



Response to ASIIN's Updated PWQC Evaluation Report

21st January 2021

**Chamber of Engineers | 127, Professional Centre, Sliema Road,
Gżira GZR 1633, Malta**

E-Mail: info@coe.org.mt | Telephone: +356 2133 4858



Background

Reference is being made to the Evaluation Report of the Pre-Warrant Qualifications Course¹, as prepared and revised by the ASIIN Consult and which was sent to the Chamber of Engineers (CoE) by the Engineering Profession Board (EPB) on 18th January 2021.

The CoE has provided consistent and timely feedback to this review process throughout the past 9 months out of dedication to our mission to effectively represent the Engineering Profession in Malta. We have done so while safeguarding its autonomous role and therefore the below statement will account for the respected reviewers' conclusions but will not discount from the organisation's recommendations throughout the process.

Reactions

The CoE is hereunder presenting its views on following ASIIN's updated evaluation, specifically Sections J and K, and the reactions can be summarised as follows:

1. The CoE acknowledges the progress obtained through this evaluation progress whereby the content of the study modules was drastically improved, and the engineering project was given a standalone component in the PWQC. The core content was updated to one which is exclusively academic, addressing fundamental gaps in mathematics and physics and ensuring formal time-constrained examinations. Additionally, the course length has been extended to 12 months as deemed only reasonable.
2. On a general perspective, the PWQC has reached an improved and consolidated state in serving as a bridge for the eligibility for the engineering warrant as opposed to the incomparable starting structure and the originally ambiguous objectives of the program.
3. The recommendation of having a larger engineering project (i.e. 20 ECTS) as part of the PWQC was not taken on board and the CoE registers this as an unattained requirement. However, the CoE takes note of the rationale of the peer panel in explaining why this recommendation was not merged within the peer's same recommendations and why 10ECTS is proposed as sufficient.
4. The CoE respectfully disagrees with the recommendation not to increase the project weighting, however, the organisation is not reducing any of the merits of the peer panel and maintains full respect to ASIIN as independent reviewers.
5. Given the above, the CoE respects the way forward recommended by ASIIN and agrees with the remainder requirements to be fulfilled by MCAST as stated by the consult in their latest report update – i.e. *The organizational and substantial alignment of the units and the engineering project needs to be appropriately ensured and plausibly demonstrated.*

¹ Reference is made to the revision of 18-JAN-2021 of the *Evaluation Report of the Pre-Warrant Qualifications Course*.



6. The CoE confirms its disposition to propose engineers as nominees (with minimum Masters & Industrial Experience) for the PWQC 'viva board panel' with the nomination being done by MCAST, aligning with ASIIN's recommendation about proposition vs. nomination and in spirit of supporting quality assurance in engineering education.
7. The CoE welcomes ASIIN's stance that the PWQC needs to be reviewed after the successful execution of the course to determine that the outcomes truly meet the intended objectives as presented by MCAST during this review process. This is important also in light of the fact that the units being based upon are originating from the B.Eng.(Hons.) courses which are also under the review of the consult.

Conclusive Remarks

The CoE feels it has managed to entrench many of its original requirements in the PWQC with a single requirement of the engineering project weighting not being taken on board, and therefore while considering these factors and the professional approach taken by the ASIIN consult, the CoE respects entirely the position taken by ASIIN.

The CoE anticipates that the consultants will perform a post-PWQC review which is commensurate with the rigourousness taken by the peer panel through this review process. This will provide the ultimate confidence for the PWQC students to approach the Engineering Profession Warrant.

Following conclusion of ASIIN's evaluation report of the PWQC, and prior to launch of the subject course, the CoE solicits the publication of the report in its entirety. Transparency and dissemination within the engineering profession community is considered a key requirement for the success of this review process.

In practice, the CoE has taken an active role to ensure a solution is found, and has contributed to this review process to the best of its abilities spearheaded by the mission to ensure that the access to the engineering profession warrant in Malta is available to candidates which achieve a desired level. The engineering profession advocates **only** the highest standards.