



**ACCREDITATION: SUPPORTING CHANGE IN
ENGINEERING EDUCATION?**

PROFESSOR AM JOLLY, PRESIDENTIAL ADVISER IN CTI
SEFI CHAIR OF THE QUALITY AND ACCREDITATION GROUP
MEMBER OF LABEL COMMITTEE OF ENAEE

Engineering Change
EPC Congress 2019
University College London

WHAT ABOUT ACCREDITATION?

Accreditation has evolved thanks to ENQA (ESG, integration of stakeholders in the elaboration of criteria), **and this is a very good thing**

The spread of EUR ACE label (European accreditation) has increased in conjunction with the development of accreditation agencies in many countries

However, very often rules of the laws of countries are more strict on the precise contents of programmes than the rules of accreditations agencies (ENAEE or CTI for example) !

ENAEE has published EAFSG (**G mean Guidelines!**) less strict than criteria

INTEREST OF ACCREDITATION

One of the main goals of the accreditation of EE programs is to **ensure transparency and hence build TRUST**, favoring mobility of students and engineers;

A European accreditation system for EE should respect **the rich cultural diversity of European HE Institutions** and it must be the same when national agencies go abroad to do cross national accreditation;

SEFI fully supports the development of the EUR-ACE System, since it is fully compatible with the requirement mentioned in the previous point, being based on cooperation and mutual recognition between existing National Accreditation bodies, and **being based on Learning Outcomes for its implementation**;

SEFI also appreciates the fact that the EUR-ACE System has acquired global visibility through contacts with the Washington Accord, the Sydney Accord, and the whole International Engineering Alliance (IEA);

WHY OPPOSE ACCREDITATION AND INNOVATION?

Accreditation agencies work on learning outcomes and no more on syllabus

This allows **very different organisations** and even « à la carte » programs

Accreditation agencies look for **Best practices and innovative pedagogies**

The terms of accreditation allow much **flexibility of methods** of organisation and teaching

This also means experimentations in organisations, involvement of students, recruitments, pedagogies

The **quality process** includes the taking account of stake holders (students, employers...)
it is now at the heart of the process: this means for example that the opinions of all these stake holders have to be taken into consideration

BUT!

Engineering is also a vocational field

The voice of employers is important concerning accreditation: the existence of programs advisory boards is fundamental but when CTI visits an institution, in France or abroad, in some of the programs, those advisory boards have never been convoqued (or just before our visit, for the first time!)

This shows that even if the global quality system of an institution is good, it is necessary to visit the programs to see if quality is really applied at this level too

Perhaps human nature has a trend to go on its one way and we see in France that in school internal to universities , HCERES (our national all fields agency) do not even look at those engineering education institutions because comittees for institutional accreditations are not composed of engineers

That is why a cooperative work has begun between CTI and HCERES, our competences being complementary

SOME IDEAS THAT CTI USES TO PLAY ITS PART OF BOOSTER OF INNOVATION

Since 3 years we realise a focus on subjects that are most touchy at a specific moment:

2 years ago and last year we did a focus on 3 themes: sustainable development, innovation and surety and safety at work

This year the focus is on « digital » in all its implications for institutions

We aim to put into evidence best practices and to help institutions to evolve

Another moment is our annual conference dedicated on a specific subject: quality, evaluation of learning outcomes

We have common conferences with CDEFI and HCERES too...

EVEN ACCREDITATION AGENCIES HAVE TO TRY , THEY CAN MAKE ERRORS AND MUST RECOGNIZE IT

For example:

This year our « Lean accreditation » was a mistake....

We are still trying to find a good indicator for the characterization the number of staff involved

We are still trying to evaluate face to face time.....

Only discussions with institutions can help us!!!

Thanks to all of you