Between ABET and EUR-ACE Accreditation: A Decision-Oriented Framework for Engineering Programs Outside the U.S. and Europe

Article history
Received
12 November 2025
Received in revised form
8 January 2026
Accepted
21 February 2026
Published online
26 June 2026

Faical Mnif [a*]
[a] *Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat, Oman*
**mnif@squ.edu.om*

Abstract
Engineering program accreditation plays a critical role in assuring educational quality, supporting graduate mobility, and enhancing institutional credibility in an increasingly globalized higher education landscape. Among the most influential accreditation systems worldwide, ABET and the EUR-ACE® label represent distinct accreditation paradigms shaped by different professional, academic, and governance traditions. While both frameworks are widely adopted beyond their regions of origin, institutions outside the United States and Europe face limited guidance in selecting the accreditation pathway that best aligns with their mission, graduate trajectories, and external environment. This study addresses this gap through a qualitative, document-based comparative analysis of ABET and EUR-ACE accreditation frameworks. Official accreditation criteria, policy documents, and peer-reviewed literature are systematically analyzed to examine differences in accreditation philosophy, student outcome structures, recognition mechanisms, and mobility pathways. Rather than ranking the two systems, the study develops a decision-oriented analytical framework that supports strategic accreditation choice based on institutional objectives, labor-market orientation, and academic mobility considerations. The analysis shows that while ABET is strongly aligned with professional practice and industry recognition, EUR-ACE is more closely embedded in academic mobility and qualification transparency within the European Higher Education Area. The proposed framework provides institutional leaders and policymakers with a structured tool to align accreditation decisions with regional context and long-term strategic goals.

Keywords: Engineering accreditation; ABET; EUR-ACE®; decision-oriented framework; international engineering programs; graduate mobility; quality assurance; accreditation strategy.

List of Abbreviations

- **ABET** – Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology
- **EUR-ACE** – European Accredited Engineer
- **ENAEE** – European Network for Accreditation of Engineering Education
- **ENQA** – European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education
- **EHEA** – European Higher Education Area
- **EQF** – European Qualifications Framework
- **ECTS** – European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System
- **ESG** – Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area
- **IEA** – International Engineering Alliance
- **WA** or **Washington Accord** – Washington Accord (spell out first, then acronym if used)
- **SO** – Student Outcomes
- **CQI** – Continuous Quality Improvement
- **GCC** – Gulf Cooperation Council
- **MENA** – Middle East and North Africa

Introduction

Engineering education is widely recognized as a strategic driver of national development, industrial productivity, and technological innovation. As economies transition toward knowledge-intensive and digitally interconnected models, the demand for engineers capable of working across borders, collaborating in heterogeneous teams, and solving complex, real-world problems has increased significantly (UNESCO, 2021; OECD, 2019). In this context, ensuring that engineering graduates possess the required competencies is not only a matter of institutional accountability but also a structural requirement for national competitiveness. Accreditation frameworks function as formal assurance mechanisms that verify the quality, relevance, and consistency of engineering programs. They assess whether programs achieve expected learning outcomes, maintain academic rigor, provide adequate laboratory and design experiences, and

Mnif. F. (2026), Between ABET and EUR-ACE Accreditation: A Decision-Oriented Framework for Engineering Programs Outside the U.S. and Europe, *ASEAN Journal of Engineering Education*, 10(1), 124-134. https://doi.org/10.11113/ajee2026.10n1.205

operate under effective internal quality systems (Dill & Beerkens, 2010; ENQA, 2015).

Among the various accreditation models that have gained international prominence, ABET (formerly the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology) and EUR-ACE® (administered by the European Network for Accreditation of Engineering Education, ENAEE) stand as the two most influential and widely recognized frameworks. While ABET originated in the United States and EUR-ACE emerged within the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), both now operate transnationally and are increasingly sought by engineering programs outside their regions of origin (Augusti, 2008; Campbell & Wolfenden, 2016). Their influence extends across Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East, where institutions pursue accreditation both to strengthen internal quality practices and to enhance graduate mobility in an increasingly competitive global labor market (Knight, 2013; Al-Yahya & Barrage, 2010).

Despite shared objectives, ABET and EUR-ACE are grounded in distinct policy environments, educational traditions, and strategic orientations. ABET accreditation reflects the North American emphasis on outcomes-based assessment, program-level continuous improvement, and alignment with professional engineering practice (Lattuca et al., 2006; Rogers, 2006). It is closely linked to professional licensure pathways, industry expectations, and longstanding relationships between academia and professional engineering societies. The ABET framework defines student competencies in terms of problem-solving ability, design capacity, ethical awareness, teamwork, communication skills, lifelong learning, and contemporary technical knowledge (ABET, 2024). Its global recognition is reinforced by alignment with multinational engineering employers and with international agreements such as the Washington Accord, which promotes mutual recognition of accredited engineering qualifications (International Engineering Alliance, 2021).

In contrast, EUR-ACE is situated within the Bologna Process, which seeks to harmonize higher education structures across Europe through comparable degree cycles, qualification frameworks, and credit transfer mechanisms (Clarke, 2021; European Commission, 2020). The EUR-ACE label emphasizes academic transparency, mobility, and compatibility across national education systems rather than professional licensure alone. The framework specifies program requirements at both Bachelor and Master levels and aligns expected learning outcomes with the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) and the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) (ENAEE, 2023; ENQA, 2015). As such, EUR-ACE situates engineering programs within a broader governance architecture designed to promote student mobility, mutual recognition of academic credentials, and structured progression to advanced studies across Europe (Maffioli & Augusti, 2003; Augusti, 2008).

For engineering programs outside Europe and the United States, the choice between ABET and EUR-ACE is not merely technical. It represents a strategic institutional decision shaped by national policy priorities, graduate mobility patterns, labor market orientation, industry partnerships, and aspirations for international visibility. Institutions in the Gulf region and parts of Asia, for example, have adopted ABET accreditation to strengthen recognition among international employers and align curricula with global industry standards (Al-Yahya & Barrage, 2010). In contrast, universities in North Africa, Turkey, and parts of Eastern Europe have increasingly turned to EUR-ACE to support student mobility into European master's and doctoral programs and to align with regional higher education convergence policies (Campbell & Wolfenden, 2016; Clarke, 2021).

Despite the growing importance of this strategic choice, comparative studies of ABET and EUR-ACE remain limited in analytical depth. Existing discussions tend to focus on procedural characteristics, surface-level criteria, or isolated institutional experiences. What is largely missing is a structured analysis that situates both accreditation systems within their broader governance logics, accreditation philosophies, and graduate mobility frameworks. This gap is significant, as accreditation decisions influence not only curriculum design and assessment practices but also institutional identity, international partnerships, recognition pathways, and long-term strategic positioning (Hazelkorn, 2015; Marginson, 2016).

At the same time, the global shift toward competency-based engineering education has further increased the strategic importance of accreditation. As engineering programs place greater emphasis on problem solving, interdisciplinary collaboration, and real-world design, accreditation frameworks function not only as compliance instruments but also as drivers of curricular reform and organizational change (Jesiek et al., 2010). In this context, accreditation choice shapes how institutions define learning outcomes, engage with industry, and support graduate trajectories (Crawley et al., 2014; Walther & Radcliffe, 2007).

Against this background, this paper examines ABET and EUR-ACE as global models of engineering accreditation through a comparative and decision-oriented lens. The analysis focuses on their philosophical and policy foundations, student outcome structures, approaches to recognition and mobility, and the implications of these differences for engineering programs operating outside the United States and Europe. Rather than ranking the two systems or proposing their integration, the study aims to clarify how their distinct orientations align with different institutional missions and external environments.

Methodologically, the study adopts a qualitative, document-based comparative approach, drawing on official accreditation frameworks and peer-reviewed literature. The contribution of the paper lies in conceptualizing accreditation choice as a form of institutional positioning and in proposing a decision-oriented analytical framework to support universities, accreditation committees, and policymakers in aligning accreditation pathways with institutional objectives and regional contexts.

Accreditation Philosophies: Foundations and Governance Logics

This study adopts a qualitative, document-based comparative approach. The analysis draws on official accreditation criteria, policy documents, and peer-reviewed literature to examine the philosophical foundations, governance logics, and outcome structures of ABET and EUR-ACE. The comparison proceeds through thematic identification of key accreditation dimensions, followed by cross-framework mapping and interpretive synthesis. The objective is not to evaluate or rank accreditation systems, but to support strategic accreditation decision-making for engineering programs operating outside the United States and Europe.

Although ABET and EUR-ACE are both designed to assure the quality of engineering education, they are grounded in distinct historical trajectories and policy environments. These differences shape how each framework defines engineering competence, professional identity, and institutional accountability. Understanding these underlying philosophies is important because accreditation is not merely a technical procedure. It reflects broader assumptions about the role of engineers in society and the relationship between universities, professional practice, and governance systems.

The ABET Model: Professional Competence and Continuous Improvement

ABET emerged in the early twentieth century in parallel with industrial expansion and the professionalization of engineering in the United States. Its foundational logic is rooted in engineering as a regulated profession, where competence is demonstrated through standardized preparation, ethical responsibility, and alignment with professional practice (Lattuca et al., 2006).

Within this model, accreditation emphasizes professional readiness, problem solving and design capability, outcomes-based assessment, and continuous quality improvement. Graduates are expected to enter engineering practice with the technical, analytical, and professional skills required for immediate contribution. Continuous improvement is treated as an institutional obligation, supported by systematic assessment and evidence-based decision making (Rogers, 2006).

This orientation positions the university as responsible for producing engineers who are technically proficient, ethically grounded, communicatively effective, and capable of sustained professional growth. Accordingly, ABET student outcomes foreground analytical reasoning, engineering design under realistic constraints, experimentation and data interpretation, teamwork, communication, professional responsibility, and lifelong learning. Quality, in this framework, is demonstrated when measurable learning outcomes align with professional competencies and are reinforced through documented cycles of assessment and improvement.

The EUR-ACE Model: Academic Mobility, Transparency, and Harmonization

EUR-ACE emerged from a different historical and policy context, namely the Bologna Process and the development of the European Higher Education Area. Its primary objective is to harmonize diverse national higher education systems in order to promote transparency, comparability of qualifications, and academic mobility across borders (Clarke, 2021; ENQA, 2015).

Rather than being anchored in professional licensure systems, EUR-ACE is grounded in qualifications frameworks and degree-cycle compatibility at the Bachelor and Master levels. Emphasis is placed on clarity of intended learning outcomes, coherence of curricula within degree structures, and alignment with European mechanisms such as the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System and the European Qualifications Framework.

Within this perspective, the engineer is conceived as a knowledge professional operating within a transnational academic space. Professional and design competencies are included, but they are embedded within a broader educational architecture oriented toward intellectual development, transparency of qualifications, and structured academic progression, particularly toward graduate studies.

Philosophical Contrast Between ABET and EUR-ACE

Although both accreditation systems aim to ensure high-quality engineering education, they reflect different governance logics and educational rationalities. ABET is closely aligned with professional practice and labour market signalling, while EUR-ACE is embedded in a framework of academic harmonization and mobility. These contrasts influence curriculum design, assessment practices, and the professional identity of graduates.

Table 1 summarizes the main philosophical differences between the two frameworks and

highlights how their distinct orientations translate into different strategic values for institutions.

Table1: Philosophical Foundations of ABET and EUR-ACE Accreditation Frameworks

Dimension	ABET	EUR-ACE
Historical Root	Professional engineering practice in the U.S.	Harmonization of European higher education systems
Primary Orientation	Professional readiness and competency demonstration	Academic transparency and international mobility
Methodology	Outcomes-based assessment + continuous improvement cycles	Qualification descriptors + alignment with Bologna and EQF
Identity of Engineer	Practice-ready professional capable of immediate engineering work	Knowledge professional progressing through structured academic and professional pathways
Strategic Value	Strong recognition by global employers and licensing bodies	Strong recognition for academic mobility and degree equivalence

The choice between the two systems is therefore not one of superiority, but of alignment. Each framework serves institutions differently depending on mission, graduate trajectories, and regional priorities.

Implications for Institutions Outside the United States and Europe

For institutions operating outside the United States and Europe, the philosophical differences between ABET and EUR-ACE take on strategic significance. Accreditation functions as a signalling mechanism through which institutions align themselves with particular academic or industrial ecosystems and shape the professional and educational trajectories of their graduates. In practice, this choice affects curriculum priorities, industry engagement strategies, student career pathways, and international collaboration networks.

Student Outcomes and Graduate Formation

Although both ABET and EUR-ACE adopt outcomes-based approaches, the structure, emphasis, and interpretation of outcomes differ. ABET articulates outcomes at the program level, while EUR-ACE defines outcomes at the qualification level, linked to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) Level 6, which corresponds to the first cycle (Bachelor) in the Bologna structure. The comparison below clarifies how each framework conceptualizes the graduate engineer. The comparison below clarifies how each framework conceptualizes the graduate engineer.

ABET Student Outcomes (EAC, 2024)

A core element of comparison between ABET and EUR-ACE lies in how each framework defines the learning outcomes that engineering graduates must achieve. These outcomes reflect deeper assumptions about the formation of the engineer, the balance between theory and practice, and the role of the university in preparing graduates for professional and academic trajectories.

Graduates of an ABET-accredited engineering program must demonstrate the ability to achieve the following outcomes as detailed in Table 2, which presents the seven student outcomes (SO1–SO7) that structure outcomes-based assessment in ABET-accredited engineering programs.

Table 2: ABET Student Outcomes (SO1–SO7): Core Competencies in Engineering Education

Code	ABET Student Outcome
SO1	Identify, formulate, and solve complex engineering problems using principles of engineering, science, and mathematics.
SO2	Apply engineering design to produce solutions that meet specified needs with consideration of public health, safety, welfare, and global, cultural, social, environmental, and economic factors.
SO3	Communicate effectively with a range of audiences.
SO4	Recognize ethical and professional responsibilities and make informed judgments considering global, economic, environmental, and societal impacts.
SO5	Function effectively on teams to establish goals, plan tasks, and create a collaborative environment.
SO6	Develop and conduct experimentation, analyze and interpret data, and use engineering judgment to draw conclusions.
SO7	Acquire and apply new knowledge as needed, using appropriate learning strategies.

These outcomes foreground analytical reasoning, engineering design under realistic constraints, experimentation and data interpretation, teamwork, communication, professional responsibility, and lifelong learning. Within the ABET framework, quality is demonstrated when these outcomes are measurably achieved and reinforced through documented cycles of assessment and continuous improvement.

EUR-ACE Bachelor (First Cycle) Expected Learning Outcomes

Graduates awarded the EUR-ACE Bachelor label must demonstrate outcomes in six domains (ENAEE, 2023):

1. Knowledge and Understanding
2. Engineering Analysis
3. Engineering Design
4. Investigations
5. Engineering Practice
6. Transferable Skills

These domains collectively define the expected profile of the first-cycle engineering graduate within the Bologna architecture. They emphasize analytical reasoning, structured design practice, investigative capacity, and transferable skills that support both academic progression and entry into professional environments. Unlike ABET, where outcomes are expressed as program-level capabilities, EUR-ACE outcomes are embedded in a broader qualifications framework that links degrees, learning levels, and mobility pathways across national higher education systems. This structural positioning enables the EUR-ACE label to function not only as an indicator of program quality, but also as a mechanism of academic transparency and portability across the European Higher Education Area.

Comparative Mapping (Bachelor Level)

To clarify how these two frameworks align in practice, the following comparison maps ABET's seven student outcomes to the six EUR-ACE outcome domains at the Bachelor (first-cycle) level, highlighting points of convergence as well as differences in emphasis and interpretation. Table 3 provides a comparative mapping between ABET student outcomes and the EUR-ACE Bachelor-level outcome domains, illustrating areas of convergence as well as differences in framing and educational emphasis.

Table 3: Comparative Mapping Between ABET Student Outcomes and EUR-ACE Bachelor Domains

ABET Outcome	**Corresponding EUR-ACE Outcome Domain(s)**	**Interpretation**
SO1: Solve complex engineering problems using math, science, and engineering principles.	Knowledge and Understanding + Engineering Analysis	Strong alignment. Both frameworks require analytical competence rooted in scientific and mathematical foundations.
SO2: Apply engineering design considering constraints and broader impacts.	Engineering Design + Engineering Practice	Equivalent emphasis on design as an iterative process; EUR-ACE more explicitly links design to context of professional practice.
SO3: Communicate effectively.	Transferable Skills	Identical intent; EUR-ACE frames communication as part of transversal professional skills.
SO4: Recognize ethical and professional responsibilities; consider impacts.	Engineering Practice + Transferable Skills	ABET articulates ethics explicitly; in EUR-ACE ethics is embedded within responsible practice and professional conduct.
SO5: Function effectively on teams.	Transferable Skills	Full convergence; teamwork and collaboration are core transferable skills in both systems.
SO6: Conduct experiments and interpret data.	Investigations	Perfect one-to-one alignment; EUR-ACE explicitly defines investigative skills as experimental, analytical, and data-driven inquiry.
SO7: Acquire new knowledge using appropriate learning strategies.	**Transferable Skills** (lifelong learning capacity)	Both frameworks emphasize self-directed learning; EUR-ACE ties it to mobility and academic progression.

Overall, the two frameworks exhibit substantial conceptual convergence in analytical capability, design practice, experimentation, communication, teamwork, and lifelong learning. The primary difference lies not in the competencies themselves, but in how they are framed and situated within broader educational architectures. ABET positions outcomes in relation to professional readiness and a practice-oriented engineering identity, whereas EUR-ACE embeds outcomes within the qualification and mobility logic of the Bologna Process.

This difference reflects distinct strategic orientations. ABET outcomes are aligned with professional employability and practice-readiness, supporting transitions from university to industrial and professional environments. EUR-ACE outcomes, by contrast, support academic mobility and degree comparability, ensuring that first-cycle graduates are positioned to progress into Master's and doctoral programs within the Bologna framework. Structurally, ABET defines a fixed set of student outcomes applicable across engineering programs, while EUR-ACE integrates outcomes into a qualifications framework that allows alignment with national and institutional contexts.

For institutions operating outside the United States and Europe, these differences translate into distinct forms of graduate positioning and program governance. ABET's standardized outcomes require sustained internal assessment cycles, documentation practices, and evidence-driven continuous improvement processes. EUR-ACE, while also outcomes-based, allows alignment with national qualification descriptors, offering greater flexibility in mapping curricula to expected graduate profiles. The choice between frameworks therefore influences not only graduate trajectories, but also institutional planning, assessment culture, and the organization of academic quality management.

Recognition, Mobility and International Positioning

While the previous sections examined the philosophical and pedagogical foundations of ABET and EUR-ACE, this section focuses on how accreditation choices translate into international recognition, graduate mobility, and institutional positioning. For many institutions outside the United States and Europe, these considerations play a decisive role in selecting an accreditation pathway. Accreditation functions not only as an internal quality assurance mechanism, but also as a signal interpreted by employers, regulators, universities, and professional bodies in global academic and labour markets.

Global Recognition Pathways

ABET and the Washington Accord: ABET accreditation is formally recognized within the framework of the Washington Accord, an international agreement that establishes substantial equivalence of accredited engineering degrees across its signatory countries (IEA, 2021). Current signatories include major engineering economies such as the United States, Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, Japan, South Korea, and Singapore. This recognition implies that graduates of ABET-accredited programs are generally considered to have met the academic requirements for professional engineering licensure in these jurisdictions, often without the need for additional credential evaluation.

As a result, ABET accreditation holds particular relevance in contexts where graduates seek employment in multinational firms, where engineering practice is regulated, or where national professional bodies align their standards with internationally recognized industrial frameworks.

EUR-ACE and the European Higher Education Area: EUR-ACE operates within the Bologna Process and the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), which harmonizes degree structures and quality standards across 49 countries (European Commission, 2020). The EUR-ACE label ensures that accredited programs are aligned with EQF Level 6 at the Bachelor level and are compatible with Bologna degree cycles. Consequently, EUR-ACE-accredited degrees are readily recognized for admission into Master's and doctoral programs across Europe, support academic mobility through ECTS compatibility, and facilitate entry into professional qualification pathways linked to European frameworks.

In this sense, EUR-ACE is particularly advantageous for institutions seeking integration into Bologna-aligned academic networks and collaborative higher education initiatives.

Employer and Industry Perception

Where ABET's recognition is driven primarily by professional practice and licensure pathways, EUR-ACE's visibility is more closely associated with academic comparability and mobility within Europe. Table 4 compares how ABET and EUR-ACE accreditation are perceived by employers and professional environments, particularly with respect to industry visibility, practice-readiness, and alignment with licensure systems.

Table 4: Recognition and Professional Alignment of ABET and EUR-ACE Accreditation Systems

Aspect	ABET	EUR-ACE
Recognition by Multinational Engineering Firms	High (strong industry visibility, especially in GCC/Asia/Africa)	Moderate to High (stronger in Europe, less universal outside)

Signalling of Practice-Ready Skills	Strong emphasis	Present but embedded within broader academic outcomes
Alignment with Engineering Licensure and Professional Registration	Direct (ABET criteria often referenced by licensing bodies)	Indirect (depends on national professional regulations)

In many regions outside Europe, ABET carries stronger employer recognition due to its long-standing association with global industry hiring practices. EUR-ACE, while well regarded academically, has more limited industrial branding outside European contexts.

Mobility and Institutional Positioning Outside the United States and Europe

The recognition logics of ABET and EUR-ACE shape not only how degrees are perceived, but also the types of mobility they enable. To distinguish the types of graduate mobility enabled by each accreditation framework, Table 5 contrasts professional and academic mobility pathways associated with ABET and EUR-ACE.

Table 5: Mobility Pathways Enabled by ABET and EUR-ACE Accreditation

Mobility Type	ABET	EUR-ACE
Professional Mobility (cross-border work as an engineer)	Supported via Washington Accord	Indirect — depends on country and professional engineering council recognition
Academic Mobility (admissions to graduate programs)	Recognized, but not embedded in a system-wide degree framework	Strongly supported via Bologna / EQF / ECTS

For institutions outside the United States and Europe, these mobility patterns translate into strategic positioning choices. ABET tends to support professional mobility by facilitating transitions into regulated engineering practice and multinational industrial environments. EUR-ACE, by contrast, strengthens academic mobility by embedding degrees within a harmonized European qualifications structure that supports progression into graduate studies across the EHEA. Table 6 aligns common institutional strategies with the accreditation framework most likely to support them, emphasizing how ABET and EUR-ACE function as signals within different professional and academic ecosystems.

Table 6: Alignment of Institutional Strategies with ABET and EUR-ACE Accreditation Pathways

Institutional Strategy	Best Fit	Reason
Becoming an internationally competitive engineering school with strong industry pipelines	ABET	Reflects global industry expectations and practice-ready emphasis
Integrating with European research networks, student exchange alliances, and double-degree programs	EUR-ACE	Aligns with Bologna mobility systems and academic recognition
Serving domestic or regional markets with limited outbound mobility	Either	Decision depends on regulator preference and employer culture

Accreditation thus functions as a signalling mechanism through which institutions align themselves with particular professional or academic ecosystems. The selected framework shapes how graduates are positioned within labour markets or academic systems and influences institutional identity in international higher education landscapes.

Cost, Duration, Visibility, and Market Acceptance

Beyond recognition and mobility, institutions must consider the operational implications of accreditation. ABET accreditation typically involves higher direct costs, extensive documentation requirements, and sustained continuous improvement processes that require dedicated internal capacity. These demands are often justified by the strong global visibility of the ABET label and its recognition in international engineering labour markets.

EUR-ACE accreditation is frequently administered through national or regional quality assurance agencies authorized by ENAEE, which can reduce cost and procedural complexity, particularly in systems already aligned with the Bologna framework. Table 7 outlines key operational characteristics of ABET and EUR-ACE accreditation, including accreditation cycles, cost structure, visibility, and links to professional regulation.

Table 7: Operational Frameworks of ABET and EUR-ACE Accreditation

Dimension	ABET	EUR-ACE	Comparative Implication
Accreditation Cycle Length	6 years (typical), with interim visits possible	5 years (most agencies), aligned to EQF cycles	EUR-ACE cycles are slightly shorter due to Bologna harmonization
Time to First Accreditation (process duration)	18–36 months depending on readiness	12–24 months depending on agency and regional alignment	ABET tends to be more exhaustive and slower
Cost Structure	Generally higher: evaluation fees + team travel + documentation preparation + sustained CQI system costs	Generally lower, particularly when conducted by national or regional agencies authorized by ENAEE	ABET is a financial investment, EUR-ACE is relatively cost-efficient
Visibility in Global Industry & Multinational Firms	Very High, especially in GCC, Asia, Africa, and Anglo-influenced markets	High within Europe, moderate outside Europe	ABET has stronger hiring signal power in global industrial economies
Visibility in Academic Mobility Networks	Recognized, but not structurally embedded in multi-country academic exchange frameworks	Very High in EHEA through Bologna / ECTS / EQF	EUR-ACE is stronger for academic progression, ABET is stronger for workforce entry
Association with Professional Licensure	Direct via Washington Accord	Indirect – varies by national engineering bodies	ABET is the clearer route where engineering is a regulated profession
Perception in Emerging Economic Hubs (GCC, Turkey, India, SE Asia)	Extremely High – ABET is seen as the "global mark of engineering quality"	Growing but not equal in brand strength outside Europe	Brand-value favours ABET in non-European markets

Strategic Decision Framework for International Engineering Programs

For institutions outside the United States and Europe, the selection between ABET and EUR-ACE is a strategic positioning decision rather than a purely procedural one. Accreditation functions as a signal in international academic and labour markets, communicating how an engineering program aligns with professional practice, academic mobility, and institutional identity. The decision must therefore account for graduate destination profiles, institutional mission, regional economic context, and the financial and administrative capacity of the institution.

Key Decision Dimensions

The first decision dimension concerns graduate destination profiles. Institutions whose graduates predominantly enter professional engineering practice, particularly in regions integrated into global industrial and multinational labour markets, tend to benefit from the professional signalling power of ABET. In contrast, institutions whose graduates frequently pursue postgraduate studies, especially within Europe, may derive greater benefit from EUR-ACE due to its embedding within the Bologna architecture of academic recognition and mobility.

A second dimension is institutional identity and strategic orientation. Universities positioning themselves as practice-oriented engineering schools focused on applied problem solving, design competence, and industry engagement often find ABET aligned with their educational mission. Institutions emphasizing academic formation, research integration, and participation in European knowledge networks may find EUR-ACE more coherent with their long-term strategy.

A third dimension relates to regional economic and industrial geography. In regions where professional standards and labour markets are influenced by U.S. or Anglo-Saxon engineering norms, ABET generally carries stronger recognition among employers and professional bodies. In regions with strong cultural, academic, or regulatory ties to Europe, EUR-ACE aligns more naturally with prevailing qualification and mobility systems.

Financial and administrative capacity constitutes a fourth dimension. ABET typically requires higher investment in documentation, assessment infrastructure, and continuous improvement processes. EUR-ACE is often less costly and procedurally lighter, particularly when administered through ENAEE-authorized national agencies, making it more accessible for institutions at earlier stages of quality assurance development.

Decision Matrix for Accreditation Selection

Synthesizing the preceding analysis, Table 8 presents a decision-oriented framework that supports institutions in selecting an accreditation pathway aligned with graduate trajectories, institutional mission, and regional context.

Table 8. Decision-Oriented Framework for Selecting ABET or EUR-ACE

Decision Criterion	ABET	EUR-ACE
Primary graduate destination	Professional engineering practice	Graduate studies and academic mobility
Institutional identity	Practice-oriented, industry-facing	Academically oriented, research-integrated
Recognition geography	Global industry and licensure markets	European Higher Education Area
Alignment with labour markets	Strong in multinational and regulated environments	Indirect, varies by national regulation
Academic mobility support	Present but not systemically embedded	Strong via Bologna, EQF, and ECTS
Administrative and financial demand	High	Moderate to low
Suitability for emerging QA systems	Demanding	More accessible

How Institutions Can Use the Framework

Institutions may apply this framework by assessing their position along each decision dimension and identifying where alignment is strongest. Where indicators consistently favour one framework, the accreditation choice becomes clear. In cases where institutional objectives and graduate trajectories are mixed, a phased or dual-alignment strategy may be appropriate, provided that regulatory and resource constraints permit such an approach.

Taken together, the framework emphasizes that the decision is not about accreditation superiority, but about coherence between accreditation logic, institutional mission, and the environments in which graduates will operate. ABET is generally advantageous for institutions prioritizing professional readiness and industrial recognition, while EUR-ACE is more coherent for institutions emphasizing academic mobility and integration into European higher education

Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

Engineering accreditation frameworks increasingly shape how institutions define their educational purposes, articulate institutional identity, and position graduates within global professional and academic landscapes. The comparison between ABET and EUR-ACE demonstrates that accreditation is not merely a quality assurance exercise, but a strategic decision that aligns universities with specific networks of recognition, mobility, and influence. ABET reflects a tradition of engineering as a regulated profession, emphasizing competence, ethical responsibility, problem-solving capability, and preparedness for industrial practice. EUR-ACE, by contrast, is rooted in the Bologna Process and focuses on transparency, comparability, and portability of engineering degrees within a harmonized academic space.

For universities outside the United States and Europe, the central question is therefore not which framework is intrinsically superior, but which more coherently aligns with institutional mission, graduate aspirations, regional economic structures, and patterns of international collaboration. Institutions operating in labour markets that prioritize applied engineering practice, multinational corporate employment, or professional licensure are likely to derive greater benefit from ABET, which enjoys strong global industry visibility and recognition through the Washington Accord. Conversely, institutions that are academically oriented, research-intensive, or integrated into European mobility and knowledge networks may find EUR-ACE more strategically appropriate, as it facilitates academic progression and situates degrees clearly within the European Qualifications Framework.

Accreditation selection should not be understood as a static or one-time choice. Institutional missions, graduate trajectories, and international partnerships evolve over time in response to national policy shifts and global mobility trends. Effective accreditation strategies are therefore dynamic and adaptive. In some contexts, EUR-ACE may serve as a foundational step toward strengthening internal quality assurance systems and regional recognition, with ABET pursued later once outcomes assessment cultures and

continuous improvement mechanisms are fully established. In other cases, dual or sequential accreditation strategies may be appropriate, particularly where institutions seek to support diverse graduate destinations while enhancing both industrial relevance and academic portability.

Clear policy implications follow from this analysis. National higher education authorities should avoid prescribing a single accreditation pathway as universally optimal. Instead, they should enable institutions to conduct structured self-assessments that consider graduate trajectories, industry demand, research integration, and international partnership ecosystems. Governments can support this process by funding accreditation readiness initiatives, investing in faculty development related to outcomes-based education, and strengthening national quality assurance frameworks that minimize duplication of evaluation efforts. Regional cooperation initiatives, particularly across MENA, African, and Asian higher education systems, can further enhance institutional capacity to engage with international accreditation systems in ways that align with national development priorities.

In conclusion, ABET and EUR-ACE each provide rigorous and internationally recognized frameworks for engineering education, yet they embody distinct philosophies and serve different strategic functions. The value of accreditation lies not in the label itself, but in the clarity of institutional purpose that emerges from the process of selecting, preparing for, and engaging with an accreditation system. Institutions that treat accreditation as a strategic instrument rather than a compliance obligation are better positioned to advance their educational mission, enhance graduate capability, and establish a coherent presence within the global landscape of engineering education and practice.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Sultan Qaboos University. The authors take full responsibility for the views and arguments expressed herein. Assistance from AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT) was limited strictly to language refinement and did not contribute to the intellectual content or structure of the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

ABET. (2024). Criteria for accrediting engineering programs. ABET.

Al-Yahya, S., & Barrage, J. (2010). Challenges of outcomes-based accreditation in the MENA region. Quality in Higher Education, 16(3), 231–245. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2010.506726

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution. UNESCO.

Augusti, G. (2008). Transnational accreditation and recognition in engineering education. European Journal of Engineering Education, 33(3), 285–295. https://doi.org/10.1080/03043790802088580

Campbell, D., & Wolfenden, F. (2016). Harmonization of engineering accreditation in Europe. Higher Education Policy, 29(4), 521–540. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-016-0015-7

Clarke, T. (2021). Bologna and the governance of higher education quality. Policy Reviews in Higher Education, 5(3), 287–310. https://doi.org/10.1080/23322969.2021.1894606

Crawley, E. F., Malmqvist, J., Östlund, S., & Brodeur, D. R. (2014). Rethinking engineering education: The CDIO approach (2nd ed.). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05561-9

Dill, D. D., & Beerkens, M. (2010). Public policy for academic quality: Analyses of innovative policy instruments. Springer.

Downey, G. L., Lucena, J. C., Moskal, B. M., Parkhurst, R., Bigley, T., Hays, C., Jesiek, B. K., Kelly, L., Miller, J., Ruff, S., Lehr, J. L., & Nichols-Belo, A. (2006). The globally competent engineer. Journal of Engineering Education, 95(2), 107–122. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2006.tb00883.x

ENAEE. (2023). EUR-ACE® framework standards and guidelines (EAFSG). European Network for Accreditation of Engineering Education.

ENQA. (2015). Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education.

European Commission. (2020). The European Higher Education Area in 2020: Bologna process implementation report. Publications Office of the European Union.

Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2003). Designing and teaching courses to satisfy the ABET engineering criteria. Journal of Engineering Education, 92(1), 7–25. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2003.tb00734.x

Grasso, D., & Martinelli, D. (2007). Holistic engineering education. In D. Grasso & M. B. Burkins (Eds.), Holistic engineering education (pp. 1–9). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-73329-0_1

Hazelkorn, E. (2015). Rankings and the reshaping of higher education: The battle for world-class excellence (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

International Engineering Alliance. (2021). Graduate attributes and professional competencies. IEA.

Jesiek, B. K., Borrego, M., & Beddoes, K. (2010). Advancing global engineering education research. European Journal of Engineering Education, 35(2), 117–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/03043791003703159

Kehm, B. M., & Stensaker, B. (2015). University rankings, diversity, and the new landscape of higher education. Palgrave Macmillan.

Knight, J. (2013). Transnational education and quality assurance. Journal of Studies in International Education, 17(2), 173–188. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315312472987

Lattuca, L. R., Terenzini, P. T., & Volkwein, J. F. (2006). Engineering change: A study of the impact of EC2000. ABET.

Maffioli, F., & Augusti, G. (2003). The EUR-ACE initiative: Accreditation of European engineering programmes. European Journal of Engineering Education, 28(2), 203–214. https://doi.org/10.1080/0304379031000079033

Marginson, S. (2016). Higher education and the common good. Melbourne University Press.

Materu, P. (2007). Higher education quality assurance in Sub-Saharan Africa: Status, challenges, opportunities, and promising practices. World Bank.

OECD. (2019). Benchmarking higher education system performance. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/be5514d7-en

Rogers, G. (2006). Outcomes-based assessment and continuous improvement of engineering programs. Journal of Engineering Education, 95(1), 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2006.tb00875.x

Teichler, U. (2019). Higher education and the changing labor market. European Journal of Higher Education, 44(1), 145–160.

UNESCO. (2021). Engineering for sustainable development: Delivering on the Sustainable Development Goals. UNESCO.

Walther, J., & Radcliffe, D. F. (2007). The competence dilemma in engineering education. Australasian Journal of Engineering Education, 13(1), 1–9.