

### About this document

The Graduate Attributes and Continual Improvement (GA/CI) rubrics aid the visiting team in their assessment of compliance with the Graduate Attribute or Continual Improvement accreditation criteria. The rubrics are made available to the programs receiving and accreditation visit to demonstrate how the criteria are assessed by the visiting team.

## Graduate Attributes

3.1	Graduate Attributes:	Accreditation Criteria and Procedures Description	Rating	Assessment Category Descriptors
	3.1.1 Organization and engagement	There must be demonstration that an organizational structure is in place to assure the sustainable development and measurement of graduate attributes. There must be demonstrated engagement in the process by faculty members and engineering leadership.	✓	Strong organizational structures and processes are in place that demonstrate the sustainable collection and assessment of GA data. <b>AND</b> clear evidence of engagement by most full-time faculty members and engineering leadership.
			*	Weak or limited organizational structures and processes are in place. <b>AND/OR</b> no organizational structures and processes are in place. <b>AND/OR</b> limited or absent engagement of full-time faculty members and/or engineering leadership.
	3.1.2 Curriculum Maps	There must be documented curriculum maps showing the relationship between learning activities for each of the attributes and the semesters in which these take place.	✓	At least three learning activities for most graduate attributes are mapped. <b>AND</b> distributed across multiple semesters.
			*	Less than three learning activities are mapped for many or most graduate attributes. <b>AND/OR</b> many graduate attributes are mapped over a limited number of semesters. <b>AND/OR</b> there are limited processes in place to evaluate the effectiveness of the mapping procedures.
	3.1.3 Indicators	For each attribute, there must be a set of measurable, documented indicators that describe what students must achieve in order to be considered competent in the corresponding attribute.	✓	Measurable indicators describe and span the compliance requirements for each graduate attribute. <b>AND</b> are consistent with expected compliance learning levels for each graduate attribute. <b>AND</b> the number of indicators is consistent with a sustainable data collection program for each graduate attribute.
			*	Measurable indicators do not adequately describe or span the compliance requirements of several or most graduate attributes. <b>AND/OR</b> are not consistent with expected compliance learning levels for several or most graduate attributes. <b>AND/OR</b> the number of indicators is not consistent with a sustainable data collection program for many or most graduate attributes.
	3.1.4 Assessment tools	There must be documented assessment tools that are appropriate to the attribute and used as the basis for obtaining data on student learning with respect to all twelve attributes over a cycle of six years or less.	✓	The nature and number of selected assessment tools for the learning levels for each graduate attribute is reasonable. <b>AND</b> the rationale for their selection is well documented.
			*	The nature and number of selected assessment tools for the learning levels for several or most attributes is not reasonable. <b>AND/OR</b> the rationale for the selection of the assessment tools is not well documented. <b>AND/OR</b> the rationale for the selection of the assessment tools is not documented.

<b>3.1.5 Assessment results</b>	At least one set of assessment results must be obtained for all twelve attributes over a period of six years or less. The results should provide clear evidence that the graduates of a program possess the attributes or that remedial action is in progress.	✓	<p>Assessment results are compiled and documented for all graduate attributes over a period of six years or less.  <b>AND</b> At least three learning activities for most graduate attributes are assessed.  <b>AND</b> results demonstrate that the graduate cohort has achieved the HEI compliance requirements for most graduate attributes OR that remedial action is in progress.</p>
		*	<p>Assessment results are compiled and documented for most graduate attributes over a period of six years or less.  <b>AND/OR</b> assessment results have not been compiled or documented for most attributes over a period of six years or less.  <b>AND/OR</b> Less than three learning activities for some graduate attributes are assessed.  <b>AND/OR</b> many graduate attributes are assessed over a limited number of semesters.  <b>AND/OR</b> results demonstrate that the graduate cohort has not achieved the HEI compliance requirements for most graduate attributes OR no remedial actions are being taken.  <b>AND/OR</b> the processes are in place but not consistently applied by all participants in the process.</p>

Note 1: "GA component" – a component of the attribute description in section 3 of the "Accreditation Criteria and Procedures" (e.g. mathematics is a component of the knowledge base description)

Note 2: "Performance Levels" – a scale of descriptors of the performance corresponding to an individual indicator. Performance levels for a coherent group of indicators corresponding to individuals are aggregated to measure graduate attribute achievement levels.

## Continual Improvement

3.2	Continual Improvement:	Accreditation Criteria and Procedures Description	Rating	Assessment Category Descriptors
	3.2.1 Improvement process	There must be processes in place that demonstrate that program outcomes are being assessed in the context of graduate attributes, and that the results are validated, analyzed and applied to further development of the program.	✓	Adequate continual improvement processes are in place that demonstrate program outcomes are being assessed and applied to the further development of the engineering program <b>AND</b> clear evidence of engagement by most full-time faculty members and engineering leadership.
			*	Absent or limited continual improvement processes are in place that demonstrates program outcomes are being assessed and applied to the further development of the engineering program <b>AND/OR</b> process is not adequately documented <b>AND/OR</b> limited or absent engagement of full-time faculty members and/or engineering leadership.
	3.2.2 Stakeholder engagement	There must be demonstrated engagement of stakeholders both internal and external to the program in the continual improvement process.	✓	Internal and external stakeholders are broadly selected (e.g. internal: students, program faculty, engineering and/or non-engineering faculty; external: alumni, engineering professionals, other professionals, employers, learned societies, etc.) <b>AND</b> stakeholder roles in the improvement process are adequately demonstrated.
			*	Internal and external stakeholders are narrowly or insufficiently selected. <b>AND/OR</b> stakeholder roles in the improvement process are inadequately demonstrated or are not specified
	3.2.3 Improvement actions	There must be a demonstration that the continual improvement process has led to consideration of specific actions corresponding to identifiable improvements in the program and/or its assessment process. <b>Note, if the evidence suggests no change is warranted, then no change is necessary. This criterion does not apply to new programs.</b>	✓	Following decisions for improvement, evidence-based program-level and/or assessment process improvement actions have been implemented (if change was necessary) <b>AND</b> timelines and accountability for implementation have been documented.
			*	Despite decisions for change, only a limited number of or no evidence-based program-level and/or assessment process change actions have been implemented (if change was necessary). <b>AND/OR</b> no timelines or accountability for implementation have been established.