ABET

Computing Accreditation Commission

Summary of Accreditation Actions
for the
2017-2018 Accreditation Cycle

Mody University of Science and Technology
Sikar, India

Computer Science and Engineering (B.Tech.)

Accredit to September 30, 2024. A request to ABET by January 31, 2023 will be required to initiate a reaccreditation evaluation visit. In preparation for the visit, a Self-Study Report must be submitted to ABET by July 01, 2023. The reaccreditation evaluation will be a comprehensive general review.

This is a newly accredited program. Please note that this accreditation action extends retroactively from **October 01, 2016.**

ABET

Engineering Accreditation Commission

Summary of Accreditation Actions
for the
2017-2018 Accreditation Cycle

Mody University of Science and Technology
Sikar, India

s & Communication Engineering (B.Tech.)

redit to September 30, 2024. A request to ABET by January 31, 2023 will be requ
ate a reaccreditation evaluation visit. In preparation for the visit, a Self-Study Rep
mitted to ABET by July 01, 2023. The reaccreditation evaluation will be a comprel
eral review.

s is a newly accredited program. Please note that this accreditation action extends
n ay 01, 2018.

· Science and Engineering (B.Tech.)

redit to September 30, 2020. A request to ABET by January 31, 2019 will be requ
ate a reaccreditation report evaluation. A report describing the actions taken to co
rtcomings identified in the attached final statement must be submitted to ABET by
9. The reaccreditation evaluation will focus on these shortcomings. Please note t
required.

s is a newly accredited program. Please note that this accreditation action extends
n October 01, 2015.

afaq
AFNOR CERTIFICATION

Certificat
Certificate

N° 2020/86577.1

AFNOR Certification certifies that the management system implemented by:
AFNOR Certification certifie que le système de management mis en place par :

MODY UNIVERSITY SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

for the following activities:
pour les activités suivantes :

PROVISION OF GRADUATE, POST GRADUATE AND PH.D LEVEL HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICES.

has been assessed and found to meet the requirements of:
a été évalué et jugé conforme aux exigences requises par :

ISO 9001 : 2015

and is developed on the following locations:
et est déployé sur les sites suivants :

LAKSHMANGARH - 332 311 DISTT SIKAR, RAJASTHAN, INDIA

This certificate is valid from (year/month/day) *Ce certificat est valable à compter du (année/mois/jour)* **2020-04-24** until *jusqu'au* **2023-04-23**

cofrac
CERTIFICATION DE SYSTEMES DE MANAGEMENT
ACCRÉDITATION N° 4-0001
PORTÉE DISPONIBLE SUR WWW.COFRAC.FR

Ce document est signé électroniquement. Il constitue un original électronique à valeur probatoire.
This document is electronically signed. It stands for an electronic original with probationary value.

Franck LEBEUGLE
Managing Director of AFNOR Certification
Directeur Général d'AFNOR Certification

The electronic certificate only, available at www.afnor.org, attests in real-time that the company is certified. *Seul le certificat électronique, consultable sur www.afnor.org, fait foi en temps réel de la certification de l'organisme.* COFRAC accreditation n° 4-0001, Management Systems Certification. Scope available on www.cofrac.fr *Accréditation COFRAC n° 4-0001, Certification de Systèmes de management, Portée disponible sur www.cofrac.fr.* AFAQ is a registered trademark. *AFAQ est une marque déposée.* CERTI F 0956.8 – EN 11/2019

Scan this QR code to check the validity of the certificate

सूचना का अधिकार
RIGHT TO INFORMATION

दूरभाष/TEL : 26962819, 26567373
(EPABX) : 26565694, 26562133
: 26565687, 26562144
: 26562134, 26562122
फैक्स/FAX : 26960629, 26529745
Website : http:/www.dsir.gov.in
(आईएसओ 9001:2008 प्रमाणित विभाग)
(AN ISO 9001:2008 CERTIFICED DEPARTMENT)

सत्यमेव जयते

भारत सरकार
विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी मंत्रालय
वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान विभाग
टेक्नोलॉजी भवन, नया महरौली मार्ग,
नई दिल्ली - 110016
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
Department of Scientific and Industrial Research
Technology Bhavan, New Mehrauli Road,
New Delhi - 110016

F.No. 11/856/2020-TU-V

Date: 17th November, 2020

The Registrar
Mody University of Science and Technology,
NH-52, Lakshmangarh,
District Sikar – 332 311 (Rajasthan)

Subject : Registration of Research Institution, other than a Hospital, for the purpose of availing Customs duty exemption in terms of Government Notifications No. 51/96-Customs dated 23.07.1996; No. 24/2007-Customs dated 01.03.2007; No. 43/2017-Customs dated 30.06.2017; No. 45/2017-Central Tax (Rate) & 47/2017-Integrated Tax (Rate) dated 14.11.2017; No. 9/2018-Central Tax (Rate), No. 09/2018-Union Territory Tax (Rate) & No. 10/2018-Integrated Tax (Rate) dated 25.01.2018; and State Tax (Rate) as applicable and all notification, as amended from time to time.

CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION

This is to certify that **Mody University of Science and Technology, Sikar (Rajasthan)** is registered with the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research (DSIR) for the purpose of availing Customs duty exemption in terms of Government Notifications No. 51/96-Customs dated 23.07.1996; No. 24/2007-Customs dated 01.03.2007; No. 43/2017-Customs dated 30.06.2017; No. 45/2017-Central Tax (Rate) & 47/2017-Integrated Tax (Rate) dated 14.11.2017; No. 9/2018-Central Tax (Rate), No. 09/2018-Union Territory Tax (Rate) & No. 10/2018-Integrated Tax (Rate) dated 25.01.2018; and State Tax (Rate) as applicable and all notification, as amended from time to time. The Registration is subject to terms and conditions mentioned overleaf.

This Registration is valid upto **31.03.2022.**

Please acknowledge the receipt.

Yours faithfully,

(Dr. P.K. Dutta)
Scientist - 'F'

A. Senthil

From: Hadfield,Lorna <LHadfield@theiet.org>
Sent: Monday, November 4, 2019 8:30 PM
To: A. Senthil
Cc: DEAN SET
Subject: MODY UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY VISIT REPORT
Attachments: Advisory_Visit_Report_MODY_University_September_2019 final.docx; SUBMISSION_GUIDE_AccredVisit_2019-20.pdf; USER_GUIDE_ADAMS_ForHEIs_2019-20.pdf

Dear Dr Senthil

Thank you for welcoming the IET to MODY University of Science and Technology, School of Engineering and Technology on 26th and 27th September 2019 for your Accreditation Advisory visit. I am pleased to now provide you with a copy of the report from this visit, please find attached.

The panel is of the opinion that all programmes listed in the report are suitable for accreditation subject to the recommendations within the report. The University is advised that it should be able to demonstrate progress in addressing the issues raised in this report, in particular with respect to the recommendations concerning external examiner arrangements and project threshold standards, prior to the accreditation visit. The IET would like a progress update on these when you book the accreditation visit. With this in mind the Panel recommends that the University aims for a full accreditation visit in the Autumn of 2020.

The University is advised to consult with its IET Accreditation Advisor in the development of its submission. The advisor will be happy to clarify the recommendations in this report and advise upon any plans that the University is developing to address the issues raised. I will forward a separate email confirming the contact details for your Advisor.

You are asked to honour the confidentiality of the report and to contact IET before re-producing any part of it. The Panel also encourages you to share this visit report with your Board of Studies or equivalent.

Once you are ready to book your accreditation visit please contact us and we will find a mutually agreeable date. Please note that to prepare your submission for a full visit you will need on average of 3 months and your submission will need to be uploaded to ADAMS 16 weeks prior to the visit.

You can start to upload your submission on ADAMS now; please find attached the submission guidance and user guide for ADAMS. We would also like to book a training session for your relevant staff please let us know when would be suitable for you.

The Panel would like to thank you and your staff for your co-operation in the accreditation exercise. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Lorna

Lorna Hadfield
International Accreditation Account Manager

The Institution of Engineering and Technology

T: +44 (0)207 344 5702
M: + 44 (0)7860 403460

Visit our website theiet.org
Follow us on Facebook, Twitter, Engineering Communities and LinkedIn

Michael Faraday House
Six Hills Way
Stevenage
SG1 2AY

The Institution of Engineering and Technology

CONFIDENTIAL

Advisory Visit Report

Report on the visit to: **MODY University of Science and Technology, School of Engineering and Technology**

Date: **26th & 27th September 2019**

Head of Department: **Professor V K Jain**

Accreditation Contact: **Dr A Senthil**

Panel:

Name	Role
Professor Andy Downton	Chair
Dr Sravanthi Sashikumar	Panel Member

Programmes for Review

The department asked the Panel to consider the appropriateness of the following programmes for accreditation by the IET:

	Type	Title	Mode	Duration of Programme	Accreditation Level Sought	Delivery Site
1.	BTech	Biomedical Engineering	FT	4	Partial CEng	Laxmangarh
2.	BTech	Computer Science & Engineering	FT	4	Partial CEng	Laxmangarh
3.	BTech	Electronics & Communication Engineering	FT	4	Partial CEng	Laxmangarh
4.	BTech	Electrical Engineering	FT	4	Partial CEng	Laxmangarh
5.	BTech	Mechanical Engineering	FT	4	Partial CEng	Laxmangarh

Visit Summary:

Mody University was established in Rajasthan in 2004 exclusively for women students. It occupies a 265 acre campus on the edge of Laxmangarh, a small rural town, and provides self-contained facilities including accommodation, catering, social and sports facilities for most of its students and staff who live on-site. The university comprises a number of vocational Schools, including the School of Engineering and Technology (SET), within which the programmes considered during this Advisory visit are based. The university is generously resourced and largely self-sufficient, as the nearest large city (Jaipur) is 140kms away. In addition to the 5 BTech programmes reviewed during this visit, the School offers 2-year MTech programmes which are not currently being considered for accreditation and PhD programmes.

The submission for this visit was supplied initially on ADAMS, with a supplementary set of data provided just before the visit on GDrive. Comprehensive and very well organised data was also provided on paper during the visit, which was helpful in following up unresolved queries efficiently, and for which the School is thanked and commended.

Mody BTech 4-year undergraduate programmes, in common with other Indian HEIs, are at a similar level to Scottish 4-year programmes, or English programmes which include a foundation year 0 (i.e. covering the equivalent of levels 3-6 of the UK Framework of Higher Education Qualifications). The Panel found a range of commendable features during its visit and these are listed in the relevant sections below. It has also made several recommendations which will align programmes with current IET accreditation expectations, and these broadly cover the following areas:

- Review and revise Learning Outcome table descriptions, and consequently overall programme module maps, in line with IET guidance, and add information on assessment (and ideally AHEP LOs) to all module specifications.
- Exam papers in years 3/4 need to provide better coverage of higher level LOs, particularly in Analysis, Design and Engineering Practice, and to reduce reliance on MCQs testing simple recall of facts.
- There is a need to toughen up all project and PBL marking to align with award thresholds elsewhere in Indian higher education.
- Marksheets need to provide explicit allocation, justification and evidence for individual student mark elements of groupwork in PBLs, the minor project (and the capstone project if any continue to be undertaken in groups).
- The project marking process needs to ensure that full double blind marking is completed before moderation commences, and that each examiner provides independent textual justification for all marks awarded.
- The School needs to make clear within documentation for the accreditation visit how moderation arrangements for disparate project marks (>10% difference between the two examiners) are resolved.
- The School should revise its plagiarism guidance to students to reduce the acceptable plagiarism threshold to <15% (several of the sampled projects had plagiarism levels above 20%)
- The Panel recommends that a project handbook is developed to include all project information required by students.
- The role of external examiner/moderator needs to be developed and the process defined before accreditation can be awarded.
- The recently approved 3+1+1 joint programme with Hautes Etudes d'Ingenieur, Lille, France will probably require an IET visit if accreditation is to be extended to include students undertaking this scheme.

The Panel thanks all the staff of the School of Engineering and Technology for their hospitality, the open and friendly way the discussions were conducted, and particularly for the efficient and responsive way in which the department has provided all documentation on request, both before and during the visit.

Programmes suitable for IEng Accreditation:

Exemplifying qualifications for satisfying the educational requirements for registration as an Incorporated Engineer are defined in UK spec as being:

- an accredited Bachelors or honours degree in engineering or technology
- a Higher National Certificate/Diploma or Foundation Degree in engineering or technology, plus appropriate further learning to Bachelors degree level
- an NVQ4 or SVQ4 which has been approved for the purpose by a licensed engineering institution.

Programmes suitable for CEng Accreditation:

Exemplifying qualifications for satisfying the educational requirements for registration as a Chartered Engineer are defined in UK spec as being:

- an accredited Bachelors degree with honours in engineering or technology, plus either
  - an appropriate Masters degree accredited by a Licensed Member
  - or appropriate further learning to Masters level
- an accredited integrated MEng degree.

1: Programmes Aims, Learning Outcomes and Content

Comments
Programme Aims and Learning Outcomes as expressed in the programme specifications are distinct and appropriate to each programme. AHEP Learning Outcomes table descriptions (section 2.0) do not however identify which modules specifically contribute to achieving each programme learning outcome (through delivery and particularly assessment of relevant content). Consequently, limited confidence can currently be placed in the overall programme module maps, which should be reviewed and revised in line with IET guidance. Module specifications provide information about the aims, syllabus and intended learning outcomes of each module, but do not provide any summary of the assessment diet (which is critical in identifying learning outcomes and level achieved in the module). It is helpful if the intended learning outcomes listed in each module specification can also indicate which AHEP LOs are covered, as this makes it straightforward to complete the overall AHEP Learning Outcomes mapping table.

Recommendations for Change:	
1.1	Review and revise Learning Outcome table descriptions, and consequently overall programme module maps, in line with IET guidance.
1.2	Add a summary of the assessment diet as part of each module specification. It is also good practice to augment the module outcomes with corresponding AHEP Learning Outcomes codes to facilitate completion of the AHEP mapping table.

2: Achievement of AHEP Learning Outcomes

Comments
The overall range of programme content and learning opportunities available to students via a combination of core courses and elective options is impressive and wide-ranging, and the best students clearly achieve outstanding results. The School successfully promotes a very positive and hard-working culture amongst students and staff, and laboratory modules in many cases provide considerable opportunities for students to work collaboratively showing independence and creativity in achieving excellent design and engineering practice outcomes. As far as could be judged from syllabi, content of taught modules was appropriate in both range and level, but the Panel was less convinced that module exams and coursework satisfactorily tested higher level Design and Engineering Practice learning outcomes, particularly in 3rd/4th year modules (see Criterion 3, Assessment, below). Further review of coverage will benefit from comparison against revised AHEP descriptions of learning outcome coverage and mapping tables. Laboratory modules deliver impressive coverage of Design, Engineering Practice and additional general skills learning outcomes through an innovative and commendable standard structure (applied to all laboratory modules), wherein initial traditional laboratory experiments are complemented by a group (typically 5 students) semester-long design and build Project-Based Laboratory (PBL). Students found this format enjoyable and stimulating, and examples of PBL outcomes that the Panel saw during the laboratory tour (in several different subject areas) demonstrated that impressive results are achieved. (The School has a large number of laboratories in total, so it was only possible to visit a subset during the laboratory tour, and selected examples of student PBLs.) Overall coverage of programme learning outcomes through the combination of traditionally taught lecture modules and more innovative laboratory modules appears to ensure that all AHEP Programme Learning Outcomes are delivered across the programme. The Panel were satisfied from discussions with staff at the staff meeting and from their scrutiny of syllabi that areas such as Ethical, Social, Environmental and Business/Commercial/Economic learning outcomes are covered, and some elective module options also add significant breadth and strength in these areas.

Commendable Aspects:	
2.1	The combination of traditional and PBL laboratory experiments in each Mody laboratory module achieves excellent coverage of Design and Engineering Practice programme learning outcomes and facilitates development of additional general skills.

3: Assessment

Comments

The Panel had some concerns about the standard of assessment of both exams and project work in the material that it reviewed, particularly for the minority of students whose performance is around threshold level.

With regard to exams, virtually all exams (including 3rd/4th year) have a format that includes a 'short questions' section that often consists of multiple-choice questions which mainly test basic recall. The second 'long questions' section (required by the Mody exam rules), which provides the opportunity to set longer and more open-ended integrated questions testing higher-level analytic, evaluative or design-oriented questions is also often broken down into unrelated sub-questions. The Panel would like to see more evidence of higher-level learning outcomes being tested in exams.

With regard to project work (including the capstone project, semester 7 minor project and PBLs), the Panel was impressed with the quality of outcomes achieved by most students but considered that work is marked excessively generously for those students who are closer to threshold level. For example, the 10 projects reviewed (including 5 that were amongst the best in the year and the 5 weakest), all achieved marks that were in the range 80-95%, despite the fact that in the Panel's view, the 5 weakest were judged to be no higher than threshold pass standard, and generally described work that was limited, incomplete, unsuccessful, relatively trivial or survey material lacking any substantive practical project work. A similar pattern was observed across the extensive range of PBL laboratory work, where the spread of marks observed over several hundred submissions was 73-94% against a formal Mody University threshold pass level of D (equivalent to 40%). The Panel would expect that the distribution of project and PBL marks should at least cover a distribution of 60-95% for consistency with other Indian IET-accredited institutions, as this may affect the threshold at which accreditation can be awarded.

PBL Laboratory and project work currently involves several examples of group work (which is beneficial), however the capstone (semester 8) project format has this year been revised from being predominantly group-based (in groups of 2-3) to being an individual project, which the Panel commends. At present, assessment arrangements for groupwork do not meet IET expectations that they should include a significant individual student mark element evidenced by separate justification of their contribution to the group activity within the marking criteria. In addition, the IET would wish to see evidence of students' individual contributions to group projects through attributions of different report sections to the student responsible for their content, and/or inclusion of a project plan showing the allocation of project roles and activities to each member of the group.

Commendable Aspects:

3.1	The Panel commends the School's decision to switch the capstone project to being an individual project and its intention to extend it in due course to become a 2-semester (7 and 8) project instead of separate minor and capstone projects in semesters 7 & 8.

Recommendations for Change:

3.1	Exam papers in years 3/4 need to provide better coverage of higher level LOs through longer integrated questions, particularly in Analysis, Design and Engineering Practice, and to reduce reliance on Multiple Choice Questions (MCQs) testing simple recall of facts.

3.2	There is a need to toughen up all project and PBL marking (which is over-generous at the lower end of student achievement) to align with award thresholds elsewhere in Indian higher education.
3.3	Marksheets need to provide explicit allocation, justification and evidence for individual student mark elements of groupwork in PBLs, the minor project (and the capstone project if any continue to be undertaken in groups).

4: Projects

Comments
The Panel noted that from 2019-20 all capstone projects in semester 8 will be undertaken by students individually. Currently some use is made of external examiners to mark projects although this is not required for IET accreditation, and this arrangement is also potentially inequitable to students (as some will benefit from independent external marking of their project while others do not). Project marksheets that the Panel reviewed provided limited textual justification for marks awarded against each of the current marking criteria and did not appear to include a criterion for technical achievement. Some review of the marking template is suggested to encourage more detailed comments justifying all marks awarded (and hence an increased range of project marks, particularly at the lower end of the marks distribution). In most of the capstone projects reviewed there was evidence of submission to Turnitin through plagiarism reports. The Panel was concerned that several of these reports showed matches of >20%, which suggests that significant portions of the report are not the students own work. The Panel also noted that it was commonplace for diagrams from external sources to be included in reports without attribution, which is also a form of plagiarism (and copyright violation) and should be rectified in future.

Recommendations for Change:	
4.1	The project marking process needs to ensure that full double blind marking is completed before moderation commences (e.g. averaging of marks where similar), and that each examiner provides independent textual justification for all marks awarded.
4.2	The Panel understands that a third marking/moderation process is in place for use when the two project examiners marks differ significantly but saw no examples of this during its visit. The School needs to make clear within documentation for the accreditation visit how moderation arrangements for disparate project marks (>10% difference between the two examiners) are resolved.
4.3	Any group project work (whether PBL, minor or capstone project) requires a substantial individual mark element (as well as a group mark), with clear criteria and documented evidence to justify marks.
4.4	The School should revise its plagiarism guidance to students to reduce the acceptable plagiarism threshold, the Panel would recommend it is reduced to <15% (several of the sampled projects had plagiarism levels above 20%), as this would be more in line with common practice.
4.5	The Panel can confirm that external examiners are not needed for project marking to meet IET accreditation requirements (but that their role could beneficially be reassigned to exam moderation, see criterion 8).

4.6	The Panel recommends that a project handbook is developed to include all project information required by students, including project process stages, project document templates for all assessment submissions, marking criteria, timetable etc (most of which are currently available but as separate documents).

5: Student Support and Staffing

Comments
Student support is an area of considerable strength for the School, and has many commendable features listed below. Industry engagement with the department is exemplary, with a number of specialist programme options developed in conjunction with industry partners and part-taught by them. Currently there is no formal Industrial Advisory Board (IAB), but the University is in the process of developing an industry incubation centre and this may provide an opportunity to implement IAB-style industry involvement through incubator activities such as workshops, an annual conference to which all industry partners are invited etc.

Commendable Aspects:	
5.1	Internship arrangements and high student take-up of internship opportunities, leading to high placement/employment rate of graduates
5.2	Excellent progressive employability support provided from year 1 onwards by the Careers Development unit
5.3	Impressive support from industry both for programme review and development and for substantial contributions to a number of taught modules and specialist options
5.4	Mentor support arrangements for all students that are effective and much appreciated by students
5.5	Good student/staff ratio overall (10:1) with appropriate laboratory technical and postgraduate demonstrator support
5.6	Numerous well-resourced laboratories providing ample laboratory experience for all students
5.7	Blackboard VLE provides all required lecture and laboratory resources online, although coursework submission and marking are all completed on paper at present (except for Turnitin plagiarism checks).
5.8	Online student feedback system comprehensively used to provide per-semester feedback. Online complaints mechanism for resolving more immediate problems (provided using software developed as extra-curricular activities in SW development labs by students)
5.9	The Panel notes that currently 9/33 members listed in advisory visit documentation (about 50% of total SET academics are included in this list) are IET members and commends this. The School is encouraged to continue to support and develop professional body membership and registration.

6: Resources and Facilities

Comments
Generally well resourced; too many different subjects to see all labs. Most labs have up to date facilities and offer excellent PBL opportunities, but a few could be more imaginative or are based on outdated standards.

Commendable Aspects:	
6.1	The university appears to be well resourced throughout, with an impressive campus and generous provision and equipping of student laboratories.

7: Quality Assurance and Enhancement

Comments
Currently, external examiners at Mody are appointed to write 1 of 3 alternative exam papers for each module, and also act as examiners for some capstone projects (neither of which is required to meet IET accreditation requirements). However, they do not moderate (review and revise if required) exam papers (which is completed internally), nor provide oversight and commentary (including an annual report) on the overall standards of the programmes for which accreditation is sought. These roles (providing independent confirmation of the standard of the School's awards) need to be introduced before accreditation by the IET can be granted. Draft documentation and guidance on the expected role and activities of External Examiners/Moderators is available from the IET. Students undertaking the recently approved 3+1+1 joint programme with France are probably not accreditable without an IET visit to France because the IET would need to see final year BTech content (in France) first hand and could not reasonably APL a final year programme. Curriculum mapping documents for the 1+1 in France are needed to check further.

Commendable Aspects:	
7.1	University processes are generally well defined and consistently implemented in all areas, providing a sound framework on which the School builds its departmental processes
7.2	University examination memoranda of rules and processes (MORPs) provide a sound permissive framework on which external review of examination and moderation can be developed to meet IET accreditation requirements.

Recommendations for Change:	
7.1	The role of external examiner/moderator needs to be developed and the process defined, building on elements already in place and/or facilitated by current university processes, before accreditation can be awarded. An IET draft guidance document is available to support this process.
7.2	The recently approved 3+1+1 joint programme with Hautes Etudes d'Ingenieur, Lille, France will probably require an IET visit if accreditation is to be extended to include students undertaking this scheme. In addition, a full mapping of AHEP outcomes achieved on the 1+1 elements of the scheme will be needed to confirm award of the BTech from Mody University.

Overall Summary and Recommendations

The Panel is of the opinion that the School of Engineering and Technology programmes are suitable for accreditation subject to the recommendations above. The University is advised that it should be able to demonstrate progress in addressing the issues raised in this report, in particular with respect to the recommendations concerning external examining arrangements and project threshold standards prior to the accreditation visit. With this in mind, the Panel recommends that the University aims for a full accreditation visit in the Autumn of 2020.

The University is advised to consult with its IET Accreditation Advisor in the development of its submission. The advisor will be happy to clarify the recommendations in this report and advise upon any plans that the University is developing to address the issues raised.