programs at the institution.

Moreover, if the Accreditation Board judges that there are areas of concern, accreditation may be granted for a term of less than six years.

A program may be granted a limited-term accreditation, extendable to a longer term (not exceeding six years), subject to receipt of a report which convinces the Accreditation Board that the matters giving rise to its concerns have been resolved adequately. After reviewing the report, the Accreditation Board may extend the accreditation or it may issue a notice of termination of accreditation.

If the Accreditation Board judges that significant weaknesses exist in a currently accredited

program, a Notice of Termination of Accreditation is issued. If the Accreditation Board judges that a currently unaccredited program does not meet the published Accreditation Board criteria, accreditation of the program is denied.

4.6.2	Following an Accreditation Board accreditation decision, the institution is notified of the decision through the dean and the president and the dean is provided with a comprehensive explanation for it. The institution is expected to inform students and staff of the process of accreditation and of the accreditation status of the program.
4.6.3	A notice of termination of accreditation specifies that the accreditation of the program is extended for a maximum of three years at which time the accreditation is terminated unless the Accreditation Board judges, before that date, that the matters giving rise to its concerns have been resolved adequately. To determine whether these matters have been resolved adequately, both a report and an accreditation visit may be required. If the Accreditation Board judges that the matters giving rise to its concerns have not been resolved adequately, the accreditation of the program is terminated on the date specified in the original Notice of Termination of Accreditation. If the Accreditation Board judges that the matters giving rise to its concerns have been resolved adequately, accreditation is extended for an appropriate period and no loss of accreditation will have occurred.
4.6.4	In the event that an unaccredited program is denied accreditation, the institution may submit a request for an early re-visit. This request, accompanied by a description of positive changes that have been implemented, must be received by the Accreditation Board Secretariat within 60 days of the notification to the institution of the accreditation action of the Accreditation Board. If the Accreditation Board Executive Committee is satisfied that positive changes of substance have been made, a re-visit will be scheduled for the fall or winter immediately following the decision to deny accreditation.
4.6.5	The Accreditation Board reserves the right to alter the accreditation status of any program at any institution if that program is not in compliance with any of the Accreditation Board's accreditation criteria or regulations.

4.7 Significant change

Any significant change that takes place during the term of accreditation of an accredited engineering program must be reported to the Accreditation Board. Any change related to an aspect referred to in the Accreditation Criteria and Procedures and related regulations is a significant change giving rise to the reporting obligations and may necessitate an immediate reassessment.

Any change in the title of an accredited program requires approval by the Accreditation Board for that programs continued accreditation. When an institution supplies information for the renewal or extension of accreditation, it has an obligation to highlight and notify the Accreditation Board of any changes to the program. An Interpretive statement on significant change is attached as an appendix to this document.

4.8 Formal review

In the event of a decision by the Accreditation Board to terminate the accreditation of a program or to deny accreditation to an unaccredited program, the institution may apply for a formal review of the Accreditation Board decision. The formal review follows procedures

established by Engineers Canada. The Procedures for formal review of an Accreditation Board decision to deny accreditation are included as an appendix in this publication.

4.9 Informal evaluation or visit

If requested by an institution, the Accreditation Board will assist to arrange for an informal evaluation of a proposal or an informal visit to an unaccredited program at an appropriate time in its development. The purpose of the evaluation or visit is to provide comment and advice to the institution with respect to the program. No undertaking is given by the Accreditation Board as to the eventual accreditation of the program. A report is presented to the institution. No report is presented to the Accreditation Board. The cost of such an evaluation or visit, including nominal compensation for the visitors or persons who are asked to carry out the evaluation, is borne by the institution.

4.10   Publication

Records and deliberations of the Accreditation Board are kept confidential. The list of accredited programs maintained by the Accreditation Board includes only those programs that have been accredited by the Accreditation Board, together with the effective date or dates. The list is made available on request and is published in the annual report of the Accreditation Board. Documents describing policies and procedures of the Accreditation Board are also maintained by the Accreditation Board Secretariat and are available upon request.