Doc no. EAB-RFE	Revision no. 0	Effective Date: 2022- 05- 05	
Subject: REQUEST FOR EVALUATION			
Compiler JS/ACCY	Approving Officer RHP	Next Revision: 2024-MM-DD	No of Pages:22

INSTITUTION OF ENGINEERS MAURITIUS
Engineering Accreditation Board
REQUEST FOR EVALUATION OF NEW UNACCREDITED PROGRAMMES

Incorporating APPENDIX-A & B

Document Reference: EAB-RFE
Document Name: Request for Evaluation of New Unaccredited Programmes (RFE)
Version Status/Date: Draft 06 May 2022

Purpose of this document

This document offers guidance to HEIs on how to request the EAB to undertake an evaluation of their new unaccredited programmes and includes a form (Form EAB-RFE) that HEIs must use to communicate their request and supply basic information to the EAB. It recapitulates for the HEI the substance of various provisions from the several EAB documents that describe the EAB Accreditation System, the Criteria and Procedures for conducting accreditation. The guidance material does not replace the contents of the EAB accreditation documents.

---

1.   PREAMBLE

1.1   A Request for Evaluation is an essential step in the Accreditation System and Process put in place by the Engineering Accreditation Board, an autonomous body established under the constitution of the IEM.

1.2   Council of IEM has delegated to EAB, the responsibility for the accreditation of engineering degree programmes, or the renewal thereof, and for carrying out any review of an engineering degree programme (for the purposes of an accreditation) in conformity with the Policy and Procedures of EAB, subject to an HEI making a formal request in that connection.

2.   ENGINEERING PROGRAMMES TO COMPLY WITH STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

2.1   The Accreditation Process is described in **document EAB-A11-P:** *Procedure for Arranging and Conducting an Accreditation Visit* which sets out all the activities which take place, and their sequence once an evaluation assignment is initiated.

Doc no. **EAB-RFE**	Revision **no.** 0	Effective **Date:** 2022- 05- 05	
Subject: REQUEST FOR EVALUATION			
Compiler JS/ACCY	Approving Officer RHP	Next Revision: 2024-MM-DD	No of Pages:22

2.2   Under the statute governing engineering practice, an engineering degree programme must meet the educational standard prescribed by the Council of Registered Professional Engineers (CRPE) for the holder to be eligible for registration as a professional engineer.

2.3   Under the Higher Education Authority Act (2017), the Higher Education Commission will grant accreditation to such a programme, (and therefore authorise the HEI to offer the programme to the public), provided the CRPE, in its turn, approves the programme of studies.

2.4   The requirement in Section 2.3 places the onus on the CRPE to approve a programme at its inception stage (prior to the programme being offered to the public) while under Section 2.2 an applicant for registration as a professional engineer presents his/her degree (i.e., after the latter has completed his/her programme of studies) to CRPE for approval prior to the applicant's registration.

2.5   The engineering programme accreditation system put in place by EAB includes a procedure for evaluation of new programmes, wherein the EAB evaluates a programme on the basis of planning information. This is not accreditation and cannot be considered as such. An Evaluation, with a visit, if required, to the existing facilities of the Engineering Faculty of the HEI by an Evaluation Team can be done as an advisory assignment based on planning information. Such a step permits EAB to examine all aspects of the planning of the programme over its full cycle and ascertain if the programme as well as its delivery environment satisfy the EAB's criteria over a 5-year cycle, and incorporates the measures, including feedback post-graduation which, if implemented, would satisfy the CRITERIA 1 to 4 spelt out in document **EAB-A03-P***: Accreditation Criteria for BEng(Hons) type degree*, and the same outcome can eventually be demonstrated through the EAB's evaluation procedure.

2.6   Under a Memorandum of Understanding signed between CRPE and IEM, the two organisations have agreed that IEM will assume responsibility for pre-launch evaluation and approval required for the HEI's new programmes, and that IEM will discharge its responsibility through the EAB. However considering that EAB, in the normal course of its procedures, intervenes at programme level at the time it undertakes a provisional accreditation, that is, only when the programme attains at least 50% (or 280 plus Credit Units) of the prescribed minimum programme Accreditation Credit Units (560), the delivery of the commitment between IEM and CRPE, imposes *an obligation on the part of EAB to ascertain, at the RFE stage itself, that the programme has the potential to deliver the academic standard prescribed by EAB, by meeting the Criteria 1 to 4, including each of the 11 Graduate Attributes in a delivery environment that conforms to that specified by EAB*.

2.7   To enable EAB to fulfill the obligation in paragraph 2.6, HEIs must, at the RFE Stage itself, submit to EAB sufficient information and evidence to the effect the programme submitted for evaluation has been designed and planned to comply with or satisfy the standards and the criteria specified in EAB documents EAB-A02-P and EAB-A03-P respectively. However, considering that the HEI will, in accordance with EAB's requirements spelt out in document EAB-A12 (Self Study Submission), compile and submit its Self-Study documentation in connection with the scheduled Provisional Accreditation *EAB will not, at the RFE Stage, require evidence of full compliance with document EAB-A03 (Accreditation Criteria), but*

only evidence of compliance with the elements of criteria specified in APPENDIX-B to this document.

3. WHICH PROGRAMME DOES EAB ACCREDIT?

3.1   IEM's delegation of authority to EAB is in respect of engineering degree programmes intended for professional engineering practice. These programmes, which are offered by tertiary educational institutions, generally span over four (4) full-time academic years or eight (8) semesters or, in terms of the European Education System, implies completion of the First and Second Cycles or the integrated First and Second Cycle programmes of a duration of four (4) to five (5) years. A student would, therefore, be expected to graduate after 16 or 17 years of combined primary, high school and university studies. In terms of student study workload, such a programme requires an overall input of not less than 5600 hours (comprising teacher-student contact hours and study time away from lecture rooms, or 560 Accreditation Credit Units (ACU) under the EAB credit system.   Computed workload by other organisations may differ slightly because of curriculum content as well as the estimate of off-campus studies that students need to do. Programmes of studies intended for technologists or engineering technicians are not currently within the ambit of EAB.

3.2   In the normal course of things an HEI may be running several programmes in engineering, some of which may have been accredited or been granted provisional (or interim) accreditation pending the HEI addressing some concerns (that would have been identified during a preceding Accreditation Visit); it could also be that an HEI has no accredited programmes though they may be producing graduates, as well as some new programmes being envisaged by an HEI or perhaps recently launched, as well as redesigned programmes.

4. REQUEST FOR EVALUATION

4.1   Any HEI desiring the evaluation of any one or more of its programmes in engineering must submit a Request for Evaluation *if it does not have any accredited programme running or has no previously accredited programme or plans a new programme.* The HEI does so by submitting the Request for Evaluation (RFE) form, viz. Form EAB-RFE. See Appendix A to this document.

4.2   Section 3.2 of document **EAB-A12-P**, clarifies that one of the objectives of this Request for Evaluation is to permit the HEI to identify itself to the EAB, by supplying evidence of its legal incorporation in the Republic of Mauritius; the HEI also submits evidence of the authorisation it holds from the educational authorities to establish a campus and offer programmes of studies in engineering, and communicate to IEM information about its Faculty of Engineering, the Departments and programmes that it offers to the public as well as other relevant information, including names of contact persons.

5.   PROCEDURE ON RECEIPT OF A REQUEST FOR EVALUATUIN

The procedure that follows the receipt of a Request for Evaluation is spelt out in Section 8.5 below.

The EAB Chair takes cognizance of the Request for Evaluation and apprises himself/herself of the specific HEI making the request and nature of the request. The EAB Administrator (Accreditation) (AA) will verify if this is the first exchange of communications with that HEI for same or similar purposes, and if there was/were any previous, what was the outcome. AA will update the EAB Database with the data supplied by the HEI or create a new record.

EAB Chair may decide on the mode of communications to adopt, for acknowledging and responding to the RFE, viz. responding by mail, convening the Dean of Faculty to a meeting, together with the Head of Department and the programme coordinator, or arranging a video-conference with the Dean, if a meeting around a table is impractical.

6.   PURPOSE OF MEETING BETWEEN EAB AND DEAN

6.1   (a)   The Meeting is an opportunity for EAB, especially if the HEI has no accredited programme running, to enquire from the Dean about whether the Faculty has accessed the documents relating to the EAB Accreditation System and in particular, whether the Dean or Head of Department is aware of:

(i)   the criteria against which the HEI's programme(s) will be evaluated,

(ii)   the nature of information and documents and data that the HEI would need to compile and submit to EAB, as well as the timing of the submissions,

(iii)   the facilities and logistics to be provided to the eventual EAB Evaluation Team on-site, during the visit period that would normally last one day, and the access required to existing facilities such as lecture rooms, libraries, laboratories, and other facilities that the HEI intends to use in the delivery of the proposed programme.

(b)   Notwithstanding the above, the EAB will provide the HEI with the required EAB Accreditation Manuals, documents, questionnaire, and any guidance documents published by IEM or direct the HEI to the digital source.

6.2   EAB will offer to run, on request, a Training Workshop on the Accreditation Requirements, including Criteria for accreditation of engineering degree programmes. Such a Training Workshop is mandatory for HEIs not having any accredited programme or not having benefited from such a Training Workshop previously and is run in accordance with Section 9.7 of document **EAB-A10-P:** *Accreditation Policy*.

6.4   EAB Chair will brief the HEI on EAB's cost recovery policy, including cost elements over the intervention of any overseas Evaluator or Observer from Washington Accord signatories, should their presence be required.

7.   FORMAT FOR SUBMISSION OF RFE

HEI should submit the information detailed in Appendices A and B. It is the responsibility of the HEI to submit complete and correct detailed information to ensure a timely evaluation of the RFE.

(i) Five (5) hard copies of the RFE documentation are required. To restrict the physical volume of the submission, **double-sided printing** must be used and a ring-binder that permits the volume(s) to be opened flat must be employed.

(ii)   An electronic submission of the documentation is also required. It must be in both pdf format and Microsoft Word 2016 or 365, or later, on a memory stick or uploaded to an EAB server by arrangement. Five memory sticks are required per programme.

8.   PROCESSING OF RFE INFORMATION

8.1   EAB Chair, in consultation with the Administrator (Accreditation) (AA) constitutes an Engineering Programme Accreditation Committee (EPAC) from among EAB members (qualified in the relevant engineering discipline or allied there with, but unconnected with the specific HEI), and designates one of them to be the Chairperson of EPAC.

8.2   EAB Chair and AA will also identify, from among persons registered as Evaluators with the EAB, up to three (3) persons to comprise the eventual Evaluation Team, one of whom will be the Team Leader. If more than one programme from different engineering disciplines are to be evaluated, separate Teams will have to be constituted, along with a Team Leader for each. In such a situation, to the AA, in consultation with EAB Chair will coordinate the several programmes to be evaluated.

8.3   EAB Chair will have to examine the experience of each person designated to be in the Teams to ensure that they satisfy the criteria laid down in document **EAB-A10-P:** *Accreditation Policy* for their responsibilities in the Teams.

8.4   In addition to meeting the criteria, EAB will communicate their names to the HEI for ascertaining eventual conflict of interest and resolving any that can exist.

8.5   AA will send all documents received from the Dean to the appointed the Team Leaders, who will proceed as follows:

"**S**" is date IEM receives Request for Evaluation,

Table 1: Essential steps in evaluation process

Desktop	Action	Responsibility
S	Dean submits Documentation to IEM/AA at date S	
S+1w	Appoint person of TL, status as Lead Evaluator (LE)	**EAB**
S+2w	Initial Screening documentation for completeness	**Ch, LE**
S+3w	Documentation not complete: refer back to Dean	**AA**
S+4w	Documentation complete: Appoint Team Members	**EAB with LE**
S+4w	Communicate Team Membership to Dean for identification of any conflict of interest	**AA**
S+5w	Dean to confirm/identify any conflict of interest	**Dean to AA**
S+5w	Secure Team Members' commitment to evaluate report	**TL, AA**
S+6w	Resolve unavailability/ineligibility issues	**CH, AA**
S+7w	Issue documents to Team	**AA**
S+8w	Team training or briefing	**AA, LE**
S+9w	TL contacts Team to commence evaluation	**TL**
S+11w	E-mail / teleconference and on-site visit as required to complete evaluation	**TL, TEAM**
S+12w	Draft Report complete and coordinated by LE	**TL, LE**
S+12w	Send Draft report to AA	**TL, LE**
S+12w	Send report to Dean for factual correctness	**AA to Dean**
S+13w	Dean to confirm factual correctness	**Dean**
S+14w	Report circulated with AC Agenda	**AA**
S+14w	TL presents Team Report and AC deliberates, formulates Advisory Opinion	**CH**
S+15w	AC Report submitted to EAB for approval	**EAB**
S+15w	AC Report with recommendations submitted to Dean	**AA**

………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

REVISION HISTORY

Section 2.6: Text <12 Graduate Attributes> amended to read <11 Graduate Attributes>

Date	Description	Reviewer	Remarks
17-02-2024	Section 2.6 : Amend <12>to <11> (Graduate Attributes)	J. Soobarah	Reflect only 12 WA (GAs)
	Inserted Header &Footer, Revision History and Boiler Plate		

AUTHORITY FOR THIS DOCUMENT

Document Reference	EAB-RFE
Document Name	REQUEST for EVALUATION
This Version Date	05 May 2022
ISSUE No	2022-2
Checked By (Designation/Name)	Administrator (Accreditation) Donald Dhondee
Signature/Date	
Approved By (Designation /Name)	Chairperson- EAB: Dr Andre Chan Chim Yuk, BSc Eng, MSc, DIC, PhD, FIEM, RPEM
Signature/Date	
Status (please tick)	Approved for publication on website/public access
	NAME: Raj H Prayag, GOSK, PDSM, PEng. C.Eng. B.Sc. M.Sc. MICE. FIEM

Document Release authorised for public access by	DESIGNATION: President, Institution of Engineers Mauritius.
	SIGNATURE: Date:

APPENDIX-A

REQUEST FOR EVALUATION

Document Reference: EAB-RFE

Version Status/Date: Draft 23 March 2021

Section-A

1. **NAME OF INSTITUTION**

2. **Address/Location (Registered address/Campus/Multiple Locations?)**

3. **INSTRUMENT of INCORPORATION (Statute, Business, Association, Trust, etc}**

4. **AUTHORISATION /REGISTRATION from EDUCATIONAL AUTHORITIES**

5. **AUTHORISATION to OFFER ENGINEERING EDUCATION PROGRAMMES.**

3. DEAN/HEAD of FACULTY of ENGINEERING

Name	
Designation {Dr/Prof/Assoc Prof/0ther (specify)}	
Professional Institution Membership	
Professional Registration (for Engineering Practice)	
Address	
Phone (office & Extension)	
Phone (mobile)	
Fax	
Email	

Where a second Staff member other than the Dean or Head of Faculty is designated, his/her particulars should be provided hereunder:

Name	
Designation (Dr/Prof/Assoc Prof/?}	
Professional Institution Membership	
Professional Registration (for Practice)	
Address (if different)	
Phone (office & Extension)	

Phone (mobile)	

Section-B

PROGRAMME FOR WHICH EVALUATION IS SOUGHT

Name	
Department	

If Programme is on-going, give the number of students enrolled in each year.	4th Year	3rd Year	2nd Year	1st Year

Year of last Accreditation (if any) for Programme, Name of Accreditation Agency and reasons for termination (if any).	
Year when Programme was first offered?	
Other accredited programmes (if any) offered by the Department? (State Year and name of Programme)	
Name of Accreditation Agency	

Latest accredited programmes (if any) in other Departments (State Department, Programme, Accreditation Agency and Year (from-to)

Department	Programme	Accreditation Agency	Year	
			From	To

Which of the Programmes for which evaluation/accreditation is being sought will have NO graduating students in this coming Academic Year. Indicate the Year of first output of graduates from the Programmes.

Programme	Year of first output from Programme

Is there any integral part of a programme for which main evaluation is being sought offered at other sites? If so, please list programme and locations.

Note-1: All correspondence will be addressed to the Dean **unless** a designated official is named, in which case correspondence will be addressed to that person.

Note-2: In all cases, the Evaluation Team report and official notification of the Engineering Accreditation Board recommendations will be addressed to the Dean.

Name and Title:

Address (if different from above)

Phone:

Fax:

E-Mail:

Doc no. EAB-RFE	Revision no. 0	Effective Date: 2022-05- 05	
Subject: REQUEST FOR EVALUATION			
Compiler JS/ACCY	Approving Officer RHP	Next Revision: 2024-MM-DD	No of Pages:22

……….

Signature of Dean (or equivalent)   Date:

………..

APPENDIX-B

-
-
-
-
-
-

-
-
-
-
-

APPENDIX-B

To EAB Document EAB-RFE: REQUEST FOR EVALUATION

Guidance to HEIs Intending to Submit a Request for Evaluation to EAB

EAB Doc EAB-RFE: Request for Evaluation   Page **1** of **11**

Criteria for Evaluation of RFE (Extracted from EAB-A03)

INTRODUCTION

The EAB Criteria for accreditation of engineering degree programmes are set out in the EAB Document EAB-A03-P, and the HEI requesting accreditation will be expected to have ensured that its programme design and delivery environment conform to the EAB Criteria whenever the HEIs submits its Self-Study Pack in accordance with EAB requirements in EAB-A12-P.

Notwithstanding EAB's standard procedure, that requires information as per Section 5.1 of the Self Study submission to be submitted sometime after a cohort of students have already embarked on the programme, EAB wishes to be assured that HEIs have planned their programmes with EAB's requirements in mind, especially in these early initiatives of HEIs to seek accreditation. Any major departure from EAB requirements, if detected at the time of submission might require the HEI to undertake remedial action of an extent that can result in the suspension of the scheduled accreditation exercise. Consequently, to avoid waste of resources and perhaps embarrassment at that stage, EAB will appreciate that any HEI intending to submit a Request for Evaluation of any of its programme gives due consideration to the elements of Criteria reproduced hereafter and ensures that its programme is compliant with these at least.

As spelt out elsewhere, EAB's evaluation of the HEI's submission at this stage will remain advisory, with the HEI having the discretion to attend to any issues raised by EAB on its RFE submission. The HEI's efforts at remedying any deficiency that could be highlighted at this stage will certainly be examined during the Provisional Accreditation assignment and will influence its outcome.

PROGRAMME DESIGN AND PLANNING CRITERIA

The references quoted refer to the Sections and Paragraphs in Document EAB-A03

The Criteria against which EAB will evaluate the RFE are defined herein under four CRITERIA as follows:

> **CRITERION-1**: Programme Educational Objectives, Credits, Knowledge Profile, and Coherent Design.
>
> **CRITERION-2**: Assessment of Graduate Attributes.
>
> **CRITERION-3**: Quality of Teaching and Learning.
>
> **CRITERION-4**: Resourcing and Sustainability.

Doc no. EAB-RFE	Revision no. 0	Effective Date: 2022-05- 05	
Subject: REQUEST FOR EVALUATION			
Compiler JS/ACCY	Approving Officer RHP	Next Revision: 2024-MM-DD	No of Pages:22

It is the responsibility of the institution seeking evaluation of an engineering programme to demonstrate clearly that the programme meets all the criteria prescribed in Sections 3.1 to 3.4. The Institution is also responsible for documenting that the programme satisfies each CRITERION.

3.1 CRITERION-1: Programme Educational Objectives, Credits, Knowledge Profile and Coherent Design

3.1A Programme Educational Objectives (PEOs).

(a) (i) For each programme seeking RFE, there must have been planned PEOs that are consistent with the mission of the institution, the needs of the programme's various constituencies, and the Programme Outcomes;

(ii) The programme must state the primary purpose of meeting the educational requirements for its identified engineering role;

(iii) The programme must be planned with industry participation in the development of the curriculum to ensure it is relevant, and meets the needs of the industry, particularly in areas experiencing rapid changes. An engineering programme should have an *Industry Advisory Committee* which meets at least once yearly with the department to provide feedback.

(b) The EAB expects some degree of commonality between the Programme's Educational Objectives and the purpose of the qualifications as described in Section 9 of Document **EAB-A02-P:** *Qualifications Standard for the BEng(Hons)/BSc(Eng)(Hon) degree programmes*.

3.1B.   Credits, Knowledge Profile, and Coherent Design

The programme should conform to the specific requisites of the BEng standard set down in document **EAB-A02-P**, particularly with regards to:

3.1B1. Total (minimum) Accreditation Credits specified.

The credit computation includes both contact and non-contact time, i.e. classroom and out of class learning time. See document **EAB-A01-P:** *Background to Accreditation of Engineering Education Programmes*.

3.1B2. The Knowledge Areas

Doc no. **EAB-RFE**	Revision **no.** 0	**Effective Date:** 2022- 05- 05	
Subject: REQUEST FOR EVALUATION			
Compiler JS/ACCY	**Approving Officer RHP**	**Next Revision:** 2024-MM-DD	**No of Pages:22**

An accredited engineering degree will conform to the minimum credit quantity prescribed in document **EAB-A02-P**, in respect of the Mathematical Sciences, the Natural sciences, Engineering Sciences, Design & Synthesis, and the Complementary Studies.

3.1B3. Complementary Studies

In addition to the foregoing requirements (in sections 3.1B1 & 2), the programme design must ensure learning opportunities for students in the other areas specified in Section 13.3 of document **EAB-A02-P**, which are relevant to the practice of engineering. These include, inter-alia, the following key areas: engineering economics, management, the impact of technology on society, effective communication (oral and written), as well as the humanities and social sciences. [see Appendix A.2 of document **EAB-A01-P** for *definition /description* of the Knowledge Areas.]

3.1B4. A coherent core appropriate to the purpose of the programme defined in that standard.

The programme must have a coherent core of mathematics, natural sciences and engineering fundamentals that prepares students for a career as well as provide a viable platform for further studies and lifelong learning. No specific courses are prescribed, but a key requirement will be a programme design and structure that ensures that each of the Graduate Attributes or learning outcomes can be attained.

3.1B5. The Specialist study component.

The coherent core must enable development in a traditional discipline or in an emerging field. This requirement may be satisfied through either compulsory or elective credits.

3.1B6. A minimum period of Industrial Training/Work Based Learning

(a) Industrial training may be related to attainment of a Graduate Attribute. A continuous period of Industrial Training (work-based learning) of a minimum of 8 weeks must be included in the curriculum and completed before the final semester.

(b) However, as provided for in Section 10.4.3 of document **EAB-A02-P**, the quantum of credits, in accordance with the quantum in (c), may only be

assigned if the training is quality assured by the HEI to ensure achievement of stipulated objectives.

(c) Credits may only be assigned to the industrial training in accordance with the provisions in document **EAB-A02-P:** *Qualification Standard for BEng(Hons) /BSc(Eng)(Hon) Degree Programmes*.

3.1B7. Laboratory Experience

(i) This is an essential component of the curriculum aimed at integrating theory with practice through exposure to laboratory work and professional engineering practice. Laboratory work should be planned to complement learning through theory and should be supervised by academic staff members who are registered professional engineers.

(ii) Application of computers and appropriate laboratory experience must be an integral component of the engineering curriculum.

3.1B8. An Integrated Design (Capstone) Project.

(i) The Integrated Design Project should conform to the specifications defined in Section 10.4.5 of document **EAB-A02-P:** *Qualifications Standard for the BEng(Hons)/BSc(Eng)(Hon) degree programmes*.

3.1B9. A Research (Research-Oriented) Project

As stated in Section 10.4.5.2of document **EAB-A02-P**, the HEI may, if it considers appropriate to assess the research component in a separate Research Project, include such a requirement (for a maximum of 48 Accreditation Credit Units).

3.1B10. The Programme Designation

A designation and qualifier consistent with the programme's purpose and engineering sciences content as stated in Section 6 of document **EAB-A02-P**. For example, for this purpose, System Engineering or Computer Engineering are acceptable qualifiers.

3.1B11. Explicit rules of combination and progression.

The requirements for and process of admission of students to the programme must be explicit. Likewise, the policies and processes for credit transfer and exemption in relation to the programme or to any of its modules.

Where the policies result in a requirement for extra support to be provided to the students to enhance and ensure their potential for attainment of some specific or all the Graduate Attributes, the learning necessitated shall not be computed into the minimum credits included under sections 3.1B1 and 3.1B2.

3.1B12. Explicit horizontal and vertical articulation options

Applicable policies and rules for moving at the same levels or to another between programmes must be explained, justifiedand stated. The students concerned by these rules must still satisfy the provisions under sections 3.1B1 and 3.1B2.

3.2 CRITERION-2: Assessment of Graduate Attributes

3.2.1 Programme Outcomes and Graduate Attributes

EAB has adopted the set of Graduates Attributes (GAs) published by the International Engineering Alliance and approved and adopted by the Washington Accord signatories as the basis of Learning Outcomes. These are reproduced under Sections 13.5.1 to 13.5.12 of document **EAB-A02-P:** *Qualification Standard for BEng(Hons)/BSc(Eng.) Degree programmes*. The programme must demonstrate that, by the time of graduation, the students have attained each and every one of the set of Graduate Attributes published by the EAB.

3.2.2 Every Graduate Attribute to be assessed.

HEI must map the Programme Outcomes in the academic curriculum against the Graduate Attributes indicating the specific module and the academic cycle (or Semester) in which each attribute is developed and explicitly addressed, and the means of assessment and the criteria for satisfaction of each outcome or attribute and the required level at assessment.

3.2.3 Continuous Improvement

(i) There must be a long-term commitment on the part of the HEI to quality improvement of the engineering education it delivers.

(ii) The HEI must have in place appropriate quality assurance mechanisms for,

- assuring quality and improving the same,
- putting in place a process to ensure continuous improvement, and thirdly
- putting in place adequate arrangements for planning, development, delivery and review of engineering programmes together.

(iii) The system must oversee and monitor the overall achievement of both the Programme Educational Objectives as well as the Graduate Attributes.

3.3 CRITERION-3: Quality of Teaching and Learning Processes

The programme must provide an effective teaching and learning process towards achievement of the outcomes that is evidenced by the following:

3.3.1 Documentation

The content, learning objectives, expected outcomes and method of assessment for each module of the programme are defined.

3.4 CRITERION-4: Resourcing and Sustainability

The HEI must provide a plan that demonstrates it will be adequately resourced to ensure that it is sustainable over the planned period of accreditation. The plan must provide for the following:

3.4.1 Students (as Resources)

(i) The level of selection of students is commensurate with the programme's academic requirements and defined by the HEI consistent with the demands of the curriculum, the preparedness of students at intake and expected progression.

(ii) The policies and procedures for student admission and transfer to allow alternative educational pathways, including the grant of exemptions from requirements on grounds of credits earned elsewhere, should be clearly spelt out and transparent.

3.4.2 Academic Staff (as resources)

3.4.2(1). Professional and Technical Competence-planning and management of assessment

(i) The staff members responsible for leadership, planning and management of assessment of the Graduate Attributes, are professionally and technically competent in the respective disciplines. Registration with CRPE as Professional Engineers is the approved norm for professional standing. Opportunities must be available to staff to achieve professional registration.

(ii) The authority and responsibility to steer and run the programme must lie with members of the faculty. This includes the authority over evaluation, assessment processes and decisions on programme involvement.

3.4.2(2). Qualification, assessment competence, knowledge and teaching experience

(i) The academic staff responsible for the programmes are suitably qualified, have assessment competence and possess sufficient and relevant knowledge and teaching experience to implement the outcome-based approach to education.

(ii) The academic staff members have the range of expertise and abilities to teach at specialist and fundamental level that is required by the programme and are expected to hold a post-graduate degree at least for teaching the core and specialist modules.

(iii) Staff members have research profiles relevant to the programme.

(iv) Faculty staff teaching modules that are primarily design in content are qualified to teach the subject matter by virtue of education and experience or professional registration.

(v) Faculty member(s), whether on full time or part time basis, supervising the Integrated Design (Capstone) project should have relevant educational qualifications, and preferably, a professional registration.

(vi) New faculty members without sufficient teaching experience receive training on teaching methodology.

(vii) All faculty members receive training on outcomes assessment to enable them to set appropriate course outcomes and can apply a combination of direct and indirect assessment tools to determine the level of outcomes achievement.

3.4.2(3) The number of academic and support staff is sufficient for the programme

Doc no.\n\nEAB-RFE	Revision\nno. 0	Effective\nDate: 2022-\n05- 05	
Subject: REQUEST FOR EVALUATION			
Compiler\nJS/ACCY	Approving\nOfficer RHP	Next Revision:\n2024-MM-DD	No of Pages:22

(i) The programme is delivered by at least eight (8) academic staff of whom at least four (4) should be engaged on full-time basis and whose first degree must be in the appropriate engineering discipline.

(ii) The academic staff should include at least one (1) full-time member holding professional engineering registration with CRPE or a Washington Accord signatory. Staff teaching engineering design or supervising Integrated Design projects have industry experience or are engaged in engineering consultancy if not holding a professional registration.

(iii) The academic strength should be adequate to permit members to engage in activities other than teaching, e.g. on research and for the purposes of professional development and interaction with industrial and professional practitioners.

(v) HEIs may engage part-time staff with acceptable professional qualifications in the related engineering fields.

3.4.2(4) Faculty Strategy for Staff Recruitment, Development and Retention

(i) Faculty has an academic staff recruitment, development and retention plan in place and that plan is aligned with the diversity plan of the HEI.

(iv) Opportunities for the development of support staff should also be provided; this can be achieved through further education as well as exposure to the industry.

3.4.3. Research Opportunities and Students' Facilities

3.4.3(1). Research Opportunities

(i) The faculty must support, encourage and maintain such Research and Development activities. Appropriate research development opportunities and programmes for staff members are consistent with requirements of Higher Educational Authorities, if applicable and aligned with the Institution's mission.

(ii) Appropriate research development opportunities and programmes for staff members are in place.

3.4.3(2). Laboratory and Library Facilities

(i) Office, teaching and laboratory accommodation and equipment are adequate to provide a learning environment conducive to the fulfilment of programme objectives.

(ii) Computing and information technology support systems and library services are in place to support the scholarly activities of both faculty and students, including books, journals, and other resources.

1.

3.4.4. Institutional support and Financial Resources

(a) The Faculty has sufficient autonomy to ensure timely procurement of financial support and facilities and logistics to meet contingencies and requirements for achieving all Graduates Attributes.

(b) Institutional support and financial resources are sufficient to ensure programme quality and continuity and sustainability, including with support from external bodies, if available.

3.4.5. Academic Development of students

Note: Academic development programmes may be present in various forms: foundational, that is, before entry into the main programme, or extended, that is, integrated with the main programme.

Where academic development programmes for students are either offered or are associated with the programme:

o the programmes are designed to match the students' state of preparation and progression towards the main programme;

o realistic criteria are applied for acceptance of students into the academic development programmes; and

o the academic development programmes are quality assured.