MEngC (EEAC) Accreditation Manual and Guidelines

Engr. U Aye Myint

Patron

Myanmar Engineering Council

14-09-2024 (Saturday)

Procedures for Accreditation of Programmes

Article 1:	Myanmar Engineering Council authorizes the accreditation committee to establish this document in accordance with Article 3 of Policies for Accreditation of Programs to govern all matters concerning accreditation of programs.

Article 2:	Accreditation Committee promulgates accreditation timetable and related documents annually on the MEngC website: www.myanmarengc.org/ accreditation,

	www.myanmarengc-eeac.org

Procedures for Accreditation of Programmes

Article 3:   Accreditation Registration

i.   A program seeking accreditation must submit completed Request for Evaluation Form approved by its university to Accreditation Committee before the deadline.

ii.   A program seeking accreditation shall identify the kind of bachelor degree(s). An application for combined review of the bachelor's and beyond degrees programs may include only one bachelor's and one beyond degree program with the same chair and with no separate funding. Additional programs must apply separately and will be charged for additional fees.

iii.   Once the request for accreditation is accepted, Accreditation Committee will issue official notice by mail stating the deadlines for submitting further documents and the date of the on-site visit. The program must then submit a Self-Assessment Report and the on-site visit fee by deadline and prepare for the on-site visit.

iv.   Newly established programs that have yet to produce the first class of graduates may also request for accreditation.

Procedures for Accreditation of Programmes

Article 4:   Accreditation Team and Editors

    i.   Upon agreeing the request for accreditation, chair of the accreditation committee shall nominate the accreditation team which is composed of one team chair and additional one to four program evaluators and who have expertise in the professional domain of the program. Should there be two or more programs from one university seeking accreditation during the same academic year; the Accreditation Committee chair will nominate an accreditation team convener to coordinate the consistencies among the teams. In special cases, the number of program evaluators in a team may be exempted from the restrictions above.

    ii.   Registrar shall assign a liaison to each university with administrative matters.

    iii.   To ensure consistency in accreditation actions, the accreditation committee members shall serve as editors to proofread drafts of the Accreditation Findings Statement and Accreditation Action Recommendation. Consensuses between the accreditation team and editor must be reached on the wording and/or actions in the documents.

Procedures for Accreditation of Programmes

Chapter 2   Document Review and On-site Visit

Article 5:   Review of the Self-Assessment Report

i.   Registrar will verify receive of the associated documents and forward the Self-Assessment Report to the accreditation team for review.

ii.   Members of the accreditation team shall submit preliminary review findings on the Self-Assessment Report to the team chair prior to the on-site visit.

iii.   Having reviewed the Self-Assessment Report, the accreditation team may request for additional information to be presented upon the on-site visit.

Procedures for Accreditation of Programmes

Article 6:   Preparation for On-site Visit

      i.   Registrar shall notify the program by mail with the listing of the accreditation team members two weeks before the on-site visit and assist in the process of finalizing the on-site visit itinerary and list of interviewees.

      ii.   The program must display supporting documents during the on-site visit to support its Self-Assessment Report and to demonstrate its compliance with the accreditation criteria.

      iii. Registrar is responsible for the arrangement and expense of the accreditation teams associated with the accreditation visit.

Procedures for Accreditation of Programmes

Article 7:　　　　Accreditation Visit

i.　The accreditation team and the program under review must discreetly follow the on-site visit Itinerary during the review process.

ii.　The accreditation team must convene for a pre-departure meeting the night before the on-site visit to review findings from the Self-Assessment Report and reach consensus on the key issues to be investigated.

iii.　The accreditation team members must compile collaboratively the Exit Interview Statement during the on-site visit and to announce it at the end of the visit. The program under review, in return, must reply with the Response to Exit Interview Statement within two weeks from the end of the on-site visit.

iv.　The program under review must ensure that all unrelated personnel not interfering the on-site visit. It must also ban all forms of activities that may disrupt the visit, including but not limited to sound recording, videotaping, photographing, and note-taking. Both the accreditation team and the program under review must abide by the conflict of interest principles, avoiding all forms of improper reception, gifts, and lobbying.

Procedures for Accreditation of Programmes

Chapter 3   Delivery of Accreditation Action

Article 8:   Generation of Accreditation Findings Statement and Accreditation Action:

i.   The accreditation team chair, on reading the Response to Exit Interview Statement, shall produce a draft of the Accreditation Findings Statement and Accreditation Action Recommendation. These drafts are then proofread by the Editors.

ii.   The accreditation Committee shall call for an accreditation action meeting upon the finalization of the Accreditation Action Recommendation. After the accreditation action meeting, Registrar shall mail the accreditation action and the Accreditation Findings Statement to the university and copy the program under review.

Procedures for Accreditation of Programmes

Article 9:   Publishing of the Accreditation Action:

i.   There are three types of accreditation actions: "Accredited," "Action Pending", and "Not to Accredit."

ii.   The accredited status takes effect from the academic year in which the program under review is accredited. For example, if a program requested for accreditation on January 1, 2016, had the on-site visit on November 1st of the same year and was accredited for the duration of five years, then graduates of the program between the academic years 2016 and 2020 would be recognized by the Accreditation Committee.

iii. For provisionally accredited program, the accredited status will take effect from the academic year when the first class of graduates is produced. The five year period cycle, however, starts with the year when the program first registered for accreditation.

Procedures for Accreditation of Programmes

Article 9:   Publishing of the Accreditation Action:

(iv) Program receives Action Pending decision; the accredited status will take effect from the academic year when the program receives accreditation. The five year period cycle, however, starts with the year when the program first registered for accreditation.

(v) Each program will be given its own individuals accreditation action. Actions of all programs under the same department will be listed on the same accreditation certificate.

(vi) Should a program receive "Not to Accredit" action and object, it may appeal to the Accreditation Committee according to the Policies and Procedures for Appeals within two weeks of receiving the action.

(vii) The Accreditation Committee will confer the accreditation certificate and publish the name of the accredited program on MEngC website and the related media forms upon receiving of the Annual Accreditation Maintenance Fee.

Procedures for Accreditation of Programmes

Chapter 4   Annual Continuous Improvement Report

Article 10:   Accredited and Provisionally Accredited programs must submit an Annual Continuous Improvement Report on-line to the Accreditation Committee by July 31st each year. The reports will be taken into consideration in the program's next review.

Procedures for Accreditation of Programmes

Chapter 5   Interim Review

Article 11:   Accredited programs must register with the Accreditation Committee before the specified deadline.

Article 12:   The program must submit the Interim Review Report, which demonstrates the improvement made on the weakness identified from the last review and other areas of continuous improvement.

Article 13:   For a program that must undertake on-site visit, the visit itinerary shall be decided based on the extent of the weakness identified from the last review.

Article 14:   After the review, the accreditation Committee shall call for an accreditation action meeting and decide on the date of the next review.

Procedures for Accreditation of Programmes

Chapter 6   Action Pending Review

Article 15:   Action pending programs must register with the Accreditation Committee before the specified deadline. The council will decide if additional review fees are needed.

Article 16:   The program must submit the Self-Assessment Report, which demonstrates its compliance with the criteria with sufficient supporting documents and undertake a general review on-site visit.

Procedures for Accreditation of Programmes

Chapter 7   Subsequent Review of the Provisionally Accredited Programs

Article 17:   Article 6(a) of the Policies for Accreditation of Programs stipulates that Provisionally Accredited programs must issue an official notification through its university to the Accreditation Committee three months before its first class of graduates to be produced.

i.   The Accreditation Committee shall inform the programs about the structure and requirement of the subsequent review. The program must submit a report with the following information within two months after the first class of graduates is produced:

ii. Bachelor's degree programme:

iii. Evidence of compliance with Accreditation Manual, Qualifying Requirements, Clause -7.0.

iv. Evidence of compliance with Accreditation Manual, Programme Educational Objectives, Clause -8.0,

v.   Evidence of compliance with Accreditation Manual, Graduate Attributes, Clause -8.1.

vi. Evidence of compliance with Accreditation Manual, Accreditation Criteria No.1 to 7, Clause-7.0.

vii. Continuous improvement made based on last review.

Procedures for Accreditation of Programmes

Chapter 9   Supplementary Provision

Article 22   Should an arranged on-site visit be prevented by earthquake, flood, typhoon, or other force majeure circumstances, the Accreditation Committee shall re-schedule the on-site visit. Registrar must notify the accreditation team and the program under review in due time of the contingency measures.

Article 23   This document and any subsequent amendments thereto shall be approved by the accreditation Committee and promulgated for implementation by the Accreditation Committee Chair.

Procedures for Nomination of Accreditation Team Members

Article 1   The accreditation committee stipulates this document for the purpose of regulating the qualification and responsibility of the accreditation team convener, chair and program evaluator. It is drawn up in compliance with Myanmar Engineering Council Regulations and Article 5 of Procedures for Accreditation of Programs.

Article 2   Programme evaluator must attend at least one MEngC programme evaluator training workshop.

     i.   In addition, one of the following qualifications applies depending on the nature of their respective background:

     ii.   Academia: Senior professor, either from Myanmar or abroad.

     iii.   Industry:

- At least ten years of practical experience in the industry.
- With experience in administration and management.
- Non-profit research and development institutes: senior engineer or has held position equivalent to or higher than a section chief.

Procedures for Nomination of Accreditation Team Members

Article 3   Accreditation team convener and chair must meet at least one of the following qualifications in addition to those stated in Article 2:

      i.   Having observed an on-site visit, or been a discipline coordinator for a domestic evaluation project.

      ii.   Having held department chair or above position at a university either in Myanmar or abroad and participate the accreditation affairs actively.

Procedures for Nomination of Accreditation Team Members

Article 4   Accreditation team convener, chair, and program evaluator are in charge of the actual execution of accreditation reviews; their responsibilities are:

i.   Conduct each visit and interview according to the Accreditation Criteria.

ii.   Participate the on-site visit in its entirety and according to the on-site visit
      itinerary.

iii. Evaluate all supporting document provided by the program under review.

iv.   The Exit Interview Statement shall reflect the Program's actual merits and areas
      for improvement; it shall be provided in written form, using language that is fair, reasonable, clear, succinct, and non-emotional, while complying with the MEngC format

v.   Abide scrupulously by the requirements of the Code of Ethics for Accreditation of Programmes.

Procedures for Nomination of Accreditation Team Members

(vi) In addition to above, the accreditation team convener is also charged with the following:

- Serve as representative of the accreditation teams;
- Gain in-depth understanding of the effectiveness of the administration of the university and the college;
- Coordinate among the accreditation teams to ensure consistency in the review process and accreditation actions;
- Compile observation statement about the university and college in the concerned sections in the Accreditation Findings Statement.
- Chair the pre-departure meeting for the on-site visit.

Preparation for Accreditation Visit

i.   The Evaluation Team needs to be aware of the EEAC policies on accreditation as detailed in Section 7 of this Guideline and 2020 EEAC Accreditation Manual (Stage I Engineering Graduate Capabilities Appropiates to a Period of Nation Building).

ii. The Evaluation Team members shall read the programme documentation carefully, with a view to ensuring that it provides the necessary information sought by the EEAC in the prescribed format.

iii. The Evaluation Team will assess the Programme Objectives and Outcomes as well as carry out an evaluation based on all the accreditation Criteria 1 to 7 set forth in Section 7 of this Guideline. The assessment includes the auditing and confirmation of documents submitted by the IHL. If the documents submitted are not complete, the Evaluation Team shall request for the additional information through the EEAC office.

Preparation for Accreditation Visit

i. The Evaluation Team needs to be aware of the EEAC policies on accreditation as detailed in Section 7 of this Guideline and 2020 EEAC Accreditation Manual (Stage I Engineering Graduate Capabilities Appropiates to a Period of Nation Building).

ii. The Evaluation Team members shall read the programme documentation carefully, with a view to ensuring that it provides the necessary information sought by the EEAC in the prescribed format.

iii. The Evaluation Team will assess the Programme Objectives and Outcomes as well as carry out an evaluation based on all the accreditation Criteria 1 to 7 set forth in Section 7 of this Guideline. The assessment includes the auditing and confirmation of documents submitted by the IHL. If the documents submitted are not complete, the Evaluation Team shall request for the additional information through the EEAC office.

iv. The Convener, Chair of Evaluation Team and the Evaluation Team members, either together or separately, should prepare a list of questions for each section of the criteria to be certain that all aspects of the criteria have been addressed.

v. It is highly desirable for the Evaluation Team to meet face to face and/or communicate by phone and/or on-line (pre-accreditation visit meeting) regarding issues associated with the evaluation

Preparation for Accreditation Visit

Typical Schedule <u>Accreditation: (-1)</u>

i. A day before the accreditation visit, the Convener, Chair of Evaluation Team and the Evaluation Team members should hold a further meeting to finalise their findings and other issues related to the institutional programme to be evaluated. It is also important to review the questions and concerns that they have raised.

ii. At this meeting, the Convener, Chair of Evaluation Team and the Evaluation Team members should discuss the E EAC evaluation criteria and how they apply to the programme being evaluated.

Preparation for Accreditation Visit

(iii) The discussion should include, but not limited to the following:

- Solving of complex engineering problems is demonstrated.
- Programme objectives and outcomes
- The development, review and attainment of programme outcomes are shared with the relevant stakeholders
- The outcome specification drives a top-down educational design process
- The academic curricular reflects a professional engineering programme, and whether it satisfies the criteria completely

Preparation for Accreditation Visit

(iii) The discussion should include, but not limited to the following:

1. Solving of complex engineering problems is demonstrated.
2. Programme objectives and outcomes
3. The development, review and attainment of programme outcomes are shared with the relevant stakeholders
4. The outcome specification drives a top-down educational design process
5. The academic curricular reflects a professional engineering programme, and whether it satisfies the criteria completely
6. The learning outcomes and assessment measures within courses systematically track delivery of the targeted graduate outcomes
7. The mathematics and natural sciences, courses are at appropriate levels
8. The content of each course is appropriate

Preparation for Accreditation Visit

(iii) The discussion should include, but not limited to the following:

9. The level of course materials is appropriate

10. The courses are built on previous course work

11. The teaching-learning process includes appropriate assessment

12. The industrial training and project work are at a sufficient level

13. Students' standing in terms of their admission standards, academic performance, and industrial internship

14. The academic and support staff in terms of their credentials and qualifications, range of competencies, advanced degrees, industrial experience, teaching loads, and their involvement and accountability as an Evaluation Team member for educational design, review and improvement, etc.

Preparation for Accreditation Visit

(iii) The discussion should include, but not limited to the following:

15. The facilities are appropriate for the programme and operational; whether there is sufficient laboratory space for the programme, and whether safety is a theme conveyed in the laboratories, etc.

16. The quality management system is adequate for the programme

17. The external assessment is appropriate, consistent and fair

18. Networking with the relevant industries is available and sufficient

19. The quality loop is properly closed at both programme and individual course levels

Preparation for Accreditation Visit

Accreditation Visit: Day 0

18:00 – 21:00   **Dinner and Pre-departure Meeting**

Topic:

(1)   Reviews on the self-study report

(2)   Workload distribution and triangulation questions
(3)   Discussion on grouping of alumni, industry
          representatives, and students interviews.

Preparation for Accreditation Visit

Accreditation Visit: Day1

09:00 – 09:30   **Presentation by Institution Administrators**
An overview of the institution

09:30 – 09:45   **Traveling time to the meeting spot**

09:45 – 10:15   **Presentation by Chair of the Program**
An overview of the program and additional comments on the Self-Study report

10:15 – 11:00   **Meeting with the Program Faculty**
Questions on the Self-study report from the accreditation team

Preparation for Accreditation Visit

Accreditation Visit: Day1

11:10 – 11:50   **Interview Alumni**
                       Understand performance of the graduates

11:50 – 12:30   **Interview Industry Representatives -**
                       Understand the partnership between the program and industry

13:00 – 13:20   **Drafting the List of Questions for the Institution Administrators**

13:20 – 14:40   **Inspections and Reviews Documents on Display**
                       Discussion of Self-Study Report supporting evidence

14:40 – 15:40   **Tour Facilities and Space**
                       Understand the teaching resource and environment. Labs, libraries, etc…

Preparation for Accreditation Visit

Accreditation Visit: Day1

15:50 – 17:00   **Interview Students**
                   Understand student outcomes

17:00 – 18:00   **Return to Hotel**

18:00 – 22:00   **Dinner and Team Meeting -**
                   (1) Exchanges of finding
                   (2) Drafting Exit Statement
                   (3) Discussion on consistency of the Exit Statements

Preparation for Accreditation Visit

Accreditation Visit: Day2

09:00 – 10:00 **Meeting with Institution Administrators**
Discussion with institution on topic of administration and funding

10:00 – 10:15 **Traveling time to the meeting spot**

10:15 – 11:15 **Interview Faculty**
Discuss in-depth about curriculum design and student outcomes

11:15 – 12:00 **Inspections and reviews of Documents on Display**
Discussion of Self-study Report supporting evidence

12:00 – 12:30 **Exist Interview with Chair of the Program**
Final clarification on issues

12:30 – 13:00 **Lunch**

13:00 – 15:00 **Accreditation Team Meeting**
Discussion on consistency of Exit Statements

15:00 ~ **Announcement of the Exit Statement**
Team chair announces the Exit Statement

Preparation for Accreditation Visit

Accreditation Visit: Day2

- Throughout the discussions with the administrators, academic staff, students, and support staff, the Evaluation Team should confirm that an outcome-based approach to education is progressively being implemented by the IHL.

- Meetings with alumni, employers, and other stakeholders are important, as this would give an indication of their involvement in ensuring that programme is keeping abreast with stakeholders' requirement.

Evaluation Team Report General Statement

- It is expected that all IHLs will strive to achieve and maintain the highest standards. Thus, the quality control aspect has to be audited by the Evaluation Team.

- The Evaluation Team is to evaluate the submitted documents and check on the relevant sections of Appendix B (Checklist of Documents for Accreditation/Approval of New Programme and Relevant Information) of 2020 EEAC Accreditation Manual (Stage I Engineering Graduate Capabilities Appropiates to a Period of Nation Building).

- The Evaluation Team is to prepare a report as per Appendix H (Evaluation Team Report) of 2020 EEAC Accreditation Manual (Stage I Engineering Graduate Capabilities Appropiates to a Period of Nation Building) and/ or as per Section 6, 7 of this Guideline. Appropriate comments and remarks shall be made based on the assessment, which includes checking and confirmation of the documents submitted by the IHL.

Evaluation Team Report General Statement

The Evaluation Team Report shall:

i. State whether the programme meets EEAC requirements.

ii. Where appropriate, provide constructive feedback in the report, which may include strengths, concerns and even weaknesses. Suggestion for opportunities for improvement should be given in the report.

iii. In the event of adverse comments, provide a judgement as to the seriousness, any remedial action proposed or required, the time frame for the remedial action, and whether accreditation should be recommended, deferred or declined.

iv. Make clear and unequivocal recommendations to E EAC.

The Evaluation Team Report should be forwarded to EEAC no later than 4 weeks after the visit.

Evaluation Team Report General Statement

For full accreditation, there should not be any weakness for any criterion (Section 6.1 to 6.7) of this Guidelines and/ or Appendix H (Evaluation Team Report) of 2020 EEAC Accreditation Manual (Stage I Engineering Graduate Capabilities Appropiates to a Period of Nation Building). Before proceeding with the thorough evaluation of the criteria, the Evaluation Team must ensure that the following qualifying requirements have been met by the programme:

1. Outcome-based Education (OBE) implementation.
2. A minimum of 135 SLT credits* of which 90 SLT credits* must be engineering courses offered over a period of four years
3. Integrated design project (IDP).
4. Final year project (minimum six (6) credits)
5. Industrial training (minimum of 8 weeks)
6. Full-time academic staff (minimum of eight (8)) with at least three (3) Registered Engineers with the MEngC or equivalent.
7. Staff: student ratio 1: 20 or better
8. External examiner's report (minimum of two reports over five years)

If any of the requirements above are not complied with, the application for accreditation shall be rejected.

Assessment and Evaluation

The following guide shall be used by the Evaluation Team to assess Criteria 1-7:

Criterion 1: Programme Educational Objectives (PEOs)

An engineering programme seeking accreditation shall have published PEOs that are consistent with the mission and vision of the IHL, and are responsive to the expressed interest of various groups of programme stakeholders. The PEOs with appropriate performance indicators must be considered in the design and review of curriculum in a top down approach.

The following are examples of performance indicators expected for Programme Objectives:

1. Defined, measurable and achievable
2. Linked to Programme Outcomes
3. Have own niche
4. Published and publicised
5. Consistent and linked to mission & vision of IHLs and stakeholder needs
6. Linked to curriculum design
7. Reviewed and updated
8. Established process for assessing and evaluating achievement of PEOs
9. Evaluation results are used in CQI of the programme
10. Stakeholder involvement

11. The process of establishing the educational objectives should be evaluated by the Evaluation Team by examining the evidence provided by the programme. The following guidelines are recommended for evaluation:

Performance Level

i.   Indicative Guide

ii.   Unsatisfactory

iii. Poor: Fails to address the performance indicators

iv.   Satisfactory: Addresses most of the performance indicators

v.   Good: Addresses all or more of the performance indicators

Criterion 2: Graduate Attributes

An engineering programme seeking accreditation must have published Gradaute Attributes (GAs) that have been formulated considering items (i) to (xii) given in Section 8.1 of the 2020 EEAC Accreditation Manual (Stage I Engineering Graduate Capabilities Appropiates to a Period of Nation Building), and/or any added outcomes by the programme that can contribute to the achievement of its stated Programme Educational Objectives. The Gradaute Attributes (GAs) must be shown to be linked to the Programme Educational Objectives.

The following performance indicators are expected for Graduate Attributes (GAs):

1. Covers (i) to (xii) of Section 8.1

2. Linked to Programme Educational Objectives

3. Defined, measurable and achievable

4. Detailed out and documented

5. Published

6. Consistent and tied to Programme Educational Objectives

7. Outcomes in line with national needs

8. Reviewed and updated

9. Evaluation shall be based on the following:

Performance Level

i. Indicative Guide
ii. Unsatisfactory
iii. Poor: Fails to address the performance indicators
iv. Satisfactory: Addresses most of the performance indicators
v. Good: Addresses all or more of the performance indicators

10. Processes and Results:

The programme shall also establish a process of measuring, assessing and evaluating the degree of achievement of Gradaute Attributes (GAs). The results of this assessment process shall be applied for continual improvement of the programme.

11. The following performance indicators are expected for Processes and Results:

- Processes for all elements of criteria are quantitatively/qualitatively understood and controlled
- Processes are clearly linked to mission, Programme Educational Objectives , and stakeholder needs
- Systematic evaluation and process improvement in place
- CQI involved support areas
- Processes are deployed throughout the programme, faculty, and IHLs
- Sound and highly integrated system
- Common sources of problems understood and eliminated
- Sustained results
- Results clearly caused by systematic approach

12. Evaluation shall be based on the following:

Performance Level
i. Indicative Guide
ii. Unsatisfactory
iii. Poor: Fails to address the performance indicators
iv. Satisfactory: Addresses most of the performance indicators
v. Good: Addresses all or more of the performance indicators

13. Stakeholder Involvement

The IHL shall produce evidence of stakeholder involvement in the programme with regard to Section 8.1 of 2020 EEAC Accreditation Manual (Stage I Engineering Graduate Capabilities Appropiates to a Period of Nation Building).

The following performance indicators are expected for relevant Stakeholders Involvement:

i. In defining Gradaute Attributes (GAs) statements

ii. In assessing the achievement of Gradaute Attributes (GAs)

iii. In assessing improvement cycles (CQI)

iv. Involved in strategic partnership

Criterion 3: Academic Curriculum

Programme Structure and Course Contents, and Balanced Curriculum

The academic curriculum and curricular design shall strongly reflect the philosophy and approach adopted in the programme structure. The programme structure shall be appropriate to, consistent with, and shall support the attainment or achievement of the Gradaute Attributes (GAs).

1. Emphasis on the curriculum shall be placed on the understanding and acquisition of basic principles and skills of a discipline, rather than memorisation of facts and details.

2. The curriculum shall also provide students with ample opportunities for analytical, critical, constructive, and creative thinking, and evidence-based decision making.

3. The curriculum shall include sufficient elements for training students in rational thinking and research methods and other Gradaute Attributes (GAs) listed by the programme.

4. Co-curriculum activities must be designed to enrich student experiences, foster personal development and prepare them for responsible leadership.

5. For each course, the title shall be suitable, and the pre-requisites shall be mentioned and appropriate in terms of content.

6. The course content and core materials etc. shall cover each component specified in 2020 EEAC Accreditation Manual (Stage I Engineering Graduate Capabilities Appropiates to a Period of Nation Building) to an appropriate breadth and depth, and shall be adequate and relevant to the Gradaute Attributes (GAs).

7. The curriculum shall encompass the complex problem solving, complex engineering activities and knowledge profile as summarised in the same appendix.

8. Adequate time shall be allocated for each component of the content/course, including the elective courses.

9. The sequence of contents shall be appropriate and updated to keep up with the scientific, technological and knowledge development in the field, and to meet the needs of society.

10. There shall be mechanisms for regularly identifying topics of contemporary importance at local, national and global levels and topics that may not be adequately addressed in the curriculum.

11. The curriculum content shall cover:

    i.   mathematical techniques, technical subjects, co-curriculum subjects and technical communication subjects;

    ii.   technical proficiency in a major field of engineering, including the ability to tackle a wide variety of practical problems;

    iii.   a professional attitude towards matters such as design reliability and maintenance, product quality and value, marketing and safety;

    iv.   skills in oral and written communication; and

    v.   appropriate exposure to professionalism, codes of ethics, safety and environmental considerations.

12. The curriculum shall be balanced and includes all technical and non-technical attributes listed in the Gradaute Attributes (GAs) by the Programme.

13. Electives are encouraged, monitored, and appraised.

14. The proportion of electives shall not exceed the core subjects and shall preferably offer wide options.

15. The curriculum integrates theory with practice through adequate exposure to laboratory work and professional engineering practice.

Programme Delivery and Assessment Methods

❑ The programme delivery and assessment methods shall be appropriate to, consistent with, and shall support the attainment or achievement of the Gradaute Attributes (GAs). Alongside traditional methods, other varieties of teaching-learning (delivery) modes, assessment and evaluation methods shall be designed, planned and incorporated within the curriculum to enable students to effectively develop the range of intellectual and practical skills, as well as positive attitudes as required in the Gradaute Attributes (GAs).

i.   The assessment to evaluate the degree of the achievement of the Gradaute Attributes (GAs) by the students shall be done both at the programme as well as at course levels.

ii. The teaching-learning methods shall enable students to take full responsibility for their own learning and prepare them for life-long learning.

iii. The Evaluation Team is to find out from staff members and students the opportunities provided for interaction and group learning.

iv. Tutorials must be supervised, and attendance made compulsory.

(vi)   Sufficient contact hours must be allocated for consultation and interaction between staff members and students.

(vii)   Staff members can be full time academic staff members at the remote campuses, or qualified engineers from the industry.

(viii) Tutorials, group learning, interaction and innovative educational experience are designed to complement lectures.

(ix)   Tutorial and all other delivery approaches are part and parcel of the programme so as to complement the lectures.

(x)   A tutorial session should preferably not exceed 30 students at any one time.

(xi)   The Evaluation Team shall ascertain if the continuous assessment components demonstrate the depth of knowledge that satisfies the condition for passing courses.

Laboratory

❑ Laboratory reports shall be checked by the Evaluation Team. The assessment of laboratory reports shall have been done through a systematic manner. There must be proper laboratory supervision by academic staff members or qualified engineers from the industry. Students shall receive sufficient laboratory work to complement engineering theory that is learnt through lectures. The laboratory should help students develop competence in executing experimental work. Students need to work in groups, not exceeding five (5) in a group. The laboratory works shall also involve open-ended exercises. Laboratory exercises shall be relevant and adequate, illustrative, and promote development of instrumentation skills. Inspection of reports needs to show that the required outcomes have been achieved.

Final Year Project

❑ The final year project report shall be checked by the Evaluation Team. The assessment shall have been done through a systematic manner. The appropriateness of the project topics in relation to the degree programme is to be monitored. It is proposed that at least 9 reports are to be examined by the Evaluation Team (3 from the best group, 3 from the middle group and 3 from the poor group). The supervisors of the Projects must be academic staff members or qualified Engineers from the industry. The place where the projects are conducted should have the facilities to support the projects. The final year project is compulsory for all students and demands individual analysis and judgement, and shall be assessed independently. The student is shown to have developed techniques in literature review and information prospecting. It provides opportunities to utilise appropriate modern tools in some aspect of the work, emphasising the need for engineers to make use of computers and multimedia technology in everyday practice.

Integrated Design Project

❑ The assessment shall have been done through a systematic manner. The appropriateness of the project topics in relation to the degree programme is to be ascertained. It is proposed that at least 9 reports are to be examined by the Evaluation Team (3 from the best group, 3 from the middle group and 3 from the poor group). The facilitator/coordinator of the Projects must be qualified academic staff with relevant experience. The projects must be supported with relevant resources and facilities. Integrated Design Projects/Capstone Projects shall involve complex problem solving and complex engineering activities which include design systems, components or processes integrating (culminating) core areas; and meeting specific needs with appropriate consideration for public health and safety, cultural, societal, project management, economy, and environmental considerations where appropriate. The capstone project should involve students working in group. The programme may take the opportunity to assess many relevant programme outcomes through capstone project.

Industrial Training

❑ Exposure to professional engineering practice in the form of an industrial training scheme is compulsory for minimum of eight (8) weeks continuously. The industrial training is shown to have exposed students and to have made them familiar with relevant engineering practices. Students should be placed in relevant organization and undergo structured training supervised by qualified person. The IHL shall put in place a system to monitor and assess the industrial training. It is proposed that at least 9 reports are to be examined by the Evaluation Team (3 from the best group, 3 from the middle group and 3 from the poor group)

Exposure to Professional Practice

❑ Exposure to engineering practice is integrated throughout the curriculum. It has been obtained through a combination of the following:

(a) Lectures/talks by guest lecturers from industry

(b) Academic staff with industrial experience

(c) Courses on professional ethics and code of conduct

(d) Industry visits

(e) Industry-based project

(f) Regular use of a logbook in which industrial experiences are recorded

Criterion 4: Students

Transfer Policy/Select-ion Procedures

❑ The entry requirement to the programme shall be evaluated to ensure that the students accepted have the minimum qualifications required for training and education as an engineer. The IHL shall develop a clear, documented and enforced policy on admission and transfer of students. The policy shall take into account the different backgrounds of students in order to allow alternative educational pathways. The exemptions of credit hours shall be based on justifiable grounds. A maximum Credit Exemption of 30% of the total programme credits is allowed for accredited/ recognized Diploma to Bachelor degree; and a maximum Credit Transfer of 50% of the total programme credits is allowed between accredited/recognised from Bachelor to Bachelor degree..

Workload

- Students shall not be over-burdened with workload that may be beyond their ability to cope with.

Average Credits* per 15-week semester:

20 or more	less than 20
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory

Enthusiasm and Motivation

- The teaching-learning environment shall be conducive to ensure that students are always enthusiastic and motivated.

Co-Curricular Activities

- IHLs shall also actively encourage student participation in co-curricular activities and student organisations that provide experience in management and governance, representation in education, competitions and related matters and social activities.

- These involvements can be towards attainment of the relevant GAs if the IHL designed them to be part of the process. Evaluation Team should consider these.

Observed Attainment of the Programme Outcomes by the Students

- The Evaluation Team is to get a first-hand feel of the students' achievement of the Programme Outcomes by interviewing and observing them at random to triangulate various aspects of the attainment.

Criterion 5: Academic and Support Staff

Adequacy of Academic Staff

- There must be a minimum of 8 full-time academic staff relevant to the particular engineering discipline. The staff shall be sufficient in number and competencies to cover all curricular areas.

Academic Qualification

- At least 60% of the staff members are full-timers, with the majority having postgraduate degrees (Masters level or higher) in appropriate areas.

Professional Qualification

- Each programme shall have at least three (3) full-time Registered Engineers with the MEngC or equivalent, and actively teach in programme or equivalent at all times and actively engaged in the programme.
- For programmes with a total student enrolment exceeding 160, at least 30 percent of the full time and actively teaching engineering academic staff shall be registered with the MEngC as Registered Engineers or have equivalent certification.
- Staff Members are also encouraged to attain other Professional qualifications and be active.

Research/ Publication

- Academic Staff members should be given opportunities to conduct research. The IHL should have provision for research grants for the staff members.
- Research Output includes recent publication in conferences/refereed journals and patents.

Industrial Involvement/ Consultancy

- The Evaluation Team is to assess whether the staff members are involved in appropriate consultancy, collaborations, advisory and engagements with the industry and relevant organisations.

Teaching Load

- Average teaching load (teaching hours per week):
  - 12 – 15 (satisfactory)
  - >15 (unsatisfactory)
- The Evaluation Team shall triangulate the teaching load assessment with the academic staff during the interview.

Motivation and Enthusiasm

- The Evaluation Team is to have a separate meeting with faculty staff members to assess their motivation and enthusiasm.

Use of Lecturers from Industry/Public Bodies

- The Faculty is encouraged to invite engineers from industry and professional bodies to deliver seminars/lectures/talks to students.

Awareness of the Outcome-Based Approach to Education

- The Evaluation Team is to assess staff ability to implement the Outcome- Based approach to education..

Support Staff Qualifications

- Certificates, diplomas and degrees in the relevant areas:
- ≥60 (Satisfactory)
- < 60 (Unsatisfactory)

Adequacy of Support Staff

1 Laboratory Staff Member to 2 Laboratories: Satisfactory

- The Evaluation Team may use his/her discretion when a large laboratory/workshop is evaluated. The objective is to ensure that the laboratories and workshops are well maintained, and equipment is functioning for the learning purposes.

Staff Development

- The IHL shall systematically plan and provide appropriate training, sponsorship for postgraduate studies/ sponsorship for conferences, sabbatical leave etc. for academic staff.
- Similarly, for support staff, the IHL shall provide the opportunities for them to upgrade their competencies through training and practical exposure.

Staff Assessment

- The IHL shall incorporate annual assessment of staff performance which takes into account participation in professional, academic and other relevant bodies as well as community involvement.
- Similarly, the IHL shall also establish a working system for evaluation/feedback by students on matters relevant to their academic environment.

Staff : Student Ratio

- The Evaluation Team shall evaluate the ratio of academic staff: student for the programme for the last four (4) academic sessions. The following guide shall be used for evaluation.
  - i.   Poorer than 1:20 (Unsatisfactory)
  - ii. 1:20 or better (Satisfactory)

Criterion 6: Facilities

❑ Facilities in terms of lecture rooms, laboratory facilities, library/resource centre, eateries and general facilities should be available and accessible to the students. In the case of off-campus/distance-learning mode, the Evaluation Team should comment on whether the facilities are equivalent to those provided for the on- campus students. In the case where the students are sent to the main campus to complete the experiments over a short period of time rather than being spread out (as in the case of the main campus), the Evaluation Team should comment on the effectiveness of such a practice in the report after interviewing the students.

Lecture Rooms- QuantityProvided andQuality of A/V

- Lecture Rooms – Quantity and Quality (in terms of furniture, environment and AV Equipment.
  Unsatisfactory   Satisfactory
  Inadequate   Adequate.

Laboratory / Workshop - Student Laboratory and Equipment

- Laboratory/Workshop – Laboratory facilities should be examined to ensure there are sufficient facilities and equipment, and in working order to cater for the students.
- Average Student Number per Laboratory Experiment is:
- more than 5 (Unsatisfactory) 4-5 (Satisfactory)

IT/Computer Laboratory/Modern Tools - Adequacy of Software

- IT/Computer Laboratory/Modern Tools Accessibility and Adequacy
  Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory

Library / Resource Centre - Quantity of Books Provided

- The IHL is to have sufficient, relevant and recent titles of online/hardcopies of text and reference books, standards and journals to support teaching and research for the programme evaluated.

- For off-campus/distance-learning mode, the Evaluation Team should comment on how the learning materials are made available and accessible to the students.

  Not available/Not accessible   Available/Accessible

  Unsatisfactory   Satisfactory

Criterion 7: Quality Management System

Institutional Support, Operating Environment, and Financial Resources

Quality and Continuity of the Programme

- The Evaluation Team should examine the evidence provided by the Faculty/IHL on whether institutional support and financial resources are sufficient to ensure programme quality and continuity.
- Support from external bodies should be encouraged.

Attract and Retain a Well-Qualified Academic and Support Staff

- The Evaluation Team should examine the evidence provided by the Faculty/IHL on whether the institutional support and financial resources are sufficient for the programme to attract and retain well-qualified academic and support staff.
- Support from external bodies should be encouraged.

Acquire, Maintain, and Operate Facilities and Equipment

- The Evaluation Team should examine the evidence provided by the Faculty/IHL on whether the institutional support and financial resources are sufficient for the programme to acquire, maintain and operate facilities and equipment.
- Support from external bodies should be encouraged.

Programme Quality Management and Planning

System for Programme Planning, Curriculum Development, and Regular Curriculum and Content

❑ The Evaluation Team should assess the overall CQI process being used in the programme. Generally, the Evaluation Team will assess whether there are proper and sufficient policies/rules/regulations/ procedures in the Department/ Faculty or IHL, and whether those systems are implemented. Quality systems used in the IHL can be highlighted. Other forms of implementation for quality purposes such as external examiners, board of studies, and benchmarking shall also be evaluated. The established system for the programme shall be evaluated to assess the effectiveness of such a system towards improvement of overall programme delivery. Benchmarking should also be available either desktop or site visit.

External Assessment and Advisory System

External Examiners and how these are being used for Quality Improvement

- The programme shall appoint an external examiner to assess the overall quality of the programme.
- The Evaluation Team shall examine the external examiner's reports and determine whether the recommendations by the examiners have been implemented by the programme to improve overall quality.
- External examiner's evaluation is to be made at least one in every two academic years.

Industry Advisory Panel and other Relevant Stakeholders

- The programme shall have an Industry Advisory Panel (IAP) with members officially appointed with specific Terms of Reference (TOR) and period from industry and/or other relevant stakeholders. The programme shall provide evidence of meetings and dialogues with the IAP and the extent of their involvement in terms of quality improvement.
- IAP meeting shall be conducted at least once a year and properly documented.

Quality Assurance

- System for Examination Regulations including Preparation and Moderation of Examination Papers
- The IHL shall establish a working system for examination regulations including preparation and moderation of examination papers.

System of Assessment for Examinations, Projects, Industrial Training

- The IHL shall establish a working system for assessment of examinations, projects, industrial training and other assessments. The scope and tools of assessment shall be coherent to measure the achievement of programme outcomes. IAP meeting shall be conducted at least once a year and properly documented.

System for managing and implementation of safety, health and environment

- The IHL shall demonstrate that it has put in place a policy, system and resources for managing and implementation of safety, health and environment. The safety, health and environment culture must be apparent among staff and students.

Guidelines for Programme Evaluators

1. This is a guide to all Evaluation Team members who are appointed by the EEAC, on their responsibilities and conduct during the accreditation exercise. It must be adhered to strictly in order to ensure consistency between one Evaluation Team and another in terms of evaluation and final recommendation.

2. These guidelines are organized into different sections:
   a) how to prepare for the accreditation visit;
   b) a typical schedule of the visit;
   c) how to prepare the Program Evaluator Summary Report and finally
   d) how each criterion and sub-criterion of the PEV Worksheet should be assessed.

3. It should be noted that these guidelines only give examples of the performance indicators and the evidence to be sought by the PEVs against each defined attribute.

Guidelines for Programme Evaluators

1. At the end, *Program Evaluation Worksheet Rubrics* is also provided, which is helpful to the PEVs to interpret the three compliance levels, namely, *Deficiency*, *Weakness*, and *Concern*, against each criterion and sub-criterion.

2. There are a number of assessment attributes against each of the nine main criteria defined in the Accreditation Manual 2020 and also in PEV Worksheet. Naturally, all these assessment attributes do not carry equal weightage towards the bigger picture that has to be drawn by the Evaluation Team while arriving at the final decision about the accreditation of a specific program.

3. The *Program Evaluation Worksheet Rubrics* not only defines the compliance level against each assessment attributes, it also emphasizes on the importance of each assessment attributes by assigning it a number legend, i.e. 1, 2, 3 or 4, and a colour code that is indicative of the contribution of a specific assessment attributes to the overall compliance level of the main criterion.

4. It should be noted that there is no quantitative mechanism for the final decision making and these number legends are just provided to help the PEVs in knowing about the relative importance of each assessment attributes.

5. It will also help the PEVs to draw the bigger picture and to maintain consistency in their decision making.

Criteria and Statement Entries

1. Compliance of a criterion and accreditation statement should correlate each other.

2. Programme Educational Objectives, Graduate Attributes and Curriculum are the most important criteria. If criterion, Graduate Attributes and Curriculum is a Concern, Programme Educational Objectives should not be an Observation in level of compliance.

3. If a programme has any criterion that is a Deficiency in compliance; not to be accredited is recommended.

4. For programme in the second cycle, if most criteria are Observation in level of compliance (including Criterion Graduate Attributes and Curriculum), along with few Concerns, to be accredited for a full accreditation cycle (5 year) is recommended.

5. For the purpose of monitoring the effects of continuous improvement, if a department's programmes are currently in the second cycle with additional programme being accredited for the first time, the whole department is required to go through an interim review.

Criteria and Statement Entries

1. Compliance of a criterion and accreditation statement should correlate each other.

2. Programme Educational Objectives, Graduate Attributes and Curriculum are the most important criteria. If criterion, Graduate Attributes and

3. If Curriculum is a Concern, Programme Educational Objectives should not be an Observation in level of compliance.

4. If a programme has any criterion that is a Deficiency in compliance; not to be accredited is recommended.

5. For programme in the second cycle, if most criteria are Observation in level of compliance (including Criterion Graduate Attributes and Curriculum), along with few Concerns, to be accredited for a full accreditation cycle (5 year) is recommended.

6. For the purpose of monitoring the effects of continuous improvement, if a department's programmes are currently in the second cycle with additional programme being accredited for the first time, the whole department is required to go through an interim review.

Guidelines on Drafting the Exit Statement

7. For the first time and fails to be accredited due to insufficient supporting documents, action pending is recommended.

8. For programme undergoing second cycle and beyond, if its self-assessment report and the supporting evidences are inadequate but do prove to have achieved the educational objective and continuous improvement upon the observation during the on-site visit, it is recommended to be accredited for one year. But, if the programme fails to prove to have achieved the educational objective and continuous improvement, not to be accredited is recommended.

9. If a programme under interim review is lacking in continuous improvement; not to be accredited is recommended.

10. For a combined department (a bachelor's programme and a master's programme in one) under interim review, it is advised to harmonize the accreditation actions between the two programmes. Ex: An interim review bachelor's programme that has already recieved 2 years accreditation is getting a 4 years accreditation result; its graduate programme should get the same 4 years accreditation for synchronization purpose.

Guidelines on Drafting the Exit Statement

6. Three areas are to be considered in drafting the statement:
   - what is asked by the criterion?
   - Is the evidence sufficient?
   - And what will be the effect of noncompliance?

7. Graduate attributes in criterion 2 is described being attained through surveys without direct evidence; other type of assessment should be considered and needed.

8. All comments of substance should be made into actual statements in the strength or, improvement sections and not to be mentioned only in oral discussions or put into the observation part of the exit statement.

9. The observation section is for commenting on non-criteria related findings. Maximum of 2 points in principle.

10. After reviewing the programme's response to the exit statement, statements on the final accreditation statement can be modified or removed. New additional entry is not recommended.

Code of Ethics for Accreditation Programmes

Article (1)   To ensure objectively and fairness of the accreditation process and action and to maintain confidentiality of all accreditation documents and decision–making process, this document is drawn up by the Accreditation Committee in compliance with Article 7 of Policies for Accreditation of programmes.

All Committee members, staff, and members of accreditation team who are associated with the Accreditation Committee must abide scrupulously by the following in their accreditation undertakings and professional conducts.

Article (2)   All personnel associated with the Accreditation Committee and members of the accreditation team shall identify with the values and spirits of accreditation. They must uphold the honor and credibility of the community by exhibiting professionalism, fairness, and respect for others when executing accreditation.

Code of Ethics for Accreditation Programmes

Article (3)   For the purpose of sustaining the impartiality and independence, members of the Appeal and Review Committee may not be appointed as member of the accreditation team.

Article (4)   Accreditation team members must attend at least a programme evaluator training workshop, comply with accreditation principles, and conduct each review and interview as regulated by the Accreditation Criteria.

Code of Ethics for Accreditation Programmes

Article (5)   Individuals affiliated in the following respects with a programme under review must voluntarily identify and avoid being involved in the accreditation process:

i.   Having , in the past three years, held or is currently holding a full-time or part-time position in the programme;

ii.   Having awarded the highest academic degree by the programme;

iii. Having awarded an honorary degree by the university that the programme belongs to;

iv.   Having spouse or relative up to twice removed work or enroll in the programme;

v.   Holding a paid position, as member of an advisory committee member or a board member ,etc. in the university that the program belongs to;

vi.   Serving as a member of the program's advisory or self–Accreditation committee during the same academic year when the accreditation occurs;

vii. Having any other stake-holding affiliation with the Programme that is capable of undermining accreditation objectivity.

Code of Ethics for Accreditation Programmes

Article (6)   Accreditation team members must exhibit genuine dedication to their work, carefully examining the programme's Self –Assessment Report and related documents prior to the review. Compliance with the accreditation timeline is required. In addition to full participation of every accreditation procedure, members should avoid tardiness and early departure.

Article (7)   Accreditation team members must cooperate in mutual respect. They must not shirk responsibilities or workload, cite professional recommendations from other members without their consent, or probe into/criticize privacy/opinions of other team members.

Article (8)   Accreditation team members and staff must remain impartiality, declining all forms of lobbying, improper reception, and gifts. Office of the MEngC shall arrange and pay for the expenses for the accreditation team's meals, accommodation, and transportation during the on-site visit.

Article (9)   Accreditation team members must endeavor to speak in moderate manner, express sincerity, listen attentively and respect the input of the programme; they should refrain from excessive communication and feedback, and consciously adhere to the roles of a "interviewer" and "listener".

Code of Ethics for Accreditation Programmes

Article (10)   Accreditation team members must examine the documents for accuracy and completeness through triangulations, and allow the programme to explain and respond. The team must record the programme's actual merits and areas for improvement in written form that complies with the MEngC format, using language that is fair, reasonable, clear, succinct, and non –emotional.

Article (11)   Accreditation team members must keep their identities confidential prior to the review. Direct contact with the programme seeking accreditation should be avoided. They shall contact MEngC liaison should any requests concerning accreditation arise. Prior to the promulgation of the accreditation action, members of the accreditation team should not give lectures or attend activities related to accreditation on invitation by the programme or the university.

Article (12)   Documents provided by the programme are to be used exclusively for accreditation purposes. Disclosure is forbidden unless formal authorization is otherwise obtained from the programme. Accreditation forms filled out by accreditation team members, as well as any meeting minutes or records of discussions during the accreditation process are also classified information, not to be disclosed to the public.

Code of Ethics for Accreditation Programmes

Article (13)   All individuals involved in reviewing documents during the accreditation process must observe the confidential principles and are forbidden to publicly discuss the contents. Individuals involved with the deliberation of accreditation actions are also forbidden to discuss the matter in public.

Article (14)   Accreditation team members and staff must sign the Conflict of interest and Confidentiality Agreement before nomination, and re-endorse the agreement should further amendments be made.

Article (15)   All members, staff, and accreditation team members associated with the Accreditation Committee are responsible for familiarizing themselves with this regulation; all ethics-related issues should be confronted , treated , and addressed based document.

Article (16)   This document and any subsequent amendments thereto shall be approved and promulgated for implementation by the Accreditation Committee.

Importance and Advantages of Accreditation

1. The Accreditation Process includes evaluations of Norms and Quality of the educational institutions and programmes.

2. Accreditation ensures engineering students to have the knowledge and abilities necessary to thrive in their professional work.

Points to be Checked by the Evaluators

1. Consistency with Accreditation Criteria.

2. Quality of education to achieve Graduate Attributes (GAs).

3. Consistency with Programme Outcomes (POs), Graduate Outcomes, Educational Design Processes and Systems for Quality Assurance.

4. Curriculum Development and Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI).

5. The quality and experience of teaching staff and supporting staff to achieve required outcomes.

6. The sufficiency of teaching aids.

Points to be Checked by the Evaluators (Contd.)

7. Practical works of students and sufficiency of lab equipment.

8. Facilities, Resources and Financial Support.

9. Internship Programmes and arrangements.

10. Alumni, External Employers and External Examiners.

11. The Vision and Mission of the University to nurture the Qualified Students.

12. Adaptation for industrial sector.

13. Consistency with Qualifying Requirements.

14. Teacher and Student Ratio.....etc.

1. Accreditation serves a huge impact on the careers of engineering students.

2. The process of Accreditation serves a quality control measure to make sure the university complies with a set of requirements.

3. These requirements cover things like teacher credentials, curriculum, facilities, instructional strategies and resources for supporting students.

4. By becoming accredited, an engineering university may reassure students that it complies with the required standards.

1. Engineering Universities eligible for accreditation committee provide publications from diploma to postgraduate level in the field of engineering and technology.

2. It is certainly an honour to have the badge of accreditation stamped on your engineering programmes.

3. Accredited Programmes have been assessed through specialists (Qualified Evaluators) in the programme and discovered to have met the most appropriate first-rate standards.

4. This is the most important benefit of Accreditation Board programme outcomes to both engineering universities and their students.

5. The graduates from accredited engineering programmes will have opportunity to practice in or go for higher education in different member countries.

Accreditation Committee also provide the following advantages

1. Validates Quality Standards.

2. Fosters trusts in the University.

3. Improves Students' performance.

4. Helps in SWOT (Strength, Weakness, Opportunities and Threats) Analysis and Better Outcomes.

5. Provides a basis for fund-raising (Eligibility for Financial Aid)

6. Edge in giving employment opportunities.

7. Better mobility going forward.

8. Quality Assurance.

9. Career Opportunity.

10. Transferability of Credits.

11. Global Recognition…..etc.

12. Professional Licensure…..etc.

1. Due to a lot of advantages, the finest engineering institutions requires careful consideration of accreditation.
2. Students can be confident that the university they are attending is devoted to offering high-quality education since it has been accredited as meeting certain Criteria.
3. Students are given the skills and knowledge they need by accredited universities to succeed in the workplace.
4. Additionally, accreditation guarantees that students have access to financial aid, professional licensure, internship and employment opportunities.
5. Furthermore, Engineering Universities receive international recognition through accreditation, facilitating student`s pursuit their academic and professional objectives.