ENGINEERS AUSTRALIA

ACCREDITATION BOARD

ACCREDITATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT THE LEVEL OF

ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGIST

Document No.	S01ET
Title	Overview

DOCUMENT STATUS

Revision	Prepared by	Authorised by	Issue Date
0	Associate Director – Accreditation. Professor Alan Bradley.	Chair of the Accreditation Board. Professor Mike Brisk.	February 2007

Table of Contents

1.   ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGIST – PRACTICE CONTEXT

The National Generic Competency Standard (Reference 3), published by Engineers Australia, defines the context for engineering practice at the technologist level as follows.

"Engineering technologists normally operate within a relatively well-defined technical environment, and undertake a wide range of functions and responsibilities. They are often specialists in the theory and practice of a particular branch of engineering technology or engineering-related technology, and in its application, adaptation and management in a variety of contexts. Their expertise lies in familiarity with its current state of development and its most recent applications. Within their specialist field, their expertise may be at a high level, and fully equivalent to that of a professional engineer; but they are not expected to exercise the same breadth of perspective as a professional engineer, or carry the same wide-ranging responsibilities for stakeholder interactions, for system integration, and for synthesising overall approaches to complex situations and complex engineering problems.

The work of engineering technologists combines the need for a strong grasp of practical situations and applications, with the intellectual challenge of keeping abreast of leading-edge developments in their particular field. For this purpose they need a strong understanding of scientific and engineering principles and a well-developed capacity for analysis. The work of technologists is most often concerned with applying current and emerging technologies, often in new contexts; or with the application of established principles in the development of new practice. They may also contribute to the advancement of particular technologies.

Some engineering technologist qualifications include an emphasis on technical management as well as a grounding in a particular area of technology. Technical management is seen as an appropriate field of specialisation in itself, and many technologists build their career paths in this direction. Examples of such specialisation include product development for manufacturing, manufacturing management, mine management, and management and maintenance of processing plants, complex building services, or testing laboratories.

Persons may also be recognised as engineering technologists who hold degrees in fields related to engineering, and who have developed expertise and experience in applying their knowledge in conjunction with engineering work. Examples might be in geology and geotechnics, information technology and software development, mining, biomedical technology, optical communications, renewable energy systems, agriculture, and so on.

The competencies of engineering technologists equip them to approve and certify many technical operations such as calibration and testing regimes, compliance with performance-based criteria for fire safety, and design of components and subsystems and of installations such as building services in circumstances that do not call for significant new development. Such certification should be fully acceptable in the public domain and should not require further endorsement by other practitioners perceived to be more highly qualified.

Engineering technologists may lead or manage teams appropriate to these activities. Some may establish their own companies or may move into senior

management roles in engineering and related enterprises, employing professional engineers and other specialists where appropriate."

Stage 1 Competency

"Qualifications for an engineering technologist may relate to a particular technology or group of technologies – such as instrumentation, optoelectronics, information technology, computer networking, robotics – that have application in many contexts. Alternatively, they may relate to the technologies supporting a particular industry sector, such as air conditioning and refrigeration, aviation, the biomedical industry, manufacturing, railway signalling. The term technology is used below in the singular, and should be understood to mean also a group of technologies supporting an industry sector.

Within their organisation, an engineering technologist may be the person most expert in a particular technology or area of application, with responsibility for its reliable operation. Engineers Australia will also recognise as engineering technologists persons who have chosen to specialise in technical management – such as management of a testing laboratory, building and construction management, manufacturing management – provided they have an adequate grounding in the technologies concerned, as well as in the techniques of management.

Stage 1 competency represents the level of preparation necessary and adequate for entry to practice leading to these responsibilities. A graduate engineering technologist would be expected to work initially under the supervision and guidance of more experienced technologists or engineers, while experience is gained. Graduate engineering technologists are encouraged to undertake EA-approved Professional Development Programs while developing the practice competencies that will qualify them for Stage 2 assessment and the status of Chartered Engineering Technologist."

An accredited 3-year Engineering Technology program must deliver graduates who, in a generic sense, will satisfy the Stage 1 competencies.

2. ACCREDITATION SYSTEM – PURPOSE AND EVOLUTION

One of the objects and purposes of The Institution of Engineers, Australia (Engineers Australia), defined by Royal Charter, is "To increase the confidence of the community in the employment of engineers by admitting to The Institution only those persons as shall have satisfied the Council of The Institution that they have an adequate knowledge of both the theory and the practice of engineering".

In accordance with this purpose, Engineers Australia evaluates complete courses or programs (hereafter referred to as programs) leading to the award of engineering degrees and diplomas by Australian educational institutions. The key objective of this evaluation task is to accredit those programs which are adjudged as preparing their graduates adequately for entry to the profession and admission to membership of Engineers Australia in the grade of Graduate – career category – Professional Engineer, Engineering Technologist or Engineering Associate as appropriate.

This documented accreditation system is concerned with the criteria and processes for evaluating engineering education programs leading to the award of engineering degrees appropriate for entry to the profession in the career category of Engineering Technologist.

In summary, accreditation provides:

- the identification of engineering education programs, producing graduates that are deemed to have attained the competencies defined for Stage 1 of the Standards, in the appropriate career category, without further assessment;
- one of the two prerequisites for chartered status and/or registration, and consequently is a critical component of certification to governments and licensing bodies, and thence to the public, in relation to competence and safety;
- public identification of programs that have been evaluated by the relevant professional body, independently of the offering organisation, and have met the stated criteria;
- a guarantee of standing that engineering educators can offer to prospective students and graduates, Australian and international;
- a basis for international comparability, reciprocal recognition, and graduate mobility;
- a statement to governments and universities of the basic requirements of engineering education, and the level of resources reasonably required to meet these requirements;
- consultative feedback on the design of new programs, modes of delivery, and engineering schools, and assistance in the promotion of innovation and good educational practice.

2.1. System Evolution

Engineers Australia has accredited professional engineering programs for many years, under well-established procedures.

Prompted by the profound changes taking place both within engineering and in all aspects of the environment within which engineering is practised, a major review of Australian engineering education was initiated in 1994. The Review was jointly sponsored by the Australian Council of Engineering Deans (ACED), The Institution of Engineers, Australia, and the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering. Its report, *Changing the Culture: Engineering Education into the Future*, was published in December 1996. As the title implies, the report advocated fundamental changes in the culture and processes of engineering education. Its conclusions parallel those of similar reviews undertaken in other countries around the world since the early 1990's.

The essence of one of the recommendations of the Review was for the Institution, in close collaboration with the ACED to develop a new accreditation system for engineering schools.

In response, the Council of The Institution of Engineers Australia issued a new *Policy on the Accreditation of Professional Engineering Courses* in November 1997, (Reference 1). Workshops were held to introduce the new policy to universities, and the first series of evaluations under the policy commenced in 1998. In the course of these, it became clear that the operational documentation needed further development. A significant review of the detailed accreditation process was undertaken in 1999 in conjunction with the ACED and the revised criteria, approach and documentation requirements recorded in the first edition of the publication, *Manual for the Accreditation of Professional Engineering Programs,* released in October of 1999.

The transformation of process first implemented in 1999 was not meant to be a fixed prescription, but a foundation for continuing evolution and improvement.

Consequently the defining documentation of a process designed to promote change, must itself continually evolve. If it is to offer active guidance as well as criteria for judgement, it must relate to the current state of practice and the changes currently needed. The Engineers Australia/ACED Accreditation Consultative Committee provides a key input to managing this change process.

Engineers Australia is a transitional signatory to the Sydney Accord, (Reference 6), first signed in 2001. The signatories to the Accord through exchange of information, periodic review and mutual observation ensure that the policies, processes and practices for granting accreditation to engineering education programs are comparable. This agreement means that engineering education programs accredited by signatories to the Accord are considered to be substantially equivalent in terms of satisfying the academic requirements for the practice of engineering at the technologist level. A listing of programs accredited by signatories to the Accord is thus a useful resource to bodies responsible for the registration or licensing of engineers in signatory countries or territories, thus assisting the international mobility of professional engineers.

- Development of this definitive document for accreditation of programs at the level of Engineering Technologist represents a further incremental step in the evolution of the Engineers Australia accreditation processes. This Accreditation Management System has been built on the August 2006 revision of the companion system developed for accreditation of programs at the level of Professional Engineer and first published in December of 2004. The drafting of this Accreditation Management System for Engineering Technologist programs was undertaken by a Working Party comprising representatives from:
    - University of Southern Queensland (Working Party Chair),
    - Queensland University of Technology,
    - University of Ballarat,
    - Central Queensland University,
    - University of Technology Sydney,
    - Monash University,
    - Engineers Australia Accreditation Board.

2.2. Governing Body

Implementation of the Policy on Accreditation is the responsibility of the Engineers Australia Accreditation Board. The terms of reference for the Board are detailed in Reference 6.

2.3. Documenting the Engineers Australia Accreditation System – 2004 Revision

This basic criteria for accreditation used in the Accreditation Management Systems for both Professional Engineer and Engineering Technologist programs remains unchanged from that first introduced in 1999 and based on the Engineers Australia Policy on Accreditation, set in 1997, (Reference 1). The accreditation processes developed in these documents are built on the notion of an outcomes driven approach to educational design, performance assessment and continuous quality improvement as well as the accreditation evaluation task itself.

This defining documentation uses a modular, controlled document structure, to provide for ease of navigation and updates as well as effective version control.

The accreditation criteria, (Reference 2), provides a consistent theme and will underpin the development of submitted documentation by the educational provider as well as the work of the evaluation panel.

The accreditation submission documentation requirements have been consolidated since 2004 to minimise the complexity of the compilation task, removing any duplication of effort, and maximising the effectiveness of the information sought. This documentation is expected to serve as a self-evaluation instrument, as well as guiding the accreditation assessment process.

Flexible delivery of engineering education programs through distance, offshore and workplace options is addressed more thoroughly in this revision.

3. THE BASIS OF ACCREDITATION

An engineering education program is defined as a sequence of study within a specific discipline or field of specialisation, with uniquely defined educational outcomes. An overall program definition may incorporate multiple delivery options, with each delivery option representing a separate implementation pathway. Accreditation must embrace all declared delivery options for a particular program.

Graduates of a particular program will be eligible for a specific degree or diploma award with an appropriately designated title.

Engineers Australia considers engineering programs for accreditation at the request of the educational institution offering a particular program or range of programs. Accreditation is not obligatory.

Accreditation is accorded to engineering education programs, not to degree or diploma award titles, nor to organisational entities such as faculties or schools. Individual academic programs are considered for accreditation at one of three levels - Professional Engineer, Engineering Technologist or Engineering Associate, in accordance with the defined educational outcomes and targeted career destinations for graduates.

Programs are not ranked or merit-graded: they are either accredited, or not.

Accreditation of engineering education programs offered by Australian engineering education providers is governed solely by the Engineers Australia Policy on Accreditation of Professional Engineering Programs, (Reference 1).

3.1. Building an Outcomes Based Approach to Accreditation and Educational Design

The Engineers Australia Policy on Accreditation of Engineering Technology Programs, (Reference 1), requires graduates from an accredited program in any engineering discipline to be characterised by 10 generic attributes. These attributes cover personal and professional capabilities, the need for in-depth technical competence, problem-solving capabilities, a systems based approach to design and the ability to apply fundamental knowledge. The generic attributes statement provides a common platform for an outcomes based approach to educational design for all engineering programs. Graduates must be technically competent across a broad field of engineering practice (ie a designated engineering discipline) and be equipped with high level skills and knowledge in one or more specialist areas within the nominated field of practice.

More recently, Engineers Australia has published the National Generic Competency Standards - Stage 1 Competency Standard for Engineering Technologist (Reference 3). This standard expands on the generic attributes platform to develop a full generic statement of competencies defining the level of preparation necessary and adequate for entry to engineering practice.

In establishing or reviewing an engineering education program in a particular engineering field, a key resource will be a detailed specification of educational outcomes set for the program. Such a specification would include broad program objectives and a detailed range of capabilities targeted for graduates. Graduate capabilities would be expected to cover enabling skills and knowledge, depth and breadth of technical competence, engineering application skills as well as personal and professional capabilities. The Stage 1 Competency Standard provides a useful generic template for such an outcomes specification to which would need to be added technical outcomes appropriate to the designated field of practice and/or specialisation(s).

Targeted graduate capabilities ideally need to be coupled with integrated performance indicators which aggregate to demonstrate an appropriate level of attainment of the Stage 1 competencies and thus the generic attributes. Such an outcomes based approach to educational design is discussed in further detail in Reference 4.

A specification of declared educational outcomes provides the starting point for the accreditation process and also a foundation for the educational design and review tasks.

3.2.   Evaluating Innovative Programs

It is a challenge for an accreditation process to act so as to promote innovation and experimentation, and at the same time maintain standards that can be objectively certified, publicly and internationally. There is no simple answer to this. Innovation by its nature challenges existing wisdom, but not every program that departs from existing norms can be said to be innovative or good.

The Engineers Australia accreditation system encourages innovation by minimising the degree of prescription in how the required program outcomes are to be attained. Program evaluation will always focus on the intent of the criteria and on the demonstrated capability of graduates to enter engineering practice. Clearly however, a program which departs radically from the methods normally found necessary – for example, by employing only a fraction of the normal complement of staff – may expect a searching examination of method as well as outcomes. The Board and its evaluation panels are required both to be receptive to new approaches, and to use the best judgement available to evaluate their substance and merit.

Continuing innovation and development can be expected to lead to a restatement of the accreditation criteria and even the Policy from time to time. These are not expected to be frequent occurrences.

3.3.   Promoting Best Practice

Accreditation acts in a general way to promote best practice, through the exposure and experiences of Board and panel members with developments nationally and internationally both in industry and academia. Engineers Australia does wish to encourage more direct mechanisms for disseminating innovation and best practice

within the Australian engineering education community.

Accreditation reports are confidential between Engineers Australia and the educational provider. It is not appropriate for Engineers Australia to publish these, nor even to publish a selection with universities' permission, as this might imply a form of ranking.

Engineers Australia strongly encourages universities to share educational innovations and developments in good practice by all available means, including dissemination via ACED and by publication, for example through The Australian Association for Engineering Education (AAEE) publications and conferences. It is appreciated that universities find themselves in serious competition, but shared development is in the interests of engineering education and engineering practice in Australia generally.

Following a decision by Engineers Australia to accredit a program, the educational provider may be asked to give permission for examples of innovation or good practice to be communicated to ACED or AAEE for promulgation. This may take the form of an invitation to write an article for publication.

3.4.   Communicating Views

The Policy requires engineering schools to maintain their own industry advisory mechanisms and consultations with constituents. Nevertheless, Engineers Australia may wish from time to time to provide a viewpoint to engineering schools: for example a perceived need for new programs in certain fields, or a suggested change in direction or emphasis. Similarly, it may wish to consult with engineering schools in forming views to put to Government or other third party.

The Board may conduct such communications directly with schools, or through ACED or AAEE.

3.5.   Essential Elements of the Accreditation Process

Direct assessment of outcomes is important in the quality cycle for any particular program. It is also an important consideration in accreditation but cannot by any means be the sole determinant. A judgement on the appropriateness and standard of attainment of outcomes must also take into account inputs, process and content.

For any particular program the accreditation process begins with consideration of the declared educational outcomes specification with special emphasis on the targeted graduate capabilities and any associated performance indicators. Evidence of the attainment of outcomes will be partially through an aggregation of assessment and feedback data gathered by the education provider. Further evidence that graduates will be potentially equipped with the full range of Stage 1 competencies will arise from the provider's approach to educational design and review; the program structure, curriculum content and delivery modes; the approach to assessment; the quality assurance systems and the overall operating environment.

The accreditation process does not prescribe detailed program content or educational method, but invites innovation and diversity. It requires engineering education providers to have in place their own mechanisms for researching and systematically reviewing program objectives and targeted graduate capabilities, for educational design and performance assessment and for continuous quality improvement. The focus of accreditation is on the essential graduate outcomes and

the evidence of their attainment.

3.6. Accreditation Criteria

The formal accreditation criteria are derived directly from the Policy and are developed under three main headings:

- the operating environment,
- the academic program, and
- the quality systems.

The detailed accreditation criteria and associated performance indicators are clearly identified in summary form, (Reference 2).

3.7. Standards of Technical Competence

A frequent misconception of the evolving accreditation system is that the emphasis is shifting away from building a high standard of technical competence to the development of a broad range of 'softer' skills in engineering graduates. The generic attributes statement within the Policy in fact contradicts this interpretation by demanding that graduates be equipped with appropriate foundation knowledge and skills in engineering and science, complex problem solving and design capabilities as well as in-depth technical competence.

A primary responsibility of the engineering education provider is to set a detailed and measurable specification of targeted graduate capabilities, appropriate to the designated domain of practice and associated area(s) of specialisation. These targets need to be determined in consultation with external constituencies and with reference to national and international engineering education practices. The outcomes specification needs to include an objective definition of the knowledge base and technical skills, the engineering application skills and the professional and personal capabilities expected for a graduate of the program. A key function of the accreditation task is to make judgement on the appropriateness and level of attainment of these targeted outcomes.

The development of professional and personal skills is also fundamental to the generic attributes statement and needs to be inter-woven with the development of technical competence, enabling skills, problem solving and design capabilities as a holistic and unified educational experience.

The emphasis should be on systematic educational design and a balanced curriculum, which perhaps is less 'content packed', but never-the-less delivers a demonstrated depth of technical competence, focussed within selected specialist areas of the designated practice domain. Through a proven life long learning ability there will be capacity for a graduate to add breadth and depth to this technical competence on an 'as-required' basis.

4. THE ACCREDITATION CYCLE

So far as possible, accreditation is scheduled so that all programs offered by a particular education institution or engineering school are reviewed concurrently at intervals of five years. This is referred to as a general review of programs offered by the particular provider. Established programs which meet all criteria are normally accredited or re-accredited for the five year period.

ACCREDITATION
ENGINEERS Overview
AUSTRALIA

S01ET Rev 0

SYSTEM & CONTEXT
Page 11 of 15

Accreditation is normally accorded on a full calendar year basis. Should Engineers Australia be unable to schedule procedures to re-accredit within a five-year period, or should a school be unable to meet a schedule through genuine misadventure, existing accreditation will normally be extended for one further calendar year. Where a program is scheduled for closure, accreditation can normally be extended from year to year for a limited time.

4.1.   The General Review Process

The engineering education provider will normally submit a request to Engineers Australia for a program or programs to be accredited. Engineers Australia will issue a timely reminder where a general review of programs is due.

Engineers Australia will acknowledge the accreditation request by issuing a date for submission of initial documentation and a targeted visit date. Guidelines for preparing the initial documentation are detailed in Reference 5.

An independent evaluation panel comprising senior academic and industry practitioners undertakes the evaluation of programs. The Accreditation Board formally approves the composition of evaluation panels. The accreditation process involves a formally documented submission from the institution concerned, and normally a panel visit to the campus. The submission documentation provides a fundamental self-review against the accreditation criteria, (Reference 2). A panel tele-conference is held some 4-5 weeks prior to the visit to discuss initial findings. A tele-conference report is prepared for the educational institution to advise of any initial concerns the panel may have and any additional data or information that is required. Following the campus visit, a formal report from the panel provides recommendations on accreditation to the Accreditation Board. The Board approves a draft version of the report for release and invited comment from the educational institution before finalising its decision on accreditation.

A panel bases its findings and recommendations on both the initial documentation and the visit. The structure of the visit report is outlined in Reference 7. The education provider has the opportunity to comment on a draft form of the visit report prior to finalisation by the Accreditation Board.

Full details of the general review process are provided in Reference 7. Possible terms and conditions on accreditation, limitations on publication of outcomes, confidentiality issues, avenues of appeal, mechanisms for investigating concerns and potential conflicts of interest are all covered in Reference 7.

4.2.   Introducing New Programs

Education providers are required to advise Engineers Australia of the intention to introduce a new program. This will normally be undertaken at the time internal institutional approval has been obtained for the program's introduction and must be provided prior to commencement of the first cohort of students.

Given the strong focus on graduate outcomes, a new program cannot be given full accreditation until after the emergence of the first group of graduates. To provide the school and its students with reasonable reassurance, ***provisional accreditation*** may be accorded on the basis of compliance with the criteria to the extent then possible. A new program is considered for full accreditation when it reaches completion (i.e. graduation of its first sizeable intake of students).

Consideration of provisional accreditation should normally be undertaken during the first year of operation of a new program. Provisional accreditation in some cases will require a campus visit. Documentation requirements and details of processes for the accreditation of new programs are provided in Reference 8. Provisional accreditation assures graduates of a program the same recognition and entitlements as full accreditation status. It is important however to seek full accreditation for a program as soon as practicable once substantial numbers of graduates begin to emerge on a regular basis. At the very latest, full accreditation should be sought at the next scheduled general review once these conditions are met.

4.3.   Changes to Existing Programs

The terms of accreditation will provide for on-going development of structure and content and the expectation of continuing improvement. It would normally be expected that such amendments be within the framework of the educational outcomes specification, (program objectives and targeted graduate capabilities), approved as part of the accreditation process.

Where major amendments are being proposed and will result in changes to the program title or formal program objectives and/or graduate capability targets, then Engineers Australia must be notified in writing of such changes prior to the implementation of the change.

Under such major changes the Accreditation Board will take the decision on whether to maintain continuing full accreditation or whether to consider the revised program for provisional accreditation. In any case full accreditation will need to be re-affirmed once the first cohort of students has graduated from the revised program. Further details on the consideration of program changes are provided in Reference 8.

4.4.   Alternative Implementation Pathways

Engineers Australia encourages innovative approaches to program design leading to flexible options for students and the provision of new engineering education products.

Flexible delivery options will commonly be manifested as alternative implementation pathways within a single program definition. In this case each pathway will normally be designed to meet the same objectives and deliver the same educational outcomes and neither the title of the program nor that of the associated award would normally be differentiated on the basis of the particular implementation pathway followed.

Alternative implementation pathways may for example occur through optional major or minor study sequences, elective academic units, workplace learning options, defined articulation routes, external or distance study modes or through project/thesis options. A further example is where a program is implemented alternatively through a remote or offshore campus.

A fundamental requirement is that the same educational outcomes are delivered through all implementation pathways. For a program to maintain ongoing accreditation, all implementation pathways must be individually evaluated and each

pathway must meet the accreditation criteria concurrently. The accreditation processes for the alternative pathways are thus coupled. A program implementation cannot be accredited at any one location unless it is accredited for implementation at all locations.

Accreditation of alternative implementation pathways is discussed in more detail in Reference 9.

4.4.1. Offshore, Remote Campus and Distance Based Implementation

Offshore, remote campus, and distance based program offerings may well be alternative implementations of a host program already established on an educational provider's home campus and are thus undifferentiated in title, award and specified outcomes. Alternatively such offerings may be quite separate to programs offered on the home campus and are thus fully differentiated.

Home campus and remote or offshore campus accreditation visits would not normally be carried out at the same time for logistical reasons. This means that reviews of alternative implementations of a particular program on separate campuses would not be synchronised, although the implementations are claimed to be undifferentiated in terms of educational outcomes. Although each campus will thus have a separate general review cycle, accreditation of a particular implementation of a program at one location will link with and reaffirm the on-going accreditation of all other implementations of the program at that time. Such reaffirmation will of course be limited to the accreditation term associated with the individual review cycle set for each campus.

The rules and procedures of the Sydney Accord, now recognise the accreditation of programs that are offered in differentiated or undifferentiated form by a provider, headquartered in the jurisdiction of a signatory, but delivered at a location outside of the national or territorial boundaries of that signatory. In the case of an Australian engineering school implementing an undifferentiated program at a location within the jurisdiction of another signatory to the Accord, accreditation of the offshore offering would be initiated by Engineers Australia, but undertaken collaboratively with the signatory associated with the country of delivery. In this case the offshore program implementation must satisfy the accreditation criteria of both signatories.

Reference 9 provides more detailed guidelines for the accreditation of offshore, remote campus and distance based offerings.

4.4.2. Articulation on the Basis of Advanced Standing

Reference 9 also provides guidelines for the accreditation of articulation pathways. Where agreed academic credit for a particular articulation route exceeds the equivalent of 50% of the study program, the designated prior learning program will need to be separately considered as part of an integrated accreditation process.

4.5. Discontinuation of Programs

Engineers Australia must be notified of any intention to discontinue an accredited program or individual implementation of a program, together with arrangements for providing ongoing teaching to currently enrolled students. A terminating year will be determined to conclude the accreditation term. This will normally correspond with the last year of intake of students to the program, thus covering the recognition of this final enrolled cohort.

4.6. Publication of Accreditation Status and Term

Engineers Australia publishes a listing of accredited programs with accreditation normally accorded on a full calendar year basis. Each program is assigned a designated term of accreditation with a defined start date. The start date will normally correspond with the year in which provisional accreditation was first confirmed by the Accreditation Board. The term of accreditation will normally range from the published start date to the first intake of students for the year following the scheduled year of the next general review. This extension is provided as a safeguard against possible processing delays in concluding the general review cycle. For discontinued programs, Engineers Australia will publish a terminating year for accreditation of the program.

Where a student is continually enrolled in an engineering education program, and where such enrolment overlaps at least partially with the published term of accreditation, once qualifying for the associated award, the student will be deemed to have graduated from an accredited program.

4.7. Publication of Accreditation Outcomes

Educational institutions may wish to publish statements to the effect that certain of their programs are accredited by Engineers Australia. An institution is responsible for ensuring the accuracy of such statements, and in particular, must avoid statements which might be read as implying that certain programs are accredited where this is not the case. An example might be where a program implementation on one campus is accredited, but an alternative implementation of the program offered at a different campus, though leading to the same degree, is not. The education provider is obliged to make such distinctions clear, and misleading statements may result in the loss of all Engineers Australia accreditation.

Accreditation visit reports are confidential between Engineers Australia and the educational institution concerned, and should not be published. If a report is required to be disclosed for any reason, then it should be reproduced in full and both Engineers Australia and the institution concerned should be notified. Excerpts taken out of context are specifically not authorised.

5. REFERENCES

1   P02ET   Engineers Australia Policy on Accreditation of Professional Engineering Programs

2   S02ET   Accreditation Criteria Summary

3   P05ET   Engineers Australia National Generic Competency Standards - Stage 1 Competency Standard for Engineering Technologist

4   G02ET   Accreditation Criteria Guidelines

5   G06ET   Preparation of Submission Documentation

6   S03ET   Governing and Consultative Bodies, International Framework