



# COUNCIL FOR THE REGULATION OF ENGINEERING PRACTICE IN NIGERIA

## ENGINEERING ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE (EAC)

### PROGRAMME EVALUATORS GUIDELINES

Doc. Number: EAC-COREN-PROGRAMME-EVALUATORS-GUIDELINES-002.

September 15<sup>th</sup>, 2025

Revision	Status Description	Role	Names	Signature & Date
C01	Issued for Approval	Originator	EAC Review Team	
		Reviewer	EAC	
		Approval	COREN COUNCIL	



Party	Ref Ind	Name	Sign	Date

**Revision Philosophy**

- i. All NEW documents for review shall be issued at R01, with subsequent R02, R03, etc. as required.
- ii. All documents approved for issue, or approved for IMPUT shall be issued at A01 with subsequent A02, A03, etc. as required. (Management of Change is required for A02, A03, etc. excluding Issued for Information documents)
- iii. All Detailed documents for review shall be issued at D01, with subsequent D02, D03, etc as required.
- iv. All documents approved for USE shall be issued at C01 with subsequent C02, C03, etc. as required. (Management of Change is required for C02. C03, etc.)  
  
All revisions approved for Purchase of any EAC Facilities will be issued as P01, with subsequent P02, P03, etc with status AFP
- v. All Cancelled documents will be issued at X01, X02, and X03 respectively with status CAN.
- vi. All approved “Deviation from the initial approval as used for any purpose” documents shall be issued at Z01, with subsequent Z02, Z03, etc. as required. (Use versions Z01.1, Z01.2, Z01.3, etc. to review “As Built” document to Z02).
- vii. Previous revision details to be removed from the cover page at subsequent issues
- viii. Drawings/diagrams revised from previous approved issues are highlighted by 'clouding' the affected areas and by the use of a triangle containing the revision status.

**Revision History**

Rev	Date of issue	Reason for change

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD.....	4
PREFACE TO THE 2025 EDITION .....	6
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	7
1.0 INTRODUCTION .....	8
2.0 PREPARATION FOR ACCREDITATION VISIT.....	8
3.0 ACTIVITIES DURING ACCREDITATION VISIT .....	9
4.0 GENERAL CONDUCT AND SCRUTINY OF DOCUMENTS .....	10
5.0 EVALUATION TEAM REPORT .....	13
6.0 ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION .....	13
APPENDICES.....	15
PROGRAMME EVALUATION RUBRIC.....	16
Criterion 1: Programme Educational Objectives (PEOs) .....	17
Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes (POs).....	18
Criterion 3: Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs).....	21
Criterion 4: Curriculum and Learning Process.....	23
Criterion 5: Students .....	29
Criterion 6: Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI).....	33
Criterion 7: Staffing .....	36
Criterion 8: Physical Facilities & Infrastructure .....	42
Criterion 9: Industrial Linkages & Community Service .....	48
Criterion 10: Institutional Support & Funding.....	51
PROGRAMME EVALUATION WORK SHEET.....	52
PROGRAMME EVALUATOR REPORT TEMPLATE.....	62
UNIVERSITY FEEDBACK REGARDING ACCREDITATION VISITATION TEAM .....	68
PEER EVALUATION FORM OF EVALUATOR.....	69
EVALUATION FORM OF COREN STAFF BY INSTITUTION AND EVALUATORS.....	71
CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM .....	73

## FOREWORD

The need to improve the quality of our engineering graduates from universities and polytechnics has been consistently and passionately discussed in many Engineering fora such as the International Engineering Alliance (IEA), Federation of Engineering Institutions of Asia and the Pacific (FEIAP), Annual Engineering Assemblies and Conventions across African Countries as well as Annual Conferences of the Societies/ Associations of Engineers in Nigeria, Kenya, Ghana, South Africa, Ethiopia, Rwanda, Tanzania, etc. The sole goal is to ensure global benchmarking, substantial equivalence across different systems and economies to encourage and promote global mobility and competitiveness of engineering expertise. These have been our main objective at COREN over a decade which I spearheaded and championed as a former member of the COREN Council, former Chairman of E&T Council Committee and team leader of capacity development of both OBE implementors and PEVs. After leading COREN to be admitted as provisional signatory of Washington Accord (WA) in 2023 as President of COREN, it has been my fervent desire to find practical, sustainable, and forward-looking ways to enhance the quality of engineering education in Nigeria and admission into full signatory status of not only WA but also Sydney Accord and eventually Dublin Accord. The mandate of COREN is to regulate engineering - education, training and practice - in all its aspects and ramifications. At the upstream of the regulation value chain-educational level, this is achieved through the regulation of academic curriculum standards and the diligent accreditation of engineering and technology programmes in universities, polytechnics and technical colleges. COREN's regulatory functions and accreditation activities are therefore critical tools for engaging stakeholders in improving the process of knowledge acquisition, skill development, and value addition in transforming admitted students into globally competent engineers, technologists, technicians, craftsmen, etc.

In line with this vision, COREN has pursued active participation in the rapid pace of globalizing its operations and deploying emerging technologies to discharge its responsibilities. Our goal is for all Nigerian engineering graduates to meet not only local employers' expectations but also the standards of the international job market in the engineering and technology sectors.

It was in this context that in November 2015, COREN applied to join the Federation of Engineering Institutions of Asia and the Pacific (FEIAP) and was accepted in 2016. In 2018, we began the process of applying for the Provisional Signatory Status of the Washington Accord (WA) under the International Engineering Alliance (IEA). This effort required a complete shift to Outcome-Based Education (OBE) in Nigerian engineering programmes. COREN established a dedicated committee that developed OBE guidelines, outlining the policies, courses of action, and tools necessary for efficient and internationally compliant accreditation.

Today, I am proud to announce that in June 2023, Nigeria, through COREN, has attained Provisional Membership of the Washington Accord. This achievement is a historic milestone—it positions our engineering education system on the global stage and demonstrates our commitment to internationally benchmarked standards.

However, Provisional Membership is not the destination—it is the gateway. Our next critical mission is to secure Full Membership of the Washington Accord. This will mean that Nigerian engineering degrees will be mutually recognized by all signatory countries, instantly enhancing the mobility, employability, and competitiveness of our graduates worldwide. It will open vast opportunities for Nigerian engineers to practice across borders without unnecessary requalification, and it will inspire continuous improvement in our curricula, teaching methods, and assessment systems.

To achieve this, COREN will intensify collaboration with universities, faculties of engineering, programme evaluators, industry stakeholders, and international partners. Our trained and certified evaluators will continue to ensure the evidence-based implementation of OBE during accreditation visits. The COREN Accreditation Manual and Programme Evaluators' Guidelines provide a clear and practical framework for assessing compliance, identifying strengths, and addressing deficiencies—whether they result in full accreditation or require targeted improvement.

As you read this updated Programme Evaluators' Guidelines, I urge you to see it not just as a compliance tool, but as a roadmap towards making Nigerian engineering graduates globally competitive. Every evaluator, every faculty, and every stakeholder have a role in this journey. The prize—global recognition, graduate mobility, and elevated national prestige—is worth every effort.

Finally, COREN expresses deep gratitude to our nominators—the Board of Engineers Malaysia (BEM) and the Pakistan Engineering Council (PEC)—for their invaluable guidance. We also acknowledge the unwavering commitment of Nigerian institutions and stakeholders who have worked tirelessly towards this achievement. Together, we will move decisively from provisional status to full membership of the Washington Accord, ensuring that the Nigerian engineer of tomorrow is truly a global engineer.

**Engr. Prof. Sadiq Z. Abubakar, FNSE, FAEng.**

President

Council for the Regulation of Engineering in Nigeria

29<sup>th</sup> August 2025

## PREFACE TO THE 2025 EDITION

The Council for the Regulation of Engineering in Nigeria (COREN), through the Engineering Accreditation Committee (EAC), remains committed to upholding and advancing the standards of engineering education in Nigeria. The continuous growth of the engineering profession, coupled with rapid technological developments and evolving societal needs, demands a dynamic and responsive accreditation framework.

This 2025 Edition of the Programme Evaluators Guidelines reflects COREN's dedication to the best global practices in engineering accreditation, quality assurance, and continuous improvement. It incorporates lessons learned from recent accreditation exercises, stakeholder feedback, and developments in international benchmark standards, including the Washington Accord, Sydney Accord, and related frameworks.

The Guidelines are intended to provide Programme Evaluators with clear, consistent, and transparent procedures for assessing engineering programmes in Nigerian institutions. They serve not only as a reference for evaluators, but also as a tool for engineering faculties, departments, and programme leaders to understand the standards and expectations that underpin accreditation decisions.

Key enhancements in this edition include:

- Updated criteria for programme outcomes and graduate attributes in alignment with Outcome-Based Education (OBE) principles.
- Refined guidance on assessing institutional resources, governance, and industry engagement.
- Strengthened emphasis on sustainability, innovation, ethics, and emerging technologies in engineering curricula.
- Expanded sections on report writing, scoring, and evaluator conduct to promote consistency and fairness.



The EAC acknowledges the invaluable contributions of programme evaluators, engineering educators, industry practitioners, and other stakeholders whose insights and dedication make the accreditation process robust and credible. Your commitment ensures that engineering graduates from Nigerian institutions are well-prepared to compete, innovate, and lead in a rapidly changing world.

It is our expectation that this 2025 Edition will serve as a practical, authoritative, and user-friendly guide for all accreditation stakeholders, thereby strengthening the engineering profession and advancing national development.

Engr. Prof. O.A.U. UCHE FNSE

Registrar/CEO, Council for the Regulation of Engineering in Nigeria.

11th August, 2025.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The Council for the Regulation of Engineering in Nigeria (COREN) wishes to acknowledge its Washington Accord Mentors, Pakistan Engineering Council (PEC) and Board of Engineers, Malaysia (BEM) for their immense input in the development of these guidelines. Aspects of these guidelines were adopted from PEC's Guidelines for Programme Evaluators and developed in conjunction with the COREN Accreditation Manual for Engineering Programmes in Nigerian Universities.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document serves as a guide to all Programme Evaluators who are appointed by the Engineering Accreditation Committee (EAC) of COREN, on their responsibilities and conduct during an accreditation visitation. It must be adhered to strictly to ensure consistency amongst various accreditation Team Members in terms of evaluation and final recommendations.

## 2.0 PREPARATION FOR ACCREDITATION VISIT

The Programme Evaluation Team needs to be acquainted with the EAC policies on accreditation as detailed in the COREN Accreditation Manual. The Evaluation Team Members shall carefully read the Self Study Report (SSR) submitted by the accrediting Programme, to ensure that it provides the necessary information sought by EAC in the prescribed template.

The Evaluation Team will assess and carry out an evaluation based on all the accreditation Criteria 1 to 10 as required in Section 3 of COREN Accreditation Manual. The assessment includes the auditing and confirmation of documents submitted by the institution. If the documents submitted are not complete, the Evaluation Team shall request additional information through the EAC.

The purpose of these Guidelines for Programme Evaluators is to ensure that every criterion for accrediting a degree programme, and its delivery are assessed and reported. However, it is worth noting that the aim of accreditation is to determine whether a degree programme meets the basic Outcome-Based Education (OBE) requirements as specified by EAC.

The Evaluation Team Leader and Team Members, either together or separately, should prepare a list of questions for each section of the criteria to ensure that all aspects are properly addressed. If the institution/programme does not provide sufficient information, EAC should be notified and asked to request additional

information from the institution/programme. When the information is received, it should be forwarded to the Programme Evaluation Team.

### 3.0 ACTIVITIES DURING ACCREDITATION VISIT

The success and credibility of an accreditation visit depend mostly on:

- the professionalism and *prior preparation* of the Evaluation team
- the rigor and objectivity of on-site enquiries and the report
- the quality of feedback provided to the institution by the Evaluation Team and
- timeliness of report to the EAC.

The visit schedule should allow time for group discussion among all Evaluation Team Members for preliminary feedback and discussion of issues with the Dean and/or Head of Department alongside staff of the Programme and Faculty/School/College.

DAY1	
	Arrival, Accreditation Team check into accommodation
7:00PM	Dinner and pre-accreditation meeting. This is to enable them to discuss the identified gaps based on preliminary review of the submitted SSR and plan how to execute the accreditation exercise. Further information required from the programme should be communicated to the HoD/Dean through the Team Leader.
DAY 2	
The following suggested activities should be modified based on the outcomes of the pre-accreditation meeting on Day 1.	
7.00 AM	Breakfast
8.00 AM	Opening meeting with the Dean and Head of Departments
9.00 AM	Courtesy call on Vice Chancellor accompanied by Dean and Head of Department
10.00AM	Team visits common facilities used by the faculty – Library, Workshop, Laboratories, Design studios, General Environment, etc
1.00 PM	Lunch



2.00 PM	Presentation by the Head of Department of the programme being evaluated and ensuing discussions.
3.00 PM	Meeting with staff members
4.00 PM	Teams tours Departmental facilities - classrooms, offices, laboratories, workshops, etc.
5.30 PM	Team retires to discuss preliminary report
7.00 PM	Dinner and Review Meeting by Programme Evaluators.
<b>DAY 3</b>	
7.00 AM	Breakfast
8.00 AM	Inspection of relevant supporting documents
9.00 AM	Team meets with students.
10.00AM	Meeting with external stakeholders such as alumni, employers, and industry advisors
12.00 PM	Meeting with HOD, Lecturers, Workshops & Laboratories staff to discuss observation(s).
1.00 PM	Lunch
2.00 PM	Inspection of relevant documents and interaction with Stakeholders continues
4.00 PM	Inspection of relevant documents and interaction with stakeholders concluded.
5.00 PM	Team prepares Final Report on the Programme and makes final assessment. Completed questionnaires and final assessments are submitted to the Team Leader.
7.00 PM	Dinner
<b>DAY 4</b>	
7.00 AM	Breakfast
9:00 AM	Team visits Vice Chancellor for preliminary report /Exit meeting.
10;00 AM	Departure

## 4.0 GENERAL CONDUCT AND SCRUTINY OF DOCUMENTS

Throughout the discussions with the administrators, academic staff, students, and support staff, the Evaluation Team should confirm that an outcome-based approach to education is progressively being implemented by the Institution. It is expected that all Institutions will strive to achieve and maintain the minimum standards. The Evaluation Team is to evaluate the submitted documents and check the relevant

sections according to the following Checklist of Documents for Accreditation and Relevant Information as defined by COREN:

1. A copy of the latest prospectus/handbook.
2. Admission details/policies for the Engineering Programmes concerned.
3. Programme curriculum, evidence of benchmarking, regular review and consistency with COREN guidelines and adoption of Outcome Based Education (OBE) System.
4. Course files, Laboratory Manuals and students' feedback for the courses offered in the programme.
5. PEOs and POs assessment and attainment folders indicating complete process.
6. Random check of students' work, examination question papers and answer sheets and student attendance record.
7. Proof/evidence that assignments, tests, examinations etc. are properly graded.
8. Evidence of exposure to Complex Engineering Problems (CEPs) and activities, Problem based learning, design projects and open-ended Labs.
9. The availability of training aids for imparting quality education.
10. Record for Student Industrial Work Experience Scheme (SIWES)/student internship and employer feedback.
11. Evidence for Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) of the programme and implementation plan.
12. Record of minutes of meeting; policy documents, staff profile; syllabi; research publication; project reports, Industrial Advisory Board/Committee and other such documents required as evidence.
13. Record of Final Year Projects and sample reports.
14. Validity of COREN Registration and practicing license for all Engineering Staff.
15. Details pertaining to faculty/departmental staff members verify their requisite qualifications, publications, R&D projects and research funding.
16. Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and other training for departmental staff members.



17. Proof/evidence of staff workload.
18. Details of laboratories with equipment, their supporting staff and laboratory manuals.
19. Evidence for provision of best practice in health, safety and environment (HSE).
20. A copy of the approved budget (previous and current years) for the university and concerned Engineering Programme to be evaluated. This may include current endowment fund status, if any.
21. Details of self-generated financial resources through consulting. This may include field/lab testing etc. and their distribution if any.
22. Details of conference, seminars, CPD courses and colloquia held by the department/institution.
23. Academics Officer, Bursar, Registrar, concerned faculty members, alumni, employers or students should be available to the Accreditation Team along with relevant records.
24. Actions taken by the institution/programme on deficiencies/ weaknesses and concerns pointed out in the last accreditation visit report (if applicable).
25. Other additional document(s) required in support of the programme.

The evaluation team must ensure that the following qualifying requirements have been met by the programme before proceeding with the accreditation visit during which a thorough evaluation of the criteria shall be carried out:

- a. A minimum of 160 credit hours of which 85 credit units must be core engineering courses offered over a period of five (5) years.
- b. Final year project (minimum of 6 credit hours)
- c. Industrial training (SIWES) and Student Work Experience Programme (SWEP)
- d. Full-time Engineering staff (minimum of 6)
- e. Teaching staff: student ratio of 1:15 minimum
- f. External Examiners' Report (based on COREN template)
- g. Programme Educational Objectives (PEOs)
- h. Programme Outcomes (POs)
- i. Evaluation of attainments of POs at the individual and cohorts levels

If any of the requirements above are not complied with, the application for accreditation shall be deemed rejected

## 5.0 EVALUATION TEAM REPORT

The Evaluation Team is expected to prepare a report based on the assessment of the programme. This includes auditing and confirmation of the documents submitted by the programme using appropriate comments and remarks.

The Evaluation Report shall:

- (a) State whether the programme meets EAC requirements.
- (b) Otherwise, recommend appropriate remedial actions to meet requirements, based on details given in PEVs Rubric in the Appendix.
- (c) Include commendation for good practices and areas of strength by the programme.
- (d) Make clear and unequivocal recommendations to the EAC.

**The Evaluation Report should be given to EAC representative at the end of Accreditation visit.**

For full accreditation of five years, there should not be any deficiency or weakness for any of 10 compliance criteria defined in Chapter 3 of COREN Accreditation Manual. Otherwise, the program may be awarded Accreditation for less than five years. This action indicates that the program has one or more basic Weaknesses and/or serious concerns. Program meets all the accreditation criteria, but no severe deficiency. The accreditation team may decide that the Program submits a report on the remedial actions taken to address the issues. The accreditation is for a period of less than five years – typically two or three years. The Program Evaluator (PEVs) may recommend Deferred / Pended Accreditation to ensure removal of deficiencies. This action indicates that a currently accredited program has one or more severe Deficiencies. The team may decide that the Deficiencies are such that a progress report or/and on-site visit will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. This action has a typical duration of not more than two years. PEVs may recommend a program not to be accredited. This indicates that a Program is not ready for accreditation due to non-conformance to one or more criteria or no significant actions to remedy serious deficiencies

## 6.0 ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

As given in detail in the Appendices, the Evaluation Rubrics and Work Sheet may be helpful to the Evaluation Team for evaluating each criterion and sub-criterion. The performance



indicators for each criterion and sub- criterion are defined. The Program Evaluators (PEVs) should check course files and other sources (see details in section 3.0) to find evidence for achievement of each criterion or sub-criterion. The PEVs should also peruse through available documents and conduct interviews to objectively confirm the level of compliance. Then, the team should accordingly give recommendations based on the following definitions:

**Full Compliance (Y):** A criterion, policy, or procedure has adequately satisfied the benchmark requirements stipulated in the manual. No corrective measure is required to strengthen compliance prior to the next review.

**Opportunity For Improvement (OFI):** A criterion, policy, or procedure is in compliance and would be further strengthened by incorporating suggested measures/ improvements.

**Concern (C):** A criterion, policy, or procedure is broadly in compliance but requires improvement to avoid compromising the quality of the program or is currently in compliance but the potential exists for the situation to change, resulting in future noncompliance. Progress on the corrective measures is required prior to the next review.

**Weakness (W):** A criterion, policy, or procedure lacks compliance, compromising the quality of the program. Corrective measures are required to strengthen compliance prior to the next review.

**Deficiency (D):** A criterion, policy, or procedure either does not exist or is in the elementary stage. Compliance is required



## **APPENDICES**



# **ENGINEERING ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE**

## **PROGRAMME EVALUATION RUBRIC**

**PROGRAMME EVALUATORS PRE-ACCREDITATION AND ACCREDITATION RUBRICS DEFINING  
DEFICIENCY (D), WEAKNESS (W)**

**CONCERN (C) AND COMPLIANCE (Y) FOR PROGRAMME EVALUATION WORKSHEET**

The tables under each criterion provide general guidelines for qualitative assessment of the components of that criterion.

Note that any observation made by the Programme Evaluators on any issue not covered in these rubrics but is relevant to the implementation of Outcome-Based Education, should be put in writing and made a part of the report submitted by the Programme Evaluators.



## Criterion 1: Programme Educational Objectives (PEOs)

The Programme Educational Objectives (PEOs) describe the achievement expected of graduates of the programme three to five years after their graduation.

### i. Formulation of the PEOs

The formulation of the PEOs should be guided by the vision and mission of the university, global, national and local needs, as well as long-term goals. Lecturers for the programme must work continuously with other stakeholders such as local employers, industries, the alumni, parents, etc., to define the PEOs.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
A	The PEOs are formulated, published and consistent with institution's vision and mission statements and satisfy the requirements of stakeholders.	Y
B	The PEOs are formulated, published and only fairly consistent with institutions vision and mission statements and fairly satisfy the requirements of stakeholders	C
C	PEOs are formulated, but not published for the programme	W
D	PEOs are not formulated nor published for the programme	D

### ii. Involvement of Stakeholders in Formulation/Review of PEOs

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
A	There is a mechanism in place for involvement of stakeholders in formulation/review of PEOs	Y
B	There is informal involvement of stakeholders in formulation/review of PEOs	C
C	There is no formal evidence showing involvement of stakeholders so far	W
D	System does not have any mechanism for involvement of stakeholders in formulation or review of PEOs	D



## Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes (POs)

Programme Outcomes (POs) are statements of the knowledge, skills and behavior that students are expected to have by the time they graduate.

### i. POs Encompassing Required Graduate Attributes (GAs)

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
A	The POs for the program encompass all the required Graduate Attributes listed in COREN Accreditation Manual	Y
B	The POs for the program mostly encompass the required Graduate Attributes listed in COREN Accreditation Manual	C
C	The POs for the program partially encompass the required Graduate Attributes listed in COREN Accreditation Manual	W
D	The POs for the program do not encompass the required Graduate Attributes at all.	D

### ii. Mapping of Programme Outcomes to Programme Educational Objectives

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
A	The POs are well mapped to the PEOs showing clearly how the POs contribute to the attainment of the PEOs.	Y
B	The POs are fairly well mapped to the PEOs showing how the POs contribute to the attainment of the PEOs.	C
C	The POs are poorly mapped to the PEOs.	W
D	The POs are not mapped to the PEOs	D

### iii. Description of the Relationship Between Programme Outcomes and Program Educational Objectives

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
A	Description of the relationship between POs and PEOs is adequate	Y
B	Description of the relationship between POs and PEOs is fairly adequate	C
C	Description of the relationship between POs and PEOs is inadequate	W
D	No description of the relationship between POs and PEOs.	D

### iv. Mapping of Courses to POs



Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
A	All courses are well mapped to POs	Y
B	Most courses are well mapped to POs	C
C	Many courses are poorly mapped to POs	W
D	No mapping of courses to POs	D

**v. Supporting of Attainment of POs by Teaching and Assessment Methods**

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
A	Teaching and assessment methods used by Lecturers are very good for the attainment of POs	Y
B	Teaching and assessment methods used by Lecturers are fairly good for the attainment of POs	C
C	Teaching and assessment methods used by Lecturers are inadequate for the attainment of POs	W
D	Teaching and assessment methods used by Lecturers are very poor and so cannot help in the attainment of POs	D

**vi. Evaluation of the Attainment of POs at the Individual Levels**

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
A	There exists high quality assessment process for/and evaluation of the level of attainment of POs by individual students through well-defined Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)	Y
B	There exists a fairly good quality assessment process for/and evaluation of the level of attainment of POs by individual students. KPIs are not well-defined, or assessment is not carried out at the appropriate taxonomy level.	C
C	There is a very poor-quality assessment process for/and evaluation of the level of attainment of POs by individual students. KPIs are poorly defined.	W
D	There is no assessment process for/and evaluation of the level of attainment of POs by individual students. KPIs are not defined.	D

**vii. Evaluation of the Attainment of POs at the Cohort Levels**



Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
A	There exists high quality assessment process for/and evaluation of the level of attainment of POs by the cohort or whole level through well-defined Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)	Y
B	There exists a fairly good quality assessment process for/and evaluation of the level of attainment of POs by the cohort/ whole level. KPIs are not well-defined, or assessment is not carried out at the appropriate taxonomy level.	C
C	There is a very poor-quality assessment process for /and evaluation of the level of attainment of POs by the cohort / whole level. KPIs are poorly defined.	W
D	There is no assessment process for/and evaluation of the level of attainment of POs by cohort and/or KPIs are not defined.	D



### Criterion 3: Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)

Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) are statements of knowledge, skills and changes in behavior that students are to have by the end of each course they take. The Course Learning Outcomes should be well mapped to POs to show clearly the set of courses contributing to the attainment of each of the POs.

#### i. Adequacy and Documentation of Course Learning Outcomes

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
A	Course Learning Outcomes are documented, adequate and well publicized	Y
B	Course Learning Outcomes are documented, fairly adequate and fairly well publicized	C
C	Course Learning Outcomes are poorly formulated and inadequate	W
D	There are no Course Learning Outcomes	D

#### ii. Defining appropriate level of knowledge, skill and attitude for each CLO.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	All the CLOs defined for all the courses are with appropriate Blooms taxonomy levels	Y
b	CLOs are defined with inappropriate Blooms taxonomy levels for $\leq 10\%$ of the courses	C
c	CLOs are defined with inappropriate Blooms taxonomy levels for 11 - 50% of the courses	W
d	CLOs are defined with inappropriate Blooms taxonomy levels for more than 50% of the courses	D

#### iii. Mapping of Course Learning Outcomes to Programme Outcomes

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Course Learning Outcomes are well mapped to POs	Y
b	Course Learning Outcomes are fairly well mapped to POs	C
c	Course Learning Outcomes are not well mapped to POs	W
d	Course Learning Outcomes are not mapped to POs	D

#### iv. Description of the relationship between Course Learning Outcomes and Programme Outcomes

Describe how the curriculum and its associated prerequisite structure support the attainment of the Programme Outcomes.



Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Description of the relationship between CLOs and POs is adequate	Y
b	Description of the relationship between CLOs and POs is fairly adequate	C
c	Description of the relationship between CLOs and POs is inadequate	W
d	No Description of the relationship between CLOs and POs	D

## Criterion 4: Curriculum and Learning Process

The curriculum of the degree programme is the totality of the experience that is offered by the institution to achieve the philosophy, goal and objectives of the type and level of education. The curriculum should give the student total education that enables and equips him/her with knowledge and professional skills to be able to practice in his/her chosen field at the appropriate level. The curriculum and structure of the programme should be assessed against the stipulations showing the programme structure, titles and content of courses in the Benchmark Minimum Academic and Professional Standards (BMAPS).

### i. Courses Available to Students Covering Required Depth and Breadth of the Curriculum Specified by COREN

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	The courses are available for students to take and their contents are very good for the degree programme.	Y
b	The courses are available for students to take and their contents are good for the degree programme.	C
c	The courses are available for students to take and their contents are fairly good for the degree programme.	W
d	The courses are available for students to take but their contents are not good for the degree programme.	D

### ii. Engineering and Non-Engineering Contents in the Curriculum

The curriculum should contain enough courses as stipulated in COREN BMAPS in the following curricular domains: Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Humanities, Management, Engineering Sciences and Technology.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	The curriculum provides balanced coverage of engineering and non-engineering contents in all the curricular domains in line with COREN BMAPS.	Y
b	The curriculum provides fairly balanced coverage of engineering and non-engineering contents in the curricular domains in line with COREN BMAPS.	C
c	The curriculum provides poorly balanced coverage of engineering and non-engineering contents in the curricular domains in line with COREN BMAPS.	W



d	The curriculum does not provide balanced coverage of engineering and non-engineering contents in all the curricular domains in line with COREN BMAPS.	D
---	---	---

### iii. Exposure to Complex Engineering Problems and Activities

Lecturers are expected to expose students to complex Engineering Problems (CEPs) and complex Engineering Activities (CEAs) in their courses and laboratory work. More than 50% of final year projects/courses/labs should provide CEPs and CEAs exposure for the students.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	The curriculum provides adequate exposure of students to complex engineering problems and activities in courses and labs	Y
b	The curriculum provides inadequate exposure of students to complex engineering problems and activities in courses and labs	C
c	The curriculum provides grossly inadequate exposure of students to complex engineering problems and activities in courses and labs	W
d	The curriculum provides no exposure of students to complex engineering problems and activities	D

### iv. Laboratory Experiment and Workshop Practice

The laboratory experiment and workshop practice topics for each course at all levels (where required) should be listed. The level of coverage of the experiment and workshop practice for each course should be clearly stated. Practical work should be clearly recorded in logbooks, which should be made available to Programme Evaluators. It is expected that students will perform not less than ten (10) experiments in a semester.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	The laboratories are well equipped and 100% of all practical/workshop topics specified for each course at all levels are covered	Y
b	The laboratories are fairly well equipped and 80-99% of all practical/workshop topics specified for each course at all levels are covered.	C



c	The laboratories are not well equipped and 50-79% of all practical/workshop topics are covered	W
d	The laboratories are poorly equipped and less than 50% of all Practical/workshop topics are covered	D

**v. Involvement of Engineers from Industries in Development and Review of the Curriculum**

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Engineers from Industries are well involved in developing and reviewing the curriculum for the degree programme	Y
b	Engineers from Industries are fairly involved in developing and reviewing the curriculum for the degree programme	C
c	Engineers from Industries are mostly not involved in developing and reviewing the curriculum for the degree programme	W
d	Engineers from Industries are not involved in developing and reviewing the curriculum for the degree programme	D

**vi. Employment of Other Teaching Methods**

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Apart from regular classroom interaction and lab sessions, other methods by which students can learn are used (e.g. tutorials, seminars, videos, etc.)	Y
b	Other methods are fairly used	C
c	Other methods are inadequately used	W
d	No other method is used apart from lectures and laboratory sessions	D

**vii. Exposure to skill Acquisition through Industrial Training**

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Students are well exposed to relevant skill acquisition through well supervised industrial training programme	Y
b	The exposure and supervision during industrial training is inadequate	C
c	The exposure and supervision during industrial training is poor	W
d	There is no exposure to skill acquisition through industrial training	D

**viii. Summative Assessment for Graduating Students for Determining Attainment of Graduates Attributes**



Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Summative assessment of attainment of graduate attributes for graduating students are well carried out	Y
b	Summative assessment of attainment of graduate attributes for graduating students are fairly carried out	C
c	Summative assessment of attainment of graduate attributes for graduating students are mostly not carried out	W
d	Summative assessment of attainment of graduate attributes for graduating students are not carried out	D

### ix. Adequacy of External Examination System

The use of external examiners is necessary to help the University obtain external input on how well the University is meeting the national standards laid down for the level of certification.

External examiners should therefore be qualified persons who can make judgment on the standard of work having regard to the type and level of manpower to be produced. External examiners should therefore be used at least within the final year of the degree programme to assess final year courses and projects and to certify the overall performance of the graduating students as well as the quality of facilities and teaching.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	External examination system exists and meets the requirements stated in the external examiners' template	Y
b	External examination system exists and mostly meets the requirements stated in the external examiners' template	C
c	External examination system exists and fairly meets the requirements stated in the external examiners' template	W
d	External Examination system does not exist	D

#### Comments:

Programme Evaluators should comment on the quality of the external examiners and their report vis-a-vis their general impressions of standard of work and of instruction.

### x. Existence of Course Files

Every course taken by the students on the degree programme should have a course file.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	There are files for more than 75% of the courses	Y
b	There are files from 50% to 75% of the courses	C
c	There are files for less than 50% of the courses	W



d	There are no course files	D
---	---------------------------	---

### xi. Adequacy of Course Files Contents

Each course file is expected to contain the course compact, CLOs with taxonomy levels and their mapping to POs, Sample of answer scripts of students, term paper topics and rubrics (if any), record of students attendance at lectures, schedule for laboratory experiments, record of CLOs assessment and attainment, lecturer's course feedback form, and recommendations and suggestions for teaching the course in the next session. The course file should contain information over the last 3 – 5 academic years. Lecturer(s) for a course is(are) responsible for ensuring each course file contains all the necessary contents.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	More than 80% of the course files contain all the necessary contents of a course file	Y
b	More than 80% of the course files contain more than 75% of the required contents	C
c	Fifty to eighty percent of the course files contain between 50% and 75% of the required contents	W
d	Most of the course files contain very few contents	D

### xii. Course Contents and Coverage of the Syllabus

Each course has clear content as indicated in the BMAPS. Therefore, the course file should show the Course Contents and Coverage of the Syllabus.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	More than 90% of the Course Contents and Coverage of the Syllabus meet the BMAPS requirements	Y
b	80% - 89% of the Course Contents and Coverage of the Syllabus meet the BMAPS requirements	C
c	60% - 79% of the Course Contents and Coverage of the Syllabus meet the BMAPS requirements	W
d	Less than 60% of the Course Contents and Coverage of the Syllabus meet the BMAPS requirements	D



## Criterion 5: Students

### i. Compliance with Guidelines for Admissions

All students admitted into engineering programmes should have Five (5) O' Level credits at not more than 2 sittings in Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry and English Language. The fifth credit may be in any other science subject. For all engineering disciplines, the UTME subjects shall be Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry and the Use of English.

Minimum admission requirements in the programme in any institution should be as stipulated in these COREN minimum requirements for admission into undergraduate degree programmes.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	All students enrolled in the programme to be accredited meet the degree admission requirements.	Y
b	There is at least one student enrolled in the programme to be accredited that did not meet the degree admission requirements.	D

### ii. Number of Students Admitted

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	The number of students admitted at 100, 200 and 300 levels does not make the class size to exceed the maximum number prescribed	Y
b	The number of students admitted at 100, 200 and 300 levels make the class size exceed the number prescribed by 10% or less	C
c	The number of students admitted at 100, 200 or 300 levels makes the class size exceed the number prescribed by more than 10% but less than 20%	W
d	The number of students admitted at 100, 200 or 300 levels makes the class size to exceed the number prescribed by 20% and above	D

### iii. Existence of Policy on inter-university transfer

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	There is a documented policy on transfer of students from another institution running accredited programme	Y
b	There is no documented policy on transfer of students	D

### iv. Availability of Counsellors to Advise Students

Apart from Level Advisers who serve as counsellors to students on academic matters, students should have access to other counsellors who can assist them to handle other issues (spiritual, emotional, health, financial, stress, etc.)

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Adequate number of counsellors are available to advise students on academic, career, health, finances, Stress, emotional and spiritual problems	Y
b	Mostly adequate number of counsellors are available to advise students on academic, career, health, finances, Stress, emotional and spiritual problems	C
c	Inadequate number of counsellors are available to advise students on academic, career, health, finances, Stress, emotional and spiritual problems	W
d	No counsellors are available to advise students on academic, career, health, finances, Stress, emotional and spiritual problems	D

### v. Class Size and Laboratory Group Size

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	The class size limit is not exceeded, and laboratory group sizes are conducive for hands-on type of experiment (4 – 5 students per workstation)	Y



b	The class size limit is partially exceeded, and laboratory group sizes (6-8) are not conducive for hands-on type of experiment	C
c	The class size limit is largely exceeded and laboratory group sizes (9 - 12) are not conducive for hands-on type of experiment	W
d	The class size limit is exceeded (about 30:1) or laboratory group sizes (> 12) are not conducive for hands-on type of experiment	D

#### vi. Participation of Students in Industrial Excursions, Engineering Conferences/Exhibitions, etc.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	There is evidence that students participate well in industrial excursions, national and/or international conferences/exhibitions, competitions, etc.	Y
b	There is evidence that students participate fairly in industrial excursions, national and/or international conferences/exhibitions, competitions, etc.	C
c	There is evidence that students hardly participate in industrial excursions, national and/or international conferences/exhibitions, competitions, etc.	W
d	There is no evidence that students participate in industrial excursions, national and/or international conferences/exhibitions, competitions, etc.	D

#### vii. Standard of Tests and Examinations

The tests and examinations must comply with the minimum standards set by COREN. There should be a full examination on each course at the end of every semester. Examination questions should cover all areas of the courses as contained in the syllabus. Tests should be adequately administered to cover the course content. A well-developed marking scheme should be available for each examination/test and should be well applied. There should be samples of past questions, marking schemes and model answers for the various levels of the programme.



Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Tests and examinations are of good standard and quality and adequately cover the syllabi.	Y
b	Tests and examinations are of fairly good standard and quality and fairly cover the syllabi	C
c	Tests and examinations are below average in standard and do not adequately cover the syllabi	W
d	Tests and examinations are of low standard and do not cover most of the syllabi	D

**Comment:**

Assessment should be based on review of past examinations and tests, continuous assessment and the opinion of the Programme Evaluators on clarity of questions (based on Bloom's Taxonomy) set for degree examinations for the past three years, syllabus coverage at the appropriate level, the quality of students' answer scripts and a reflection of Nigerian milieu. Highlight factors that may improve the quality of student's performance. (See external examiners' report guideline as shown in the Accreditation Manual).

**viii. Student Files**

Each student is expected to have a file that will contain letter of admission, credentials, course registration forms, sessional examination results, correspondence between the student and the university administration, record of involvement in student's organizations, etc.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	There are files for all students and they contain all that is required	Y
b	There are files for more than 90% of the students and most of the files contain more than 90% of required contents	C
c	There are files for greater than or equal to 50% of the students with most containing appropriate contents	W
d	There are files for less than 50% of the students with some containing only few of the appropriate contents	D



## Criterion 6: Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)

### i. Assessment of Processes for Data Collection for Evaluating Programme Outcome

There should be regular use of appropriate, documented processes for assessing and evaluating the extent to which the Programme Outcomes are being attained. The HEI should state and describe the assessment processes used for data collection for the purpose of evaluation of each Programme Outcome. Assessment processes include: tutorials, examinations, assignments, quizzes, laboratory reports, SIWES reports, SWEP reports, seminars, industrial advisory committee meetings.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Assessment of processes as listed above are stated and exist for determining the extent of attainment of PEOs POs and CLOs	Y
b	Assessment of processes are stated and described but do not adequately cover some areas	C
c	Assessment of processes are stated and described but do not adequately cover most areas	W
d	Assessment of processes such as those listed above do not exist.	D

### ii. Frequency of Assessment of Programme Outcomes and Methods of Results Documentation and Storage.

State the frequency of conducting the assessment processes and the expected level of attainment for each of the Programme Outcomes. Give summaries of the results of the evaluation process and an analysis illustrating the extent to which each of the Programme Outcomes is being attained. Indicate the method of results documentation and storage.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Frequency of PO evaluation is adequate and the results are well documented and stored	Y
b	Frequency of PO evaluation is adequate but some of the results are not well documented and stored.	C
c	Frequency of PO evaluation is adequate but many of the	W



	Results are not well documented and stored.	
d	Frequency of PO evaluation is inadequate and the results of the evaluation are not well documented and stored.	D

### iii. Systematic Utilization of the Results of PEOs Evaluation for CQI

The results of evaluations of PEOs should be systematically utilized as input for the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) of the programme.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Results of PEOs evaluation are utilized in CQI analysis and POs Mappings with PEOs.	Y
b	Results of PEOs evaluation are fairly utilized in CQI analysis and POs Mappings with PEOs.	C
c	Results of PEOs evaluation are poorly utilized in CQI analysis and POs Mappings with PEOs.	W
d	Results of PEOs evaluation are not utilized in CQI analysis and POs Mappings with PEOs.	D

### iv. Systematic Utilization of the Results of POs Evaluation for CQI

The results of evaluations of POs should be systematically utilized as input for the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) of the programme.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Results of POs evaluation are utilized in CQI analysis and CLOs development.	Y
b	Results of POs evaluation are fairly utilized in CQI analysis and CLOs development.	C
c	Results of POs evaluation are poorly utilized in CQI analysis and CLOs development.	W
d	Results of POs evaluation are not utilized in CQI analysis and CLOs development.	D

### v. Applying Assessment Results of CLOs for individual students and cohort level for CQI

The results of assessments and evaluations of CLOs should be systematically utilized as input for the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) of the programme.



Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Results of CLOs evaluation are utilized in CQI analysis and Course development, delivery or assessment.	Y
b	Results of CLOs evaluation are fairly utilized in CQI analysis and Course development, delivery or assessment.	C
c	Results of CLOs evaluation are poorly utilized in CQI analysis and Course development, delivery or assessment.	W
d	Results of CLOs evaluation are not utilized in CQI analysis and Course development, delivery or assessment.	D

**vi. Remedial Actions taken in View of the Observations Made During the Last Accreditation Visit.**

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Evidence of the implementation plan based on the observations during the last accreditation visit and the remedial actions taken are available and well implemented.	Y
b	Evidence of the implementation plan based on the observations during the last accreditation visit and the remedial actions taken are available and fairly implemented	C
c	Evidence of the implementation plan based on the observations during the last accreditation visit and very limited remedial actions were taken.	W
d	Evidence of the implementation plan based on the observations during the last accreditation visit and the remedial actions taken are not available.	D



## Criterion 7: Staffing

The adequacy of teaching staff may be determined by the extent to which they meet the following criteria:

- a) The student/Lecturer ratio,
- b) The staff mix by rank,
- c) Academic Qualifications of the teaching staff,
- d) Professional registration status and currency of the practicing license of the academic staff

There should be at least 2 Ph.D. and 4 Master's degree full-time staff for each engineering degree programme and they must be registered with COREN and have the current practicing license.

### i. Student /Lecturer Ratio and Adequacy of Full-time Lecturers.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	The actual student/staff ratio complies with the student/staff ratio of 15:1 and there are at least 6 full-time lecturers with COREN registration and current practicing license.	Y
b	The actual student/staff ratio is more than 15:1 but does not exceed 25:1 and there are 4 - 6 full-time lecturers with COREN registration and current practicing license.	C
c	The actual student/staff ratio is more than 25:1 but less than 30:1 and there are 4 - 6 full-time lecturers with COREN registration and current practicing license.	W
d	The actual student/staff ratio is more than 30:1 and there are less than 4 full-time lecturers with COREN registration and current practicing license.	D

#### Comments:

1. For the purpose of determining the student/staff ratio, only the population of students from 200 - 500 Level in that programme and only Lecturer II and above who are COREN registered with current practicing license should be used to determine the ratio.
2. The institution should provide a table stating the name of staff, academic qualification, COREN Registration status, currency of annual practicing license, Rank/Designation, courses taught by the lecturer and his contact hours per week (specifying lectures, tutorial and practical) and detailed up-to-date curriculum vitae of each academic staff.
3. Adjunct/Associate Lecturers should be counted as half mark as compared to full time Lecturers.
4. The number of full-time lecturers should include lecturers from the rank of Lecturer II to Professor

### ii. Staff Mix

The lecturers in the department are expected to be specialists in different areas of Specialization of the

discipline. At least two (2) lecturers per area of specialization, one of which must be at a professional cadre.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	The lecturers cover all the areas of specialization of the degree programme.	Y
b	The lecturers cover fairly all the areas of specialization of the degree programme.	C
c	The lecturers cover only a few core areas of specialization of the degree programme.	W
d	The lecturers do not cover core areas of specialization of the degree programme	D

### iii. Qualifications of the Teaching Staff

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	80% or more have Bachelor and PhD degrees in Engineering	Y
b	70%-79% have Bachelor and PhD degrees in Engineering	C
c	51%-69% have Bachelor and PhD degrees in Engineering	W
d	Less than 50% have Bachelor and PhD degree in Engineering	D

### iv. Non-Teaching Staff (Technical)

These are support staff that are indispensable in the proper running of the workshops, laboratories, clinics/studio etc. Programme Evaluators should assess the quality and number of the staff in relation to their adequacy in providing the needed support. All laboratories/clinics/studio etc., should have technicians/technical officers/technologists to run these in addition to the lower cadre of technical staff. The Technical/Academic Staff minimum ratio is 1:3 subject to each laboratory having at least one technologist or laboratory engineer and one other technical staff. Each workshop should have adequate staff to run all the sections and units properly. For the programme for which accreditation is sought, the non-teaching staff (technical) should be assessed against the following guidelines:

- Adequate in number in terms of Technical/Academic Staff minimum ratio of 1:3
- Quality of Technical Staff can be measured in terms of academic and professional qualifications, ability to operate and explain how the hardware and/or software function.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Attainment of 1:3 of Technical/Academic Staff ratio has been achieved and all registered with COREN with up-to-date practicing license.	Y
b	Attainment of 1:3 of Technical/Academic Staff ratio has been achieved and at least 90% registered with COREN	C



	with up-to-date practicing license.	
c	Attainment of 1:3 of Technical/Academic Staff ratio has been achieved and/or less than 90% registered with COREN with up-to-date practicing license.	W
d	Attainment of 1:3 of Technical/Academic Staff ratio has not been achieved	D

#### v. Administrative Support Staff

Each Head of Department should have a minimum of One Confidential Secretary and a clerical officer.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Administrative staff are adequate in number and quality	Y
b	Administrative staff are mostly adequate in quality and number	C
c	Administrative staff are fairly adequate in quality and number	W
d	Administrative staff are inadequate and of poor quality	D

#### Comments

Programme Evaluators should confirm that the non-teaching staffs listed in the self-study report are on ground. List additional staff required, if necessary, and their qualifications and indicate redundant/superfluous staff, if any.

#### vi. Staff Development Programme/Continuing Professional Development

Staff development programmes are intended to upgrade and update staff competences. This is achieved through their attendance of seminars, professional conferences (e.g. COREN Assembly), and industrial attachments, acquisition of diplomas/first degree, and higher degrees. The institution is required to have a functional staff development programme. The Head of Department should give details of the programme, including the beneficiaries in the last 5 years. The need for staff training on regular basis may be based on the outcome of evaluation by students, HOD or as recommended by stakeholders.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Evidence that staff development policy exists and all members of staff of the department have benefited from it in the past five years.	Y
b	Evidence that staff development policy exists and only 70% and above of staff of the department have benefited from it in the past five years.	C
c	Evidence that staff development policy exists and only 50% to 69% of staff of the department have benefited	W



	from it in the past five years.	
d	Staff development policy does not exist or less than 50% of staff have benefited from staff development in the last 5 years	D

**Comments:**

The Head of Department should list the names of staff of the department that have benefited from staff development policy in the past five years. He or She should also recommend the type(s) of staff development programme(s) available that the staff can undergo to make them more productive.

**vii. Staff Contact Hours**

It is expected that the Timetable, Courseware and Course compact are uploaded on the university website for all Undergraduate Courses taught in the programme. There should be adequate contact between lecturers and students. The method of delivery of lectures to students, including number of hours, teaching aids to be used, recommended textbooks, tutorials etc., should be well stated.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Evidence of lecture timetable and course distribution among lecturers exists. There is evidence of the availability and access of these materials on the programme website.	Y
b	Evidence of lecture timetable and course distribution among lecturers exist. There is no evidence of availability and access to these materials on the programme website but it is available elsewhere.	C
c	Evidence of lecture timetable and course distribution among lecturers does not exist. There is no evidence of availability and access to these materials on the programme's website or elsewhere.	D

**viii. Recognized Staff Publications**

It is expected that Academic staff should make their presence visible online (e.g. on Google Scholar, etc.) through publications in ISI-Indexed journals.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	More than 70% of the lecturers each have at least 3 publications in 5 years	Y
b	50 - 70% of the Lecturers each have at least 3 publications in 5 years	C
c	Less than 50% of the Lecturers each have at least 3 publications in 5 years	W
d	No evidence of the Lecturers each having at least 3 publications in last 5 years	D

**ix. Professional Status of the Teaching Staff and Being up to date in payment of Practicing Fees**

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	All teaching staff are registered with COREN and have up-to-date practicing license	Y
b	All teaching staff are registered with COREN, but 20% or less do not have up-to-date practicing license	C
c	All teaching staff are registered with COREN, but more than 20% do not have up-to-date practicing license	W
d	There are teaching staff that are not registered with COREN	D

**x. Overall Management of the Programme by the Head of Department**

In assessing the administration of the Department, it should be noted that a good head performs his leadership role with concern for policies affecting the staff and students in the Department. He should be a specialist in the field and should have considerable experience in educational administration. Some of his responsibilities include the maintenance of the facilities for staff and students, administration, conducting examinations, scheduling of staff and interpretation of the department's regulations to members of the profession and the public.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	The administration of the Department is run by a Professor/Reader/Senior Lecturer registered by COREN with an up-to-date practicing license; and very effective and efficient.	Y
b	The administration of the Department is run by a Professor/Reader/Senior Lecturer registered with COREN but not having an up-to-date practicing license.	W
c	The administration of the Department is run by a Professor/Reader/Senior Lecturer who is not registered with COREN.	D

**Comments:**

Programme Evaluators should give their impression on *the esprit de corps* (feelings of pride, mutual care and support) among staff and the effectiveness of the administrative and academic leadership.



Each member of staff (academic and technical staff) is expected to have a file that will contain up-to-date Curriculum Vitae (CV), letters of employment and confirmation of appointment, credentials, Records of staff development for higher degrees, sponsorship for attendance of conferences, workshops, seminars etc., records of promotion, correspondence between the staff and the university administration, etc.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	There are files for all members of staff, and they contain all that is required	Y
b	There are files for $\geq 90\%$ of the members of staff and most of the files contain more than 90% of required contents	C
c	There are files for more than 50% but less than 90% of the members of staff with most containing appropriate contents	W
d	There are files for less than 50% of the members of staff with some containing only few of the appropriate contents	D

## Criterion 8: Physical Facilities & Infrastructure

### (i) Laboratories and Workshops.

Professional skills necessary to practice professional discipline can be acquired first and foremost from the training using institutional facilities that are designed and equipped to simulate the practice of the profession. It should therefore be adequate in size, well equipped with suitable machinery, tools and equipment, safe, well maintained and suitably laid out.

The minimum size of the facilities should not be less than those provided for, in the BMAPS.

#### A. Laboratory Spaces

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	The spaces in the existing laboratories meet the provision of the BMAPS on space requirements.	Y
b	The spaces in the existing laboratories are fairly adequate to meet the provision of the BMAPS on space requirements.	C
c	The spaces in the existing laboratories are inadequate to meet the provision of the BMAPS on space requirements.	W
d	The spaces in the existing laboratories do not meet the provision of the BMAPS on space requirements.	D

Comment by the Programme Evaluators

Programme Evaluators are to confirm that the actual spaces available in the laboratories/clinics/studios conform to those prescribed in the revised COREN BMAPS.

#### B. Laboratory Equipment

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	The pieces of equipment in the laboratories meet the BMAPS specification for the programme.	Y
b	Some of the pieces of equipment in the laboratories do not meet the BMAPS specifications for the programme.	C
c	Many of the pieces of equipment in the laboratories do not meet the BMAPS specifications for the programme.	W
d	The pieces of equipment in the laboratories do not meet the BMAPS specifications for the programme.	D

Comment by the Programme Evaluator

Programme Evaluators are to confirm the actual pieces of equipment available in the workshop/laboratories/clinics/studios and compare them with those listed in the Self-Study Report, their use for teaching the programme, safety and management. Also, Programme Evaluators should list the additional equipment not available which are required to teach the programme.

### (ii) Classrooms

At least, there should be available minimum space required for lecture theatres and classrooms for each programme as specified in the BMAPS for 300-500 levels.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	The classroom spaces are adequate	Y
b	The classroom spaces are mostly adequate	C
c	The classroom spaces are fairly adequate	W
d	The classroom spaces are not adequate	D

### (iii) Office Accommodation

Lecturers require adequate offices where they counsel students and prepare materials for teaching students. Such an office should be furnished with basic items of furniture and storage. They should be well air conditioned, ventilated and lit. Staff should have adequate office/research laboratory space.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	The office spaces meet the BMAPS specification	Y
b	The office spaces are mostly adequate based on the BMAPS specification	C
c	The office spaces are fairly adequate based on the BMAPS specification	W
b	The office spaces are not adequate based on the BMAPS specification	D

#### Comments:

Programme Evaluators are to indicate their general impression on office accommodation and the adequacy for the number of staff in the department, including Professorial Offices. In addition to standard furnishing like air conditioners, refrigerators, file cabinets there should be a secretary, research laboratory and a private restroom.

### (iv) Safety and Environmental Sanitation of Teaching Facilities

A good institution should have a clean environment, and buildings should be safe and comply with Federal, State and Local Government EAC Laws relating to safety, fire hazards, etc. All buildings should have exit signs, functional fire-extinguishers, fire buckets with sand, and water source/reservoir and all staff and students should have some knowledge on how to operate all firefighting equipment. Programme Evaluators should check to ascertain that these requirements are being complied with. Adequate and clean restrooms should be available for staff and students.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Teaching facilities for the Programme and the environment are safe; thus, comply with all Federal, State and Local Government	Y



	Laws relating to fire and environmental sanitation	
b	Teaching facilities for the Programme and the environment are unsafe; thus violate Federal, State and Local Government Laws relating to fire and environmental sanitation	D

Comment by the Programme Evaluator

Programme Evaluators are to comment on the adequacy of general safety and environmental sanitation of the College/School/Faculty/Department offering the programme to be accredited

#### (v) Drawing Office and Equipment

There should be space and furniture in the graphics room for at least 20% of the students taking the Engineering Graphics course in the faculty to be able to carry out their drawings at the same time, in line with the BMAPS specification. All students are expected to own portable drawing boards, instruments and T-Square. There should be provision for computer-aided graphics.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	The graphics rooms and facilities are adequate	Y
b	The graphics rooms are adequate, and the facilities are mostly adequate	C
c	The graphics rooms are adequate, and the facilities are fairly adequate	W
d	Neither the graphics rooms nor the facilities are adequate	D

#### (vi) Teaching Aids

Each programme should have an adequate number of projectors installed in the classrooms. There should be good whiteboards and public address systems for large lecture rooms. Modern facilities such as interactive magic boards are expected in the lecture rooms. Each student is expected to have access to and use a Computer/Laptop.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Teaching aids are available in adequate quality/quantity and accessible	Y
b	Teaching aids are available in mostly adequate quality/quantity and accessible	C
c	Teaching aids are available in fairly adequate quality/quantity and accessible	W
d	Teaching aids are either not available or inaccessible	D

#### (vii) Virtual Laboratory, Simulation Systems and Models

To aid effective delivery and impartation of knowledge and skill, it is expected that the programme

should have the following lecture delivery technique and tools including virtual laboratory facilities, audio-visual recording studio, models, and simulation computer software packages. (Pirated copies are not acceptable)

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Lecture delivery techniques and tools are available, accessible and the personnel having the required skills to use them are available	Y
b	Lecture delivery techniques and tools are mostly available, accessible and the personnel having the required skills to use them are available	C
c	Lecture delivery techniques and tools are mostly available, fairly accessible and the personnel having the required skills to use them are mostly available	W
d	Lecture delivery techniques and tools are unavailable or inaccessible and the personnel having the required skills to use them are unavailable	D

**(viii) Library**

**(A) University/Central Library**

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Hard Copy and/or Soft Copy Resources meet the BMAPS specification in number, spread, currency and quality	Y
b	Hard Copy and/or Soft Copy Resources meet the BMAPS specification in number, but only mostly good in spread, currency and quality	C
c	Hard Copy and/or Soft Copy Resources meet the BMAPS specification in number, but only fairly good in spread, currency and quality	W
d	Hard Copy and/or Soft Copy Resources do not meet the BMAPS specification in number, spread, currency and quality	D

**(B) Faculty/Departmental Electronic Library**

The Departmental Library should subscribe to some online databases relevant to the engineering degree programme, as specified in the BMAPS. Where the university e-library is readily accessible, then, this may not be required.



Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	There is evidence of subscription to online databases relevant to the engineering programme; the databases are accessible and there are members of staff with skills to use the facilities	Y
b	There is no evidence of subscription to online databases relevant to the engineering programme; or they are inaccessible, or members of staff have no skills to use the facilities	D

Comment by the Programme Evaluators

Programme Evaluators are to confirm the functionality, accessibility and utilization of the electronic library resources from staff and students.

### (C) Faculty/Departmental Library

A faculty or departmental library should be available for the use of staff and students. Current local, national and international, technical reports, conference proceedings, professional magazines and journals relevant to that discipline should be available e.g. past students' project reports and theses, COREN Engineering Assembly proceedings and Nigerian Society of Engineers' Technical transactions. Relevant codes and standards should also be available.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Books and other resources in the Faculty/Departmental Library meet the BMAPS specification in number, spread, currency and quality	Y
b	Books and other resources in the Faculty/Departmental Library meet the BMAPS specification in number, and mostly meet the requirements in spread, currency and quality	C
c	Books and other resources in the Faculty/Departmental Library meet the BMAPS specification in number, and fairly meet the requirements in spread, currency and quality	W
d	Books and other resources in the Faculty/Departmental Library do not meet the BMAPS specification in number, spread, currency and quality	D



The infrastructural facilities required for effectively running the degree programme include: Road network & Transportation system, Health, Sanitation and Water supply services, Electric Power Supply & Internet Services, Recreational & Sport Services and Student Hostel and Fire/Security services.

#### A. Road Network & Transportation System

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Road network & Transportation system are available, accessible and functional in the University community	Y
b	Road network & Transportation systems are mostly available, accessible and functional in the University community	C
c	Road network & Transportation systems are fairly available, accessible and functional in the University community	W
d	Road network & Transportation systems are unavailable, inaccessible and non-functional in the University community	D

#### B. Health, Sanitation and Water Supply

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Health, Sanitation and Water supply services are available, accessible and functional in the University community	Y
b	Health, Sanitation and Water supply services are unavailable, inaccessible and non-functional in the University community	D

#### C. Electric Power Supply & Internet Services

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Electric Power Supply & Internet Services are available, accessible and functional in the University community	Y
b	Electric Power Supply & Internet Services are mostly available, accessible and functional in the University community	C
c	Electric Power Supply & Internet Services are fairly available,	W



	accessible and functional in the University community	
d	Electric Power Supply & Internet Services are unavailable, inaccessible and non-functional in the University community	D

#### D. Recreational & Sports Services

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Recreational & Sport Services are available, accessible and functional in the University community	Y
b	Recreational & Sport Services are mostly available, accessible and functional in the University community	C
c	Recreational & Sport Services are fairly available, accessible and functional in the University community	W
d	Recreational & Sport Services are unavailable, inaccessible and non-functional in the University community	D

#### E. Student Hostel & Fire/Security Services

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Student Hostel and Fire/Security services are available, accessible and functional in the University community	Y
b	Student Hostel and Fire/Security services are mostly adequate	C
c	Student Hostel and Fire/Security services are fairly adequate	W
d	Student Hostel and Fire/Security services are unavailable, inaccessible and non-functional in the University community	D

Comment by the Programme Evaluators

### Criterion 9: Industrial Linkages & Community Service

The programme should engage with relevant industries. In addition to teaching and research, a programme should provide services to the community. Students should be involved in community service since participation in such activities helps them to develop soft skills.

**Professional Practice and Attendance of Trainings to Enhance Professional Practice.**

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Evidence of attendance and certificates are available	Y
b	Evidence of attendance and certificates are available for most of the staff	C
c	Evidence of attendance and certificates are available for some of the staff	W
d	No evidence of attendance and certificates	D

**(ii) Collaborative Projects/Research with Industry**

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Evidence of progress or completion of relevant and functional collaborative projects and research works/grants (such as: project reports, minutes of joint meetings, commercialization of projects, etc.) by staff, in the last few years are available	Y
b	Evidence of progress or completion of relevant and functional collaborative projects and research works/grants (such as: project reports, minutes of joint meetings, commercialization of projects, etc.) by staff, in the last few years are mostly available	C
c	Evidence of progress or completion of relevant and functional collaborative projects and research works/grants (such as: project reports, minutes of joint meetings, commercialization of projects, etc.) by staff, in the last few years are fairly available	W
d	Evidence of progress or completion of relevant and functional collaborative project and research works/grants (such as: project reports, minutes of joint meetings, commercialization of projects, etc.) by staff, in the last few years are unavailable	D

**(iii) Student Leadership**

Programme Evaluators should look for evidence of students' activities and involvement in student organizations that provide experience in management and governance, representation in educational and related matters and social activities

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Students in the degree programme participated in at least one (1) engineering organization in which students are elected/nominated into leadership position every academic year	Y
b	Students in the degree programme mostly participated in at least one (1) engineering organization in which students are elected/nominated into leadership positions every academic year	C



c	Students in the degree programme fairly participated in at least one (1) engineering organization in which students are elected/nominated into leadership positions every academic year	W
d	No engineering organization in which students are elected/nominated into leadership positions every academic year	D

**(iv) Currency of Impact on Immediate Community (Social Responsibility)**

There should be evidence of projects or services to the community by the students within and outside the University campus.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	There is evidence of at least 2 projects or services to the community by the students in the last 3 years.	Y
b	There is evidence of at least 1 project or service to the community by the students in the last 3 years.	C
c	There is evidence of at least 1 project or service to the community by the students in the last 5 years.	W
d	There is no evidence that students engaged in community service in the last 5 years	D

Comment by the Programme Evaluator



## Criterion 10: Institutional Support & Funding

### i. Staff Employment and Retention

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	The documented policies used for the employment and retention of staff as provided in the Accreditation Manual (Annex J) are available and implemented with retention index $\geq 0.7$	Y
b	The documented policies used for the employment and retention of staff as provided in the Accreditation Manual (Annex J) are available and implemented with retention index of 0.6 - 0.7	C
c	The documented policies used for the employment and retention of staff as provided in the Accreditation Manual (Annex J) are available and implemented with retention index of 0.5 – 0.59	W
d	The documented policies used for the employment and retention of staff as provided in the Accreditation Manual (Annex J) are available and implemented with retention index lower than 0.5	D

### ii. Funding of the Programme

Funding of the programme is very important. First, in establishing the programme. Second, in meeting its annual recurrent expenditure such as payment of staff salaries, maintaining the facilities and for the purchase of consumable materials for use in workshops, laboratories and classrooms.

If funding is evaluated on the basis of student population in the programme, then at least ₦500,000 per student per year can be considered adequate for operational expenses and equipment consumable, exclusive of emoluments.

Levels of meeting requirement of component of criterion		Qualitative Assessment
a	Financing of operational consumables for the programme for which accreditation is required is higher than or equal to ₦1,000,000 per student per annum	Y (discuss with ADM)
b	Financing of operational consumables for the programme for which accreditation is required is from ₦750,000 to less than ₦1,000,000 per student per annum	C
c	Financing of operational consumables for the programme for which accreditation is required is from ₦500,000 to less than ₦750,000 per student per annum	W
d	Financing of operational consumables for the programme for which accreditation is required is lower than ₦500,000 per student per annum	D

Comment by the Programme Evaluator

Confirm that the direct funds allocated to the programme in the past three years are as shown in the Self -Study Report.

## PROGRAMME EVALUATION WORK SHEET

### FOR RESOURCE VERIFICATION, PRE-ACCREDITATION, ACCREDITATION & RE-ACCREDITATION

Institution Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Programme: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Visit: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Instructions for Completing this Worksheet

- 1) Based on the findings of the Programme Evaluators during the accreditation visit, all accreditation criteria and their components shall be given qualitative scores using: Y for 'Compliance', OFI for 'opportunity for improvement', C for 'Concern', W for 'Weakness', and D for 'Deficiency', in the "Compliance Level" columns.
- 2) In case of 'C', 'W', or 'D', Justification should be provided in the observations and Remarks for "Non-compliance" columns. In case of 'Y' - full compliance, indicate how or where pieces of evidence are obtained. In the case of OFI, suggest possible improvement.

EAC

ENGINEERING ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE

Doc. Number: EAC-COREN-PROGRAMME-EVALUATORS-GUIDELINES-001

Rev. Number: 003

Date: 29<sup>th</sup> August 2025.



Doc. Number: EAC -COREN-PROGME-EVALUATORS-GUIDELINES: Rev 003a



Issue Date: 20/08/25  
Issue N0: 1  
Page: 1of 1  
Rev. Date: 25/08/25



## Criterion 1: Programme Educational Objectives (PEOs)

S/N o.	Components of Criterion	Compliance Level	Observations and Remarks for compliance or Non-compliance
i	Formulation of the PEOs, PEOs are defined, consistent with the Vision / Mission, and well publicized		
ii	Involvement of Stakeholders in Formulation/Review of PEOs		

## Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes (POs)

S/N o.	Component of Criterion	Compliance Level	Observations and Remarks for compliance or Non-compliance
i	POs Encompassing Required Graduate Attributes (GAs)		
ii	Mapping of Programme Outcomes to Programme Educational Objectives		
iii	Description of the Relationship Between Programme Outcomes and Program Educational Objectives		
iv	Mapping of Courses to POs		
v	Supporting of Attainment of POs by Teaching and Assessment Methods		
vi	Evaluation of the Attainment of POs at the Individual Level		
Vii	Evaluation of the Attainment of POs at the cohort Level		

## Criterion 3: Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)



S/N	Component of Criterion	Compliance Level	Observations and Remarks for compliance or Non-compliance
i	Adequacy and Documentation of Course Learning Outcomes		
ii	Defining appropriate level of knowledge, skill and attitude for each CLO.		
iii	Mapping of Course Learning Outcomes to Programme Outcomes		
iv	Description of mapping of Course Learning Outcomes to Programme Outcomes		

### Criterion 4: Curriculum and Learning Process

s/no	Component of Criterion	Compliance Level	Observations and Remarks for compliance or Non-compliance
i	Courses Available to Students Covering Required Depth and Breadth of the Curriculum Specified by COREN		
ii	Engineering and Non-Engineering Contents in the Curriculum		
iii	Exposure to Complex Engineering Problems and activities		
iv	Laboratory Experiment and Workshop Practice		
v	Involvement of Engineers from industries in Development and Review of the Curriculum		
vi	Employment of Other teaching Methods		
vii	Exposure to skill Acquisition through Industrial Training		
viii	Summative Assessment for Graduating Students for Determining Graduates Attributes Attainment		
ix	Adequacy of External Examination System		



x	Existence of Course Files		
xi	Adequacy of Course Files Contents		
xii	Course Contents and Coverage of the Syllabus		



## Criterion 5: Students

S/N o.	Component of Criterion	Compliance Level	Observations and Remarks for compliance or Non-compliance
i	Compliance with Guidelines for Admissions		
ii	Number of Students Admitted		
iii	Existence of Policy on inter-university transfer		
iv	Availability of Counsellors to Advise Students		
v	Class Size and Laboratory Group Size		
vi	Participation of Students in Industrial Excursion, Engineering Conference/Exhibition, etc.		
vii	Standard of Tests and Examinations		
viii	Student Files		

## Criterion 6: Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)

S/N o.	Component of criterion	Compliance Level	Observations and Remarks for compliance or Non-compliance
i	Assessment Processes for Data Collection for Evaluating Programme Outcome		
ii	Frequency of Assessment of Programme Outcomes and Methods of Results Documentation and Storage		
iii	Systematic Utilization of the Results of PEOs Evaluation for CQI		
iv	Systematic Utilization of the Results of POs Evaluation for CQI		
v	Applying Assessment Results of CLOs for individual students and cohort level for CQI		
vi	Remedial Actions taken in View of the Observations Made During the Last Accreditation Visit.		

## Criterion 7: Staffing

S/N o.	Component of Criterion	Compliance Level	Observations and Remarks for compliance or Non-compliance
i	Student /Lecturer Ratio and Adequacy of Full-time Lecturers		
ii	Staff Mix		
iii	Qualifications of the Teaching Staff		
iv	Non-Teaching Staff (Technical)		
v	Administrative Support Staff		
vi	Staff Development Programme/Continuing Professional Development		
vii	Staff Contact Hours		
viii	Recognized Staff Publications		
ix	Professional Status of the Teaching Staff and Being up to date in payment of COREN Practicing Fees		
x	Overall Management of the Programme by the Head of Department		
xi	Staff Files		

## Criterion 8: Physical Facilities & Infrastructure

S/N o.	Component of Criterion	Compliance Level	Observations and Remarks for compliance or Non-compliance
i	Laboratories and Workshops.		
	A Laboratory Spaces		
	B Laboratory Equipment		
ii	Classrooms		
iii	Office Accommodation		
iv	Safety and Environmental Sanitation of Teaching Facilities		
v	Drawing Office and Equipment		
vi	Teaching Aids		
vii	Virtual Laboratory, Simulation Systems and Models		
viii	Library		
	A University/Central Library		
	B Faculty/Departmental Electronic Library		
	C Faculty/Departmental Library		
ix	Other Infrastructure		
	A Road Network and Transportation System		
	B Health, Sanitation and Water Supply		
	C Electric Power Supply & Internet Services		
	D Recreational & Sports Services		
	E Student Hostel & Fire/Security Services		
	F Safety in Facilities		

## Criterion 9: Industrial Linkages & Community Service

S/N o.	Component of Criterion	Compliance Level	Observations and Remarks for compliance or Non-compliance
I	Professional Practice and Attendance of Trainings to Enhance Professional Practice		
Ii	Collaborative Projects/Research with Industry		
Iii	Student Leadership		
Iv	Currency on Impact on Immediate Community (Social Responsibility)		

## Criterion 10: Institutional Support & Funding

S/N o.	Component of Criterion	Compliance Level	Observations and Remarks for compliance or Non-compliance
I	Staff Employment and Retention		
Ii	Funding of the Program		

### RECOMMENDATION BY THE ACCREDITATION TEAM

<Name of institution> has applied for accreditation for its <Name of Engineering Programme> under the new OBE Accreditation system. Based on the OBE system of accreditation, the programme was evaluated for its compliance to the ten (10) accreditation criteria. Some deficiencies/weaknesses/concerns/opportunity for improvement (*delete whichever is not applicable*) primarily related to the compliance of << List of Criteria >> were found.

As a result, the team recommends to EAC that the programme may be granted {full accreditation for a period of <\_\_\_\_> years} {interim accreditation for a period of < > years. {Delete whichever is not applicable}}

Signatures:

\_\_\_\_\_  
<Name of Programme Evaluator>

Expert in <Name of Engineering Programme >

\_\_\_\_\_  
<Name of Programme Evaluator>

Expert in <Name of Engineering Programme >



<Name of Team Leader>

Expert in <Name of Engineering Programme>

\_\_\_\_\_

<Name of COREN staff>

Rank of COREN staff

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



## PROGRAMME EVALUATOR REPORT TEMPLATE

FOR RESOURCE VERIFICATION, PRE-ACCREDITATION, ACCREDITATION & RE-ACCREDITATION

**<Name of Institution>**

**<Name of the Programme>**

**<Type of Accreditation Visit>**

**<Date>**

### Instructions for Completing this Report Template

Please, the PEVs and Team Lead should note that this template is simply to give guidance for preparing a concise and meaningful report on the programs. Therefore, based on the findings of the PEVs during the accreditation visit, the level of compliance of all accreditation criteria and their sub-criterion shall be described. For example, if a given sub-criterion is scored using Y for 'Compliance', OFI for 'opportunity for improvement', C for 'Concern', W for 'Weakness', and D for 'Deficiency', in the "Compliance Level" columns, in the Scoring Sheet, here, the PEVs should explain how and why such decision has been taken. The PEVs should (i) refer to the requirements in the BMAPS and Accreditation Manual, (ii) rely on provisions in PEVs Guidelines and PEVs Rubric and (iii) evaluate the pieces of evidence from the Self-Study Report, courses files, observation at the site visit and interactions with the relevant stakeholders such as students, staff, industry advisory board and employers. For decision on each criterion, the PEVs must be consistent and robust by checking different sources and relaying on two or more sources of evidence. (This section should be removed after completing the report).

## 1. OVERVIEW

The visitation team appointed by Engineering Accreditation Committee of Council for the Regulation of Engineering in Nigeria (COREN) conducted a three-day accreditation visit to **<Name of Institution >**, to evaluate the Undergraduate **<Name of engineering programme>** programme from **< starting date>** to **<ending date>**. A **pre-accreditation visit** meeting was held on **<date>** to exchange findings of the Programme Evaluation with the programme members/leadership based on the review of Self-Study Report (SSR) of the programme submitted by the institution and previous evaluation report of the last accreditation visitation team. During the pre-accreditation visit meeting, a list of queries was consolidated to seek further clarification and understanding on the programme. Also based on the study of SSR, **<some aspects related specifically to OBE and CQI implementations were identified as requiring detailed study of the related documents for evidences>**. Subsequently, specific documents/evidences to be examined during the visit were also indicated. Based on these discussions, the schedule of activities for the conduct of second day visit was slightly modified and communicated to **<name>**, the focal person appointed by the Institution for the conduct of the accreditation.

The accreditation team met with **<head of the institution>**. Briefing on the institution and the programme was given by the **<name>**. The programme evaluators also visited several facilities for the programme, such as **classrooms, conference room, laboratories, library, auditorium, offices and various sports facilities**. Apart from comprehensive review of documents and evidences pertaining to various accreditation criteria, the team also held meetings and interviews with stakeholders such as students, staff members, and alumni.

The following are highlights of the findings by the Programme Evaluation Team, based on detailed visit of the facilities and thorough review of the documents/evidences about the programme:

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

## 2. GENERAL INFORMATION

**<Institution >** was established in **<year>**. The main function of the institution is to produce graduate **<field of engineering, such as Mechanical, Civil, etc>** Engineers for both local and international employments. **<Brief history of the Institution>**.



<Name of programme> has a long history of accreditation by COREN and has so far graduated <number of graduates> Engineers. The last accreditation visit was conducted by COREN in <date>, and the programme was subsequently re-accredited for <number> years.

The programme is offered as a full-time programme with students admitted through the Joint Admission and Matriculation Board (JAMB) and is in compliance with the minimum admission requirements at UTME and Direct Entry in accordance with COREN BMAPS and NUC guidelines.

A summary of total application and enrolment of students for the Programme is given below:

Session	Applicants			Total Student Admitted		
	UTME	Direct Entry	Total	UTME	Direct Entry	Total
First session after last accreditation						
Second session after last accreditation						
Third session after last accreditation						
Fourth session after last accreditation						

Note: Student Data as per Table --- on Page --- of SSR.

	Permanent Academic staff			Visiting Academic staff	
	Ph.D	M.Eng.	B Eng/B. Tech	Ph.D	M.Eng
Core Engineering Subjects					
Shared Engineering Subjects					

Note: Academic staff List as per Tables --- on Page --- of SSR



*Computation of Staff: Student Ratio:*

1) Considering Present Student Strength:

Present Student Strength = **A**

Engineering Academic staff: **B**

Staff: Student Ratio =  $A/B = 1$ : -----

(as per guidelines of Sec 3.2.5.2 of COREN Accreditation Manual, 2019)

For the purpose of determining the student/staff ratio, only the population of students from 200 - 500 Levels in that programme should be used to determine the ratio.

### 3. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Criterion-1: Programme Educational Objectives (PEOs)

Criterion-2: Programme Outcomes (POs)

Criterion-3: Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)

Criterion-4: Curriculum and Learning Process

Criterion-5: Students

Criterion-6: Continuous Quality Improvement

Criterion-7: Staffing

Criterion-8: Physical Facilities and Infrastructure

Criterion-9: Industrial Linkage and Community Services

Criterion-10: Institutional Support and Funding

#### 4. PROGRAMME EVALUATION FORM

The observations of the COREN Evaluation team while evaluating the B Eng./B.Tech. <---> Engineering programme of <Institution> for compliance to various accreditation criteria are attached as “Programme Evaluation Scoring Sheet”.

#### 5. RECOMMENDATIONS BY PROGRAMME EVALUATION TEAM

The institute had applied for accreditation under the COREN Accreditation Manual, i.e. as an institution practicing Outcome-Based Education system. Based on the OBA system of accreditation, the team evaluated the programme of <----> Engineering for its compliance to the Ten (10) accreditation criteria and found a number of deficiencies/ weaknesses primarily related to the compliance of **Criterion....**

As a result, the team recommends to EAC that the programme **may be awarded <----> Accreditation status for a period of two (2) years, i.e. For < Session---- & ----->**.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The COREN Accreditation visitation team would like to thank the entire staff of <Institution> in general, and the <head of Programme >, the Dean <----> and the focal person <----> in particular, for their hospitality and cooperation for a smooth conduct of evaluation.

<Name of Programme Evaluator>  
\_\_\_\_\_

Team Lead

<Name of Programme Evaluator>  
\_\_\_\_\_

Expert in <Name of Engineering Programme >

<Name of Programme Evaluator>  
\_\_\_\_\_

Expert in <Name of Engineering Programme >



## UNIVERSITY FEEDBACK REGARDING ACCREDITATION VISITATION TEAM

The following four criteria should be considered for evaluation of the evaluators on a scale of 1 to 5, how would you evaluate the evaluation process by the visitation team?  
1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Only necessary documents were requested.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The documents and data were given due time for evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The evaluation team was well versed and professional.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The queries raised by the team were specific to job being evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The evaluation team managed its time judiciously.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The evaluation team trusted what was presented to them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The team was responsive.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The team provided adequate time for answering queries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The people being evaluated were given due respect by the evaluation team.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Integrity of individual was respected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. The organizational system and people were not criticized.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. The evaluation was in a friendly and professional manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



## PEER EVALUATION FORM OF EVALUATOR

Write the name of each of your group members in a separate column. For each person, indicate the extent to which you agree with the statement on the left, using a scale of 1-4 (1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=agree; 4=strongly agree).

Evaluation Criteria	Team Member:				Team Member:				Team Member:			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1. Well-versed with COREN Accreditation manual.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Maintained aplomb and decorum of the visit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Completed in depth preparation of SSR.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Attended evaluation Team's meetings regularly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Contributed meaningfully to group discussions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Completed assigned tasks in time.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Prepared his part of work in a befitting manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Demonstrated a cooperative and supportive attitude.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Evaluation Criteria	Team Member:				Team Member:				Team Member:			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
9. Contributed significantly to the success of the evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Met with the host institution's management in a courteous manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Focused only on relevant questions and documents.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Submitted his part of report in time.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Demanded additional favors from host institution.	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	



## EVALUATION FORM OF COREN STAFF BY INSTITUTION AND EVALUATORS

Write the name of the COREN Staff/ Representative(s) and indicate the extent to which you agree with the statement on the left, using a scale of 1-4

(1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=agree; 4=strongly agree).

Evaluation Criteria	COREN Staff:				COREN Staff:				COREN Staff:			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1. Well-versed with COREN Accreditation manual.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Maintained aplomb and decorum of the visit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Completed in depth preparation of SSR.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Attended evaluation Team's meetings regularly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Contributed meaningfully to group discussions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Completed assigned tasks in time.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Prepared his part of work in a befitting manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Demonstrated a cooperative and supportive attitude.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Evaluation Criteria	COREN Staff:				COREN Staff:				COREN Staff:			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
9. Contributed significantly to the success of the evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Met with the host institution's management in a courteous manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Focused only on relevant questions and documents.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Submitted his part of report in time.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Demanded additional favors from host institution.	Yes	No			Yes	No			Yes	No		



## CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

I, .....  
(Name of Programme Evaluator or Team Leader)

declare with respect to the accreditation visit scheduled for  
.....(Date) to.....  
(Name of Higher Educational Institution), that:

- I am not a present or former academic or non-academic member of staff of the institution;
- I have not applied to the institution for employment in the past;
- I am not a present or past member of any Committee involved with the institution;
- I have no current or past involvement in any for-profit activity in the institution;
- My spouse is not studying or working in any capacity at the institution;
- I am not a current or former student of the institution;

No child or close relative of mine is a present or past student or employee of the institution.

There is no conflict of interest whatsoever that should hinder me from accepting to serve as a Programme Evaluator or Team Leader in the accreditation team visiting this institution.

Signature: .....

Date: .....