

**Meeting of the ENAE Administrative Council,
acting also as Executive Group of the
EUR-ACE Implementation Project**

Minutes
(approved by AC on 12/10/07)

3 May 2007 - Brussels

Present:

Members of ENAE Administrative Council (and substitutes):

Prof. Giuliano AUGUSTI (President, Acting Chairman)

Mr. Jean-Michel SIWAK

Mr Christian FORSLUND

Mr Philippe WAUTERS

Secretariat: Mrs Françoise DECLERCQ

1. Welcome and apologies

Prof. Augusti welcomed all participants but regretted the lack of participants to the meeting. He stated that he had received apologies from Messrs Wasser and Chuchalin who had other commitments on that day and also from Prof. Pugh who was obliged to cancel his trip at the last minute for personal reasons. Prof. Augusti and the whole AC expressed their best wishes to Prof. Pugh for the happy solution of his problem.

2. Approval of the agenda

Prof. Augusti proposed to add the topic 'ENAE website' after item 9).
His proposal was approved.

3. Information from President and other members

Prof. Augusti reminded the participants that the 4th TechnoTN Forum was going to take place on 4 & 5 May in Brussels and that the ENAE delegation would consist of Messrs Wasser, Siwak, McGrath, Compte, Wauters and himself. He remarked that the costs of the delegates would be paid thanks to a small grant from the Commission for the organization of the Forum.

He insisted on distributing the homepage of the new ENAE website to all participants to that Forum. A suitable number of copies of this page was printed just after the meeting and handed to Prof. Augusti.

4. Approval of the minutes of previous meeting (23 February 2007)

Prof. Augusti suggested to accept some observations received from Dr Wasser and consequently to make the following changes to the minutes:

- page 5 (Budget) § 3: change the sentence starting with “Dr. Wasser was worried ...” into “It was argued that if CTI refuses to pay for each accreditation, the other agencies might do the same, and in that case how the 100.000 € scheduled in the EUR-ACE Implementation project (to be provided from external sources) could be reached”.

- page 6 (Procedure for evaluating applications), § 2: change LC into AC at two places, which makes “...the AC may not have a say in the operational process of the LC. He added that the AC has anyway the final decision as appeal body”.

- page 6 (Request from NVAO), § 2: change the sentence “...the LC has finalised the procedures for evaluating ...” into “the LC has agreed on the principles of the procedures for evaluating applications from agencies...”.

- page 7, last §: insert at the end of the first sentence: “...and preparing the relevant decision by the AC”.

All these modifications were accepted.

Prof. Augusti then went through the list of actions. It was noted that all actions have been performed except the following ones:

- Finance (item 3): reimbursement of AC costs still to be discussed with Mrs Guberti
- TPU-RAEE joint CPD programme: Prof. Augusti stated that the situation is still in progress and that a decision will be taken in a later meeting with the presence of Prof. Chuchalin..

The revised draft minutes were then unanimously approved. The Secretariat will put the final version on the website.

The question remains whether to put the final versions of the minutes on the public section of the website or only in the private section. Prof. Augusti will ask AC members about their opinion by email.

5. Implementation of item 7 of the minutes of the EUR-ACE PB meeting of 16 November 2006

Prof. Augusti reminded that it was unanimously agreed on that day to dissolve the Executive Group of the project and to identify it with the ENAE AC provided the latter fulfils the following requirements:

- Ensure that the project work plan would be fulfilled and the outputs would be achieved;
- Continuously inform the PB about the project progress;
- Allow the Legal Representative (Mr Borri) to verify with the AC that the project is proceeding well;
- Involve the project partners in its work as much as possible and hold meetings open to the project partners.

Prof. Augusti remarked that the first 3 points have been and will be regularly followed

but noted that some members of the EUR-ACE-2 Project Board raised some objections, maintaining that the AC has not satisfied the last point. That is why he sent an email to PB members inviting them to attend the AC provided that they inform the Secretariat: no message to this effect has been received.

Prof. Augusti asked the participants if they agree with this procedure also for future meetings; however, the expenses would be covered only for AC members. All agreed.

6. Report by the EUR-ACE Label Committee

Prof. Augusti stated that the LC sent to all AC members the final text of the following documents which had been refined and updated according to comments received, and approved by the LC on 19 April 2007 :

- ENAEE Standards and Guidelines for Accreditation Agencies (SGA) (Annex 1)
- ENAEE Application form for Accreditation Agencies (Annex 2)
- LC Procedures for Evaluating Applications from Agencies (Annex 3)

as well as a memo of the LC to the AC with questions arisen in the latest LC meeting (19 April 2007). (Annex 4)

The first two documents (Annexes 1 and 2) are public documents and can be put on the website; Annex 3 is an internal ENAEE document.

Mr Wauters emphasized that he has never seen any formal report of examination of the 6 agencies, which were authorized to award the EUR-ACE label for 2 years. Prof. Augusti confirmed that there is indeed no formal document, but that the LC has examined the Standards and Procedures of each Agency before proposing the authorization, awarded by the AC on 17 November 2006 (see point 6 of the Minutes of that meeting). In any case, before the expiration of the authorizations, each Agency will be re-examined following the SGA just approved.

Mr Forslund remarked a mistake on page 5 of the SGA, item ‘Programme Outcomes’, last paragraph: the word ‘will’ must be deleted. The Secretariat would inform the LC Secretariat accordingly.

The NVAO intention to participate in the EUR-ACE system as an agency authorized to award the EUR-ACE label was then discussed. Prof. Augusti reminded that Prof. Aelterman, representative of NVAO in the EUR-ACE-2 PB, had complained that, in his view, the authorization procedure was different for NVAO with respect to the six engineering agencies already authorized; he reminded the AC that NVAO participates in the EUR-ACE-2 project with the specific aim of including “general” accreditation agencies into the EUR-ACE system: Prof. Augusti intends to proceed in contacts with NVAO until an appropriate solution is found, also as a test case for the enlargement of the EUR-ACE system. It was acknowledged that some difficulties arise because the implemented application procedure has been formulated with only engineering accreditation agencies in mind. Therefore, the integration of NVAO in the EUR-ACE system may require some slight modification of the procedure and of the ENAEE Standards and Guidelines for Accreditation Agencies (SGA) (Annex 1).

Mr Wauters remarked that the ENAEE Statutes should probably be modified if ENAEE wants to include agencies, which do not accredit engineering programmes only. However, it was confirmed that to participate in the EUR-ACE system, it is not necessary for an agency to be an ENAEE member (this will in particular be the case of non-engineering associations).

In any case, it was agreed that an acceptable solution must be found for the participation to the EUR-ACE system of associations, which are not limited to engineering accreditation. Prof. Augusti underlined that the goal is to enlarge the system by keeping the quality.

Noting that NVAO is member of ENQA and therefore already obtained recognition of its quality, Prof. Augusti suggested the possibility that the Review Team, which must verify if the association meets the quality standards, would not have to check it again.

Mr Wauters did not agree with this possibility.

To conclude, Prof. Augusti informed that he would organize a meeting with Mr Aelterman and Dr. Wasser immediately after at the TechnoTN Forum, and keep the AC members informed on the results of the discussion.

[This meeting was later convened for 22 June at the SEFI headquarters in Brussels; Prof. Freeston will participate instead of Dr. Wasser, who is not available in that period.]

Memo and questions of the LC (Annex 4)

(1) Documents

In its memo, the LC asks the AC to ‘decide, if a formal commitment should be provided by the applicant to the mutual recognition of the EUR-ACE Label accreditation decisions of all other authorized agencies within the legal scope provided by national legislation, if the ENAAE Administrative Council decides that the Applicant is authorised to award the EUR-ACE label.’

All agreed that the meaning of the sentence was not very clear. Prof. Augusti understood the sentence as follows: “should an agency authorized to award the EUR-ACE label recognize the EUR-ACE label given to a programme by the other authorized agencies”.

An example was given by Mr Siwak, who explained that CTI has the monopoly to accredit programmes in France. Mr Siwak added that on the national level, the local agency should have the monopoly and that there should be therefore no competition between the 6 authorized agencies in their own country.

After discussion, it was finally agreed that in principle mutual recognition is the essence of the EUR-ACE system but that, since it may be in contrast with national legislations, it must be accepted that the implementation of this principle will be gradual: however, all participating Agencies should strive to reach this goal. Moreover, if a new agency intends to enter into the system, it should accept the above recalled principle and goal.

(2) Clarification of financial issues

(a) Fees to be paid by the applicant agency: see item 9 of the agenda

(b) Organization of reimbursement of incurred expenses to the members of the review team: while the AC accepts the recommendation that in principle the members of the Review Teams should be guaranteed a quick refund of their expenses, it was agreed that this is a matter to be dealt and solved between by the LC and the ENAAE Secretariat.

(3) Publishing results

The AC agrees with LC proposal.

(4) EUR-ACE certificates

All suggestions made by the LC were taken into account in the new draft of the EUR-ACE certificates.

Prof. Augusti will take care of further discussions and modifications in order to reach in a short time a consensus of AC and LC members on a final version.

The other questions were not tackled by the AC: some are details that can and should be defined by the President, the Secretariat and the LC.

The possible appeal procedure will be discussed in a later meeting.

7. Relations with ENQA and other bodies

Prof. Augusti informed the AC about his contacts via e-mail with the ENQA Secretariat: he received information on how to apply, and was told that ENAEF might apply for ‘affiliate status’ and not for ‘associate status’; neither ‘status’ allows an association to define itself as ‘ENQA member’.

He suggested postponing the decision about a possible application by ENAEF until the status and role of ENQA in the framework of the Bologna Process is known and the possible advantages of such an application are clear, especially with regard to the European Register of QA agencies that should be set up after the London Ministers’ Conference. He would then try to establish a direct contact before the application.

His proposal was accepted.

In the meantime, Prof. Augusti will also maintain contacts with other relevant European bodies, such as EUA, ECA, etc. It was suggested that in particular CTI, a member of ENAEF that is also member of ENQA and ECA, should help in facilitating such contacts.

8. ENAEF financial results

ENAEF results by 30.04.2007

Mrs Declercq distributed to all members the ENAEF results by 30.04.07 together with the explanatory notes. (**Annexes 5 and 6**)

Mr Wauters explained that the table is now divided into 3 columns:

- Costs estimated and agreed by EUR-ACE 1 PB

This column was added to remember that estimations were made for some items by the EUR-ACE 1 PB, based on the assumption that a grant from the Commission would be obtained.

- Forecasts Year 2

He explained that the forecasts for the item ‘travel and subsistence costs’ have been increased to include the subsistence costs. (Only travel costs were reimbursed up to now) The forecasts for the item ‘Others’ has also been increased as ENAEF had already to pay a bill of 1606 € for the EUR-ACE trademark.

- Cumulative results by 30.04.07

Mr Wauters confirmed that all ENAEF members have paid their membership fee except MÜDEK for reasons already explained. Prof. Augusti stated that MÜDEK should make the payment very soon.

Prof. Augusti reminded that a formal agreement with the EUR-ACE Implementation project has been reached to transfer some money for the reimbursement of the expenses of the AC members, but that only staff costs may be claimed (the grant allows staff expenses only).

Mr Wauters will discuss with Mrs Guberti how to incorporate this money in the 'income' section. He will then update the table by considerably increasing the staff costs, and circulate it to all AC members.

9. EUR-ACE Label fee policy

The AC decision of a "labelling fee" of € 150 per programme, proposed by the LC and confirmed by the PB, and the disagreement of CTI, already recorded in the previous AC meeting, was discussed again.

Mr Siwak reminded all participants that CTI is an administrative body and that it is therefore difficult to ask and accept fees from universities and schools. So, in order to encourage the EUR-ACE label and consequently ask money from schools, he proposed two solutions:

- either CTI pays a lump sum to ENAE,
- or the school is allowed to ask to ENAE the EUR-ACE label for a programme "habilitated" by CTI, and then pay the labelling fee directly to ENAE. But this solution would create some problems, because the school should to prove that the EUR-ACE label is something extra with respect to the CTI "habilitation" (while, as well known, EUR-ACE & CTI criteria are very similar).

Prof. Augusti informed the AC that on 18 April he had a meeting on this problem with the CTI President Prof. Remaud, Prof. Siwak and Mr R.P.Martin, in which the possibilities presented by Prof. Siwak were considered: however, an immediate solution could not be found and therefore was postponed to further meetings. Prof. Augusti remarked the very constructive attitude of CTI and underlined that any decision on this point must be taken in complete agreement with CTI.

In this meantime, the label fee policy will be implemented as previously decided: 150 € per label; but CTI will not award any EUR-ACE label until the solution is found.

Prof. Augusti insisted on the fact that the EUR-ACE label should be something extra and not something automatically given with an accreditation.

In the Memo already quoted in item 6, the LC asked the AC to clarify its position on the financial issues of the review of agencies, and more particularly concerning a possible fee to be paid to the peers on addition to the expenses (+/- 2000 € per peer).

Prof. Augusti reminded the previous AC decision:

"the members of the EUR-ACE Implementation project willing to become authorised agencies (NVAO, MÜDEK and IDA for example) would not be charged any fee but only asked to refund the expenses incurred, providing they apply within 2007 in order to be likely to conclude the procedure within the lifetime of the project (July 2008)." As indicated by the AC, he has informed those agencies accordingly.

Prof. Augusti insisted to confirm that decision, although he agreed that the peers should be paid a fee in addition to their expenses: these fees will be included in the cost of the visit and paid by the relevant agency.

For the possible fee to be paid for the renewal of the authorization and by any new

applicant agency, it was decided that Prof. Augusti and Mr. Wauters would discuss the matter and make a proposal to the AC as soon as possible.

10. ENAAE website

After consultation and acceptance of the content and layout of the provisional ENAAE website by all participants, it was unanimously agreed to ask the transfer to the domain name already reserved. Mrs Declercq called the IT Manager who immediately launched the new ENAAE website, www.enaee.eu, which is now operational.

A discussion started to whether centralize the update of the website at the ENAAE Secretariat or allow other persons to do it also. Most participants agreed to centralize it but this might represent a lot of work for the Secretariat.

Proposed updates of the website:

- Prof. Augusti suggested asking the 6 authorized agencies (listed on the ENAAE homepage) to transmit to the Secretariat the correct link to the web page where instructions for getting the EUR-ACE label can be found. (The current link is the homepage of each website).

- Prof. Augusti also suggested inserting in the item 'planning of events' (only ENAAE internal meetings for the moment), a list of forthcoming events related to ENAAE. Mr Wauters replied that this might be confusing to mix all meetings together and suggested adding in the left column a separate item dedicated to relevant events.

It was unanimously agreed to change the item 'planning of events' into 'ENAAE meetings' and to create a new item entitled 'Forthcoming ENAAE-related events'. Prof. Augusti provided a first list of such events, and will ask all AC members and other persons to provide the Secretariat appropriate information to be included in this new item.

- Prof. Augusti pointed out that all links to Romania could now be deleted except in the list of founding members.

11. Future meetings

Possible dates for the next AC meeting were investigated, but the first date on which an agreement of the presents could be found was 12 October 2007: Prof. Augusti will contact the three AC members absent today to seek their agreement on this date.

Prof. Augusti regretted the long interval before the meeting, that risks to hinder the launch of the EUR-ACE system: he therefore asked to be authorized to take in the meantime any necessary initiative and decision, consulting the AC via e-mail. This authorization was unanimously granted.

[A few days after the AC meeting, Prof. Augusti met Dr Wasser and Prof. Chuchalin, who are available on 12th October: therefore, the next AC meeting is confirmed for that date, at the FEANI Headquarters in Brussels.]

List of Actions

- **Minutes of last meeting**

The Secretariat to put the final revised version of the minutes on the private (or public) section of the website.

- **Finance**

- Mr. Wauters to check with Mrs Guberti, (Treasurer of EUR-ACE Implementation project) how to deal with reimbursement of AC members' costs, update the table and circulate it to all AC members.

- **NVAO application for awarding EUR-ACE label**

Prof. Augusti to keep AC members informed on the results of the meeting with Mr Aelterman from NVAO.

- **EUR-ACE label fee policy**

- Messrs Augusti and Wauters to discuss about the fee to be paid for the renewal of the authorization, and for new applicant agencies, and consult the AC members for a final decision.

- **ENAE website**

- Prof. Augusti to ask AC members if the final version of the minutes should be put on the public section of the website or be left on the private section.

- Prof. Augusti to ask the 6 authorized agencies to transmit to the Secretariat the correct link to the web page where instructions for getting the EUR-ACE label can be found.

- The Secretariat to change the item 'planning of events' into ENAE meetings' and add a new item 'forthcoming ENAE-related events and Prof. Augusti to ask all AC members to provide the Secretariat with appropriate information to be included in this new item.



European Network for Accreditation of
Engineering Education

ENAE

Standards and Guidelines for Accreditation Agencies

Table of Contents

1. Introductory Note	2
2. Review of Accreditation Agencies – Procedure.....	3
3. Evaluation of Accreditation Agencies – Standards and Guidelines.....	5
3.1 Accreditation Standards (Compliance with “EUR-ACE Framework Standards”).....	5
3.2 Accreditation Procedure (Compliance with “EUR-ACE Framework Standards”).....	6
3.3 Institution (Compliance with the European standards and guidelines for external accreditation agencies).....	6

1. Introductory Note

The purpose of this document is to describe the guidelines and procedures for agencies intending to apply for authorisation or reauthorisation to award the EUR-ACE label to degree programmes in engineering. These guidelines do not form part of the standards to be met, which are specified in “EUR-ACE Framework Standards for the Accreditation of Engineering Programmes”.

The framework developed within the EUR-ACE project (2004-2006) is applicable to the accreditation of engineering programmes within Europe at the First and Second Cycle levels, and proposed the award of the EUR-ACE label to accredited programmes. The framework also accommodates the accreditation of “Integrated Programmes” (i. e. programmes leading directly to a Second Cycle degree), if the EUR-ACE program outcomes of the combined levels are achieved.

The EUR-ACE Implementation project (2006-2008) aims to use the framework of the EUR-ACE project to establish, on a permanent and self-supporting basis, a system for the accreditation of engineering programmes within Europe. It is intended as a decentralised system in which national (or regional) bodies will accredit the individual programmes, and mutually recognize two quality labels, namely the “EUR-ACE Bachelor” (European Accredited Engineering Bachelor) and the “EUR-ACE Master” (European Accredited Engineering Master), corresponding respectively to First Cycle and Second Cycle accredited degrees in engineering.

An international, non-profit association, the European Network for Accreditation of Engineering Education (ENAAE), has been established to administer the necessary organization and planning, and to support the accreditation system. The Administrative Council of the ENAAE has appointed a EUR-ACE Label Committee, composed of representatives of European engineering accreditation agencies, to evaluate applications from agencies wishing to award the EUR-ACE label and to recommend agencies to be authorized to award the EUR-ACE label. Agencies from countries within the European Higher Education Area that accredit engineering programmes are eligible to apply for authorization to award the EUR-ACE label.

The next section outlines the procedure for evaluating applications, and the final section provides detailed guidance on making an application.

In formulating the Framework, the document “Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area” adopted by the Bergen Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education on May 19-20, 2005, were taken into consideration.¹

¹ Cf. ENQA Report “Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area”, 2005, http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/050221_ENQA_report.pdf.

2. Review of Accreditation Agencies – Procedure

This section outlines the procedure for evaluating an application for the authority to award the EUR-ACE label. There are five phases

(i) Application.

An accreditation agency (subsequently referred to as the Applicant) seeking the authority to award the EUR-ACE label should apply to ENAAE by submitting in English the information listed below. The application should be addressed to the EUR-ACE Label Committee, and sent to the ENAAE Secretariat (c/o FEANI_{AISBL}, avenue Roger Vandendriessche 18, 1150 Bruxelles, Belgium, E-mail: enaee@feani.org). The information supplied will be treated in confidence, and will be used only for the purposes of the application.

Four paper copies and one electronic copy of the following information are required:

- A completed Application Form (attached) explaining how the standards and procedures of the Applicant comply with those of the EUR-ACE Framework. Detailed guidance on completing the Application Form is given in the next section. The completed Application Form is essentially a self-evaluation document, and can refer to existing documentation of the Applicant.
- Supporting documentation (in English), and in particular that referred to in the Application Form. All references to information in the supporting documentation should be precise and detailed.

The EUR-ACE Label Committee will review the application for formal completeness and, if necessary, ask the Applicant to provide additional information. A complete application is a precondition for the initiation of the review process.

(ii) Appointment of Review Team.

The EUR-ACE Label Committee will appoint a team of at least three auditors (usually one member of the Label Committee plus two other experts), which will be responsible for the evaluation of the application. The members of the Review Team should be completely independent of the Applicant, and have the necessary knowledge, experience and expertise to conduct the review. Nominations of experts will be sought from a wide range of sources – including other agencies, stakeholders, local authorities, etc, but the selection and appointment will be carried out by the EUR-ACE Label Committee to ensure the consistency and integrity of the process. The Applicant may request that auditors be replaced, if there is a possible conflict of interest.

The responsibilities of the Review Team are to:

- evaluate the submitted application and supporting documents;
- observe and evaluate *at least two visits* of the Applicant to accredit *at least one degree programme at each programme level covered by the agency* (First Cycle degree, Second Cycle degree and/or integrated programmes) and at least two programmes, if only one level is covered by the agency, as appropriate;

- observe and evaluate the decision making process at a meeting of the decision making body of the Applicant, and preferably the one in which the decisions on the observed accreditation visits are to be reached;
- submit an evaluation report to the Label Committee.

(iii) Visits by the Review Team

The details of the duration and schedule of the visit may vary for different reviews. The length of the visit will be determined at the beginning of the review process when the terms and conditions are being decided upon. It is likely that a visit of at least two days will be necessary for a Review Team to validate fully the documentation and clarify any points at issue. In general, the visits will be conducted in English.

The date of the visit and its agenda will be coordinated by the Chair of the Review Team. The date will depend on the availability of the Review Team, but the Applicant may indicate convenient dates when submitting the application.

(iv) Report on the Application.

After assessing all the evidence, the Review Team will draft a report on the application. This draft report will be sent to the Applicant for the correction of any errors of fact. The corrected report, together with recommendation of the Review Team, will be submitted to the EUR-ACE Label Committee for consideration.

(v) Decision on Authorisation

The EUR-ACE Label Committee will evaluate the report of the Review Team, and decide whether or not to recommend to the ENAAE Administrative Council that the Applicant should be authorised to award the EUR-ACE label. The Applicant will be informed of the decision by the ENAAE Administrative Council, and receive a final version of the report. The Applicant may ask, in writing, for further information about the decision.

If the decision is not to authorise the Applicant to award the EUR-ACE label, the Applicant may appeal to the ENAAE Administrative Council. If the Applicant decides to re-apply, the Label Committee may decide on a shortened procedure to evaluate the re-application.

The maximum period of authorisation is five years. Before the expiration of this period, an authorised agency should apply for re-evaluation to demonstrate compliance with the current EUR-ACE Standards and Procedures. A shortened procedure may be used for such a re-evaluation.

3. Evaluation of Accreditation Agencies – Standards and Guidelines

3.1 Accreditation Standards (Compliance with “EUR-ACE Framework Standards”)

(1) Programme Outcomes

Standard: The programme outcomes published as a standard by the applicant agency should fully comply with each of the six outcomes in Section 1 of the “EUR-ACE Framework Standards for the Accreditation of Engineering Programmes”.

Guidelines: Programme Outcomes must form a part of the accreditation standards. Demonstrate the compliance of the programme outcomes against which degree programmes are accredited by aligning them with the EUR-ACE programme outcomes, for example by listing them side-by-side in a tabular overview. A template for the alignment can be found on the ENAAE website (<http://www.feani.org/ENAAE/ENAAEHomepage.htm>).

The six EUR-ACE programme outcomes of accredited engineering degree programmes are:

- Knowledge and Understanding;
- Engineering Analysis;
- Engineering Design;
- Investigations;
- Engineering Practice;
- Transferable Skills.

Although all six of the programme outcomes apply to both First Cycle and Second Cycle programmes, there are important differences in the requirements at the two levels. These differences in the levels of First and Second Cycle accredited engineering programmes should inform the interpretation of the programme outcomes by HEIs and by accrediting panels. The differences are particularly relevant to those learning activities that contribute directly to the three programme outcomes concerned with engineering applications, Engineering Analysis, Engineering Design, and Investigations.

Integrated programmes leading directly to a qualification equivalent to that of a Second Cycle qualification will must be assessed against the programme outcomes for both First and Second Cycle Degree Programmes.

(2) Programme Organisation

Standard: The accreditation criteria published as a standard by the applicant agency should fully comply with the Guidelines for Programme Assessment and Programme Accreditation for Accreditation as set out in the “EUR-ACE Framework Standards for the Accreditation of Engineering Programmes” (Section 2).

Guidelines: This question is about the course structure, content and organisation to ensure that the students that enter the programme are able to achieve the Programme Outcomes detailed in Question II.1. The specific information we are seeking is tabulated in Section 2 of A1 (EUR-ACE Framework) under five headings:

1. Needs, Objectives and Outcomes

2. Educational Process
3. Resources and Partnerships
4. Assessment of Educational Process
5. Management System.

and your reply should be organised under these headings. The third column of the table in A1 lists the questions to which we would like answers, and the fourth column indicates where we would expect the evidence for the answer to be found.

3.2 Accreditation Procedure (Compliance with “EUR-ACE Framework Standards”)

Standard: The procedures for program assessment and accreditation published as a standard by the applicant agency should fully comply with the procedures for programme assessment and programme accreditation as set out in the “EUR-ACE Framework Standards for the Accreditation of Engineering Programmes” (Section 2).

Guidelines: Procedural guidelines for programme assessment must be specified in written form. Demonstrate that the procedure for programme assessment (based on self-assessment of the HEI followed by external assessment) correspond to the EUR-ACE standards.

Individual accreditation agencies may add further requirements to those standards to adapt to nationally and culturally distinctive features of Higher Education in engineering and to ensure compliance with national legislation. At least the following aspects need to be addressed:

- Documentation to be provided by HEIs
- Composition of accreditation team
- Duration of the accreditation visit
- Structure of the accreditation visit
- Verification and validation of the report by the accreditation agency/commission
- Decision on accreditation
- Publication of results
- Procedures for appeals

3.3 Institution (Compliance with the European standards and guidelines for external accreditation agencies²)

(1) Official status

Standard: Agencies should be formally recognised by competent public authorities as agencies with responsibilities for the accreditation of study programmes in the field of engineering and should have an established legal basis. They should comply with any requirements of the legislative jurisdictions within which they operate.

² This section is based on Part 3 of the ENQA Report “Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area”, 2005 (“European Standards and Guidelines for External Accreditation Agencies”) adopted by the Bergen Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education, 19-20 May 2005; <http://www.enqa.net/files/ENQA%20Bergen%20Report.pdf>.

(2) Activities

Standard: Agencies should undertake accreditation activities (at programme level) on a regular basis. These should be part of the core functions of the agency.

(3) Resources

Standard: Agencies should have adequate and proportional resources, both human and financial, to enable them to organise and run their accreditation process(es) in an effective and efficient manner, with appropriate provision for the development of their processes and procedures.

(4) Mission statement

Standard: Agencies should have clear and explicit goals and objectives for their work, contained in a publicly available statement.

Guidelines: These statements should describe the goals and objectives of agencies' accreditation processes, the division of labour with relevant stakeholders in higher education, especially the higher education institutions, and the cultural and historical context of their work. The statements should make clear that the accreditation process is a major activity of the agency and that there exists a systematic approach to achieving its goals and objectives. There should also be documentation to demonstrate how the statements are translated into a clear policy and management plan.

(5) Independence

Standard: Agencies should be independent to the extent both that they have autonomous responsibility for their operations and that the conclusions and recommendations made in their reports cannot be influenced by third parties such as higher education institutions, ministries or other stakeholders.

Guidelines: An agency will need to demonstrate its independence through measures, such as:

- Its operational independence from higher education institutions and governments is guaranteed in official documentation (e.g. instruments of governance or legislative acts).
- The definition and operation of its procedures and methods, the nomination and appointment of external experts and the determination of the outcomes of its accreditation processes are undertaken autonomously and independently from governments, higher education institutions, and organs of political influence.
- While relevant stakeholders in higher education, particularly students/learners, are consulted in the course of accreditation processes, the final outcomes of the accreditation processes remain the responsibility of the agency.

(6) Accountability procedures

Standard: Agencies should have in place procedures for their own accountability.

Guidelines: These procedures are expected to include the following:

1. A published policy for the assurance of the quality of the agency itself, made available on its website;

2. Documentation which demonstrates that:

- the agency's processes and results reflect its mission and goals of accreditation;
- the agency has in place, and enforces, a no-conflict-of-interest mechanism in the work of its external experts;
- the agency has reliable mechanisms that ensure the quality of any activities and material produced by subcontractors, if some or all of the elements in its accreditation procedure are subcontracted to other parties;
- the agency has in place internal quality assurance procedures which include an internal feedback mechanism (i.e. means to collect feedback from its own staff and council/board); an internal reflection mechanism (i.e. means to react to internal and external recommendations for improvement); and an external feedback mechanism (i.e. means to collect feedback from experts and reviewed institutions for future development) in order to inform and underpin its own development and improvement.

3. A mandatory cyclical external review of the agency's activities at least once every five years.



European Network for Accreditation of
Engineering Education

Application Form for Accreditation Agencies – Authorisation to award the EUR-ACE[®] Label

I. Background

1. **Please list below the address of the agency applying for authorisation, and the name, position, phone number and e-mail address of the person to whom any questions should be addressed:**

<...>

2. **History and development of the agency** (be sure to describe the founders of the agency and their motivation; the higher education context in which the agency operates; participation in the development of engineering-specific accreditation criteria; types of degree programmes accredited)

<please limit this description to 1 page>

3. **Motivation of the application**

<please limit this description to 1 page>

II. Accreditation Standards and Procedure

Please provide information and evidence below (including, where possible, any existing documentation¹ in English) about how your agency meets each of the following criteria:

Programme Outcomes

1. Provide detailed evidence how the output standards you use to judge the academic standard of accredited programmes comply with each of the six outcomes in Section 1 of the “EUR-ACE Framework Standards for the Accreditation of Engineering Programmes”. You may use as evidence English versions of existing publications provided that there is clear referencing to relevant sections.

<...>

Appendix(es) n.: ____

¹ Please number the documents and mark their reference number under each paragraph.

Programme Organisation

2. How do you assess if the teaching programme is organised, managed and maintained in order to ensure that the Programme Outcomes are achieved?

<...>

Appendix(es) n.: ____

Accreditation Procedure

3. Describe how your accreditation procedures are developed, updated and publicised.

<...>

4. Demonstrate that the procedures for program assessment and accreditation published as a standard fully comply with the procedures for programme assessment and programme accreditation as set out in the "EUR-ACE Framework Standards for the Accreditation of Engineering Programmes" (Section 3).

<...>

5. Document which of the processes listed below the agency normally uses. Please mark down and document which of the processes your agency is using.

- a self-assessment or equivalent procedure by the subject of the accreditation process;
- an external assessment by a group of experts, including, as appropriate, (a) student member(s), and site visits as decided by the agency;
- publication of a report, including any judgements, recommendations or other formal outcomes;
- a follow-up procedure to review actions taken by the subject of the accreditation process in the light of any recommendations contained in the report;
- any other processes and procedures.

<...>

6. Explain how accreditation decisions are reached and which committee(s) participate(s) in the decision making process. (Note: Minutes of the committee(s) should be available to the visiting panel during its visit.)

<...>

7. If the agency makes formal accreditation decisions, or judgments which have formal consequences, demonstrate that it has an appeals system.

<...>

Appendix(es) n.: ____

III. Institutional Information²

Please provide information and evidence below (including, where possible, any existing documentation in English) about how your agency meets each of the following criteria:

Official status

8. What is the legal basis for your accreditation role, and how do you demonstrate compliance?

<...>

Appendix(es) n.: ____

Activities

9. Is the undertaking of accreditation processes at programme level part of the core functions of your agency?

<...>

Appendix(es) n.: ____

Resources

10. What resources does your agency have at its disposal to carry out its accreditation process(es)? What provisions have you made for the development of the processes and procedures?

<...>

Appendix(es) n.: ____

Mission statement

11. Is your agency's mission statement publicly available? What are its central points?

<...>

Appendix(es) n.: ____

Independence

12. How is the independency of your agency ensured?

<...>

² Based on the "European Standards and Guidelines for External Accreditation Agencies" adopted by the Bergen Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education, 19-20 May 2005, which in turn is based on the ENQA Report "Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area", 2005, <http://www.enqa.net/files/ENQA%20Bergen%20Report.pdf>.

Appendix(es) n.: ____

Accountability procedures

13. Which procedures do you have in place for securing the accountability of your agency?
<...>

Appendix(es) n.: ____

Miscellaneous criteria

14. Show that the agency pays careful attention to its declared principles at all times, and ensures both that its requirements and processes are managed professionally and that its judgements and decisions are reached in a consistent manner, even if the judgments are formed by different groups.
<...>

Appendix(es) n.: ____

Please confirm by the signatures of both the Managing Director and the Chair of your agency that the agency seeks an authorisation to award the EUR-ACE Label and agrees to abide by the regulations of the ENAAE's EUR-ACE Label Committee.

In furtherance, this application is supported by the enclosed documentation of our agency by way of copies of legal statements, mission statement, strategic and business plans and policies etc.

Date:

Signed:

Name and position:

Name and position:

List of appendices:

- 1.
- 2.

ENAAE

EUR-ACE Label Committee

Procedures for Evaluating Applications from Agencies.

Abbreviations used:

A1. Framework standards for the Accreditation of Engineering Programmes.

AC. Administration Council of ENAAE.

CRT. Chairman of Review Team.

LC. Label Committee.

SGA. Standards and Guidelines for Accreditation Agencies.

1. Application received.

1.1. Applications are sent to the ENAAE Secretariat c/o FEANI (address in SGA Section 2.1) in four hard copies and electronically

1.2. Secretariat sends acknowledgement of receiving application to the Applicant Agency.

1.3. Secretariat distributes electronic copies of the application to the members of LC.

1.4. The LC appoints a Chair of the Review Team (CRT) who will usually be one of its members and will have responsibility to take the application through the necessary stages and informs the secretariat to send one hard copy to the CRT.

1.5. The CRT decides if the application is complete.

1.5. If it is incomplete the CRT LC drafts a reply to be sent to the applicant by the ENAAE.

2. Appointment of Review Team.

2.1. If the application is complete, the LC appoints a Review Team composed of the Chair and at least two others selected for their expertise and experience.

2.2. CRT will ask the applicant if they have any grounds to object to any of the Review Team, and will propose dates of visits to the applicant agency and to observe an accreditation visit by the applicant.

2.3. CRT will write to the applicant to confirm the membership of the Review Team and the dates of visits, and ask the applicant to provide details of the arrangements for accommodation and local transport.

2.4. CRT will inform the secretariat of the postal addresses of the members of the Review Team for the secretariat to send out the hard copies of the self-report.

2.4 CRT will prepare a brief guidance note on the visit based on the relevant parts of A1 and sends it to the Review Team.

3. Visits of the Review Team.

3.1. The Review Team assesses the application and decides what are the important issues to be raised during visits.

3.2. CRT prepares an agenda for visits and informs the applicant.

3.3. The Review Team carries out visits in line with the procedures agreed by the LC.

3.4. The recommendation of the Review Team must not be communicated at the end of visit. CRT can outline what the Review Team thought were the strengths and weaknesses of the application.

4. Report on Visits.

4.1. The Review Team prepares a report on the application and visits. This is a report to the LC and will form the basis of the recommendation on the application. CRT has the principal responsibility for preparing the report but it must be agreed with the other members of the Review Team. It should be sent to the LC no later than 4 weeks prior to the LC meeting at which the recommendation to the AC shall be formulated.

4.2. The report should follow the order of items set in the SGA and without any recommendation should be sent to the applicant for correction of any factual errors.

4.3. The corrected report with the recommendation is sent to the LC.

5. Decision by LC.

5.1. The decision of the LC on the recommendation to the AC will be based on the report from the Review Team. The report must be presented to the meeting by CRT, and the decision must be made in the meeting. The LC may ask for clarification of certain issues and postpone the decision if necessary.

5.2. The decision "recommended for authorization" must be unanimous with all members voting.

5.3. The decision "recommended for authorization" is for five years.

5.4. The recommendation of the LC will be sent in writing (email acceptable) by the Chairman of the LC to the AC of ENAEE, and copied to the members of the LC.

Memo and questions of the LC to the AC based on the LC meeting of April 19, 2007

(1) Documents

Taking into consideration comments received on the latest drafts the EUR-ACE Label Committee has refined and updated the following documents:

- ENAEE Standards and Guidelines for Accreditation Agencies (external document)
- Procedures for Evaluating Applications (internal document)

The LC kindly asks the AC to decide, if a formal commitment should be provided by the applicant to the mutual recognition of the EUR-ACE Label accreditation decisions of all other authorized agencies within the legal scope provided by national legislation, if the ENAEE Administrative Council decides that the Applicant is authorised to award the EUR-ACE label.

The LC removed all financial aspects from the documents and refers them to the AC in line with its financial responsibility.

(2) Clarification of financial issues

The Label Committee kindly asks the AC to clarify the following points concerning financial issues of the review of applying agencies (unanswered questions from memo of 2007-01-24 and a few new questions):

- (a) The LC suggests to the AC to reconsider its position of not wanting to ask fees of the applying agencies.

The LC's position is that facing at least 2 to 3 visits to the applicant agency and taking into account a couple of days preparation each plus the time needed to draft the report it might become difficult to find appropriate evaluators, if ENAEE is not prepared to pay them in addition to reimbursing their actual costs. Based on the national experiences of the agencies represented in the LC, a fee of ca. 2000 Euros per peer seems to be the minimum. An equal amount should be paid to the organizing agency to cover their expenses. The LC, on the other hand unanimously argues that their fees for the review process in line with the SGA (to be terminated within the lifetime of the project) should be waved for the time and work already put into the system, e.g. in form of trial accreditations during the EUR-ACE-1 project.

If a fee should be raised:

- Should the Secretariat does not send the application to the Label committee until it is received? (*The LC's position: yes*)

- Should the fee of half of the fee should be refunded if the application is judged to be unacceptable or withdrawn? *(The LC's position: only a certain amount should be refunded)*
 - Should there be a fee for re-applications after a first application has been rejected or withdrawn? *(The LC's position: yes)*
- (b) How is the reimbursement of incurred expenses to the members of the review team to be organised? *(The LC's position: It must be ensured that the review team does not have to lay out substantial amounts of money from their own pockets).*
- (c) The LC proposes to include information about the responsibilities of the applicant for the local arrangements for the visits in a proposed external statement on fees: *"The arrangements of accommodation and local transport for the visit are the responsibility of the Applicant."* Should this alternatively be included in the letter sent to the Applicant by the secretariat or in the SGA?
- (d) The LC kindly asks the AC to develop and implement an appeals procedure.

(3) Publishing results

The LC agrees on the responsibility of the awarding agency to contact the ENAEE secretariat for inclusion in the list of study programmes having been awarded the EUR-Ace label. The LC suggests that a link should be established in the list leading to the summary of the programme according to the template published in EUR-ACE 1. The summary itself should be located on the awarding agency's website. It is suggested that no results should be published before the fee of 150 Euro have been paid to ENAEE.

(4) EUR-ACE certificates

The LC discussed the draft certificates provided and in principle agrees with the content. Nevertheless, the following suggestions are made:

- include the final EUR-ACE Bachelor and EUR-ACE Master logo to be developed on top
- include the ENAEE logo on bottom
- remove bottom line
- include the date of the national accreditation
- adopt the wording to clarify that the duration of the label is according to the duration of the underlying national accreditation

Düsseldorf, April 26, 2007

Iring Wasser

ENAE Results - Year 2
30.04.2007

	Costs estimated and agreed by EUR-ACE 1 PB	Forecasts Year 2	Cumulative results (€) 30.04.07
EXPENSES		22122.50	6079.64
Office Renting and Maintenance		975.00	354.54
Operating costs		1350.00	490.90
<i>Insurance</i>			
<i>Heating/Electricity/ Water</i>			
<i>Office Stationary</i>			
<i>Telecommunications</i>			
<i>Post/Mailing</i>			
Capital expenditure		750.00	272.72
<i>Office Furniture, Machine & Equipment</i>			
Services		1500.00	580.80
<i>Accounting /Audit AISBL</i>		<i>1000.00</i>	<i>580.80</i>
<i>IT Development (DB & Website) and Maintenance</i>		<i>500.00</i>	
Staff expenditure	86000.00	5087.50	1850.00
<i>Secretary + Secretary General</i>		<i>5087.50</i>	<i>1850.00</i>
Travel & Subsistence Costs		8360.00	617.38
Publication	20000.00	0.00	0.00
Marketing and PR	25000.00	0.00	0.00
Seminars / Workshops	25000.00	0.00	0.00
Review process	15000.00	0.00	0.00
External experts	9000.00	0.00	0.00
Internal meetings costs		1600.00	307.30
Others		2500.00	1606.00
INCOME		30000.00	28000.00
Fees from Accreditation process		0.00	0.00
Fees from Partners (accreditation agencies)		12000.00	10000.00
Fees from Partners (other than accreditation agencies)		18000.00	18000.00
Seminars/Trainings		0.00	
Review Process		0.00	
Grant from the European Commission		0.00	0.00
BALANCE		7877.50	21920.36

27 April 2007

ENAEЕ cumulative results by 30.04.07

Remark:

A new column has been added on the table in order to indicate the costs estimated and agreed by the EUR-ACE 1 Project Board for some items.

I. Expenses: justification**- Costs for office renting, operating and capital expenditure**

Calculation based on:

1. ENAEЕ Financial Plan Year 1
2. Number of days worked for ENAEЕ (3 days)

• Office renting:	6500 x 3(days) x 4 (months)		
		=	
	220 days/year (working days)		354.54 €
• Operating costs:	9000 x 3(days) x 4 (months)		
		=	
	220 days/year (working days)		490.90 €
• Capital expenditure:	5000 x 3(days) x 4 (months)		
		=	
	220 days/year (working days)		272.72 €
		Total	1118.16 €

- Services (Accounting)

The fees asked by the accountant for the closure of the 2006 figures amount to **580.80 €**

- Staff expenditure

3 days/month (2,5 for the secretary and 0,5 for Mr Wauters) have been taken into consideration.

2,5 days staff (secretary) at 125 €/month		= 312.50 €
0,5 days staff (Mr Wauters) at 300 €/month		= 150.00 €
		462.50 €
	x 4 (months)	
		1850.00 €

- Travel and Subsistence Costs

A reimbursement of 481.28 € (travel and subsistence costs) has been made to Mr McGrath for his attendance to the Label Committee meeting in Düsseldorf, which makes a cumulative total of **617.38 €**.

The forecasts for this item have been slightly modified in order to integrate subsistence costs. If we consider that the 6 LC members meet 4 times a year and have an average of 140 € for daily allowances, we have a total of 3360 €. This added to the already calculated forecasts for travel costs makes a total of **8360 €**.

- Internal meetings costs

A new item entitled 'Internal meetings costs' has been added at the end of the section 'Expenses' in order to cover renting of meeting rooms and bills of restaurants connected with AC meetings.

Two bills connected to the last AC meeting at SEFI Headquarters have been already recorded for a total amount of **307.30 €**.

The forecasts for those costs have been calculated on the basis of 4 AC meetings per year, 8 people attending each meeting and an average of 50€ per person for subsistence, which makes **1600 €**.

- Others

The amount of **1606 €** corresponds to the registration tax for the EUR-ACE trademark.

II. Income

All members, except MÜDEK, have paid their 2007 membership fee.
(Remark: Romania is no longer an ENAEE member)

III. Balance

On 30.04.07, the balance shows a positive result of **21920.36 €**.