ABET

Engineering Accreditation Commission

**PROGRAM EVALUATOR REPORT FOR 2016-2017 VISITS**

Instructions

*The Program Evaluator Report is* ***required*** *for each program being evaluated. It is completed by the Program Evaluator prior to and during the visit and left with the Team Chair.* ***Some technical societies require their evaluators to submit additional information. It is the responsibility of the evaluator to determine and meet this requirement.***

*The completed Program Evaluator Report consists of the following:*

* *Program Audit Form (E301)*
* *Program Evaluator Worksheet (E341)*
* *The E351 Report Form, which includes*
* *Basic Information Sheet*
* *Curriculum Analysis*
* *Transcript Analysis*
* *Recommended Accreditation Action*
* *Exit Statement*

For a General Review Visit, complete all forms listed above and submit them to the Team Chair at the conclusion of the visit.

*For an Interim Visit, the curriculum analysis and/or the transcript analysis may not be relevant. Complete those tables only if they are relevant to the identified shortcomings.*

*Complete the Curriculum Analysis Form, the Transcript Analysis Form, and the first column of the Program Evaluator Worksheet before the visit. Submit a copy to the Team Chair before the visit or at the first team meeting as directed. Modify the forms during the visit as required.*

*The* ***Program Evaluator Worksheet (E341)****,* ***Program Audit Form (E301), Recommended Accreditation Action (in E351), and Exit Statement to the Institution (in E351)*** *are of particular importance****.*** *Together, these form a basis from which the Team Chair will draft the Statement to the Institution. A copy of the* ***Program Audit Form*** *is to be left with the institution. Please, pay close attention to the instructions on these forms.*

ABET

Engineering Accreditation Commission

PROGRAM EVALUATOR REPORT FOR 2016-2017 VISITS

BASIC INFORMATION SHEET

*(RFE: Request for Evaluation Form)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation of |  | Program in |  |
|  | *RFE Degree Designation* |  | *Program Title as shown on the RFE* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| At |  |
|  | *Official name of institution as shown on the RFE* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Dates of Visit: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluated by: |  |
|  | *Name* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  | *Address* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | *Office Phone* |  | *Home Phone* |  | *Fax* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  | *e-mail* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Society Represented by Program Evaluator: |  |
|  | *Society* |

Evaluation conducted in accordance with EAC General Criteria and the following applicable Program Criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Program Criteria* |
|  |  |
|  |  |

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| NAME | POSITION |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### ABET

Engineering Accreditation Commission

##### CURRICULUM ANALYSIS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Institution | *[as shown on the RFE]* | Program | *[as shown on the RFE]* |

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS WORKSHEET PRIOR TO YOUR ARRIVAL AT THE INSTITUTION AND PROVIDE ONE COPY OF THE CURRICULUM ANALYSIS TO YOUR TEAM CHAIR BEFORE OR AT THE START OF THE VISIT AS DIRECTED. INCLUDE A COPY IN YOUR REPORT, REVISED AS NECESSARY TO REFLECT YOUR ANALYSIS OF ACTUAL COURSE CONTENT DURING THE VISIT.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Curricular  Category | Number of Credits\* | | | | |
| Criteria  Requirement | Table 5-1  of Self-Study | | PEV’s Evaluation | |
| College-level Mathematics and Basic Sciences |  |  | |  | |
| Engineering Topics |  |  | |  | |
| General Education |  |  | |  | |
|  | | | | | |
| Please List Below Any Applicable Program Criteria: | | Is Program Criteria Requirement Met?  (per Table 5-1 of Self-Study) | | Is Program Criteria Requirement Met? (per PEV evaluation) | |
|  | | YES | NO | YES | NO |
|  | |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |

\* One year is the lesser of 32 semester hours (or equivalent) or one-fourth of the total credits required for graduation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Are curricular requirements met in each of the following areas?** | **YES** | **NO** |
| Major design experience based on knowledge and skills acquired in earlier course work. |  |  |
| Major design experience incorporates appropriate engineering standards and multiple realistic constraints. |  |  |
| Other requirements contained in applicable program criteria |  |  |

If “no” is checked in any of the above categories, please describe the specific weakness or deficiency on the PEV Worksheet (E341) and Program Audit Form (E301) as appropriate.

### ABET

Engineering Accreditation Commission

##### TRANSCRIPT ANALYSIS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Institution | *[as shown on the RFE]* | Program | *[as shown on the RFE]* |

PLEASE COMPLETE TWO DRAFT COPIES OF THIS WORKSHEET PRIOR TO YOUR ARRIVAL AT THE INSTITUTION AND PROVIDE ONE COPY TO YOUR TEAM CHAIR AT THE START OF THE VISIT. PLEASE INCLUDE A COPY IN YOUR REPORT, REVISED IF NECESSARY TO REFLECT YOUR ANALYSIS OF ACTUAL COURSE CONTENT.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ABET  Curricular  Category | Number of Credits\* | | | | | | | | | | |
| ABET Criteria  Requirement | Credits Actually Earned by Student Number | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| College-level Mathematics and Basic Sciences |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Engineering Topics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please List Below Any Applicable Program Criteria: | | Is Program Criteria Requirement Met?  YES or NO | | | | | | | | | |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* Computed as in curriculum analysis table.

**RECOMMENDED ACCREDITATION ACTION FORM**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution** | *[as shown on the RFE]* | **Program** | *[as shown on the RFE]* |
| **Evaluator** |  |  |  |

\_\_\_ NGR This action indicates that the program has no Deficiencies or Weaknesses. This action is taken only after a Comprehensive General Review and has a typical duration of six years.

\_\_\_ RE This action indicates that satisfactory remedial action has been taken by the institution with respect to Weaknesses identified in the prior IR action. This action is taken only after an IR review. This action extends accreditation to the next General Review and has a typical duration of either two or four years.

\_\_\_ VE This action indicates that satisfactory remedial action has been taken by the institution with respect to Weaknesses identified in the prior IV action. This action is taken only after an IV review. This action extends accreditation to the next General Review and has a typical duration of either two or four years.

\_\_\_ SE This action indicates that satisfactory remedial action has been taken by the institution with respect to all Deficiencies and Weaknesses identified in the prior SC action. This action is taken only after either a SCR or SCV review. This action typically extends accreditation to the next General Review and has a typical duration of either two or four years.

\_\_\_ IR This action indicates that the program has no Deficiencies but has one or more Weaknesses. The Weaknesses are such that a progress report will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. This action has a typical duration of two years.

\_\_\_ IV This action indicates that the program has no Deficiencies but has one or more Weaknesses. The Weaknesses are such that an on-site review will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. This action has a typical duration of two years.

\_\_\_ SCR This action indicates that a currently accredited program has one or more Deficiencies. The Deficiencies are such that a progress report will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. This action has a typical duration of two years. This action cannot follow a previous SC action for the same Deficiency(s).

\_\_\_ SCV This action indicates that a currently accredited program has one or more Deficiencies. The Deficiencies are such that an on-site review will be required to evaluate the remedial actions taken by the institution. This action has a typical duration of two years. This action cannot follow a previous SC action for the same Deficiency(s).

\_\_\_ NA This action indicates that the program has Deficiencies such that the program is not in compliance with the applicable criteria. This action is usually taken only after a SCR or SCV review, or the review of a previously unaccredited program. Accreditation is not extended as a result of this action.

If this is a new program, indicate the date at which accreditation is to begin.

Normally accreditation is retroactive for one year such that it applies to all

students who graduated after October 1 of the year preceding the on-site

review (see the “retroactive year” column in the Program Information section

of the Request for Evaluation Form and section II.G.7 of the Accreditation

Policy and Procedure Manual). \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**EXIT STATEMENT TO THE INSTITUTION**

INSTRUCTIONS (NOT to be read at exit meeting)

The sample exit statement that follows should be used as a template for the overall outline and formatting for a general review, but the wording should represent the Program Evaluator’s findings for the current visit relative to the applicable General Criteria, Program Criteria, and Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (APPM). For an Interim Review, please follow the outline and format found in E411- Sample IV Statement.

The general outline for all statements should be as follows: 1) General Description of the Program, 2) Strengths (if applicable), 3) Shortcomings and 4) Observations.

The General Description of the Program normally includes information about the program’s administrative location at the institution, its enrollment and faculty size, and number of recent graduates. For new programs, the General Description also includes information on the launch date of the program and the date of its initial graduates.

Each program strength should have three components: a) the observed facts that represent the strength, b) what makes it stand out above the norm, and c) what positive effect it has on the program.

The Shortcomings sections should be in order of 1) Deficiencies, 2) Weaknesses and 3) Concerns, and a section should exist only if one or more Criteria or APPM elements have that type of shortcoming. For a GR, include all shortcomings for one Criterion under the most stringent shortcoming. For example, if a program has a Weakness and a Concern in Criterion 3, then include the descriptions for both the Weakness and the Concern in the Weaknesses section, identified as Criterion 3. In describing specific deficiencies, weaknesses, or concerns, use the exact language from the criteria where possible. For an IV, the shortcomings should be listed at the level from the previous review (with any new shortcomings inserted into the appropriate section).

Please ensure that any shortcoming relates directly to the Criteria or APPM. Each shortcoming should have three components: a) the applicable part of the criterion, using the exact language from the Criteria or APPM where possible, b) the observed facts that are inconsistent or potentially inconsistent with the stated criterion or APPM element, and c) the negative impact on the program of the inconsistencies or potential inconsistencies. It is essential that all deficiencies and/or weaknesses identified on the Program Audit Form, which could lead to an action different than NGR, be discussed in this statement exactly as they are discussed in the Program Audit Form.

While there are no institutional shortcomings, to save time during the Exit Meeting, the Team Chair may read the citations for any of shortcomings common to all of the programs that were evaluated, first explaining that they were common to all programs. However, the shortcoming(s) will be cited in each program section in the Draft and Final Statements as applicable.

Observations do not relate to findings relative to the Criteria or APPM. They may include suggestions based on the Program Evaluator’s experience, and are provided in the interest of general program improvement. They must not appear prescriptive, and have no consequence relative to accreditation if ignored by the institution.

PROGRAM EXIT STATEMENT

**(**TO BE READ AT EXIT MEETING – DO NOT LEAVE A COPY WITH THE INSTITUTION)

Widget Engineering

BS Program

Introduction

The widget engineering BS program is administered by the Widget and Gadget Engineering Department, and is the oldest and largest engineering program in the college. The program has 224 students, 20 faculty members, four adjunct faculty members, and two professional staff members who advise students from their sophomore year through graduation. The program produced 47 graduates in the 2014-15 academic year. Almost 60 percent of the widget engineering students participate in the cooperative education program.

Program Strengths

1. The program has an outstanding faculty that is committed to developing a high-quality undergraduate program. Several faculty members have published widget engineering textbooks that are widely used in widget engineering curricula across the country. The faculty also demonstrates significant engagement in contemporary teaching methods in the classroom. Multimedia presentations are common in the widget engineering courses. These various teaching strategies enhance learning opportunities for all students since students have different learning styles.

2. The program has a large endowment that provides discretionary funds for curriculum and research development both for department faculty members and for visiting scholars. A portion of this endowment has been used to support the Research Program for Widget Engineering Undergraduates through the purchase of research equipment and for financial support of the student and faculty participants. This endowment has contributed to student participation in research.

Program Weaknesses

1. Criterion 2. Program Educational Objectives This criterion requires that a program have published program educational objectives that are consistent with the mission of the institution, the needs of the program’s various constituencies, and these criteria. There must be a documented, systematically utilized, and effective process, involving program constituencies, for the periodic review of these program educational objectives that ensures they remain consistent with the institutional mission, the program’s constituents’ needs, and these criteria. It was not clear from the documentation provided that the program educational objectives incorporate the needs of the constituencies of the program. The program lists its students, faculty, industrial advisory board, major employers, and alumni as constituencies. There is no evidence that any of these groups, aside from the faculty members, participated in the periodic review of the program educational objectives. Without participation by all of the program constituents in reviewing the program educational objectives, the program is unable to ensure its program educational objectives are consistent with the needs of its various constituencies. Thus, strength of compliance with this criterion is lacking.

2. Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual The Accreditation Policy and Procedure Manual (APPM) requires that programs represent their accreditation status accurately and without ambiguity. The statement on the departmental website is inconsistent with that contained in Section II.A.6 of the APPM and is associated with multiple programs offered by the department but not accredited by the EAC. Review of the current university catalog indicates that this publication is correct. By not identifying the widget engineering program as accredited by the EAC of ABET as required by the APPM, the program is unable to clearly represent its accreditation status accurately and without ambiguity. Thus, strength of compliance with this policy is lacking.

Program Concern

1. Criterion 8. Institutional Support This criterion requires that resources must be sufficient to acquire, maintain, and operate infrastructures, facilities, and equipment appropriate for the program. Equipment maintenance and modernization do not appear to be accomplished on a routine and proactive basis. As a result, laboratory facilities are not always functional. Students often work in laboratory teams that may be too large for each student to have a consistently meaningful hands-on learning experience. Although it appears that the criterion is currently satisfied, there is the potential that laboratory facilities may degrade so that future compliance with the criterion may be jeopardized.

Program Observation

1. Students expressed a desire for opportunities to meet with alumni role models and to learn about possible career paths. A program of regularly inviting speakers from industry to the campus to interact with students is offered as a suggestion for addressing this desire.