



## European Network for Accreditation of Engineering Education (ENAAEE)

### Leuven Communiqué

The 1<sup>st</sup> ENAAEE Members Forum (KU Leuven, October 18-19, 2017)

After more than 10 years of engineering programme accreditation, ENAAEE is facing new challenges: recent developments in higher education quality assurance, ongoing debate on institutional vs. programme accreditation, common training principles for engineers, improvement of the value and recognition of EUR-ACE<sup>®</sup> labels by students and employers, etc.

ENAAEE convened its 1<sup>st</sup> Members Forum at KU Leuven (Belgium), 18-19 October 2017: **“Challenges, perspectives and good practice of programme accreditation in engineering education”** with the final objective of drafting an agenda for ENAAEE orientation in the next few years.

The Forum gathered experiences and reflections from 75 individuals actively engaged in EUR-ACE<sup>®</sup> accreditation activities.

ENAAEE is now publishing this “Leuven Communiqué” which is a summary of the conclusions and recommendations issued from nine parallel workshops and three break-out sessions.



ENAAEE members disagree with the idea of accreditation as a bureaucratic and conservative process; they consider that programme quality assessment can be **open and supportive to innovative pedagogical methods** and that the major benefit of accreditation is to improve the quality of engineering programmes through the self-evaluation process carried out by the faculty staff and stakeholders.

Accreditation is based on direct, on-site exchanges between peers and faculty, administration and students; this cannot be substituted by paper assessment. Participants noted that **outcome based assessment** is the norm, and that student competence assessment is a key issue on which ENAAEE should disseminate good practice, particularly in relation to transferable and technical competences.

ENAAE members strongly advocated that ENAAE and the authorized agencies should actively promote 'lean' programme accreditation procedures which use synergy effects with programme, institutional or system accreditation. Lean "procedures" for the periodic renewal of agency authorizations and programme accreditation should be mandatory, focusing mainly on the evaluation of changes since earlier evaluations.

Transnational accreditation should not be operated as a revenue generating exercise, but should promote international recognition of the EUR-ACE® label and the establishment of programme accreditation in host countries.

With the rise in institutional accreditation and changes in national regulations on quality assurance, which make programme accreditation more often optional than mandatory, the EUR-ACE® accreditation system enters a new era; ENAAE should demonstrate that the benefits for the final users and the whole engineering community exceeds the costs in time and human resources and should seek for bridges and synergies with all the different systems.

Further inquiries may be addressed to [secretariat@enaee.eu](mailto:secretariat@enaee.eu).

Brussels, November 2017

---