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Feedback from 2003

- What was most beneficial?
- What was least beneficial?
- How could training be improved?
- Other comments

Plan for the Session

- ABET Organization and Operation
- Roles and Responsibilities
- Engineering Criteria Compliance
- Accreditation Terminology
- Consistency Issues
- The Accreditation Process
Session Outcomes—Deans

As a result of participation in this session, institution deans will

- Understand the accreditation visit structure and organization
- Be familiar with common issues of compliance with Engineering Criteria
- Understand the processes by which accreditation actions are determined and their implications to the institution
- Continue to develop a working relationship with the visit team chair

Session Outcomes—Team Chairs

As a result of participation in this session, team chairs (TCs) will

- Be familiar with common issues of compliance with Engineering Criteria and their bearing on consistency of evaluation
- Continue to develop a working relationship with their deans
ABET and Responsibilities of Team Chairs and Institutions

ABET

- Primary organization responsible for monitoring, evaluating, and certifying the quality of applied science, computing, engineering, and engineering technology education in the United States
- Federation of 32 technical and professional societies representing over 1.8 million practicing professionals
ABET Governance

ABET Board

- Engineering Accreditation Commission
  - 1700 accredited programs at 343 institutions
- Technology Accreditation Commission
  - 679 accredited programs at 226 institutions
- Applied Science Accreditation Commission
  - 66 accredited programs at 48 institutions
- Computing Accreditation Commission
  - 197 accredited programs at 181 institutions

ABET

Engineering Accreditation Commission

Executive Committee
(4 Officers - 6 At-Large Members-1 Board Liaison (ex-officio))

- AAEE 3
- ACSM 1
- AIAA 3
- AICHE 4
- ANS 2
- ASAE 2
- ASCE 5
- ASEE 1
- ASME 5
- CSAB 1
- IEEE 5
- IIE 4
- NCEES 1
- NICE 1
- NSPE 1
- SAE 1
- SME 2
- SME-AIME 2
- SNAME 2
- SPE 2
- TMS 3

4 Officers
1 Board Liaison; 1 Public Member
51 Members, representing 22 Societies
36 From Educational Institutions
15 From Industry, Government, Private Practice
Conflict of Interest

- Expectations for ABET representatives
  - Behave ethically and professionally
  - Disclose real or perceived conflicts of interest
  - Recuse themselves from discussions or decisions related to real or perceived conflicts of interest

Confidentiality

- Information supplied by institution and derived from the visit is for confidential use of ABET and the Engineering Accreditation Commission
  - Institutions may choose to publish their own documents but not statements received from ABET
- ABET has specifically authorized Professional Societies to participate in the accreditation process
- General information about ABET is available on the ABET Web Site at http://www.abet.org
Responsibilities of Commissioners

- Commissioners have been selected to represent their professional societies on the Engineering Accreditation Commission
- In this capacity they:
  - Represent their professional societies and work with EAC colleagues from other professional societies
  - Represent ABET as a Team Chair (TC) on campus visits

Responsibilities of the Institution

- Implements engineering criteria
- Requests accreditation
- Prepares program self-study report
- Hosts visit
- Responds to reports
  - 14-day response to exit interview
  - Due-process response to Draft Statement
- Completes evaluation of team—prompted by e-mail from ABET HQ
Responsibilities of Societies

- Recommend program criteria
- Select, train, and mentor program evaluators
- Nominate members to the EAC
- Appoint representatives to ABET board of directors
- Consult with the EAC, as required

Role of Society Observer

- Experiential training prior to first “official” visit
- Aid program evaluator
- Limited participation in process
- Respond to society requirements
- Institution decides to accept or decline observers on the team
- Expenses paid by society or observer, not by ABET
Compliance with the Criteria

Objectives of Accreditation

(1) Assure that graduates of an accredited program are adequately prepared to enter and continue the practice of engineering
(2) Stimulate the improvement of engineering education
(3) Encourage new and innovative approaches to engineering education and its assessment
(4) Identify accredited programs to the public
ABET Accredits Programs

- Programs lead to degrees
- All paths of study must be accreditable
- A program is described by
  - Objectives
  - Outcomes
  - Curriculum

  For purposes of accreditation review

- Transcript is primary evidence of degree

Philosophy

- Institutions and programs define mission and objectives to meet the needs of their constituents—enable program differentiation
- Emphasis on outcomes—preparation for professional practice
- Programs demonstrate how criteria and educational objectives are being met
Engineering Criteria—A Discussion of Common Compliance Issues

I. General Criteria for Basic Level Programs
II. Criteria for Advanced Level Programs

Opportunity for Discussion*

I. Basic Level Accreditation Criteria

1. Students
2. Program Educational Objectives
3. Program Outcomes and Assessment
4. Professional Component
5. Faculty
6. Facilities
7. Institutional Support & Financial Resources
8. Program Criteria
II. General Advanced Level Programs

- Criteria are the same as for basic level programs with the following additions:
  - One year of additional study
  - An engineering project or research activity with a report that demonstrates
    - Mastery of the subject matter
    - High level of communication skills
  - Changes proposed (see 2004-05 Criteria)
Students – Criterion 1

- The institution must evaluate, advise, and monitor students
- The institution must have and enforce policies for
  - transfer students
  - validation of courses taken for credit elsewhere
- The institution must have and enforce procedures to assure that all students meet program requirements

Issues for Criterion 1

- Problems with student advising (often cited with Criterion 5 - faculty)
  - Advising ad hoc
  - Ineffective and inconsistent advising
  - Lack of understanding of curricular requirements especially if many options are available
- Ineffective monitoring
  - Monitoring too ad hoc
  - No documentation of course substitutions or missing prerequisites
Issues for Criterion 1 - continued

- Problems with transfer students
  - Evaluation of transfer student credits *ad hoc*
  - No documentation on acceptability of transfer credits (primarily for engineering topics courses)

Program Educational Objectives - Criterion 2

- Program Educational Objectives:
  - statements that describe the expected accomplishments of graduates during the first *few years following graduation*
- Unique to the program and institution
- Consistent in all publications
Program Educational Objectives - Criterion 2

- Each program must have
  - Detailed published educational objectives
  - Process based on needs of constituencies in which objectives are determined and periodically evaluated
  - A curriculum and processes that prepare students for achievement of the objectives
  - A system of on-going evaluation that demonstrates achievement and uses results to improve the effectiveness of the program

Issues for Criterion 2

- Educational objectives not published or readily accessible to the public
- Limited or no constituency input
  - No evidence of constituency input in objective setting or periodic evaluation
- Lack of faculty buy-in or support
Issues for Criterion 2 - continued

- No systematic process for evaluating achievement of objectives
  - Little or no evidence of evaluation of achievement of objectives
  - Processes not fully implemented
  - Processes not defined or documented; mostly ad hoc

Issues for Criterion 2 - continued

- Little or no evidence of continuous improvement
  - No systematic process of on-going evaluation
  - Improvements made on an ad hoc basis rather than by a systematic process
  - Little data available to demonstrate achieving educational objectives
Criterion 2*
Opportunity for Discussion

Program Outcomes & Assessment - Criterion 3

- Program outcomes:
  - Statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation
  - The achievement of outcomes indicates that the student is equipped to achieve the program educational objectives
- ABET designated (a-k) included in some way
Program Outcomes and Assessment - Criterion 3

- Programs must demonstrate their graduates have outcomes “a to k”
- Programs must have an assessment process with documented results
- Evidence that the results of the assessment process are applied to the further development and improvement of the program

Issues for Criterion 3

- No evidence demonstrating one or more outcomes
- Outcomes not assessed objectively (student performance)
  - Anecdotal versus measured results
  - Reliance on course grades as assessment of outcomes
  - Over-reliance on self-assessment (e.g., surveys)
Issues for Criterion 3
(continued)

- No systematic assessment process
  - No process or process not documented
  - Plans developed but not implemented
  - Little or no faculty support for the process
- No evidence that assessment results are being applied to improve program
  - Changes are ad hoc; assessment results not used
  - Assessment & improvement cycle not complete

Criterion 3*
Opportunity for Discussion
Professional Component – Criterion 4

- Faculty must assure that the curriculum devotes adequate attention and time to each component, consistent with objectives of the program and institution
- Preparation for engineering practice
  - Major design experience
  - Subject areas appropriate to engineering

Issues for Criterion 4

- Quality of the major design experience
  - No culminating experience - analysis or research instead of design; several courses with elements of design
  - Multiple capstone courses with widely varying quality
  - Design experience does not address many of the constraints
- Engineering topics satisfied by electives, but advising doesn’t assure adequate coverage
Criterion 4*
Opportunity for Discussion

Faculty -Criterion 5

- Sufficient in number and competencies to cover all curricular areas
- Sufficient in number to accommodate adequate levels of student-faculty interaction, advising and counseling, service, professional development, and interactions with industrial and professional practitioners and employers
- Ensure proper guidance of the program and its evaluation, development, and improvement
Criterion 5 - Issues

- Insufficient number:
  - To support concentrations, electives, etc.
  - To provide student advising
- Poor faculty morale affecting program
  - Lack of professional development
  - Excessive workloads
  - Retention/turnover rate
  - Salaries as it relates to retention and recruiting (cited with Criterion 7)

Criterion 5 Issues - continued

- Faculty Quality
  - For teaching design (program criteria issues)
  - Excessive reliance on adjuncts
Facilities - Criterion 6

- Classrooms, laboratories, and associated equipment must be adequate to accomplish program objectives and provide an atmosphere conducive to learning
  - Opportunities to learn the use of modern engineering tools
  - Computing/information infrastructure to support scholarly activities of the students and faculty and the educational objectives of the institution

Criterion 6 - Issues

- Insufficient Space
  - Overcrowded laboratories and classrooms
- Laboratories
  - Unsafe conditions
  - Inoperable equipment
  - Lack of modern instrumentation
  - Lack of funds for upgrading (cited with Crit. 7)
- Computing/Information Infrastructure
  - Lack of funds for upgrading (cited with Crit. 7)
Institutional Support and Financial Resources - Criterion 7

- Institutional support, financial resources, and constructive leadership must be adequate to assure quality and continuity of the program
  - Attract, retain, and provide for professional development of a well-qualified faculty
  - Resources to acquire, maintain, and operate equipment and facilities
  - Adequate support personnel
  - Support of quality-improvement efforts

Criterion 7 - Issues

- Unstable leadership affecting programs
  - Dean/Dept Chair positions open or filled by "interim" appointments for an extended period
  - Frequent turnover of university administration and engineering school leadership
- Inadequate operating budget affecting:
  - Acquisition and maintenance of laboratories and computing equipment
  - Faculty salaries, promotions, and professional development affecting hiring and retention
Criterion 7 - Issues (continued)

- Insufficient Support Staff
  - Teaching assistants
  - Technicians for instructional laboratories, machine shops, and laboratory services
  - Administrative/clerical

Program Criteria – Criterion 8

- Each program must satisfy applicable Program Criteria
  - Curricular topics
  - Faculty qualifications
- Current Program Criteria are on the ABET server (www.abet.org)
- Must satisfy all Program Criteria implied by title of program
Criterion 8 – Issues

- Program does not meet curriculum or faculty Program Criteria requirements
- Name change invokes Program Criteria not anticipated by the program’s designers

Accreditation Terminology
Definitions

- **Deficiency**: assigned to any criterion that is totally or largely unmet
- **Weakness**: criterion is met to some meaningful extent, but compliance is insufficient to fully satisfy requirements
- **Concern**: criterion is fully met, but there is potential for non-compliance in the near future
- **Observation**: general commentary possibly related to criteria

Possible Accreditation Actions

NGR  Next General Review
IR   Interim Report
IV   Interim Visit
SC   Show Cause
RE   Report Extended
VE   Visit Extended
SE   Show Cause Extended
NA   Not to Accredit
### Terminology vs. Action
#### General Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminology</th>
<th>Results of Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>No        Yes        Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>No        No        No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review</th>
<th>Possible Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General (comprehensive)</td>
<td>NGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following a SC</td>
<td>NGR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Terminology vs. Action
#### Interim Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminology</th>
<th>Results of Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>No        Yes        Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>No        No        No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review</th>
<th>Possible Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interim (focused)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit</td>
<td>VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit following SC</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Actions and Durations

#### General Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak?</th>
<th>Def?</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Duration (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NGR</td>
<td>Next General Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Interim Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Interim Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Show Cause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Interim Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak?</th>
<th>Def?</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Duration (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Report Extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>VE</td>
<td>Visit Extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Show Cause Extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Interim Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Interim Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Show Cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not to Accredit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interim Action
Recommendations: IR vs IV

- **Interim Visit**: recommended when degree of resolution cannot be determined by review of a report or when previous written information has not been effective in providing the necessary evidence. Requires a review by an evaluator on campus (e.g., student work, lab safety)

- **Interim Report**: recommended when resolution of shortcomings can be described by a report (e.g., faculty hiring); the current PEV and TC may review the interim report, assess progress, prepare a statement (Minor U), and recommend accreditation action

---

Interim Actions:
IR vs. IV

- Interim evaluations
  - Generally focus *only* on identified deficiencies (if Show Cause) or weaknesses
  - If a program chooses to address concerns, the team should evaluate their resolution
    - Significant deterioration surrounding a concern may become a weakness or deficiency
  - Even if a program does not address concerns, the team should determine if the situation has deteriorated significantly
  - TC and deans should discuss the issues before the visit
Consistency Issues

Consistency Checks

- Overall considerations
  - Accreditation actions must be consistent across all institutions
  - Accreditation actions must be consistent with those given for other programs with similar shortcomings (weaknesses, deficiencies)
  - Consistency is checked at five levels to various degrees of detail
Consistency Checks

Professional Societies

EAC Meeting

Team Chairs

Editor 1

Editor 2

Team Chairs check among evaluators

ABET HQ: Accreditation Director

Director checks higher-level consistency

Consistency Issues for Teams

- The depth and completeness of the evaluation from program to program
- Consistency across all programs in an institution
- The assignment of appropriate key terms (deficiency, weakness, concern) to describe shortcomings
- For weaknesses, consistency on interim recommendations—IR vs. IV
Consistency Issues for Criteria 2 & 3

- Most consistency issues have centered on Criteria 2 and 3
- TCs and evaluators should understand the institution's use of own terminology relevant to these criteria
- Requirements of the criteria should be clear to TCs and PEVs

Criterion 2 - Program Educational Objectives

- Program educational objectives:
  - statements that describe the expected accomplishments of graduates during the first few years after graduation
- Unique to the program and institution
- Consistent in all publications
Criterion 2 - Program Educational Objectives

- Consider a deficiency if the general intent of Criterion 2 is not met.

- Contributing factors may include:
  - No involvement of constituencies
  - No process-oriented approach to achieving objectives (links to curriculum)
  - No process-oriented approach to evaluate achievement of objectives
  - No data that demonstrate the extent to which objectives are met
  - No evidence of program improvement based on evaluative processes

Criterion 2 - Program Educational Objectives

- Consider a weakness if the general intent of Criterion 2 is met to some extent, but not fully met.

- Contributing factors may include:
  - Objectives are published but are not accessible to constituencies and potential students
  - Limited or ad hoc involvement of constituencies
  - Incomplete process to achieving objectives (links to curriculum are not clear)
  - Incomplete process-oriented approach to evaluating achievement of objectives
  - Evidence of program improvement based on ad hoc processes
Criterion 2 - Program Educational Objectives

- Consider a concern if the general intent of the criterion is fully met, but minor issues may lead to lack of compliance in the future.
- Contributing factors may include:
  - Objectives are published, but are changed frequently
  - Objectives are evaluated, but there is limited involvement of constituencies in this process or it varies from cycle to cycle (2b)
  - Program improvement processes may rely too heavily on one person

Criterion 3 - Program Outcomes & Assessment

- Program outcomes:
  - Statements that describe what students are expected to know and are able to do by the time of graduation
  - Achievement of outcomes indicates that the student is equipped to achieve the program educational objectives
- ABET designated (a-k) included in some way
Criterion 3 - Program Outcomes & Assessment

- Consider a **deficiency** if the general intent of Criterion 3 is **not met**
- Contributing factors may include:
  - No documented working process(es) to produce outcomes
  - Loop not closed on any outcomes
  - Absence of defined goals and documented assessment results
  - No assessment evidence that outcomes are achieved by students
  - No evidence of efforts at program improvement based on assessment

---

Criterion 3 - Program Outcomes & Assessment

- Consider a **weakness** if the general intent of Criterion 3 is met to **some extent, but not fully met**
- Contributing factors may include:
  - Absence of a working process(es) to produce some outcomes
  - Loop closed on some outcomes
  - Defined goals and documented assessment results for some outcomes
  - Absence of assessment evidence for a small number of outcomes
  - Incomplete or ad hoc evidence of efforts at program improvement based on assessment
Criterion 3 - Program Outcomes & Assessment

- Consider a concern if the general intent of the criterion is fully met, but minor issues may lead to lack of compliance in the future.
- Contributing factors may include:
  - Process to produce some outcomes is possibly inconsistent and may lead to circumstances in which their quality is insufficient to meet program metrics.
  - Loop closed on most outcomes, but some important assessment results have not been acted upon.
  - Inconsistent coverage or assessment of a small number of outcomes, e.g., with variation from year to year in the same course taught by different faculty members—may be overly dependent on one person.

Decision Exercises

Small group discussions
Decision Exercise #1

Topic: Criterion 3

Self Study & On Campus Visit Summary

- Demonstration of achievement and assessment of (a) - (k) is via student surveys administered at the end of each course. Students surveys are “self-appraisals” on attainment of (a-k) outcomes.
- Curriculum does cover all eleven outcomes.
- Quantitative survey results typically exceed metrics for performance set by faculty.
- While a process is in place for using survey results for further development and improvement of the program, survey results have not warranted the need for improvement.

Visit team options

- **No shortcomings:** Criterion satisfied
- **Concern:** Assessment process not effective for development/improvement of program
- **Weakness:** Surveys alone do not provide adequate assessment or demonstration of student outcomes as required by Criterion 3.
- **Deficiency:** Lack of an effective process for outcomes assessment; results not being applied for further development/improvement of program.
Decision Exercise #1

- Assume that the evaluator has investigated and found little or no evidence of other methods being used to demonstrate and measure achievement of student outcomes.

Decision Exercise #2

**Topic: Recommended Action**

- **Visit - Criterion 3 Related Weaknesses**
  - Lack of evidence demonstrating achievement of (a-k)
  - *Ad-hoc* assessment processes

- **Due Process Response**
  - Will formalize use of survey instruments to assess (a-k)
  - Have scheduled a faculty retreat to review survey results, identify and take steps to initiate program improvement.

- **Final Statement**
  - Weakness remains pending implementation of plan

**Final Action = Interim Visit (IV) or Interim Report (IR)??**
Decision Exercise #3
Topic: Criterion 4

Realistic design constraints

- Required: consideration of “most of the following design constraints: economic, environmental, sustainability, manufacturability, ethical, health and safety, social, political.”
- Student design reports show that only a few of the realistic constraints are included.

Decision Exercise #3

Possible scenarios during the visit

- **No shortcomings:** Additional student work shows the inclusion of other design constraints. Observation cited—the program should better document its compliance with Criterion 4.
- **Concern:** Program chair indicates that three of the constraints are always covered in design projects. Two other constraints are covered in a separate (non-capstone) course. A concern—capstone design course should culminate in an integration and synthesis of the required constraints implying that this should be done in one course.
- **Weakness:** Additional discussion with course instructor verifies that most of the constraints are not considered.
- **Weakness:** Course instructor shows other student reports that include consideration of other constraints. However, it appears that not all students have had the same experience. The criterion requirements apply to all, not just some, of the students.

Consider decision on each scenario—o.k. or not?
Decision Exercise #4
Topic: Criterion 3

- Not all (a-k) outcomes have been assessed.
  - Program claims that outcomes are all covered in various courses across the curriculum.
- The process in which results of assessment are applied to program improvement has not been completed.
- No assessment results were provided in the self-study or were made available on campus.
  - Program chair indicates they have been assessing through course surveys and student grades for several years.
  - The evaluator is provided with a summary of survey responses.
- The survey questions address student satisfaction with aspects of the course mechanics and the instructor’s teaching.

What is the most likely visit team recommendation??

Decision Exercise #4

What is the most likely visit team recommendation??

- **No shortcoming**: Although survey results have not been analyzed, it appears that students are satisfied with their program.
- **Concern**: The documentation demonstrating Criterion 3 could be improved.
- **Weakness**: The analysis and application of survey results are required in order to complete the process.
- **Deficiency**: The analysis and application of assessment results for program improvement are required in order to comply with Criterion 3. Also, Criterion 3 requires the demonstration of the eleven outcomes (a-k). Student course satisfaction surveys and student grades do not provide the necessary evidence.
Decision Exercise #5
Topic: Criterion 2

Publication of Program Educational Objectives

- Four of five programs do not have their educational objectives published anywhere. The fifth program has objectives published on the web, but not in the college undergraduate catalog nor in promotional materials given to enrolled and prospective students.

- For all five programs, all other aspects of Criterion 2 (a process based on the needs of constituencies, a curriculum that ensures that the objectives are achieved, and a system of on-going evaluation of objectives) are satisfied.

Shortcomings?

Decision Exercise #5

- All five programs are **deficient** because the objectives are not published where prospective students and the general public might look for them.

- Four programs: **deficient** with respect to Criterion 2. 5th program: **weakness** cited because its educational objectives are not available to its constituencies at large.

- All five programs: **weakness** cited for each program; the programs lack strength of full compliance.

- Four programs: cited with a **weakness** 5th program: cited with a **concern** (or observation)

- Four programs: cited with a **concern** 5th program: **no shortcoming** cited
The Accreditation Process

- Pre-Visit Activities
- Campus Visit
- Post-Visit Activities
The Accreditation Process

Pre-Visit Activities

Program Self-Study Report

Institutions send a copy of all self-study reports to the team chair

- Background Information
- Accreditation Summary
  - This is the focal point of the Self-Study Report
- Appendix I – Program Tabular Information
- Appendix II – Institutional Profile

Institutions send Program-specific reports + institutional profile to evaluators and observers
Terminology

- The institution is free to use its own terms in the context of the criteria
- Program Evaluator and TC should understand institution’s terminology
- The use of different terms and definitions within an institution introduces the potential for misunderstanding

Note on Program Titles

- Caution about program titles—be aware that program titles with multiple names may need to satisfy criteria for more than one program
  - May require multiple evaluators
  - For example, a program in civil and environmental engineering needs one civil engineering program evaluator and one environmental engineering program evaluator
Joint Visits

Joint visits occur when evaluation teams from two or more Commissions visit an institution at the same time.

- Dual Visit – Occurs when a program must be evaluated by two or more Commissions.
  - Example: a Computer Science and Engineering program must be evaluated by both CAC and EAC
  - More stringent action applies
- Simultaneous Visit – Occurs when two or more Commissions are scheduled in the same year and the institution requests that these visits occur at the same time.
  - Separate actions by each Commission

Pre-Visit Inputs/Resources for the Team

- From EAC/ABET
  - TC Workbook: latest version of Criteria, Manual of Evaluation Process, Evaluator Program Report forms, example statement formats, letters...
  - PEV Workbook: all PEV materials
  - General plan for visit
  - Relevant information regarding previous visit
- From Institution
  - Program Self-Study Report, catalogs, brochures, guides
  - Student transcripts
- From Professional Society
  - Program Evaluators and Society Observers
Transcript Evaluation

- The team chair’s 1st letter to the dean requests:
  - Transcripts (# and method of selection)
  - Related transcript analysis materials

- Program Evaluators will:
  - Determine if curriculum is being followed
  - Ask if a “work sheet” exists, if none was provided
  - Determine if deviations meet ABET requirements
  - Determine if transcript clearly indicates the title of the program being evaluated
  - Note that curriculum may be different than one being evaluated

Pre-Visit Communications

- While it is appropriate for both the Program Chairs and the Dean to assist in making arrangements, the Team Chair and the Program Evaluators should specify who they will interview and the order desired

- Programs must demonstrate compliance with the criteria

- TC and PEVs should not ask for make-work changes (e.g., rearrangement of the display of course materials and other evidence)
Pre-Visit Communications (cont'd)

- Based on review of self-study materials, the Team Chair must encourage each Program Evaluator to convey to each Program Chair a clear sense of additional information needed for a complete early analysis.
- Do not share preliminary conclusions prior to the Campus Visit.
- Keep the Dean in the loop on all communications in order that he/she knows what Program Chairs are being asked to do.

The Accreditation Process

Campus Visit
Objectives Of Campus Visit

- Make a qualitative assessment of factors that cannot be documented in a written questionnaire
- Conduct a detailed examination of the materials compiled by the Institution
- Provide the institution with a preliminary assessment of its strengths and shortcomings
- Assist the institution in its quality improvement efforts

Campus Visit Activities

Day 0 (Sunday)

- Initial team meeting
  - Review visit plan
  - Program Evaluators provide reports to Team Chair
  - Pre-visit assessment
  - Review key terms and possible actions
- Visit programs to evaluate materials
TC and Evaluator Schedules

- TC’s schedule will be different from evaluators’ schedules
  - Some overlap—dean’s presentation, luncheons, and local team travel
- TC will interview institutional officers and staff
- Evaluators will meet mainly with program faculty, staff, students, and support program representatives

Example of Times for TC Schedule - Monday

8:00 AM - 9:00 AM    Team meets with Engineering Admin.
9:00 AM - 12:00 N    TC meets with Dean, Assoc. Dean, President, Provost, Registrar, Finance, Admissions, Placement, Assessment
12:00 N - 1:30 PM    Optional luncheon; meetings as per team requirements
1:30 PM - 4:00 PM    Continue meetings with college/institutional officials
4:00 PM - 4:45 PM    Prepare for team meeting
5:00 PM - ?          ABET team meeting and dinner
Campus Visit Activities

Day 1 (Monday AM)

- Team meeting with Dean and Dean’s guests
- Individual meetings with Dean and Program Chairs
- Meet with program teams, faculty, students, and support staff (appointments based on pre-visit assessment)
- Luncheon with institutional officials and guests (optional)

Campus Visit Activities

Day 1 (Monday PM)

- Continue meetings and interviews
- Visit facilities (as time permits)
- Evening team meeting
  - Report on findings relative to previously identified potential deficiencies, weaknesses, and concerns
  - Discuss possible accreditation action
- Prepare Draft Exit Interview Statements
Campus Visit Activities

Day 2 (Tuesday AM)
- Follow-up meetings with faculty and staff
- Finalize Exit Interview Statements
- Brief Program Chairs and Dean on findings
- Private Team meeting (Luncheon)
- Program Evaluators provide drafts of program Exit Interview Statements to Team Chair

Day 2 (Tuesday PM)
- Program Evaluators provide Team Chair with program evaluator reports
- Team Chair prepares exit interview narrative and discussion of any institutional issues
Campus Visit Activities

Day 2 (Tuesday PM)

- Program Evaluators provide Team Chair with:
  - Program Audit Form (a copy will be left with the Institution)
  - Complete Table A-1: Level of Implementation for General Review visits
- Team conducts Exit Interview

Campus Visit Activities

Day 2 (Tuesday PM)

- Exit Interview
  - University CEO (or dean) determines who is present
  - Team Chair provides introductory remarks/thanks & facilitates meeting
  - Program Evaluators read program statements
  - Observers make no evaluative statements
  - Team will entertain clarification questions only
  - Team Chair explains subsequent process (14-day response, due-process response, etc.)
  - Leave PAFs with dean—note new explanatory cover page
The Program Audit Form (PAF) & Summary of the Accreditation Process

ABET
Engineering Accreditation Commission

PROGRAM AUDIT FORM
Summary of the Accreditation Process after a Visit

The attached Program Audit Form (PAF) summarizes the visit team's initial assessment of each program being considered for accreditation and/or extension of accreditation by ABET.

The PAF has two parts. The first part summarizes the team's recommendation for shortcomings in each of the eight criteria. Shortcomings are shown as a Deficiency (D), Weakness (W), or Concern (C). Definitions of the shortcomings are included on the first page of the PAF. The second part of the PAF provides a detailed description of any shortcomings identified during the visit.

Subsequent to the departure of the visit team, the due process period will begin. Due process is a critical part of the accreditation effort and consists of the following steps:

- 14-day response: Each program has 14 days after the team's departure to respond to the
  Team Chair in one of more of text. This letter must include detailed levels of the team.

---

Program Audit Form

ABET
Engineering Accreditation Commission

PROGRAM AUDIT FORM
(PROVIDE A COPY TO INSTITUTION AT EXIT MEETING)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Program Evaluator</th>
<th>Program Criteria Used for Evaluation</th>
<th>Team Chair</th>
<th>Visit Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use &quot;C&quot; for concern, &quot;W&quot; for weakness, and &quot;D&quot; for deficiency in the appropriate line.</th>
<th>Shortcomings from Previous Review</th>
<th>Exit Interview</th>
<th>14-Day Response</th>
<th>Due Process</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IF THE PROGRAM HAS NO DEFICIENCIES OR WEAKNESSES, CHECK THIS LINE AT EACH APPROPRIATE TIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. STUDENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PROGRAM EDUCATIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of Implementation Form

Each evaluator completes this form at the conclusion of the visit. Each program has completed this form before the visit and the data for all visits during the current cycle will be accumulated for analysis after the current accreditation cycle is completed. The data gathered from the institutions will not be available to any part of the accreditation decision-making process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Factor</th>
<th>Score (1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exit Interview Program Statement

- Documentation of strengths, deficiencies, weaknesses, concerns, and observations (suggestions for improvement)
  - For shortcomings (D/W/C) address only those criteria in which they are found
  - Findings concerning evaluation and assessment processes in place
  - Use of results to improve effectiveness of program
- Must correlate to Program Audit Form (PAF)
The Accreditation Process

Post-Visit Activities

Objectives of Post-Visit Activities

- Institutional and program input and the 14-day response are incorporated into the Draft Statement to the Institution
- All parties to the visit have opportunity to provide input prior to accreditation action
- Accreditation action is consistent with those given to other programs with similar shortcomings
Post-Visit Process

- 14-Day Response from institution
  - Corrects errors of fact only
- Editing cycle
  - Two levels of editing by executive committee members
- Draft Statement prepared and sent to institution

Post-Visit Process

- 30-Day Due Process Response from institution
- Editing cycle
  - Review by two executive committee members
- EAC takes final accreditation action at EAC summer meeting
- ABET sends Final Statement and accreditation letter to institution
On-Going Resolution of Shortcomings

- Institution may submit supplemental material up to the time of annual EAC meeting
- Programs are encouraged to solve problems quickly—This is, in fact, the desired result!
- Final Statement considered by the Commission (EAC), which makes final decision on accreditation
- Only “Not to Accredit” can be appealed

---

### A2a “Short Form”

**ACREDITATION BOARD FOR ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY**

**RECOMMENDED ACTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Program Director</th>
<th>Accreditation</th>
<th>Before Due Process</th>
<th>After Due Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>Dr. John Smith</td>
<td>Accredited</td>
<td>9/30/2021</td>
<td>10/15/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>Dr. Jane Doe</td>
<td>Accredited</td>
<td>10/15/2021</td>
<td>11/30/2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- Color indicates action as of 9/30/2021
- Bold indicates program is non-Accredited
- Underline indicates program has been Accredited
- Italics indicate program status as of 11/30/2021

---
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Interim Report Review

- For 2004-05 cycle, institution submits report by 1 July 2004
- ABET HQ sends the TC the previous Statement to the Institution
- For institutions with both an interim visit (IV) and interim report (IR), TC for IV will also review IR
  - TC may discuss IR issues with the dean during campus visit in fall 2004 before IR report is due

Interim Report Review

- TC reviews Interim Report and writes a draft statement
  - Use Minor University format (Form E71
    - Sample IV-IR Statement)
  - Generate short form (A2a)
  - A PAF is not needed
  - Send statement and short form to your assigned editor
Interim Report Review

- ABET sends draft statement to institution
- IR due process follows the same timeline as due process steps for visits
  - Review due process response and incorporate appropriate information within two weeks
  - Update short form and boilerplate language for final statement
- Send to Editor

Final Comments
Considerations for Visit Success

- Institutions:
  - On-going compliance with the Criteria
  - Thorough preparation of Program Self-Study Reports
  - Supporting materials that are accessible and clearly tied to the outcomes that you wish to demonstrate
  - Timely 14-day and due-process responses
  - Good communication with Team Chair and Evaluators

- Team Chairs:
  - Careful pre-visit preparation
  - Thorough on-site visit
  - Exercise of sound judgment
  - All team decisions based on the criteria
  - Consistency in evaluations and recommendations
  - Timely preparation of reports
  - Good communication with Dean and Program Evaluators
More Information

- Reference material ([www.abet.org](http://www.abet.org)):
  - Accreditation Policy and Procedures
  - 2004-05 Criteria
  - Manual of Evaluation Process
  - New Team Chair Training and other Recent Presentations
  - Team Chair Workbooks (TCs only)
  - Program Evaluator and Observer Workbooks

Web Resources

- Information for Program Evaluators ([www.abet.org/info_prgs_eva.html](http://www.abet.org/info_prgs_eva.html))
  - PEV Workbook
    - All Program Evaluator forms and documents
    - New "white paper" on Criterion 3 Guidelines from EAC ExCom
- Information for Programs and Institutions ([www.abet.org/info_prgs.html](http://www.abet.org/info_prgs.html))
  - Self Study
  - Case Study
  - Deans' Day/Team Chair Training Presentation
Feedback

- Your feedback is a key component in our continuous improvement efforts.
- Institutions
  - Fill out the online team chair evaluation
  - Fill out the online visitor evaluations
- Team Chairs
  - Fill out the online visitor evaluations
- Please complete the feedback forms for this session!