ICS 03.180
CCS A 18

T

团 体 标 准

T/CEEAA 002—2022

工程教育认证工作规范

Policy and procedure of engineering education accreditation

2022-07-15 发布　　2022-07-15 实施

中国工程教育专业认证协会　发布
中 国 标 准 出 版 社　出版

目　　次

前言 …… Ⅲ
引言 …… Ⅴ
1　范围 …… 1
2　规范性引用文件 …… 1
3　术语和定义 …… 1
4　认证程序 …… 3
4.1　申请和受理 …… 3
4.2　提交自评报告 …… 4
4.3　审阅自评报告 …… 4
4.4　现场考查 …… 5
4.5　审议和作出认证结论 …… 6
4.6　认证状态的保持与改进 …… 8
5　监督与仲裁 …… 9
5.1　公开 …… 9
5.2　监督 …… 9
5.3　申诉与仲裁 …… 10
5.4　社会举报 …… 10
6　回避、保密与其他纪律要求 …… 11
6.1　回避 …… 11
6.2　保密 …… 11
6.3　其他纪律要求 …… 11

前　言

本文件按照 GB/T 1.1—2020《标准化工作导则　第 1 部分：标准化文件的结构和起草规则》的规定起草。

请注意本文件的某些内容可能涉及专利。本文件的发布机构不承担识别专利的责任。

本文件由中国工程教育专业认证协会和教育部教育质量评估中心提出并归口。

本文件起草单位：中国工程教育专业认证协会、教育部教育质量评估中心、中国标准化协会、中国测绘学会、中国地质学会、中国电工技术学会、中国电机工程学会、中国兵工学会、中国电力企业联合会、中国电子学会、中国纺织工业联合会、中国复合材料学会、中国钢铁工业协会、中国高等教育学会、中国光学光电子行业协会、中国航空学会、中国核能行业协会、中国核学会、中国环境保护产业协会、中国环境科学学会、中国机械工程学会、中国机械工业联合会、中国建筑学会、中国建筑材料联合会、中国交通教育研究会、中国交通运输协会、中国金属学会、中国建设教育协会、中国矿业联合会、中国煤炭工业协会、中国农业工程学会、中国汽车工程学会、中国轻工业联合会、中国软件行业协会、中国石油和化学工业联合会、中国食品科学技术学会、中国水利学会、中国铁道学会、中国通信学会、中国土木工程学会、中国仪器仪表学会、中国有色金属工业协会、中国造船工程学会、中国职业安全健康协会、中国自动化学会、中国科协培训和人才服务中心、中国公路学会、联合国教科文组织高等教育创新中心（中国深圳）、中国纺织工程学会、河南省教育评估中心、广东省工程师学会、上海市工程师学会、江苏省工程师学会、江苏省教育评估院、黑龙江教师发展学院（黑龙江省教育评估院）、北京工程师学会、重庆市工程师协会、山东省工程师协会。

本文件主要起草人：范唯、周爱军、顾佩华、陈道蓄、王孙禺、王志华、王玲、乐清华、吕志伟、刘志军、李志义、李茂国、陈以一、雷庆、王天羿、孙谊、孟玉婵、戴先中、郑璇、赵自强、孙颖、贾茜、李涛、刘晶。

引　言

工程教育认证是国际通行的工程教育质量保证制度，也是实现工程教育国际互认和工程师资格国际互认的重要基础。我国的工程教育认证工作开始于2006年，是工程师制度改革工作的基础和重要组成部分。2016年，我国加入《华盛顿协议》成为正式成员。

开展工程教育认证的目标是：推动中国工程教育的质量保障体系持续完善，推进中国工程教育改革，进一步提高工程教育质量；建立与工程师制度相衔接的工程教育认证体系，促进教育界与企业界的联系，增强工程教育人才培养对产业发展的适应性；促进中国工程教育的国际互认。

中国工程教育专业认证协会是由热心中国工程教育的有关团体和个人自愿结成的全国性、非营利性、会员制社会团体组织（以下简称“认证协会”）。

开展认证以来，认证协会会同有关单位，根据我国工程教育的实际情况，参考国际工程教育界的通行做法，按照实质等效的原则，研究制定了《工程教育认证办法》，以认证协会内部印发文件的形式执行。为适应新形势下教育评价工作的有关要求，进一步规范工程教育认证工作，促进国际交流互认，根据认证协会理事会决议，在原《工程教育认证办法》基础上，保持核心内容不变，修改形成了本文件。

根据认证工作开展情况，认证协会将不断修订完善本文件。

本文件核心内容已执行多年，经历了多次修订和迭代，参与该项工作的领导、专家和工作人员众多，限于篇幅，无法在本文件主要起草人中一一列举，在此一并表示感谢。

本文件在执行过程中的意见或建议反馈至中国工程教育专业认证协会秘书处（地址：北京市海淀区学院路30号，邮编：100083，邮箱：ceeaa@cast.org.cn）。

工程教育认证工作规范

1 范围

本文件规定了开展工程教育认证工作的认证程序、监督与仲裁，以及相关的回避、保密与其他纪律要求。

本文件适用于以培养工程师为目标的普通高等学校全日制普通四年制本科专业工程教育认证工作。

2 规范性引用文件

下列文件中的内容通过文中的规范性引用而构成本文件必不可少的条款。其中，注日期的引用文件，仅该日期对应的版本适用于本文件；不注日期的引用文件，其最新版本（包括所有的修改单）适用于本文件。

T/CEEAA 001 工程教育认证标准。

3 术语和定义

下列术语和定义适用于本文件。

3.1

理事会 Council

认证协会会员大会的执行机构。理事会负责领导、组织工程教育认证工作；构建工程教育认证体系；审议通过工程教育认证办法、认证标准等；确定学术委员会、认证结论审议委员会、各专业类认证委员会的人员组成等。

3.2

监事会　Board of Supervisors

认证协会会员大会的监督机构。监事会负责监督理事会、下设机构及成员履行职责情况，监督秘书处及其成员工作情况；监督工程教育认证工作，确保诚信、公正；受理学校关于认证结论或认证过程的申诉，调查并作出最终裁决；接受社会各界对工程教育认证工作的投诉，调查并作出相应处理。

3.3

秘书处　Secretariat

认证协会会员大会的办事机构。秘书处负责在理事会的领导下组织开展工程教育认证工作，包括受理认证申请、组织开展现场考查、组织开展认证结论审议等；指导各专业类认证委员会开展工作；制定并实施认证工作计划，协调认证工作相关的部门和单位；协助学术委员会制定、修订工程教育认证有关文件，组织开展学术研究与交流；负责工程教育认证的信息服务与对外宣传工作；组织开展认证工作的国际交流与合作；组织开展认证培训；完成理事会交办的其他工作。秘书处同时为监事会、学术委员会、认证结论审议委员会开展工作提供服务。

3.4

专业类认证委员会　Program Accreditation Sub-committees

认证协会所属分支机构。专业类认证委员会负责在理事会的领导下，组织实施所在专业领域的工程教育认证工作；制定、修订相应专业的专业补充标准和本专业类认证委员会的工作文件，交学术委员会审定；推荐本专业领域的认证专家人选；组织本专业类认证专家的日常培训；委派现场考查专家组开展现场考查工作；组织撰写工程教育认证的有关报告、资料、结论建议等，报认证结论审议委员会审议；受理事会的委托处理有关事宜。

3.5

学术委员会　Academic Committee

认证协会所属分支机构。学术委员会负责对认证工作提供咨询；制定和修订认证办法、标准等认证工作文件，报理事会通过；对工程教

育认证提供学术支持;认定专家资格;指导和组织学术活动等。

3.6

认证结论审议委员会　Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee

认证协会所属分支机构。认证结论审议委员会负责在理事会领导下,审议各专业类认证委员会作出的认证报告和认证结论建议,报理事会通过。

3.7

自评　self-study

学校组织认证受理专业依照 T/CEEAA 001 对专业的办学情况和教学质量进行自我检查和评价。

3.8

考查　on-site visit;virtual review

专业类认证委员会委派的现场考查专家组到认证专业所在学校开展的实地考查活动,核实自评报告的真实性和准确性,了解自评报告中未能反映的有关情况。

4　认证程序

4.1　申请和受理

4.1.1　申请条件

4.1.1.1　工程教育认证工作在学校自愿申请的基础上开展。

4.1.1.2　满足以下条件的普通高等学校全日制普通四年制本科专业可申请认证:

a)　按照教育部规定设立;

b)　已有 3 届毕业生;

c)　授予工学学士学位。

4.1.1.3　因专业名称变更导致新专业毕业生不足 3 届的,由认证协会根据其专业内涵决定是否具备认证条件。

4.1.1.4　专业所在学校应承诺遵守认证要求,并承担认证相关费用。

4.1.2 提交申请

符合申请条件的专业所在学校向秘书处提交申请书。

4.1.3 审核申请

秘书处收到申请书后，会同相关专业类认证委员会对认证申请进行审核，审核申请学校是否具备认证的基本条件。可要求申请学校对有关问题作出答复，或提供有关材料。

4.1.4 受理申请

根据审核情况，作出以下两种结论，并做相应处理：

a) 受理申请，通知申请学校开展自评；

b) 不受理申请，向申请学校说明理由；学校可在达到申请认证的基本条件后重新提出申请。

受理认证专业所在学校需与认证协会签订委托服务合同，委托认证协会对其开展认证工作。

4.2 提交自评报告

学校应根据 T/CEEAA 001 撰写自评报告，并按规定时间向秘书处提交自评报告。

4.3 审阅自评报告

专业类认证委员会对专业提交的自评报告进行审阅，审查申请认证的专业是否满足 T/CEEAA 001 的要求。

根据审查情况，作出以下三种结论之一，并进行相应处理：

a) 通过审查，通知专业进入现场考查阶段及考查时间；

b) 补充修改自评报告，向专业说明补充修改要求；经补充修改达到要求的应按 a)处理，否则按 c)处理；

c) 不通过审查，向专业说明理由，中止本次认证工作；学校可在满足 T/CEEAA 001 要求后重新申请认证。

4.4 现场考查

4.4.1 基本要求

考查内容以 T/CEEAA 001 为依据。

现场考查时间不超过 3 天，且不安排在学校假期进行。由于不可抗力或特殊工作需要，可安排线上或线上线下相结合的方式开展考查。

专业类认证委员会应按照规定组建现场考查专家组，在考查组进入学校 4 周前分发自评报告等材料，并在入校考查前 2 周通知学校。

考查组成员进校前应认真审阅自评报告。

4.4.2 考查程序

现场考查程序如下：

a) 专家组预备会议：进校后专家组召开内部工作会议，明确考查计划和具体的考查步骤，并进行分工；

b) 见面会：专家组向学校及相关单位负责人介绍考查目的、要求和详细计划，并与学校及相关单位交换意见；

c) 实地考查：考查内容包括考查实验条件、图书资料等教学硬件设施；检查近期学生的毕业设计（论文）、试卷、实验报告、实习报告、作业，以及学生完成的其他作品；观摩课堂教学、实验、实习、课外活动；其他能反映教学质量和学生素质的现场和实物；

d) 访谈：专家组根据需要访谈包括在校学生和毕业生、教师、学校领导、有关管理部门负责人及院（系）行政、学术、教学负责人等，必要时还需访谈用人单位有关负责人；

e) 意见反馈：专家组成员向学校反馈考查意见与建议。

4.4.3 考查报告

考查报告应包括下列内容：

a) 专业基本情况；

b） 对自评报告的审阅意见及问题核实情况；

c） 逐项说明专业符合认证标准要求的达成情况，重点说明考查过程中发现的主要问题和不足，以及需要关注并采取措施予以改进的事项。

专家组应在现场考查工作结束后 15 日内向相应专业类认证委员会提交现场考查报告及相关资料。

4.5 审议和作出认证结论

4.5.1 征询意见

专业类认证委员会应将考查报告送至专业所在学校征询意见。学校在收到考查报告后核实其中所提及的问题，并于 15 日内向相应专业类认证委员会回复意见。逾期不回复，则视同没有异议。

学校可将考查报告在校内传阅，但在作出正式的认证结论前，不得对外公开。

4.5.2 审议

各专业类认证委员会召开全体会议，审议专业的自评报告、专家组的考查报告和学校的回复意见。

4.5.3 提出认证结论建议

各专业类认证委员会经过充分讨论后，采取无记名投票方式提出认证结论建议。全体委员 2/3 及以上出席会议，投票方为有效。同意票数达到到会委员人数的 2/3 及以上，则通过认证结论建议。各专业类认证委员会讨论认证结论建议和投票的情况应予保密。

工程教育认证结论建议应为以下三种之一：

a） 通过认证，有效期 6 年；

b） 通过认证，有效期 6 年（有条件）；

c） 不通过认证。

4.5.4 提交工程教育认证报告和相关材料

各专业类认证委员会根据审议结果，撰写认证报告。认证报告须写明认证结论建议和投票结果，连同自评报告、考查报告和专业所在学校的回复意见等材料，一并提交认证结论审议委员会审议。

4.5.5 认证结论审议委员会审议认证结论

认证结论审议委员会召开会议，对各专业类认证委员会提交的认证结论建议和认证报告进行审议。认证结论审议委员会如对提交结论有异议，可要求专业类认证委员会在限定时间内对认证结论建议重新进行审议，也可直接对结论建议作出调整。

认证结论审议委员会审议认证结论建议时，按照协商一致的方式进行审议，有重大分歧时，可采用无记名投票方式投票表决。全体委员2/3及以上出席会议，投票方为有效。同意票数达到到会委员人数的2/3及以上，认证结论建议方为有效。

认证结论审议委员会审议认证结论建议时，可要求专业类认证委员会列席会议，接受质询。

4.5.6 批准与发布认证结论

理事会召开全体会议，听取认证结论审议委员会对认证结论建议和认证报告的审议情况，并投票表决认证结论建议。理事会全体会议应邀请监事会成员列席。

理事会全体会议采用无记名投票方式批准认证结论。全体理事2/3及以上出席会议，投票方为有效。同意票数达到到会理事人数的2/3及以上，认证结论方为有效。

如理事会未批准认证结论审议委员会审议通过的认证结论建议，认证结论审议委员会应按原程序重新审议。重新审议后，再次向理事会提交新的认证结论建议。如果理事会再次投票后仍未批准认证结论，则由理事会直接作出认证结论。

理事会批准的认证报告及认证结论应在15日内分送相关学校，如

果学校对认证结论有异议，可向监事会提出申诉，由监事会作出最终裁决。

理事会批准的认证结论或监事会作出的裁决由认证协会负责发布。

4.5.7 认证结论

认证结论分为以下 3 种：

a) 通过认证，有效期 6 年；

b) 通过认证，有效期 6 年(有条件)；

c) 不通过认证。

其中，结论为“通过认证，有效期 6 年(有条件)”的专业，应在第 3 年提交持续改进情况报告，决定“继续保持有效期”或“中止有效期”；结论为“不通过认证”的专业，1 年后可重新申请认证。

4.6 认证状态的保持与改进

4.6.1 改进要求

通过认证的专业所在学校应认真研究认证报告中指出的问题和不足，采取切实有效的措施进行改进，并报备改进情况。

4.6.2 提交持续改进情况报告

4.6.2.1 认证结论为“通过认证，有效期 6 年”的，学校应在有效期内持续改进工作，并在第 3 年提交持续改进情况报告，认证协会备案，持续改进情况报告可作为再次认证的重要参考。

4.6.2.2 认证结论为“通过认证，有效期 6 年(有条件)”的，学校应根据认证报告所提问题，逐条进行改进，并在第 3 年提交持续改进情况报告。

4.6.3 审核持续改进情况报告

认证协会应组织各专业类认证委员会、认证结论审议委员会对持

续改进情况报告进行审议，具体审议程序与作出认证结论的程序一致。认证协会根据审核情况给出以下 3 种意见：

a） 继续保持有效期；

b） 中止认证有效期；

c） 需要进校核实。

对“中止认证有效期”的专业，认证协会应动态调整通过认证专业名单。

如学校未按时提交持续改进情况报告，秘书处应通知其限期提交；逾期仍未提交的，中止其认证有效期。

4.6.4 状态保持与改进

通过认证的专业在有效期内如果对课程体系做重大调整，或师资、办学条件等发生重大变化，应立即向秘书处申请对调整或变化的部分进行重新认证。重新认证通过者，可继续保持原认证结论至有效期届满；否则，应中止原认证的有效期。重新认证工作参照认证程序进行，可视具体情况简化。

认证协会随机抽取部分专业在认证有效期内开展回访工作，检查学校认证状态保持及持续改进情况。回访工作参照认证程序进行。

通过认证的专业如果要保持认证有效期的连续性，应在认证有效期届满前至少 1 年重新提出认证申请。

5 监督与仲裁

5.1 公开

工程教育认证工作的正式文件、通过认证的专业名单和认证结论应予以公开。

5.2 监督

监事会对工程教育认证工作实施监督。监事会委员通过随机观察认证工作的环节，抽查现场考查专家组专家的资格，列席理事会全体会

议等方式开展工作。监事会应对年度工程教育认证工作进行抽查，对认证过程中出现的问题予以处理。

对违反工程教育认证规定的各级各类认证机构成员或认证专家，监事会应对其进行调查处理。情节严重的，由监事会商请理事会同意，撤销其资格；如果有触犯国家有关法律的情形，监事会应向司法机关举报。

各级各类认证机构和现场考查专家组及其成员、接受认证专业所在学校应主动配合监事会的工作，为监事会开展工作提供条件。

5.3 申诉与仲裁

接受认证专业所在学校如果对认证结论有异议，可在收到认证结论后30日内向监事会提出申诉。逾期未提出异议，视为同意认证结论。

学校的申诉应以书面形式提出，详细陈述理由，并提供能够支持申诉理由的各种材料。

监事会应在收到学校申诉的60日内提出维持或变更原认证结论的意见。监事会提出的意见为最终裁决，对申诉学校和理事会都具有约束力。最终裁决结论由认证协会发布。

5.4 社会举报

社会单位或个人对接受认证的专业有异议，或认为各级各类认证机构和现场考查专家组成员的行为不妥，可向监事会举报。单位举报应盖公章，个人举报应署实名，否则不予受理。监事会应为举报单位和举报人保密。

监事会对被举报个人或单位进行调查，被涉及的个人或单位应就相关问题作出书面说明并提供相应证明材料。

监事会对举报的问题查实后，提出处理意见并公示。

6 回避、保密与其他纪律要求

6.1 回避

认证协会各级各类机构成员中与接受认证专业所在学校有重要关系的，在开展该专业的认证有关活动时，应进行合理的回避。认证专家与接受认证专业所在学校有重要关系的，不应担任现场考查专家，也不应以各种身份参与现场考查活动。认证协会各级各类机构成员、现场考查专家组成员和接受认证专业所在学校，应主动提出需要回避的人员及原因。

6.2 保密

认证协会各级各类机构成员、现场考查专家组成员在开展认证工作时，应保守认证工作有关的秘密，不泄露考查内部讨论的情况。接受认证专业及所在学校提交的资料，除非得到正式授权，不应公开公布。

6.3 其他纪律要求

认证协会各级各类机构、现场考查专家组应严格遵守认证工作各项相关规定，公正、客观地开展各项工作。在开展某一专业的认证工作时，不应接受学校的拜访，不应私自到学校进行指导、讲学和访问，不应利用认证工作谋取私利，不应参加任何与认证工作无关的活动，不应与学校发生任何经济关系，不应从事任何其他影响决策及有违认证公正性的活动。

接受认证专业及所在学校应保证提交的自评报告等相关材料真实可靠，应保证教学文件的原始性与真实性，不应虚构、编造。接待工作应坚持从简，不搞形式主义，不安排隆重的接站、送站及校内欢迎仪式和相关活动；不应安排与认证工作无关的考察或联谊活动，不应安排宴请。在接受认证期间，学校不应拜访专家组成员、邀请专家组成员到学

校访问、讲学，不应私自邀请专家辅导认证工作。学校不应向现场考查专家赠送礼品和礼金，或变相发放补贴，不应与认证专家发生任何经济往来。不应从事任何其他有违认证公正性的活动。

ICS 03.180
CCS A 18

Social Organization Standard

T/CEEAA 002—2022

Policy and procedure of engineering education accreditation

Issue date:2022-07-15 **Implementation date**:2022-07-15

Issued by China Engineering Education Accreditation Association
Published by Standards Press of China

Contents

Foreword ····· 17
Introduction ····· 19
1 Scope ····· 21
2 Normative references ····· 21
3 Terms and definitions ····· 22
4 Accreditation procedure ····· 25
4.1 Request for evaluation ····· 25
4.2 Submission of the self-study report ····· 27
4.3 Review of the self-study report ····· 27
4.4 On-site visit / Virtual review ····· 28
4.5 Review and make decisions on accreditation ····· 30
4.6 Continuous imporovement ····· 34
5 Supervision and arbitration ····· 36
5.1 Publicity ····· 36
5.2 Supervision ····· 37
5.3 Appeals and arbitration ····· 37
5.4 Social complaints ····· 38
6 Avoidance, confidentiality and other disciplinary requirements ····· 39
6.1 Avoidance ····· 39
6.2 Confidentiality ····· 39
6.3 Other disciplinary requirements ····· 39

Foreword

This document is in accordance with the provisions of GB/T 1.1—2020 *Directives for standardization—Part* 1: *Rules for the structure and drafting of standardizing documents*.

Please note that some of the contents of this document may involve patents. The issuing agency of this document is not responsible for identifying patents.

This document was proposed by the China Engineering Education Accreditation Association (CEEAA) and the Education Quality Evaluation Agency of the Ministry of Education, and is managed by CEEAA.

Drafting organizations of this document: China Engineering Education Accreditation Association, Education Quality Evaluation Agency of the Ministry of Education, China Association for Standardization, Geological Society of China, China Society for Geodesy Photogrammetry and Cartography, China Electrotechnical Society, Chinese Society for Electrical Engineering, China Ordnance Society, China Electricity Council, Chinese Institute of Electronics, China National Textile and Apparel Council, Chinese Society for Composite Materials, China Iron and Steel Association, China Association of Higher Education, China Optics and Optoelectronics Manufacturers Association, Chinese Aerospace Society, China Nuclear Energy Association, China Nuclear Energy Society, China Environmental Protection Industry Association, China Environmental Science Society, China Mechanical Engineering Society, China Machinery Industry Association, China Architecture Society, China Construction Materials

Council, China Communications Education Institute, China Communications and Transportation Association, China Metals Society, China Construction Education Association, China Mining Association, China National Coal Association, China Agricultural Engineering Society, Chinese Society of Automotive Engineering, Chinese Council of Light Industry, Chinese Association of Software Industry, Chinese Association of Petroleum and Chemical Industry, Chinese Institute of Food Science and Technology, Chinese Society of Hydraulic Engineering, Chinese Society of Railway Engineering, Chinese Institute of Communications, Chinese Society of Civil Engineering, Chinese Society of Measurement and Control Engineering, Chinese Association of Nonferrous Metal Industry, Chinese Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers, Chinese Association of Occupational Safety and Health, Chinese Association for Automation, CAST Center for Professional Training and Services, China Highway and Transportation Society, International Centre for Higher Education Innovation under the auspices of UNESCO (Shenzhen, China), China Textile Engineering Society, Education Evaluation Center of Henan, Guangdong Institute of Engineers, Shanghai Institute of Engineers, Jiangsu Institution of Engineers, Jiangsu Agency for Educational Evaluation, Heilongjiang Institute of Teacher Development (Heilongjiang Agency for Educational Evaluation), Beijing Institute of Engineers, Chongqing Engineers Association, Shandong Engineers Association.

The main drafters of this document: Fan Wei, Zhou Aijun, Gu Peihua, Chen Daoxu, Wang Sunyu, Wang Zhihua, Wang Ling, Le Qinghua, Lyu Zhiwei, Liu Zhijun, Li Zhiyi, Li Maoguo, Chen Yiyi, Lei Qing, Wang Tianyi, Sun Yi, Meng Yuchan, Dai Xianzhong, Zheng Xuan, Zhao Ziqiang, Sun Ying, Jia Qian, Li Tao, Liu Jing.

Introduction

Engineering education accreditation is an internationally recognized quality assurance system for engineering education and an essential basis for international mutual recognition of engineering education and engineer qualifications. Engineering education accreditation in China began in 2006 and is the foundation and an essential part of the reform of the engineering system. In 2016, China joined the Washington Accord as a full signatory.

The goals of engineering education accreditation are: To promote the construction of an engineering education quality assurance system in China, to promote the reform of engineering education in China, and to further improve the quality of engineering education; To establish an engineering education accreditation system in conjunction with the engineering circles, to promote the link between education and industry, and to improve the adaptability of engineering talent training to industrial development; To promote international mutual recognition of Chinese engineering education in the world.

China Engineering Education Accreditation Association (CEEAA) is a voluntarily established, non-profit, national, membership-based social organization by associated groups and individuals committed to China's engineering education.

Since the naissance of engineering education accreditation in China, CEEAA and associated agencies released the "*Policy for engineering*

education accreditation" in accordance with the education practices in China, based on the prevailing practices of the international engineering education community and the principle of substantial equivalence. According to the Council Meeting decision of CEEAA, the "*Policy for engineering education accreditation*" was revised and designed to form this document, which meets the relevant requirements of education evaluation in the new engineering era.

CEEAA will constantly revise this document.

The principles of this document have been implemented for many years and have undergone many revisions and iterations by many leaders, experts, and staff involved in this work. Due to the limited space, we are not able to list all the contributors. We would like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to them.

Feedback, comments and suggestions on the document are welcome by CEEAA at the postal address of No.30, Xueyuan Road, Haidian District, Beijing, zip code: 100083, and e-mail of ceeaa@cast.org.cn.

Policy and procedure of engineering education accreditation

1 Scope

This document specifies the accreditation procedures, supervision, and arbitration process for conducting engineering education accreditation, as well as related avoidance, confidentiality, and other disciplinary requirements.

This document applies to engineering education accreditation of engineering programs awarding bachelor's degree with four-year full-time study at higher education institutions.

2 Normative references

The contents of the following documents constitute indispensable provisions of the document by normative references in the text. For dated references, only the version corresponding to the date applies to this document; for undated references, the latest version (including all amendments) applies to this document.

T/CEEAA 001 *Engineering education accreditation criteria*

3 Terms and definitions

The following terms and definitions apply to this document.

3.1
Council

Executive body of the CEEAA General Assembly. Council directs and organizes accreditation activities; establishes the engineering education accreditation system; determines the composition of the Academic Committee, the Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee, and the Program Accreditation Sub-committees.

3.2
Board of Supervisors

Supervising organization of the CEEAA General Assembly. Board of Supervisors oversees the work of the Council, subordinate committees, and members; oversees the work of the Secretariat and its members; oversees accreditation work and ensures its integrity and fairness; receives appeals and complaints related to accreditation decisions or the accreditation process raised by applicant institutions, conducts investigations, and makes final decisions; receives complaints related to the engineering education accreditation process from the society, conducts investigations, and takes appropriate action.

3.3
Secretariat

CEEAA General Assembly Office. Secretariat implements engineering education accreditation work under the direction of the Council, including accepting request for evaluation, organizing on-site visit, and reviewing accreditation decisions; guides Program Accreditation Sub-committees in carrying out the accreditation, etc.; stipulates and implements accreditation work plan, coordinates the accreditation process with related organizations; assists the Academic Committee in formulating and revising working documents related to engineering education accreditation; organizes academic research and communications; organizes engineering education accreditation information service and publicity; organizes international communication and cooperation in accreditation work; organizes accreditation training, and performs related duties assigned by the Council. The Secretariat also serves the Board of Supervisors, the Academic Committee, and the Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee.

3.4
Program Accreditation Sub-committees

Branch of the CEEAA. Program Accreditation Sub-committees organizes and implements engineering education accreditation in appropriate categories under the direction of the Council; formulates and revises complementary program criteria and relevant working documents for its category; nominates candidates for accreditation evaluators in its category; organizes training programs for accreditation evaluators in its category; appoints review team to conduct on-site visit; drafts relevant accreditation reports, documents, and propose de-

cisions for the Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee; address relevant Council matters.

3.5
Academic Committee

Branch of the CEEAA. Academic Committee advises on accreditation work; formulats and revises accreditation documents such as accreditation policies and criteria, reports to the Council for adoption; provids academic support for engineering education accreditation; recognizes evaluator qualifications; directs and organizes academic activities, etc..

3.6
Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee

Branch of the CEEAA. Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee reviews accreditation reports and proposals for accreditation decisions of Program Accreditation Sub-committees under the direction of the Council and reports to the Council.

3.7
self-study

The self-study is the self-evaluation of status and educational quality that the program conducts under the direction of its institution in accordance with T/CEEAA 001.

3.8

on-site visit; virtual review

The on-site visit / virtual review is conducted by a review team appointed by the Program Accreditation Sub-committees to perform assessment and evaluation of the program under review for accreditation, verify the authenticity and accuracy of the self-study report, and examin relevant issues arised from self-study report review.

4 Accreditation procedure

4.1 Request for evaluation

4.1.1 Eligibility requirements

4.1.1.1 Engineering education accreditation is granted voluntarily by institutions.

4.1.1.2 Four-year undergraduate programs of full-time normal higher education institutions that meet the following requirements can apply for accreditation:

a) Established in accordance with Ministry of Education regulations;

b) Have at least 3 years of graduates prior to the academic year when request for evaluation occurs;

c) Authorized to award a bachelor of engineering degree.

4.1.1.3 If the new program has less than three years of graduates due to the change in program name, CEEAA will decide if they meet the requirements according to the connotation of their program.

4.1.1.4 The institution to which the program belongs must agree to meet the accreditation requirements and pay the costs associated with accreditation.

4.1.2 Submission of the request for evaluation

The request for evaluation should be submitted to the Secretariat by the institution to which the program belongs.

4.1.3 Review of the request for evaluation

Upon receipt of the request for evaluation, the Secretariat reviews the request forms in conjunction with the appropriate Program Accreditation Sub-committees. The most critical issue to be reviewed is whether the institution is qualified in principle to apply for accreditation. The Secretariat may ask the institution to answer questions or provide additional materials as necessary.

4.1.4 Acceptance of the request for evaluation

According to the results of the review, CEEAA makes one of the following decisions and take the appropriate action:

a) Accept the request and ask the program to conduct a self-study;

b) Reject the request and explain the reasons to the institution to

which requested program belongs. The institution may reapply for accreditation if it meets the basic requirements.

The institution to which the program with the accepted request belongs should sign the entrustment contract and authorize CEEAA to process the accreditation.

4.2 Submission of the self-study report

The program should prepare the self-study report based on T/CEEAA 001 and submit it to CEEAA.

4.3 Review of the self-study report

Program Accreditation Sub-committees should review the self-study report submitted by the program seeking accreditation. The most important item to review is whether the program has met the requirements of T/CEEAA 001.

The Program Accreditation Sub-committees should make one of the following decisions according to the result of the review and take the appropriate action:

a) Move to the next phase of on-site visit and creat a schedule for on-site visit;

b) Modify the self-study report according to requirements. The Program Accreditation Sub-committees should make the decision as in item a) if the report meets the requirements after the amendment or otherwise make the decision as in item c);

c) Suspend the accreditation process. The Program Accreditation Sub-committees explain the reasons to the program and its institution. The program and its institution may reapply for accreditation if it meets the requirements of T/CEEAA 001.

4.4 On-site visit/Virtual review

4.4.1 General requirements

The on-site visit should be conducted in accordance with T/CEEAA 001.

The duration of the on-site visit should not exceed 3 days. The on-site visit should not fall during the vacation time. In case of force majeure or special work requirements, a virtual review or virtual plus on-site review may be arranged.

Program Accreditation Sub-committees appoint review team according to regulations, distribute the self-study report to the review team four weeks in advance, and notify the program and its institution of the visit date two weeks in advance.

The review team should carefully review the self-study report prior to the visit.

4.4.2 Visit procedure

The visit process is as follows:

a) Preparatory meeting of the review team. Upon arrival at the campus where the program under review for accreditation

locates, the review team holds an internal meeting to confirm the schedule for the visit and the evaluation process;

b) Entrance meeting. The review team presents the purpose, requirements, and detailed schedule of the visit to the administrative officers of the institution and relevant departments, and exchange information with the institution and program;

c) Tours and investigations. The review team has a tour of experimental conditions, library, and other teaching facilities; reviews of recent graduate design (theses), student examination papers, experimental reports, exercise reports, schoolwork, and other student projects; observe student instruction, experiments, exercises, and extracurricular activities; visits sites and internships that reflect the quality of instruction and student abilities;

d) Interview. The review team meets with relevant persons, including on-campus students and alumni, academic staff, facility directors, officers in appropriate administrative departments, academic and instructional staff in respective college or department, and employers of graduates, as appropriate;

e) Exit meeting. The review team presents an exit statement of strengths, shortcomings, and/or observations at the end of the on-site visit.

4.4.3 On-site visit report

The on-site visit report should include the following contents:

a) The basic information about the program under review;

b) The examinations on the issues arised from the review of self-study report;

c) The description of the extent to which the program has met the accreditation criteria, focusing on the shortcomings identified during the on-site visit and the issues that need to be addressed and require action for improvement.

The review team should submit the on-site visit report and related documents to the Program Accreditation Sub-committees within 15 days after the on-site visit.

4.5 Review and make decisions on accreditation

4.5.1 Consultation

The Program Accreditation Sub-committees send a copy of the on-site visit report to the institution to which the program under accreditation belongs for comments. Upon receipt of the on-site visit report, the institution should review the issues identified in the report and provide feedback to the Program Accreditation Sub-committees within 15 days. If the institution does not respond within 15 days, it will be considered no appeal.

The institution may share the on-site visit report within the campus, but must not share it publicly prior to the formal accreditation decision.

4.5.2 Preliminary review by Program Accreditation Sub-committees

Program Accreditation Sub-committees holds a plenary meeting to review the self-study report, the on-site visit report, and the institution's feedback.

4.5.3 Accreditation decision proposal

Program Accreditation Sub-committees propose an accreditation decision based on extensive discussion by anonymous vote. At least 2/3 (including 2/3) of the commissioners should attend the plenary meeting to vote, and the accreditation decision shall be adopted by the affirmative vote of more than 2/3 (including 2/3) of those present. Discussion of the proposal and the result of the vote in the Program Accreditation Sub-committees should be kept confidential.

There are three types of decision proposals in engineering education accreditation:

a) Accredited with a validity period of 6 years;

b) Accredited with a validity period of 6 years (conditional);

c) Failed.

4.5.4 Submission of the engineering education accreditation report and relevant documents

Program Accreditation Sub-committees prepare the engineering education accreditation report in accordance with the commissioners' discussions and voting results. The report describes the accreditation decision proposal and voting results. The engineering education accreditation report is submitted to the Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee for review along with the self-study report, on-site visit report, and institutional feedback.

4.5.5 Further review by Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee

Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee holds a plenary meeting to review proposed accreditation decisions and accreditation reports submitted by Program Accreditation Sub-committees. If Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee disagrees with the proposed decisions, it may request the Program Accreditation Sub-committees to reconsider the proposed accreditation decisions within a specified period of time, or adjust the proposed decisions directly.

Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee reviews accreditation decision proposals in accordance with consensus. The Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee conducts an anonymous vote if there are differing opinions. At least 2/3 (including 2/3) of the Commissioners should attend the plenary meeting to vote, and the accreditation decision shall be adopted by the affirmative vote of more than 2/3 (including 2/3) of those present.

When reviewing proposals for accreditation decisions, the Accredi-

tation Decision Advisory Committee may invite members of the Program Accreditation Sub-committees to attend the plenary meeting for defense as needed.

4.5.6 Final approval and notification of the accreditation decision

The Council holds a plenary session to hear the Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee review process on accreditation decision proposals and accreditation reports. The Council votes on the accreditation decision proposals. The Board of Supervisors should be invited to participate in the plenary session.

The Council holds an anonymous vote to approve the accreditation decision. The vote is effective only if at least 2/3 (including 2/3) of the Commissioners attend the plenary meeting. The accreditation decision shall be confirmed with more than 2/3 (including 2/3) approval of those present.

If the Council does not approve the proposal for accreditation decision, the Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee should reconsider the proposal according to the established procedure. After reconsidering, the Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee submits a new accreditation decision proposal to the Council. If the new proposal is still not approved, the Council makes the final accreditation decision directly.

Accreditation decisions and accreditation reports approved by the Council shall be sent to the institutions concerned within 15 days. If the institutions disagree with the decision, they may appeal to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors makes the final decision.

CEEAA publishes the accreditation decisions approved by the Council or the Board of Supervisors.

4.5.7 Accreditation decisions

There are three types of accreditation decisions in engineering education accreditation:

a) Accredited with a validity period of 6 years;

b) Accredited with a validity period of 6 years (conditional);

c) Failed.

In addition, the program with the decision "Accredited with a validity period of 6 years (conditional)" needs to submit improvement reports in the third year. Certain decisions on retention or termination are made based on the improvement status. The programs with "Failed" can reapply for accreditation one year later.

4.6 Continuous imporovement

4.6.1 Requirements for improvement

The institutions to which the accredited programs belong should investigate the concerns and shortcomings identified in the accreditation report and take appropriate action for improvement.

4.6.2 Submission of the improvement report

4.6.2.1 The institution to which the accredited program with decision of "Accredited with a validity period of 6 years" should make improvements within the validity period and submit an improvement report to CEEAA in the third year. The improvement report will be an essential reference in the next cycle of accreditation.

4.6.2.2 The institutions to which the accredited program with decision of "Accredited with a validity period of 6 years (conditional)" should make improvements item by item according to the concerns and shortcomings in the accreditation report and submit an improvement report to CEEAA in the third year.

4.6.3 Review of the improvement report

CEEAA organizes the appropriate Program Accreditation Sub-committees and Accreditation Decision Advisory Committee to review the improvement reports and make one of the following decisions:

a) Maintain validity period;

b) Terminate validity period;

c) On-site review required.

CEEAA removes programs with the "Terminate validity period" decision from the list of accredited programs.

If the institute fails to submit the improvement report on time, the Secretariat shall notify it of the deadline for submission. If the insti-

tute fails to submit the report after the deadline, the validity of the accreditation shall terminate.

4.6.4 Maintenance of the accreditation validity

If the accredited program makes significant changes in the curriculum, faculty, supporting conditions, etc., during the accreditation validity period, it must immediately submit a request to the Secretariat for re-evaluation of the changes. If the program is re-accredited, it may maintain the previous accreditation validity period; otherwise, the validity period of the previous accreditation terminates. Re-accreditation follows the previous accreditation process, but may be simplified depending on the situation.

CEEAA may randomly select some programs within the validity period of accreditation to conduct a return visit, if needed, to examin the improvement of accredited programs. The return visit follows the previous accreditation process.

If the accredited program wishes to continue the accreditation period, it should apply for a renewing accreditation at least one year before the accreditation period expires.

5 Supervision and arbitration

5.1 Publicity

Formal documents related to accreditation work, the list of accredited programs, and accreditation decisions shall be made public.

5.2 Supervision

The Board of Supervisors monitors the accreditation work by observing the accreditation process, randomly reviewing the qualifications of evaluators, and attending the plenary meeting of the Council. The Board of Supervisors should spot-check a certain proportion of the accreditation work each year and promptly detect and deal with problems found during the accreditation process.

The Board of Supervisors has the right to investigate and dismiss evaluators or members of accreditation organizations who violate relevant regulations. The Board of Supervisors reports to the Council and revoke the qualifications of such evaluators or members if necessary. If the evaluators or members do not comply with the laws, the Board of Supervisors refers the case to the judiciary.

The accreditation organizations, accreditation review teams, evaluators, and the institutions to which programs under accreditation belong should cooperate with the Board of Supervisors and provide it with necessary work support.

5.3 Appeals and arbitration

If the institution to which the program under accreditation disagrees with the accreditation decision, it has the right to appeal to the Board of Supervisors within 30 days of receiving the decision. The institution is deemed to accept the decision if the appeal is not filed within the time limit.

The institution should submit the appeal in writing and provide de-

tailed reasons and relevant documents in support of the appeal.

The Board of Supervisors shall submit a proposal to uphold or modify the previous accreditation decision within 60 days of the appeal receipt. The proposal of the Board of Supervisors shall be the final decision, binding on the institution and the Council. CEEAA will announce the final decision.

5.4 Social complaints

The social agencies or individuals who object to the accredited programs or to the accreditation organizations, review teams, and evaluators may file complaints with the Board of Supervisors. Agency complaint reports need to bear the official stamp, and individual complaint reports need to be signed with their real name. The Board of Supervisors does not accept anonymous complaints. The Board of Supervisors shall maintain confidentiality for agencies and individuals.

The Board of Supervisors investigates individuals or units associated with the complaints. Individuals or units under suspicion are required to respond in writing to the issues involved and provide certification documentation.

After reviewing the reported problems, the Board of Supervisors proposes a follow-up and publicize.

6 Avoidance, confidentiality and other disciplinary requirements

6.1 Avoidance

All members of CEEAA accreditation organizations who have a significant relationship with the institution to which the accrediting program belongs must avoid accreditation work. Evaluators who have a substantial relationship with the institution to which the accrediting program belongs shall not be a review team member or participate in any activity during the on-site visits. The members of the CEEAA accreditation organizations, the members of the review teams, and the institution to which the accrediting program belongs takes the initiative to propose the person and reason for the recusal during the accreditation work.

6.2 Confidentiality

Members of the CEEAA accreditation organizations and the members of the review teams must keep the secrets of the accreditation work and do not share internal discussions or other confidential information. Materials submitted by the program and institution should not be made public unless official permission has been granted.

6.3 Other disciplinary requirements

All members of CEEAA accreditation organizations and all members of review teams must strictly adhere to relevant accreditation policies and conduct accreditation work fairly and objectively.

The accrediting program and its institution need to ensure the authenticity and originality of the materials in the self-study report, relevant documents, and teaching materials, and do not fabricate or falsify information. The accrediting program and its institution should not engage in any activity that violate the impartiality of the accreditaiton.