Standards Review Consultation

Sections

Key principles

The Standard, as set out in the Engineering Council publications **UK-SPEC**, **AHEP** and **AQAH**, describes how professional registration can be achieved through the demonstration of competence and commitment and what processes are in place to facilitate this.

The aim of the Review is to ensure that the Standard remains relevant, flexible and future-ready for the benefit of all stakeholders. Through the Review the Engineering Council also wants to identify what, if any, more significant changes should be considered. To remain relevant, it must accommodate changes in the knowledge and understanding, skills and behaviours required of engineering professionals and in the ways in which these are developed throughout their careers; it must also maintain appropriate standards. It is therefore important that the Review considers how these could be affected by changes in engineering and society. A number of broad issues have been identified as having the potential to affect the Standard and these are the basis for the questions below.

The consultation will close at midnight on 24 October 2018.

If you have any questions or observations about this consultation, please contact us at **standardsreview@engc.org.uk**

Thank you for your help
The Engineering Council

	Questions	Response options
1	**Future needs of professionals and the profession, and UK-SPEC as a foundation for a 50+ year career**	
	a. How might the nature of engineering practice develop in the near future (up to 20 years)?	Comments box
	b. How should these developments be taken into account within the Standard?	Comments box
2	**Emerging technologies** Examples of emerging technologies include increasing automation and data exchange, cyber-physical systems, the Internet of Things (physical infrastructures and products connected by a digital infrastructure supported by the internet), cloud computing and cognitive computing. What impact could emerging technologies have on engineering practice, and therefore on engineers and technicians?	Comments box
3	**Emerging and future engineering disciplines and practice areas** How can new engineering disciplines and areas of specialisation be catered for within the Standard?	Comments box
4	**The changing nature of professional practice** Does the Standard cater for the ways in which engineering is likely to change and for the effects of this on engineers and technicians? If not, how could it do so?	Yes / No | Comments box
5	**Globalisation** What are the main challenges for engineers and technicians arising from globalisation that should be accounted for in the Standard?	Comments box
6	**Business/management trends** What business and/or management trends are most likely to affect the way that engineers work, and the knowledge and understanding, skills and behaviours they need?	Comments box
7	**Changing qualifications landscape** What significant changes in the qualifications landscape can you foresee, and how might these affect the development of engineering competence?	Comments box
8	**Academic and vocational education** There are ongoing attempts to reduce the distinction between academic and vocational routes, and to establish parity of esteem. What impacts, if any, will this have on engineering education?	Comments box
9	**Incorporated Engineer (IEng)**	
	a. What could be done to increase the number of IEng registrations?	Comments box
	b. Do you have any general comments on the future of IEng as a registration category?	Comments box

Questions		Response options
10	**Diversity and inclusion** Diversity refers to all the ways we differ. It includes visible differences such as gender, race and ethnicity and visible disabilities. It also includes non-visible differences such as sexual orientation, social class, heritage, religion, unseen disabilities, and age.	
	a. How could greater diversity in the engineering profession be brought about?	Comments box
	b. How could the Engineering Council and the professional engineering institutions create greater diversity among registered engineers and technicians?	Comments box
11	**Employer engagement**	
	a. How could employers be engaged effectively in the education of engineers and technicians, their initial professional development, professional recognition or continuing professional development?	Comments box
	b. If you work for an engineering employer, and your organisation would be interested in engaging with the Engineering Council to contribute to the development of engineers and technicians please tell us which areas you would be interested in and how we could help you engage.	Comments box
12	**Recognised Standards** A Recognised Standard is an agreed set of contextualised competence statements for a specific occupational group, sector, or other identifiable discrete group of practitioners. At present only one such Standard exists, **Electrician EngTech**, which is used by only one professional engineering institution. The Engineering Council has yet to publish a formal policy regarding such Standards.	
	a. Should professional engineering institutions be encouraged to develop Recognised Standards?	Yes / No / Don't know | Comments
	b. Should professional engineering institutions be encouraged to seek Recognised Standard designation for standards they have already established that align to UK-SPEC?	Yes / No / Don't know | Comments
	c. Should a formal policy on Recognised Standards be developed?	Yes / No / Don't know | Comments
	d. Should Professional Affiliates be able to seek Recognised Standard designation, as well as licensed professional engineering institutions?	Yes / No / Don't know | Comments
13	**General comments** Please tell us about any other issues the Engineering Council should take into account during the Review. Please explain why these should be taken into account.	Comments box

The UK Standard for Professional Engineering Competence (UK-SPEC)

Professional registration with the Engineering Council is based on demonstration of competence and commitment. **UK-SPEC** describes the competence and commitment requirements that have to be met for registration as an Engineering Technician (EngTech), Incorporated Engineer (IEng) or Chartered Engineer (CEng).

There are five generic areas of competence and commitment for all registrants:

A – Knowledge and understanding
B – Design and development of processes, systems, services and products
C – Responsibility, management or leadership
D – Communication and inter-personal skills
E – Professional commitment

These five areas of competence, which are set out separately for EngTech, IEng and CEng, constitute the minimum competences required for registration. UK-SPEC includes examples of activities that could demonstrate achievement of the requirements, to enable individuals and employers to assess whether they or their staff can meet the registration requirements. It also explains the steps necessary to achieve professional registration; the requirement to maintain and enhance competence once registered; and the obligations to act with integrity and in the public interest.

The aim of the Review is to ensure that the Standard remains relevant, flexible and future-ready for the benefit of all stakeholders. Through the Review the Engineering Council also wants to identify what, if any, more significant changes should be considered.

The consultation will close at midnight on 24 October 2018.

If you have any questions or observations about the consultation, please contact us at **standardsreview@engc.org.uk**

Thank you for your help.
The Engineering Council

Questions		Response options
1	What value does professional registration bring to you/your organisation?	Comments box
2	Who do you consider to be the main audience(s) for UK-SPEC and what are the needs of that/those audience(s)?	Comments box
3	How important is it that UK-SPEC's requirements are aligned with other international specifications?	- Very important - Quite important - Neither important nor unimportant - Not very important - Not at all important Comments box
4	Should UK-SPEC be a UK standard that is globally recognised or a global standard administered from the UK? Please explain your response.	- A UK standard that is globally recognised - A global standard administered from the UK - Other (please comment) Comments box
5	On what principles should UK-SPEC be based?	Comments box
6	What are the appropriate aptitude, attitude and behavioural characteristics of a professional engineer?	Comments box
7	What knowledge and understanding, skills and behaviours/personal attributes will the profession and engineering professionals need in the future?	Comments box
8	Should UK-SPEC include a definition of the term “engineer”?	- Yes, there is a need to define "engineer" (please provide your definition) - No, there is no need to define "engineer" (please explain why) Comments box
	If so, how could it:	
	a. Refer to the distinction between an engineer and a technician?	Comments box
	b. Refer to the distinction between an engineer and closely associated professionals working alongside engineers who share areas of knowledge and understanding and skill, such as scientists, project managers, environmental managers, and financial managers?	Comments box
	c. Embrace the spectrum of engineers, from generalist to specialist?	Comments box

Questions		Response options
	d. Make clear the level of competence needed, or needing to be demonstrated, to be included within that definition?	Comments box
9	Should UK-SPEC include a definition of the term “technician”?	- Yes, there is a need to define "technician" (please provide your definition) - No, there is no need to define "technician" (please explain why) Comments box
	If so, how could it:	
	a. Refer to the distinction between an engineer and a technician?	Comments box
	b. Refer to the distinction between a technician and closely associated professionals working alongside them who share areas of knowledge and understanding and skill?	Comments box
	c. Embrace the spectrum of technicians, from generalist to specialist?	Comments box
	d. Make clear the level of competence needed, or needing to be demonstrated, to be included within that definition?	Comments box
10	Does UK-SPEC satisfactorily recognise:	
	a. Engineering professionals who work at the forefront of technology?	Yes / No / Don’t know
	b. Engineering professionals who work across a range of disciplines?	Yes / No / Don’t know
	c. Engineering professionals whose balance of work is more managerial than technical?	Yes / No / Don’t know
	d. Engineering professionals whose work concerns the societal/economic impact of technical developments?	Yes / No / Don’t know
		Comments box
11	Should any changes be made to the way in which the three registration levels are summarised immediately before the competences on pages 10, 16 and 24 in UK-SPEC? If so, what changes should be made?	Yes (please explain) / No / Don’t know Comments box
12	Should any changes be made to the way UK-SPEC describes the competences and the way they can be demonstrated? If so, what changes should be made?	Yes (please explain) / No / Don’t know Comments box

Questions		Response options
13	Should any changes be made to the way in which the levels of registration (EngTech, IEng and CEng) are differentiated? If so, what changes should be made?	Yes (please explain) / No / Don't know Comments box
14	UK-SPEC requires engineering professionals to demonstrate commitment to professional standards, and to developing and enhancing competence. Is "commitment" the right term? If not, what term should be used?	Yes / No (please explain) / Don't know Comments box
15	What are the key elements needed in the process for assessing competence and commitment?	Comments box
16	Should any information that is currently in the guidance section of UK-SPEC (see pages 33 to 35) be incorporated into the main body of the document? Please explain your response.	Yes / No | Comments box
17	What, if any, additional information or guidance is needed in UK-SPEC?	Comments box
18	The Engineering Council aims to make its policies inclusive and to reflect this in the content, language and style of its documents. Is there anything about UK-SPEC that could act as a barrier to inclusion?	Yes (please explain) / No | Comments box
19	How could UK-SPEC be made more accessible and useful for the widest possible audience?	Comments box
20	Do you have any other observations about UK-SPEC?	Comments box

The accreditation of higher education programmes

Accreditation of degree programmes provides a mark of assurance that the programmes meet the standards set by the profession. It helps students, their parents and advisers to identify degree programmes recognised by the engineering profession, and confers market advantage to graduates from accredited programmes when they are seeking employment and when, in due course, they seek professional registration with the Engineering Council. Some employers require graduation from an accredited programme as a minimum qualification.

The accreditation process gives educational institutions a structured mechanism to assess, evaluate and improve the quality of their programmes. Accreditation is a developmental process. It offers the opportunity for a continuing dialogue between educational institutions and professional engineering institutions licensed by the Engineering Council to accredit degrees, rather than placing all the emphasis on the periodic accreditation exercise.

The Accreditation of Higher Education Programmes (AHEP) is the handbook published by the Engineering Council that describes how engineering or technology degree programmes can be accredited and sets out the output standards, also referred to as learning outcomes, for accredited programmes.

AHEP is available to read online and to download **here**.

The aim of the Review is to ensure that the Standard remains relevant, flexible and future-ready for the benefit of all stakeholders. Through the Review the Engineering Council also wants to identify what, if any, more significant changes should be considered.

The consultation will close at midnight on 24 October 2018.

If you have any questions or observations about this consultation, please contact us at **standardsreview@engc.org.uk**

Thank you for your help
The Engineering Council

Questions		Response options
1	What qualification types should be accreditable?	- Foundation degrees - Top-ups to degrees (eg from Foundation degrees) - Bachelors degrees - Masters degrees - Bachelors and Masters degrees in combination - Integrated Masters degrees - Engineering Doctorates (EngD) - Other Doctorates (PhD) - Qualifications other than degrees Comments box
2	Are there any particular challenges associated with accreditation?	
	a. Within the UK	Yes (please explain) / No / Don't know
	b. Outside the UK	Yes (please explain) / No / Don't know
		Comments box
3	How important is it that accredited degrees are recognised internationally?	- Very important - Quite important - Neither important nor unimportant - Not very important - Not at all important Comments box
4	How well do degrees, accredited in accordance with AHEP, develop the **underpinning knowledge and understanding** that engineers need? Please explain your response.	- Very well - Quite well - Neither well nor poorly - Quite poorly - Very poorly
	a. Current needs	
	b. Future needs	
		Comments box

Questions		Response options
5	How well does conformance with AHEP support the development of **excellence** in degree content and delivery? Please explain your response. a. Content b. Delivery	- Very well - Quite well - Neither well nor poorly - Quite poorly - Very poorly
		Comments box
6	How well does conformance with AHEP help engineering degree providers **innovate** with regard to degree content and delivery? Please explain your response. a. Content b. Delivery	- Very well - Quite well - Neither well nor poorly - Quite poorly - Very poorly
		Comments box
7	Graduates from accredited degrees must have achieved learning outcomes that, together, provide a solid foundation in the principles of engineering, tailored and relevant to the discipline specialism. These learning outcomes are allocated to six key areas of learning, these being: - **Science and mathematics** - **Engineering analysis** - **Design** - **Economic, legal, social, ethical and environmental context** - **Engineering practice** - **Additional general skills**	
	Do these six areas adequately cover the learning required by engineers? If not, what changes would you wish to see?	Yes / No (please explain) Comments box

Questions	Response options
8 Thinking about your organisation's current and future priorities, please consider the learning outcomes in the six areas of learning, with respect to each of the accreditable qualification types listed below.	
a. Bachelors degrees and Bachelors (Honours) degrees <u>accredited for IEng registration</u>	
i. Is the overall number of learning outcomes appropriate? If not, what changes would you wish to see?	Yes / No, there are too few / No, there are too many Comments box
ii. Is the distribution of learning outcomes between the six areas of learning appropriate? If not, what changes would you wish to see?	Yes / No | Comments box
iii. Should the six areas of learning be listed in an order that indicates relative priority? If so, please indicate what you think this order should be.	Yes / No | Comments box
iv. Is the coverage of topics within the learning outcomes appropriate for IEng registration? If not, what changes should be made?	Yes / No | Comments box
v. Are the learning outcomes at a level appropriate to IEng?	Yes / No | Comments box
b. Bachelors (Honours) degrees accredited <u>as partially meeting the educational requirement for CEng</u> (with further learning to Masters level required)	
i. Is the overall number of learning outcomes appropriate? If not, what changes would you wish to see?	Yes / No, there are too few / No, there are too many Comments box
ii. Is the distribution of learning outcomes between the six areas of learning appropriate? If not, what changes would you wish to see?	Yes / No | Comments box
iii. Should the six areas of learning be listed in an order that indicates relative priority? If so, please indicate what you think this order should be.	Yes / No | Comments box
iv. Is the coverage of topics within the learning outcomes appropriate for CEng registration? If not, what changes should be made?	Yes / No | Comments box
v. Are the learning outcomes at a level appropriate to CEng?	Yes / No | Comments box

Questions		Response options
	c. Integrated Masters (eg MEng) degrees <u>accredited for CEng</u>	
	i. Is the overall number of learning outcomes appropriate? If not, what changes would you wish to see?	Yes / No, there are too few / No, there are too many Comments box
	ii. Is the distribution of learning outcomes between the six areas of learning appropriate? If not, what changes would you wish to see?	Yes / No | Comments box
	iii. Should the six areas of learning be listed in an order that indicates relative priority? If so, please indicate what you think this order should be.	Yes / No | Comments box
	iv. Is the coverage of topics within the learning outcomes appropriate for CEng registration? If not, what changes should be made?	Yes / No | Comments box
	v. Are the learning outcomes at a level appropriate to CEng?	Yes / No | Comments box
	d. Masters degrees (other than the integrated Masters) <u>accredited as further learning</u> to Masters level, partially meeting the educational requirement for CEng	
	i. Is the overall number of learning outcomes appropriate? If not, what changes would you wish to see?	Yes / No, there are too few / No, there are too many Comments box
	ii. Is the distribution of learning outcomes between the six areas of learning appropriate? If not, what changes would you wish to see?	Yes / No | Comments box
	iii. Should the six areas of learning be listed in an order that indicates relative priority? If so, please indicate what you think this order should be.	Yes / No | Comments box
	iv. Is the coverage of topics within the learning outcomes appropriate for CEng registration? If not, what changes should be made?	Yes / No | Comments box
	v. Are the learning outcomes at a level appropriate to CEng?	Yes / No | Comments box
9	For what purposes could AHEP learning outcomes be used?	- Degree accreditation - Recognising qualifications other than degrees - Recognising apprenticeships - Assessing knowledge and understanding during professional reviews - Other (please specify) Comments box

Questions		Response options
10	Are there any credit transfer issues associated with the accreditation of degrees;	
	a. Where some study is completed in the UK and some completed outside the UK?	Yes (please explain) / No / Don't know
	b. Where the entire degree is completed in the UK?	Yes (please explain) / No / Don't know
	c. Where the entire degree is completed outside the UK?	Yes (please explain) / No / Don't know
		Comments box
11	Should AHEP specify European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) credits (or equivalent) for accredited programmes?	Yes (please explain) / No / Don't know Comments box
12	The Engineering Council aims to make its policies inclusive and to reflect this in the content, language and style of its documents. Is there anything about AHEP that could act as a barrier to inclusion?	Yes (please explain) / No | Comments box
13	Is there any information not currently included in AHEP that you think should be added?	Yes (please explain) / No | Comments box
14	Do you have any other observations about the AHEP document or its contents?	Comments box

The approval of qualifications and apprenticeships

The purpose of the Approval of Qualifications and Apprenticeships Handbook (AQAH) is to facilitate the approval of qualifications, apprenticeships, vocational programmes, delivery methods and delivery providers that meet the requirements for professional registration. AQAH currently sets out the learning outcomes, the requirements, and the evidence that professional engineering institutions licensed by the Engineering Council should seek in order to approve a qualification or apprenticeship. Note that, for the purposes of this consultation, and with regard to apprenticeships, we are interested in views related to technician level and above.

AQAH is available to read online and to download **here**.

The aim of the Review is to ensure that the Standard remains relevant, flexible and future-ready for the benefit of all stakeholders. Through the Review the Engineering Council also wants to identify what, if any, more significant changes should be considered.

The consultation will close at midnight on 24 October 2018.

If you have any questions or observations about the consultation, please contact us at **standardsreview@engc.org.uk**

Thank you for your help
The Engineering Council

Questions		Response options
1	Are there any particular challenges associated with the approval of **qualifications**?	
	a. Within the UK	Yes (please explain) / No / Don't know
	b. Outside the UK	Yes (please explain) / No / Don't know
		Comments box
2	Are there any particular challenges associated with the approval of **apprenticeships**?	
	a. Within the UK	Yes (please explain) / No / Don't know
	b. Outside the UK	Yes (please explain) / No / Don't know
		Comments box
3	How important is it that approved qualifications and apprenticeships be recognised internationally?	- Very important - Quite important - Neither important nor unimportant - Not very important - Not at all important
	a. Qualifications	
	b. Apprenticeships	
		Comments box
4	How well do approved **qualifications** develop the **underpinning knowledge and understanding** that engineering technicians need? Please explain your response.	- Very well - Quite well - Neither well nor poorly - Quite poorly - Very poorly
	a. Current needs	
	b. Future needs	
		Comments box
5	How well do approved **qualifications** develop the **skills** that engineering technicians need? Please explain your response.	- Very well - Quite well - Neither well nor poorly - Quite poorly - Very poorly
	a. Current needs	
	b. Future needs	
		Comments box

Questions		Response options
6	How well do approved **apprenticeships** develop the **underpinning knowledge and understanding** that engineering technicians need? Please explain your response. a. Current needs b. Future needs	- Very well - Quite well - Neither well nor poorly - Quite poorly - Very poorly
		Comments box
7	How well do approved **apprenticeships** develop the **skills** that engineering technicians need? Please explain your response. a. Current needs b. Future needs	- Very well - Quite well - Neither well nor poorly - Quite poorly - Very poorly
		Comments box
8	How well does conformance to AQAH support the development of **excellence** in **qualification** content and delivery? Please explain your response. a. Content b. Delivery	- Very well - Quite well - Neither well nor poorly - Quite poorly - Very poorly
		Comments box
9	How well does conformance with AQAH support **innovation** in **qualification** content and delivery? Please explain your response. a. Content b. Delivery	- Very well - Quite well - Neither well nor poorly - Quite poorly - Very poorly
		Comments box
10	How well does conformance with AQAH support the development of **excellence** in **apprenticeship** content and delivery? Please explain your response. a. Content b. Delivery	- Very well - Quite well - Neither well nor poorly - Quite poorly - Very poorly
		Comments box

Questions		Response options
11	How well does AQAH support **innovation** in **apprenticeship** content and delivery? Please explain your response. a. Content b. Delivery	- Very well - Quite well - Neither well nor poorly - Quite poorly - Very poorly
		Comments box
12	AQAH currently only offers approval for qualifications and apprenticeships that lead to EngTech registration. Should approval be offered for:	
	a. Qualifications at other levels?	Yes / No
	b. Apprenticeships at other levels?	Yes / No
		Comments box
13	AQAH emphasises learning outcomes rather than inputs (e.g. students' entry qualifications, curriculum content). Is this the appropriate basis for approval in the future? If not, what should be the basis of approval in the future?	Yes / No (please explain) | Comments box
14	Holders of approved qualifications and apprenticeships must have achieved learning outcomes that, together, provide a solid foundation in the principles of engineering, tailored and relevant to the discipline specialism. These learning outcomes are allocated to six key areas of learning, these being: - **Science and mathematics** - **Engineering analysis** - **Design** - **Economic, legal, social, ethical and environmental context** - **Engineering practice** - **Additional general skills**	
	Do these six areas adequately cover the learning required for EngTech? If not, what changes would you wish to see?	Yes / No (please explain) | Comments box

Questions		Response options
15	With regard to qualifications and apprenticeships approved for EngTech registration:	
	a. Is the overall number of learning outcomes appropriate? If not, what changes would you wish to see?	Yes / No, there are too few / No, there are too many Comments box
	b. Is the distribution of learning outcomes between the six areas of learning appropriate? If not, what changes would you wish to see?	Yes / No | Comments box
	c. Should the six areas of learning be listed in an order that indicates relative priority? If so, please indicate what you think this order should be.	Yes / No | Comments box
	d. Is the coverage of topics within the learning outcomes appropriate for EngTech registration? If not, what changes should be made?	Yes / No | Comments box
	e. Are the learning outcomes at a level appropriate to EngTech?	Yes / No | Comments box
16	For what purposes could the Engineering Technician learning outcomes set out in AQAH be used?	- Approving qualifications - Approving apprenticeships - Approving employer schemes - Assessing knowledge and understanding during professional reviews - Other (please specify) Comments box
17	Should some form of recognition be available for the following types of apprenticeships?	
	a. An apprenticeship standard where the underpinning knowledge and understanding is based on an approved or accredited qualification	Yes / No / Don't know
	b. A higher apprenticeship standard where the underpinning knowledge and understanding is based on an accredited degree	Yes / No / Don't know
	c. An apprenticeship which has no reference to either an approved qualification or accredited degree, in which case the content could be approved in terms of how it meets the requirements for professional registration	Yes / No / Don't know
	d. An apprenticeship standard where the underpinning knowledge and understanding elements could be approved together with local arrangements to develop wider attitudes and behaviours	Yes / No / Don't know
		Comments box

Questions		Response options
18	For each level of registration should recognition of apprenticeships be with respect to the apprenticeship standard itself, or with respect to the delivery provider/partnership?	
	a. EngTech	- The apprenticeship standard - The delivery provider/partnership
	b. IEng	- The apprenticeship standard - The delivery provider/partnership
	c. CEng	- The apprenticeship standard - The delivery provider/partnership
		Comments box
19	Should professional engineering institutions be required to formally notify the Engineering Council when they are involved in the following?	
	a. Development of an apprenticeship	Yes / No
	b. Delivery of an apprenticeship	Yes / No
	c. Assessment of an apprenticeship	Yes / No
		Comments box
20	The Engineering Council aims to make its policies inclusive and to reflect this in the content, language and style of its documents. Is there anything about AQAH that could act as a barrier to inclusion?	Yes (please explain) / No | Comments box
21	Is there any information not currently included in AQAH that you think should be added?	Yes (please explain) / No | Comments box
22	Do you have any other observations about the AQAH document or its contents?	Comments box
23	The Engineering Council is seeking views about which levels of apprenticeship should be recognised for EngTech, IEng and CEng. It is also seeking views about which of the competences in UK-SPEC should be included in apprenticeships at different levels. If you are willing to complete a separate consultation about this, please **email us**.	n/a

Proposals for the recognition of higher apprenticeships

In England apprenticeships at level 4 and above are known as higher apprenticeships. Higher apprenticeships that contain a degree are labelled as degree apprenticeships. Further information about higher apprenticeships is available in the Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA) publication, **Guide to Apprenticeships in the UK**.

The Engineering Council is proposing to develop a mechanism to formally recognise higher apprenticeships that provide evidence towards achievement of professional registration as Engineering Technician (EngTech), Incorporated Engineer (IEng) or Chartered Engineer (CEng). The current options for recognition are accreditation and approval, although other options could be introduced if needed. We are interested in your views as to whether, and if so how, the engineering profession should recognise apprenticeships at higher levels, regardless of where in the UK they are delivered. To help with this we have developed a **higher apprenticeship recognition model**; this sets out how higher apprenticeships could be assessed to determine whether they deliver the learning outcomes and some or all of the competences required for each level of professional registration.

The consultation will close at midnight on 24 October 2018.

If you have any questions or observations about the consultation, please contact us at **standardsreview@engc.org.uk**

Thank you for your help.
The Engineering Council

Questions		Response options
1	a. Should the Engineering Council offer recognition for higher apprenticeships?	Yes / No | Comments box
	b. What are the possible advantages and disadvantages of the Engineering Council and professional engineering institutions formally recognising higher apprenticeships?	Comments box
2	Should recognition be available for the following types of higher apprenticeship?	
	a. Degree apprenticeships that contain an accredited degree	Yes / No / Don't know
	b. Degree apprenticeships that contain a unaccredited degree	Yes / No / Don't know
	c. Higher apprenticeships that contain a non-degree qualification	Yes / No / Don't know
	d. Higher apprenticeships that do not contain any qualifications	Yes / No / Don't know
		Comments box
3	How useful would it be for the Engineering Council to identify the minimum competence (eg some or all UK-SPEC competences) to be delivered by a recognised higher apprenticeship?	- Very useful - Quite useful - Neutral - Not very useful - Not at all useful Comments box
4	The Engineering Council is proposing a **high-level model for apprenticeship recognition**. Further details will be finalised in due course.	
	a. Do you broadly welcome the approach proposed?	Yes / No | Comments box
	b. Should the model apply to apprenticeships other than higher apprenticeships?	Yes / No | Comments box
	c. Would you like to see any changes to the model?	Yes / No | Comments box
5	Do you have any other observations about the Engineering Council's proposals to recognise higher apprenticeships?	Comments box
6	The Engineering Council is seeking views about which levels of apprenticeship should be recognised for EngTech, IEng and CEng. It is also seeking views about which of the competences in UK-SPEC should be included in apprenticeships at different levels. If you are willing to complete a separate consultation about this, please **email us**.	n/a

The Registration Code of Practice (RCoP)

The Registration Code of Practice, previously titled the Regulations for Registration, sets out the processes and practices the Licensed Members follow in complying with the terms of their Licences. This part of the Standards Review consultation is open only to Licensed Members and should be completed by their staff and/or volunteer representatives.

The **current version of RCoP** is available on the Engineering Council website.

The RCoP consultation is in two parts:

1. A series of proposals, questions and requests for observations on identified topics and specific clauses or paragraphs within RCoP
2. An annotated draft of an **updated version of RCoP**

Respondents are invited to respond to either or both parts: by answering the questions below, and/or commenting on the proposed draft update by email. Please ensure that your response has the relevant committee approval before submitting it. Emailed responses should be sent to **standardsreview@engc.org.uk**

The consultation will close at midnight on 24 October 2018.

If you have any questions or observations about the consultation, please contact us at **standardsreview@engc.org.uk**

To help you, the questions are grouped by RCoP section.

Thank you for your help.
The Engineering Council

	Questions	Response options
General		
1	**RCoP paragraphs 2, 14, 54** Proposal to replace references to EU with 'national and international legislation'. Reference to Directive to change to 'Recognition of Professional Qualifications Regulation'.	Comments box
2	**New RCoP paragraph** Proposed new paragraph pertaining to Licensed Members quality management systems and self-assessment processes: *Licensed Members shall have a suitable quality management system and self-assessment process in place, in order to demonstrate and maintain conformity with the Engineering Council requirements.*	Comments box
3	**New RCoP paragraph** The Engineering Council Bye-Laws explain that interim registration is for 'persons who have met the educational requirement': *Licensed Members may, under Bye-Law 6, register persons who have met the educational requirement for registration, but who have not yet demonstrated the necessary competences for registration in these categories. An individual shall not be registered in both the full and interim registration sections of any section.* Should this cover only accredited or approved qualifications, or any course or qualification at the appropriate level?	- Only accredited or approved qualifications - Any course or qualification at the appropriate level Comments box
4	**RCoP paragraph 9** Proposed rewording to make clearer. **Original wording:** *Each Licensed Member shall adopt standards of competence and commitment, derived from and meeting the generic threshold standards of competence and commitment set out in the Standards, which can be assessed objectively and which relate to the technologies and applications with which it is concerned.* **Proposed rewording:** *Each Licensed Member shall adopt its own standards of competence and commitment derived from and meeting those in UK-SPEC [and the ICT*Tech *Standard], which can be assessed objectively, and which relate to the technologies and applications with which it is concerned.*	Comments box
Assessment		
5	**RCoP paragraph 11** Proposed rewording to make clearer. **Original wording:** *Licensed Members have the discretion to add other components to the Professional Review.* **Proposed rewording:** *Licensed Members may add other components to the Professional Review.*	Comments box

Questions		Response options
6	**RCoP paragraph 12** This paragraph contains the list of evidence applicants shall present in support of an application. Proposal to strengthen the requirement for 'a plan for future professional development'. This could be reworded to better match the requirement to plan and record CPD. More generally, are the requirements for submission, format, and details appropriate? Do they add anything to what is in UK-SPEC? Are they taken into account in practice during Professional Review?	Comments box
7	**RCoP paragraph 16** This paragraph enables assessors to change the level of registration (ie from CEng to IEng) during the course of an interview. This can be done but must be done sensitively and in a way that does not unduly influence the applicant. **Original wording:** *In exceptional circumstances, the assessors may recommend to a committee that an applicant is registered at a different level of registration than that which has been sought. The exceptional circumstances must be recorded, report forms must be completed for both categories, and these variations must be discussed and approved by the appropriate committee.* **Proposed rewording:** *In exceptional circumstances, the assessors may recommend to a committee that an applicant is registered at a different level of registration than that which has been sought. The exceptional circumstances must be recorded, report forms must be completed for both categories, and these variations must be discussed and approved by the appropriate committee. If the decision is taken to recommend registration at a different level during the course of an interview, the interview must be restarted at the newer level and the change explained to the applicant. Both assessors and the applicant must agree to the change.*	Comments box
8	**RCoP paragraph 17** Proposed amended wording. **Original wording:** *if the application has been unsuccessful, shall be advised upon appropriate action* **Proposed rewording:** *if the application has been unsuccessful, shall be advised **about** appropriate action*	Comments box
9	**RCoP paragraph 18** Does this paragraph need more detail on what Licensed Members' appeals procedures should include, or is this adequate? *Each Licensed Member shall have an appeals procedure available to unsuccessful applicants.*	Comments box

Questions		Response options
Exemplifying qualifications		
10	**RCoP paragraph 19** The RCoP Working Group, and other groups contributing to the Standards Review, have recommended that paragraph 19, rather than seeking to list qualifications that might serve as exemplifying, should instead refer to the learning outcomes in AHEP and AQAH for the purposes of identifying which qualifications could or could not be assessed for approval or accreditation. This will future-proof the regulations against new and forthcoming provision such as higher and degree apprenticeships and higher T levels. Proposal to make this paragraph more generic and remove references to specific types of qualifications.	Comments box
11	**RCoP paragraph 19** Is paragraph 19 sufficiently clear on the difference between *knowledge and understanding*, and *competence*?	Comments box
Engineering Council examinations		
12	**RCoP paragraph 20** A small number of applicants continue to come forward each year having taken the Engineering Council Examination in past years. While the examination has been discontinued, the RCoP Working Group proposes that the regulation will remain in place while applicants still come forward.	Comments box
Accreditation and approval		
13	**RCoP paragraphs 21 – 37** Extensive redrafting of these paragraphs has been proposed by the RCoP Working Group and can be found in the consultation draft. Comments and responses are welcome either by email or in response to this question. The main tenets of the rewrite include: - consistent definitions of *approve* and *accredit*, which apply to recognition of all types of learning and development; - removing references to specific levels of the Register: 'degrees lead to IEng and CEng, other programmes lead to Technician level' is no longer accurate; - more focus on and reference to meeting the learning outcomes in AHEP and AQAH; - including a requirement for Licensed Members to promptly add approved and accredited programmes to the Engineering Council qualifications database(s) and to ensure that information on the database is 'current, complete and accurate'.	Comments box
14	**RCoP paragraphs 21 – 37** Should there be additional regulation over the requirement to undertake a visit for accreditation?	- No - Yes, as guidance in AHEP - Yes, as regulation in RCoP Comments box

Questions		Response options
15	**RCoP paragraphs 21 – 37** Should there be additional regulation covering removal of accreditation or approval?	- No - Yes, as guidance in AHEP/AQAH - Yes, as regulation in RCoP Comments box
16	**RCoP paragraphs 21 – 37** Should there be additional regulation covering further learning requirements for IEng-accredited Bachelors degrees when applying for CEng?	- No - Yes, as guidance in AHEP - Yes, as regulation in RCoP Comments box
17	**RCoP paragraphs 21 – 37** Bachelor (Honours) programmes accredited under AHEP for CEng may be recognised as either fully or partially meeting the learning outcomes. Should the same be true of programmes approved or accredited against the technician-level learning outcomes in AQAH?	Comments box
Initial professional development (IPD)		
18	**RCoP paragraphs 44 – 50** Proposed redraft of the RCoP moves the section on IPD into the 'Approval and Accreditation of learning' section, reinforcing the consistency of the defined terms. The section on IPD is primarily about accreditation of employer schemes.	Comments box
19	**RCoP paragraph 44** This paragraph is a definition of IPD and its value, rather than a regulation. This will be covered in the forthcoming IPD Policy Statement. Proposed removal of this introductory paragraph from the regulations.	Comments box
20	**RCoP paragraphs 47, 49, 50** Remove 'or approve' from the section on IPD. Under the proposed global definitions, recognition of IPD, which involves a visit (except in exceptional circumstances), is considered accreditation.	Comments box
Technical Report		
21	**RCoP paragraphs 40 – 43** There is a great deal of detail on the content and assessment of Technical Reports. To what extent is this regulation used by the Licensed Members at Professional Review? Is there scope to rationalise or shorten this section?	Comments box

Questions		Response options
Continuing professional development (CPD)		
22	**RCoP paragraph 51** The first two sentences of this section are introductory rather than regulatory. As this is now covered in the CPD Policy Statement, removal of these sentences is proposed.	Comments box
23	**RCoP paragraph 52** Proposed update to this paragraph to reflect the use of sampling for monitoring CPD. Proposed addition of regulation over removal of registrants who persistently don't respond or engage with sampling, to commence in 2020. These proposed amendments can be found in the draft updated RCoP.	Comments box
Inclusion		
24	The Engineering Council aims to make its policies inclusive and to reflect this in the content, language and style of its documents. Is there anything about RCoP that could act as a barrier to inclusion?	Yes (please explain) / No Comments box
General comments		
25	Do you have any other observations about the RCoP or its contents?	Comments box